NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
December 30, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Year-end, 1981, presents a picture of tensions, turmoil and extreme volatility on the international scene. Indeed, not since the Cold War of the 1940s and 1950s has relations between the world's two major power blocs been as dangerously strained as they are today. Just yesterday American President Ronald Reagan imposed economic sanctions on the Soviet Union for what he said was its role in the Polish military declaration of martial law. The American President accused the Soviets of being responsible for the action taken by the Polish authorities. So all Soviet airline services to the United States will be suspended; the sale and export to the Soviets of all high-technology material and equipment will be stopped Soviet shipping will come under stricter control in terms of entering American ports; negotiations for a new long-term grain agreement will be suspended. But nothing will be done about the grain deals which are already in place and under which the Soviets will get hundreds of millions of tons of grain between now and September of next year. I would have thought that if the intentions was of hitting the Soviets where it hurts most, that huge flow of American grain now in the pipeline would have been immediately cut off. The catch here is that it would also have hurt the American farmers very badly. So the one immediate and strong economic weapon which would have hurt the Soviets instantly has not been brought into play. The other sanctions are, of course, likely to hurt in the long run; but not, I suggest, so as to make the Soviets back away from their present position. Another difficul

UWI Libraries

is that some of America's Western allies may become sanction-busters when their own economic interests are involved. For instance, the West Germans in particular and the West Europeans in general, all have a great vested interest in the massive gas-pipline project which would carry vast amounts of natural gas from the Soviet arctic area to Western Europe. This project, when completed would provide Western Europe with a massive new supply of energy at relatively reasonable prices. The Americans have already tried to discourage the Europeans from entering into commitments with the Soviets about this; but the Europeans have gone ahead all the same; and there is no doubt that the Europeans will help the Soviets to get all the equipment they need for the pipeline, whatever the Americans do. In this sense, the so-called 'political will' to join in punishing the Soviets may be rather weak among America's European allies: and it is not all that easy to whip a bunch of sovereign states into line behind America's hardline Soviet policy, especially when it runs, or appears to run counter to important national self-interests. But if the Americans are not having it all their own way with their allies, neither are the Soviets. The Chinese communists, the Rumanian communists, the Yugoslav communists have all denounced the Soviet role in both Afghanistan and Poland. And yesterday the Italian communist party published its own 'bill of particulars' against Soviet policy. And within the tightly controlled Soviet bloc itself, dissent, unpopular views, keep popping up. Ideas are stubborn things: the more you try to control them the more they slip out: be it in Eastern Europe or Central America or Africa or Asia. Neither of the superpowers are having it all their own way with allies or clients. And indications are that this trend toward self-interested independence of ideological blocs and moulds will grow during what looks like being a politically volatile and dangerous 1982.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Year-End, 1981. I

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
December 28, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Christmas, 1981, has turned out to be a happier and relatively more peaceful time than most Jamaicans have known in many years. Partly it had to do with the money in circulation and all the things that were available in the shops and supermarkets; but I suspect that it had much more to do with the dramatic cooling down in the political atmosphere, the scaling down of party political activity. Much of the political tension had gone out of everyday life; choices had been made and most people knew what they were at. Life and home were again relatively secure and all sorts of anxieties were eased. And so Christmas, 1981, was a happy and tranquil affair for most of us in Jamaica. Of course, the problems and the difficulties were and are still there and will continue to be there as long as there are people. And I thought that Mr. Winston Jones, the former Manchester MP and Minister of Social Security in the last regime, touched on one of the most nagging of our problems when he spoke at a Christmas Tree lighting ceremony. Mr. Jones said, and I quote: "Jamaicans are too intolerant of each others' views, and that is why the country cannot make any meaningful development". End quote. Mr. Jones made it clear to his audience that he was talking about religious and social intolerance, as well as about political intolerance. One just retort I have heard, and it applies to all politicians of all parties, is that politicians only tend to make this sort of statement when they are out of power. Be that as it may, the truth is that the intolerance is there and even appears to be fostered in some quarters. And if this intolerance of each others'

UWI Libraries

views were to become a norm in the society then it is only a short step to the point where unpopular views are suppressed. And whoever else and whatever else might benefit from the suppression of unpopular views, democracy and freedom of expression will be the principal victims: there is no way that we can enhance and strengthen our own democratic rights and freedoms by being intolerant of the rights and freedoms of those whose views we may detest. If, in order to fight the communist or rightwing dictatorship methods of a controlled and managed news media, we impose the same kind of control and management on our news media, then the qualitative difference between them and us disappears, and with it the superior morality of our cause. The means you use are as important as the ends you are after. This is one of the things that makes democracy such a difficult political system to operate. So tolerance of each others' views - within the limits of the law, of course - is fundamental to democracy. We must tolerate and allow free expression to as wide a range of outlets and as great a diversity of views as possible in order that our democracy may grow and flourish. This, I think, must be one of the concerns of year-end 1981 and one of the wishes for 1982. And away from Jamaica the traumatic goings on in Poland continued to dominate the news and looks like doing so well into the New Year. In a political system where might is right and the ultimate language of force prevails it does not look as though there can be any other outcome than the busting of the Solidarity trade union movement. Short of going into Poland with military force there is little that the Western powers can do beyond condemnation and limited economic action. And they are not even agreed on what to do. West Germany is the most cautious and careful and against any hasty action: she is Poland's biggest creditor. France is all for tough action. Britain and the U.S. hold positions somewhere inbetween these two extremes. Meanwhile the Polish people suffer and endure. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Christmas, 1981

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
December 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: About this time last year, a day or two before Christmas, 1980, the Bank of Jamaica told us that the money in circulation at the time stood just above $300-million. This time around, for Chritmas 1981, there is roughly $340-million in circulation; and we are told that this figure may be exceeded by several million dollars more before tomorrow's final shopping is over. So in terms of money in circulation this should be a very good Christmas. And there is a greater sense of security and peace in the land than we have had in a very long time; and that too will make for a very good Christmas. That is, of course, for those Jamaicans who are fortunate enough to have the money and to be in jobs: and a majority of Jamaicans are in jobs and have the money. At the very least two-thirds of the Jamaican workforce is still working and earning. For them there will be more goodies in the shops than we have seen in years and Christmas 1981 will be merry and bright. Of course we will all bawl about prices but we will pay what we have to and have a good time. But there is that significant minority who are unemployed and there is the poor for whom Christmas, 1981, will not be a very good time. And one of the sad things is that so many of the unemployed are young, in their teens and in their twenties. When I grew up Christmas was a time of joy and of hope for the young. It is worrying that so many of the young these days have so little to hope for. This is not so only in Jamaica; there seems to be a worldwide alienation of the young in our time. It

UWI Libraries

is, I think, a challenge to the value system by which we live that there should be 'no room' in it all over the world for so many young people. And then there are the old and the lonely; and this years particularly we think of the pensioners whose pensions have not been posted out on time, and of those whose little remittances are held up because of the sluggish pace of the postal service in the absence of overtime or extra hands. And talking about the labour aspect to Christmas, let us remind ourselves that the 'Christmas bonus' began as a gesture of appreciation from a satisfied employer to his or her employees who have given good service for the year resulting in a financially successful year of business. The bonus was a thank-you gesture, not a right. Where the service given was not satisfactory or the business was not profitable, no bonus was given. Now, the bonus seems to be seen as a 'right' to which workers are entitled whether or not they worked well for the year and whether or not the business was profitable. Some have even struck because they did not get the bonus or because they did not like its size. This may very well be one of the reasons why many manggements are reluctant to make gestures of appreciation in case they are converted into 'workers' rights'. This, too, is worthy of a passing thought this Christmas. So, as well as a peaceful and happy Christmas, make it a thoughtful one too. Think about the young people entering a difficult and trying adulthood at an economically rough and socially volatile time, not only in Jamaica but throughout the world. And think of the old and the lonely and those who are so much less fortunate. That, after all, is what the season of Christmas is all about: it is about the birth of a baby, about family, about peace on earth and about goodwill among people. So, peace and love, and have a good Christamas.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Zimbabwe's Troubles

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
December 21, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Last Friday's bomb blast which destroyed the headquarters of the ruling political party in Zimbabwe was, according to the latest information out of Salisbury, set to go off at a time when the leaders of the ZANU-PF party, including Mr. Robert Mugabe, were expected to be at a regular executive meeting there. If that meeting had been held, all the leaders present would most likely have been killed and Zimbabwe would have been plunged into a deep political crisis. It was the sheerest accident that the meeting had been put off because Prime Minister Mugabe was preparing to visit Mozambique. But the try was made; and if it had been successful the effects might have been very much more far-reaching than that bomb blast earlier this year which blew up the headquarters of Iran's ruling party and killed so many of that country's political leaders, including the then key figure Ayatollah Behesti. Iran survived that mass slaughter and the later assassination of its Prime Minister, without any change in political direction. If Robert Mugabe had been killed it is very doubtful that Zimbabwe would be able to maintain its present direction, or indeed, its present relative stability. Chances are that without Mugabe on the scene there would be renewed fighting for political power and Ian Smith's people, now waiting in the wings, would again start the manoeuvreing to regain control if not direct power. They have shown how skilful they are at that; and they would almost certainly try for an alliance with Joshua Nkomo, with Nkomo as Prime Minister. In terms of tribal arithmetic Nkomo, the leader of the Ndabele would need the support of Ian Smith's white tribe

UWI Libraries

as well as some of the other smaller black tribes if he was to have any hope of winning against Mugabe's dominant Shona tribe. So much was at stake with that bomb blast last Friday. And because the stakes are so high other attempts may be made or, fearing this, the Mugabe government may now resort to large-scale repression to anticipate any likely future attempts. Either way, its spells trouble for Zimbabwe. That is on the power political front. There could also be trouble on the economic front. Last month Prime Minister Mugabe introduced legislation to double the national minimum wage and Zimbabwe's white farmers, the largest employers of unskilled labour in the country, let out an almighty howl of protest. A one hundred percent increase on any scale of wages, or a one hundred percent price increase, is massive indeed. But of course much depends on the size of the numbers involved: from one penny to two pennies is as much a 100% increase as is from $100 to $200 or a $1000 to $2000 or $10,000 to $20,000. In Zimbabwe's case the 100% increase in the minimum wage brought it up to £34-Zimbabwe a month or in terms of our money to just slightly over $112 a month. The white farmers protested that they could not pay their labour this amount and warned of wholesale lay-offs unless the increase was scaled down. The mass of the black Zimbabwe unskilled workers, on the otherhand, see this increase as only a modest first instalment of fhe better quality of life they had been promised. So Mr. Mugabe is caught between the pressures of black expectations on the one side and resistance to the scale and pace of the fulfilment of those expectations on the other. And the white farmers who are resisting are the key producers of the nation's wealth. Like it or not, Zimbabwe today cannot do without the skills and the industry of those farmers and others on whom the economy now depends and who are resisting the pace of change. That is Zimbabwe's dilemma. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) The Christmas Spirit & the News
2) The Perils of Being Proxies

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
December 18, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: With Christmas just one week away today one of the most natural impulses in nominally Christian communities is to enter into the spirit of Christmas, to put away cares and worries, and to see all things, all events, all men in a rosier, kinder, more humane, more tolerant light. And we would like the news to reflect this special spirit that we associate with Christmas. The trouble is that news is what happens, not what we would like to happen. And what is happening in our world on this last week before Christmas 1981 is neither kind, nor humane, nor rosy, nor tolerant. One shortwave radio broadcast this morning told us that 17-million infant children died in Africa and Asia this year because nobody in the world cared enough to provide the medicines that would and would have saved these infants. And they blew up the headquarters of Zimbabwe's Prime Minister Robert Mugabe's party on this Friday before Christmas. And all of us, no matter on which side of the political fence or in what corner of the world, know that the people of Poland will have a most miserable and depressing Christmas, 1981. But then, the people of once-prosperous and stable and highly sophisticated and cosmopolitan Lebanon have gone through as many and depressing Christmasses as you can remember since they became that new and terrible victim of our time; the proxy for an ideological shootout. In the case of Lebanon, instead of an open shoot-out between Arabs and Jews, we have the Israelis backing and aiding and abetting the Christian Lebanese and the Syrians and others backing and aiding and abetting the Moslem Lebanese: and so that once stable society has been bled to the verge of death as a nation. And this

UWI Libraries

destructive new phenomenon, ideologically-based war by proxy, was a menace the founding fathers of the Non-Aligned movement foresaw and feared and tried to prepare against. The really terrible thing about this kind of warfare is that the people of the country selected as the battlefield are the greatest victims of all, no matter which side comes out on top. It was so in the Congo, it is so in Indo-China. It is their almost instinctive but very clear perception of this point which has made the West Europeans come out in their millions to demand the removal of nuclear weapons from Europe by both East and West. They do not want to become the proxy victims of a nuclear war between the two super-powers. On a very much scaled-down level, the people of Poland, I think, had been trapped and manourvred into a kind of proxy situation. If Poland's Solidarity Union could be encouraged and aided and abetted into successfully challenging communist rule the whole East Eropean political situation would be opened wide and a domino effect would be let loose in all of communist East Europe, and Soviet communism itself would be psychologically embattled. And if the Soviet Union itself intervened in Poland it would suffer a much worse progaganda defeat than it did over Afghanistan. And so the very real aspirations of the Polish people were used to serve a geopolitical power end, while everybody insisted on a specous 'non-interference' which everybody violated. Now, because of the way things have developed we are told that what really happened was a military coup. The one indisputable truth is that the 35-million odd Poles are going to have a miserable Christmas because their will to freedom and political independence was seen as a 'target of opportunity' and because the superpower under whose armpit they are would not allow the unchallenged exploitation of that opportunity. Now, as Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kriesky said with bitter European realism when stemming the flow of Polish refugees to his country: "The Poles must work harder and strike less". Nobody owes them a living, and that applies to all of us, ideological proxy or not. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Pay Increases for MPs
2) Price Increases for Sugar
~~3) Tourism - a warning to be heeded~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
December 16, 1981, 6.10.m

Good evening: Two increases - one of salaries and the other of a basic staple in common daily use - are bound to cause controversy. Our parliamentarians last night voted themselves a pay increase; and the Minister of Agriculture yesterday announced huge increases in the price of sugar. Now, it is always difficult and tricky when those who make the laws and who are accountable to the people have to increase their own pay, especially in the social and economic climate of today. Predictably, there have already been murmurs about others having to settle for $29 overtwo years while MPs give themselves hefty increases that go outside their own guidelines for others. I am not so sure that this is fair, though. For one thing members of Parliament have not had a pay increase since way back in 1972-73. How many pay increases have other workers in both the public and private sectors had over that period? And will the self-righteous among us please stand up and swear that all those other workers have at all times always earned their increases. I do not think so: I think one of our hard problems stems from the fact that we have consistently refused to tie increased pay and benefits to increased production and increased performance. And I think that until we do this we will continue to be in worries over productivity and performance. The point is that however awkward the timing, and however much some of their own earlier rhetoric may now embarrass them, our MPs have a very, very strong case indeed for this pay increase. I do not myself think it is the argument that they may be doing better in some other capacity. That one almost invites the rejoinder 'Then

UWI Libraries

why don't they go there: we have not forced or begged them to be MPs'. I think the real justification for this increase must be based on our sense of equity and on the value we place on the job of being an elected servant of the people. Does a man or woman who manages a private or public company of more value to the society than one who manages and overseas one or two or more national ministries? Does a person who represents the interests of communities of anywhere between 10,000 and 30,000 people do a lesser job than a middle manager in the public or private sector? If a labourer is to be worthy of his hire then we cannot in conscience argue against the increases these people voted themselves last night. What we can and must insist on is that we get value for our money, from front-bench, back-bench and the opposition. But that is part of the wider problem of relating pay to performance and productivity, not only in parliament but throughout the society. A much less justifiably increase, I think, is that on the price of sugar, especially the brown sugar which is a staple energy food for the poorest sections of the Jamaican society Do you remember that startling comparison made by Mr. Seaga last month between the performance of our sugar industry and that of Barbados? They produced 150,000 tons of sugar from 40,000 acres and six factories; we produce 200,000 tons from 120 acres and 12 factories their average factory uses 95 workers, our comparable factory uses 457 workers. In other words we are vastly less efficient sugar producers than they are. Is the answer to this inefficiency really to doubly tax the hard-pressed Jamaican citizen: once as a consumer and then again as the taxpayer providing the government subsidy? Increasing bus fares beyond the value of the service provided the consumer did not help the bus company. Will jacking up prices and subsidy help the sugar industry? Not by itself. The bus company always argued higher fares to improve service: we know it did not work like that. Goodnigh

UWI Libraries

Poland: New Turn in a
Deepening Crisis.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
December 14, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Poland's deepening 16-month-old political/economic crisis came to a not-unexpected point over this past weekend. In the early pre-dawn hours of Sunday morning the Polish Communist Party leader, Prime Minister and head of the army, General Jaruzelski announced the proclamaition of Martial Law as the military quietly and efficiently took over the streets and the cities and all the sensitive state activities of Polish life. All meetings - except religious services - were banned; press censorship came into force; links with the outside world were cut; borders and airspace were close. Most of the leaders of the Solidarity trade union were rounded up in the port city of Gadansk while they were planning further protests and demonstrations. Those who were not rounded up called for an immediate nationwide general strike. But reports out ofWarsaw this morning suggest that there was no general strike: a few thousand workers did indeed not turn up for work; but all the utilities, particularly the highly sensitive public transport system, were reportedly functioning normally some twenty-four hours after the army took over the affairs of Poland. And if this situation holds for another twenty-four to thirty-six hours then the back of the Solidarity Union and the anti-communist movement it was so rapidly spawning in recent days would be broken with suprising ease. In the anti-communist worker uprising in Hungary in the 1950s there were brief but bloody street battles that involved Soviet troops as well before that one was put down. And in the Czechoslovakian "spring-time" of communism with a human face of Alexander Dubcek, early

UWI Libraries

intervention by Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces was critical to halting the then 'counter-revolution' which was being led by the party leader himself. This time around, the crisis has been brewing for the past 16 months and only came to its point when it became absolutely clear this past week that Solidarity's ultimate aim was nothing less than taking political power from the Communist regime. As long as Solidarity was seen as fighting for workers' rights, for human rights, for better conditions for Polish workers and peasants, it was difficult for Poland's communist rulers to smash it without being at the receiving end of worldwide condemnation, including the condemnation of Western communists and practically all democratic socialists and trade unions worldwide. By coming out as a political opposition aimed at overthrowing the communist regime, they supplied that regime with the justification which resulted in yesterday's crackdown. In this sense Solidarity brought about its own downfall by its own clumsiness or miscalaculation: it could push the regime for as long as it appeared prepared to operate within the system, not against it. No political system, rightwing, leftwing, communist or capitalist will passively allow itself to be overthrown. If the Polish Government had not itself acted, then the Warsaw Pact countries which surround Poland would have done so, no matter how many warnings came from the West. That this crisis was allowed to drag out to this point, and then handled by the Poles themselves, is an indication that the face of Soviet Communism has undergone some subtle changes and has achieved a greater flexibility than it had ten years ago, let alone what it was under the rigid Stalinist monolith. So all the earlier protests and uprisings were not in vain; perhaps Solidarity could have helped the process along further if it had continued to practice its earlier and more delicately sophisticated pressure in the face of overwhelming power. Now, whatever happens, communist Poland is into an interesting new phase. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The U.S. Campaign Against Libya

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
December 11, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The United States government has, in recent weeks, greatly intensified its propaganda campaign against the Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi. Yesterday, U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig, told America's NATO allies of America's plans to isolate Libya. And earlier the same day the State Department, through its most senior officer in the absence of Haig, let it be known that President Reagan had called on all Americans in Libya to get out. Oil companies operating there were urged to facilitate their employees' leaving. And the oil companies themselves, as well as other American businesses in Libya, have for some time now been quietly but firmly pressured by the administration to take their business out of Libya. This latter development began shortly after the deliberately leaked information out of several sources in the U.S. intelligence community that Gaddafi had dispatched 'death squads to kill the American President and some of his most senior cabinet officers. Before this particular 'leak' there had been talk of killing Gaddafi himself. So, in true spy-thriller fashion, you don't really know who is really planning what and who is to do what. This is part of the business of confusing things. Is Gaddafi really out to 'get' the President? Or is it a piece of 'disinformation' to misdirect attention and make it easier to 'get' Gaddafi? I ask some of these seemingly cynical questions because some of the moves being made now are reminiscent of what took place in the early 1950s in what was then called Persia - now Iran -when a Prime Minister who was ridiculed as 'fainting Mossadegh' was first laughed to scorn and then overthrow

UWI Libraries

and the Iranian oil industry he had nationalised was again restored to the control and management of the international oil companies. It was not until some 22 years later that it came out that that apparently popular coup which overthrew Mossadegh and restored the Shah to power had been engineered by a small handful of CIA operatives at the cost of a very small financial outlay. At that time the world knew nothing of 'covert operations' and no seemingly cynical questions were asked. But times have changed and perceptions are different, especially in the Third World. So what is behind the American campaign against Gaddafi? I don't think oil is the motive this time: OPEC and nationalisation are hard facts which nobody questions any more. And Gaddafi, whom some see as the 'wild man' of the Arab world has not changed in any new way or done anything dramatically new. So why the drive to isolate him? If you look at a map of North Africa you will see that Libya shares borders with Tunisa and Algeria to its north and west; with Egypt and Sudan to its east and south-east; and with Niger and Chad to its south. Now, Tunisia, Egypt and the Sudan are so-called 'moderate' Arab states which are pro-American. Niger and Chad, are black African states, landlocked, near the heart of Africa and ideologically uncommitted and basically unstable and therefore could easily be persuaded to lean either to East or West, depending on what is in it for them. So, in Tunisia, Egypt, the Sudan, Niger and Chad you have a constellation ofpotentially pro-American states, if only Libya and Libya's Gaddafi were not the fly-in-the-ointment. If Libya were part of the pro-American grouping they would make up a dominant force in North Africa, and point south to the heart of the continent. When Sadat died American interests in the Arab world as well as in North Africa suffered a serious setback. To restore, and perhaps improve the American position, Gaddafi, they think, must be removed. That is the geopolitics behind the camapign against Gaddafi. Goodnigh

UWI Libraries

1) The Politics of Aid
2) The UN Secretary-Generalship
3) NATO War Ministers Meet

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
December 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Trinidad and Tobago representative/~~at the~~ the current General Assembly of the Organisation of American States, now meeting in Castries, St. Lucia, is reported as having bitterly denounced the type of economic aid which undermines the political independence of those countries receiving the aid. This is only the latest in a very long line of calls from Third World spokesmen for what has come to be known as 'aid without strings'. The trouble is that there has rarely, if ever, been such a thing as aid without strings. Sometimes the 'strings' may not have been very visible; sometimes they may have been so unobtrusive as not to be seen at all; but almost invariably there have been strings of one sort or another to any aid one country has given to another. The nearest thing to aid without strings I can think of is the type of aid given by the Scandinavians and the Netherlands: but even ~~these~~ this is in persuit of a very high and sophisticated level of self-interest. The Scandinavians are wary of ideological entanglements and need customers and trading partners with whom to do business, and they also have the most highly developed welfare states in the world, and so they want to export some of the hard-headed decencies of their own systems. To varying degrees the Netherlands and, as far as we are concerned, the Canadians, can also be put into this rough category. But when we turn to the world great power brokers, to the two super-powers and the former imperial powers, the strings attached to aid are nearly always pretty visible. Basically, American and Soviet aid are clearcut and bedded in political considerations. Both superpowers

UWI Libraries

use aid to further their political, strategic or economic interests. At times they use the giving or withholding or size of the aid to nudge recipients in a certain direction, or to restrain them or to pressure them. Communist regimes or regimes which could be nudged and coaxed in that direction, or liberation movements which are likely to end up with leftist governments are more likely to get meaningful aid from the Soviet Union than the United States. Conversely rightist regimes or regimes which could be nudged and coaxed in that direction, or rightwing opponents of leftist regimes, such as Angola's Jonas Savimbi and Holden Roberto are more likely to get American aid. At this level aid is just another weapon in the cold war between capitalism and communism, especially when that cold war is as stepped-up as it has become under the Reagan administration. So there really is no such thing as aid without strings and the sooner we all face this, the sooner will we begin to learn to manipulate those strings to serve our own interests, since we cannot do without the aid. Just to bawl for aid without strings is like whistling in the dark: you can't scare duppy. Next, this is the time of year when the NATO Defence Ministers have their annual meeting and this time they seem to be in some disarray, partly because of the anti-nuclear demonstrations in Europe and partly because of the loose war talk in the Reagn administration; and now the new Greek government has opted out of the military side of the alliance. So things don't look so good. We must hope that all this will sober the Reagan people into realising that international relations is a much more delicate and complex business than a cowboy facing an enemy down. And finally a teasing thought. If Don Mills were still our man at the U.N. his standing was such with all sides that he might now have been one of the favourite candidates for the post of Secretary-General. And what a ~~coup~~ triumph for Jamaica, if he had stood and won! But our narrow party politics did not allow for this. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Human Rights & Political Democracy:
Charges Before OAS Assembly

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
December 7, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The General assembly of the Organisation of American States now meeting in Castries, St. Lucia, is about to deal with the explosive problem of human rights in the region. The OAS this past week received a series of draft resolutions on human rights from the Inter-American Human Rights Commission. And those draft resolutions make it clear that the state of human rights in the region leaves much to be desired. The security forces of El Salvador and Guatamala are accused of illegally killing the political opponents of the regimes in power; and they/are charged with doing this with the tacit approval of their governments. And so some 26,000 Salvadorans have been killed over the past two years. In Guatamala, where the violence is still in its early stages, the figure of the Human Rights Commission is 2,000 and climbing. The Commission's resolutions also accuse the Bolivian government of murdering its opponents, violating individual freedoms and stifling freedom of expression. And it calls on the OAS to urge the governments of Chile and Argentina to give information on the whereabouts of the thousands of political opponents of these regimes who have just disappeared. It also says that the exercise of political rights has been limited in Nicaragua in spite of plans to hold free elections there in 1985. On this latter point, we must hope that the OAS Assembly will discuss the question of whether it is possible to have genuinely free elections in a climate where political rights have been limited. But the more difficult question for the OAS assembly, I suspect, is going to be how to handle the

UWI Libraries

whole matter of the violation of human rights by regimes which are otherwise in complete accord with United States policy for this region of the world. These great violators of human rights are anti-communist regimes; they are regimes which believe in private enterprise and the free market system. Those whom they suppress and kill, those whose human rights they violate are mainly leftists who, if they were to come out on top, would almost certainly want to follow some variation of the Cuban or Nicaraguan road of development which, generally speaking, is anti-capitalist and would replace the free market system by centrally planned and managed economies. So what do you do? Do you defend the human rights of people who would upend your political system if they ever gained power? This is the apparent dilemma facing the delegates at the OAS asembly in Castries. But is it really such a dilemma? Mr. Caspar Weinberger, the U.S. Secretary of Defence, upset many West Europeans last week when he praised the Turkish military dictatorship because, he said, law and order must come before human rights. If a society, any society, cannot enforce law and order without violating human rights then what is the point of it all? What is the point of the rule of law? The Americans understand this for themselves in their own country, which is why they do not kill off even the communists in their midst, and why they would not countenance anything resembling an 'eradication squad' in their own country. For they know that human rights and political democracy are indivisible. You can't have one without the other. But the present leaders seem to know it only for themselves, not for other folk and other lands. And this, I suggest, is the greatest weakness of current American foreign policy and the one single factor that may result in its defeat in the struggle for the hearts and minds of men. American leaders like FDR and Eisenhower and John Kennedy and Jimmy Carter understood this; which is why Eisenhower stopped the invasion of the Suez Canal and Kennedy had a cold formal handshake for dictators who violated human rights. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

U.S-Soviet Arms Talks in Geneva;
OAS General Assembly in St. Lucia:
The Double Standard of International Relations.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
December 4, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two very important conferences began this week. One is between the world's two most powerful nations; the other is between twenty-seven mainly poor and less developed countries. And one of the world's two most powerful nation's also taking part in the conference of the twenty-seven. The first conference is the one between the United States and the Soviet Union which is aimed at working out some sort of acceptable formula by which the two superpowers can scale down and, perhaps, halt the nuclear arms race. That, at least, is the ostensible reason for the U.S.-Soviet Geneva meeting which is expected to last for months, if not years. Critics of the entire notion of the so-called 'balance of terror' on which the nuclear arms race is supposed to be based are sceptical of the motives and intentions of both sides in these talks. As a German spokesperson for the anti-nuclear movement in Europe told an American reporter yesterday: if this balance of terror, if this possession of nuclear arms is supposed to be our guarantee of peace then why not put nuclear arms in the Middle East and/in every other trouble spot in the world to ensure peace? Not a very logical question, perhaps, but certainly no less far-fetched than the notion of the two superpowers arming themselves up to their eyeballs and claiming that they do this in persuit of peace. Anyway, the Americans and the Russians are sitting down together and talking together. And they are doing this sort of thing in a number of other spheres as well in spite of the fact that the Russians detest, resent and fear the American

UWI Libraries

capitalist system quite as much as the Americans detest, fear and resent the Russian communist system. For reasons of self-interest, for reasons of survival, in hopes of outwitting each other, they talk and deal and do business with each other. In short, they accept and practice a self-interested ideological pluralism. But, ironically, neither of the two super-powers appear willing to allow their client-states, or satellites, or (according the the brutally frank Chinese description) their running-dogs, to practice a similar ideological pluralism. And so the United States representative at the St. Lucia OAS assembly, no less a person than Secretary of State Haig himself, is reportedly more interested in whipping the OAS anti-leftist representatives into line behind the anti-Cuban, anti-Nicaraguan / hard line of the Reagan administration. It is allright for the American to talk to the Russians and do business with them, but not for America clients to deal with Russia's clients. The justification for all this is interference. But then, everybody interferes when it suits their purpose. The South Africans have just interfered in the affairs of the Sychelles; earlier they had done so in Angola and Mozambique. The Americans interfere by/administration people today receiving in Washington Jonas Savimbi who is trying to overthrow the/duly constituted Angolan Government with South African help and secret American arms. So, just as the communists interfere to put down opposition and support like-minded groups, so do the capitalists. The Russians do; the Americans do it. It is part of the hypocracy, part of the double-standard of international relations that Mr. Haig will denounce and condemn the interference, real or trumped up, of the communists in Central America or elsewhere but be silent about capitalist interference, including that of America itself. Indications are that many of the OAS delegates at St. Lucia are aware of this double standard from both East and West and Mr. Haig may not have things all his own way. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Problem of Indiscipline

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
December 2, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The problem of indiscipline in the society - and the public preoccupation with it - has loomed very large of late. There have been strong signs of a new, or renewed, determination to put an end to indiscipline. This has even been given a partisan political tinge by suggestions that the indiscipline was a by-product of the policies of the past PNP administration and that bringing it under control would be a demonstration of the basic differences between that past administration and the present JLP administration. I think myself that this political tinge to the problem is unfortunate and may yet return to haunt us, especially those of us who are very seriously concerned about bringing about discipline within the society without violating any of the rights and liberties of the citizens, especially those of the poor and the weak and the young in our ghettoes. Already, in the name of restoring discipline, and the law and order which go hand and hand with it, we have witnessed some questionable social developments of which the killing of two Kingston Technical High School students and the wholesale expulsions from Passley Gardens are only the most dramatic recent examples - a sort of 'tip of the iceberg' if you like. There are other worrying symptoms about: the violence of the vigilante mob on the one hand, and the violent death of ghetto youth at the hands of law enforcement officers on the other, usually for allegedly pulling a gun or knife or a stick or in a shoot-out in which eyewitnesses at times deny that the victim had any gun. The painful difficulty here is that the lawlessness is very real and the police often are embattled and in

UWI Libraries

danger. So what do we do to come to grips with this very serious problem of indiscipline and the lawlessness it breeds? Do we try to cow our young people into obedience for all to see in hopes that all would be quiet and submissive? Do we kill off enough ghetto youth in hopes that others will get the message and stop breaking the law and finding guns with which to do so? And if we persue this course, does it matter if we penalise the innocent with the guilty? If we kill innocent youth for where they are and what they look like rather than for anything they have done? To be sure, this is one way of trying to cope with indiscipline and lawlessness and any other form of rebellion. I spent my early childhood in a country where they enforced discipline and law-and-order in this manner on the majority of its citizens. But this is not the Jamaican way. So what do we do? I suggest, with respect, that we begin by trying to understand the nature of the problem we face. I do not think it is a simple problem with a simple answer such as 'Discipline must be enforced' or 'law and order must be upheld'. Of course. But how? And why are we in this state? I suggest that the greatest indiscipline in this society has, with some exceptions, traditionally, come from the top. In work, in getting services, in cutting corners, in jumping queues, in fiddles of every kind, large or small, the people at the top, the so-called 'elites' have always set the example by getting away with it. When there were shortages they got the brown paper parcels and never really went without. And others, especially the poor and the young saw this. They saw that you get what you want by pushing and shoving and, if need be, by shouting and screaming and threatening. And when they themselves tried it, it worked. Please don't get me wrong. I am not saying this is all there is to it. All I am saying is that those at the top must do a little self-examination, self-criticism and then demonstrate some social self-discipline as an example to those they would instruct. That is where it should begin. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) JSA-Passley Gardens Issue Continues
2) U.S-Soviet Arms Talks
3) Constitutionality of Home Revenue Board Powers

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
November 30, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Jamaica School of Agriculture-Passley Gardens-issue, and expulsion of the 115 former JSA students/continues to stir and simmer and bubble like some self-heating cauldron that will not be cooled. Official silence, one-sided reports of what was supposed to have happened, even branding what happened 'rebellion', just will not, it seems, let this matter die down. Not even the call to rally behind 'law and order' has succeeded in dampening the public disquiet at the manner of the handling of this matter. Indeed, so deep has this disquiet gone that someone has speculated about one or the other of our National Heroes being the victim of this kind of situation. After all, most of our National Heroes were the victims of the law and order of their day. So perhaps it is time for the government to re-think its stance of toughness ' to prove a point', and try for justice and equity as well. The Jamaica School of Agriculture Old Students Association has called for an independent and impartial inquiry into the matter. I hope the government will listen to that call and get us all out of an socially unhealthy and festering situation. And then, at a later stage, I hope agricultural education at the level of the JSA will once again be put under the umbrella of the Ministry of Agriculture where it flourished and served Jamaica so well for so many years. But for now, let justice be done and be seen to be done; if there is crime, then let the punishment fit the crime. Punish only the guilty; do not, as the Nazis did, punish a whole village and its people by destruction for the crime of one or five or ten. And then, if we can put the politics of the business behind us, we

UWI Libraries

can go back to concentrating on the urgent tasks of developing and refining the skills we need to feed the nation from the Jamaican earth and also to earn some of the sorely need foreign exchange to help turn the economy around. So let us get out of this mess, please. On the world scene the most important new beginning after more than two years of silent cold war hostility was the start of new arms limitation talks between the United States and the Soviet Union earlier today. That the two nuclear super-powers are at least sitting down and talking to each other is important to all of us. During the time when they were not talking the nuclear arms race expanded at an alarming rate; and the talk of nuclear war was loud. I do not think the nuclear arms race will stop because they are talking; I do think it will slow down while the talks go on; and I do think that the hot talk will be muted. I think we will hear less of how many cities and how many millions of people can be wiped out in a 'first strike' if the strike is American, or if the 'strike' is Russian. And the numbers game they will play in their talks will confuse all but the experts hopelessly. The Americans claim that the Soviets have more nuclear missiles threatening Europe and the West. The Russians, with equally impressive statistics, claim that there are more American & Western nuclear weapons threatening the Soviets and their allies. And each will try to outsmart the other. This is the point of departure; but at least they have started talking and are thus a little less likely to start shooting during the months and years of chat. And finally, the Opposition in the Senate on Friday raised one or two disturbing points when the government Revenue Board Act, 1981, was debated. My first question is: if there are sections of the Act which could violate the Constitutional rights and freedoms of the individual, why were these not challenged by the Opposition in the House of Representatives? And will some independent Constitutional Scholar, like Dr. Lloyd Barnett, please advise the nation on this matter. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1)Prices, Statistics & Credibility
2) JSA Expulsions - Concern continues
3) Politics & Economic Recovery

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast in Friday
November 27, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: A number of local developments during the course of this week/and a little earlier should give the more vocal and more uncritical supporters of the government cause to pause and think a little, or so we must hope. For it is these fanatical partisans who at times make the governments job a deal more difficult than it need be. This was so with the past PNP administration, and this is becoming so today. The partisan fanatics of the PNP saw anybody who/as much as questioned anything done by the government it blindly supported as saboteurs and capitalists. Now the partisan fanatics of the JLP see anybody who questions anything as communists and terrorists. And just as this kind of approach did not in the end serve the best long-term interests of either the PNP or the country, so it is not going to serve the best long-term interests of either the JLP or the country. Take, for instance, that totally unnecessary raid conducted by the Operations Squad (more notoriously known as the 'Eradication Squad') on the offices of the Canadian University Service Overseas which has been operating in Jamaica for the best part of twenty years. To be sure this service does not enjoy diplomatic status; but it is a Canadian overseas service which has brought good to Jamaica. So what was the point of this raid which hurt Jamaican interests and Jamaica's 'image' in Canada? And who ordered it? And why? And, most important of all, did those who ordered the raid first check with the Ministry of External Affairs. I suspect that if they had Mr. Shearer would not have been placed in the unhappy position of having to apologise. This is most certainly not serving the best interests of either the country or

UWI Libraries

the government or the JLP. And this, please note carefully, was not done by any of the enemies or the critics of the government or the JLP. A little less fanatical support, a little less hunting for political and terrorist witches, a little more thought and consultation before acting, and Jamaica's interests would have been better served. Then there is the matter of that once so-highly-fancied word 'credibility' which was used, and successfully so, as a kind of all-purpose political stick with which to beat the-then government. The gap between what they said and what the people experienced was the great credibility gap. Now, the more fanatic partisans are creating it again. They blind the ordinary citizens with statistics to show that the cost-of-living has declined: and yet, those who shop for the basics know that prices have gone up, not down. If they are not to widen the 'cradibility gap' then these statisticians had better try to find some way of reconciling what people know from day-to-day experience with what the statistics says. Or else what they say may later not be believed, even when it is the gospel truth. True confidence is a state that is earned; not commanded, not ordered, not forced, not bullied, not frightened into being - especially in open plural democracies. So political self-interest as well as the national self-interest would dictate a deal less stridency from the partisan fanatics if that essentially anti-extremist and pro-economic betterment vote of October of last year is to be turned into positive support for positive programmes. And this process of cool-headedness could usefully begin with a careful re-thinking of the approach to the Jamaica School of Agriculture and those expelled students. This matter has stirred deep public concerns and will not die down; partly, I suspect, because of an instinctive revulsion against the notion of 'collective punishment.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Bauxite Situation Eased
2) Diversification & Employment
~~3) The Need for Jobs & Bauxite~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
November 25, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Prime Minister's announcement, during the course of yesterday's opening of the debate on the First Supplementary Estimates, that the United States Government is to buy 1.6-million tons of Jamaican bauxite is just about the most pre-Christmas welcome news that the embattled bauxite workers could have received. Many of them would have been apprehensive about being laid-off just before Christmas - and there was no way of knowing who the unlucky ones would be, so the anxiety would have extended way beyond just the number of 413. And there was the uneasy fear in the background that the Kaiser and Reynolds cutback announcements were almost bound to be followed by similar announcements from the other companies. So the apprehension would have been pretty widespread in the ranks of the bauxite workers. And yesterday's announcement largely laid these fears to rest - for the present at least. But the problem has not been solved completely, as the Prime Minister himself made clear. The lay-offs - both those announced, and those likely to have been announced - have been checked for the time being. The balance of payments and foreign exchange crisis we would have faced if the U.S. Government had not decided to buy that 1.6-million tons has largely been averted. And if the U.S. Government were to decide to make a second similar purchase of Jamaica bauxite next October - which seems very likely - then we would have a little extra time in which to try and grapple with the problem of the dramatic downturn in the demand for bauxite and alumina in Jamaica's traditional market

UWI Libraries

One of the hard problems is that Jamaica's traditional North American markets are facing serious reductions in demand. All the reports out of the United States speak of an economic recession which seems to be getting worse. Manufacturing is down; car sales are down; the building industry is in a slump; only unemployment, it seems, is sharply up. And this is the background against which the bauxite companies in Jamaica are being forced to cutback on production. When your market shrinks and there is a decline in demand you cannot indefinitely go on producing the same volume as when your market was booming and expanding. This is the nature of the so-call free market economies. Of course there are elements of the inevitable tug-of-war between management and labour at work as well. In times of boom when increased production is a primary interest labour usually has a strong hand and can force all sorts of concessions out of management because management is anxious not to interrupt production and lose its markets to competition. When things are in recession, on the other hand, it is usually management that is in a strong position, especially when it has ample stockpiles and can sit out long strikes and shutdowns. And I think we are into one such situation now. So I think it would be a serious misreading of the economics of our bauxite industry for any workers or any of their unions to see the just averted cutbacks as any sort of deliberate campaign against organised labour: all it is is taking advantage of an objective situation which favours management in precisely the same way that unions take advantage of objective situations which favour labour. I think the workers and their unions need to understand this reality clearly if they are to cope with the new problems of a new situation. And as for the wider crisis and its implications for the national economy, I think we are going to have to renew our efforts to sell our bauxite and alumina to more than just one market. There is a limit to what the U.S. govt. can stockpile.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Economics of Survival:
1) Budget Balanced, $9.5m Saving; Tax Revenue Up
2) Christmas Works Programme

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday,
November 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Jamaica's Parliament will tomorrow debate the First Supplementary Estimates under the now year-old new administration of Mr. Edward Seaga. And the figures that have thus far come out suggest a welcome new tightening up in the nation's money matters. The nation's housekeeping is under very strict new management and the indications are that there is unlikely to be any need to turn to the Bank of Jamaica to finance any budgetary shortfall. This resorting to the Bank of Jamaica to print money had, as you know, become a regular feature of our budgetary exercise in recent years. And this was, of course, one of the things the JLP had said it would put an end to if returned to power. And on this, to nobody's great surprise I suspect, it has delivered. Mr. Seaga came to power with an established reputation for financial management. So there has been a saving of some $9.5-million on the original spending Estimates for the 1981/82 financial year. And over this past weekend the Prime Minister told an audience that the government's revenue collections, mainly from Income Tax, is expected tobe some $80-million more than was targeted for. So, over-spending has been stopped; indeed, planned spending had been cut by nearly $10-million; and inflows from taxation is up. This all adds up to a dramatic turn-around in the nation's money management. But this could not be done without an almost ruthless tightening up on the spending of public money: you had to have the government's tight wages policy and its very strict fiscal conservatism to achieve

UWI Libraries

this kind of turn-around, and to maintain it: so public enterprises, public utilities, must either pay their way or turn a profit and justify any subsidy by overwhelming public service, or else they must be cut adrift. And so those that have been subsidised for years and that have come to expect the subsidy almost as of right, are now in crisis: the bus company and some of the other utilities, the sugar industry and a few others. And now bauxite as well. And these are, of course, large-scale employers of labour and any cutback or any cut-off almost inevitably means loss of jobs. And as in Britain, and as in the United States, so here the tightening of fiscal management, the cutting of waste and of all forms of featherbedding, bears down most heavily on those on the lowest rungs of the economic ladder. Another difficulty with us is that our size and our level of national wealth does not allow for the kind of social security and welfare assistance programmes which makes being unemployed in Western Europe or North America tolerable. The unemployed person in Western Europe and North America often collects more in unemployment benefit and other welfare assistance than does his Jamaican counterpart in a job paying between, say, fifty and a hundred dollars a week. So being unemployed in Jamaica, or indeed in any Third World country, is a heavier burden for both the unemployed and the government trying to manage its financial affairs with prudence. Balancing desperate social needs against the harsh requirements of prudent financial management is difficult and demanding enough within a politically united society: in a society divided and at war against itself, that balancing act becomes almost impossible. And prudent financial management, let us remember, is only one aspect, albeit a key one, in turning any economy around. There has to be in addition the production and the hard work from all of us to earn the money that must be prudently managed. Perhaps this year's Christmas work will see a really productive and socially useful beginning in that direction.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Jamaica School of Agriculture:
The Final Act of Demolition?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
November 20, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This morning's report over this radio station of the expulsion of 115 of the 119 students who were transferred ~~from~~ to the Passley Gardens Agricultural School when the Jamaica School of Agriculture was closed on September 10th, is just about the most depressing and most distressing news we have had in a very long time. It has become something of a cliché for us to talk about our people being our greatest national and natural asset; and, of course, the more trained and skilled the people, the greater their value to the society and to themselves. And for Jamaica this is particularly so in the field of agriculture. In the harsh world economic climate of the 1980s - and it is likely to get worse in the 1990s and onward - the countries and peoples who achieve the highest possible levels of self-sufficiency in feeding themselves will survive the strains and pressure in very much better shape than those who are heavily dependent on imported food. And bearing this in mind you would have thought that the very last thing we would want to do is to shut off the acquiring of greater agricultural skills to any of our young people. Even if the young people concerned were at fault and had to be disciplined - and/~~this~~ the extent and seriousness of their misconduct has by no means yet been established to the satisfaction of very many concerned people in the society - even then, this kind of brutal foreclosure on their future should be a last resort, a final ~~p~~painful act after all else had patently failed. Please don't get me wrong. I am not trying to excuse or make little of any of the charges of misconduct levelled at the students and

UWI Libraries

listed in the Minister's statement. But I am asking whether the students' side of the matter had been given a hearing before this drastic decision was taken. All the available information suggests that just as the decision to close down the Jamaica School of Agriculture was taken and carried out without any prior discussion with the student-body, or even the teaching-body at the JSA, so this expulsion decision was taken without giving the students a chance to at least try and defend themselves. And I think we need to bear in mind that whatever the behaviour of the former JSA students at Passley Gardens - and the accounts are conflicting - that behaviour came out of what had happened at Twickenham Park, and out of the manner in which it had happened. There are very many of us who think that in this particular situation you do not have all right on one side and all wrong on the other; that everything done and every move made by the Ministry of Education was right and proper, and everything done and every move made by the JSA students and teachers was wrong and improper. To say this is not to question the fact that the final power of decision does rest with the Minister and the Ministry of Education: the Ministry can, if it wants to, act arbitrarily and without consulting or informing either students or teachers until after the event. So the question is not of the right or the power: the question is of the justice and the fairness and the concern for the long-term social good with which that unquestioned right and power is exercised. And foreclosing on the future educational hopes and prospects of 115 young adults who wanted to complete and refine their skills in agriculture is a very serious step. What happens now to this partly trained group of our greatest national asset? Does anybody care? And is showing how tough and strong we can be the same thing as good government? And is this the final act of demolition of the Jamaica School of Agriculture which gained worldwide respect in its seventy-one years? And why? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Reagan on Arms Limitation

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
November 18, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: President Ronald Reagan's speech on arms limitation delivered before the Wshington Press Club earlier today was a major American political move which can be looked at from a number of different angles. First and foremost perhaps, it was a very brilliant move to ease the deep concerns of the West Europeans over some of the loose talk of a few weeks ago from American spokesmen, including the President himself. You may recall that over our National Heroes Day weekend Mr. Reagan's remarks that a limited nuclear war could be fought in Europe without necessarily involving all-out nuclear attacks on each other by America and Russia, resulted in those massive waves of anti-nuclear demonstrations in Western Europe. And even Vice President George Bush had to comment bitterly on the irony of the West Europeans behaving as though they had more to fear from the United States than from the Soviet Union when it came to nuclear war. And then there was Secretary of State Alexander Haig's statement that the Americans might let off a nuclear device high up in the sky to warn any Soviet or Warsaw Pact forces who might invade any part of Europe. All this went into feeding the West European worry and concern about what looked like a trigger-happy America spoiling for a limited nuclear showdown on European soil. An important, if not the most important, purpose of today's Reagan statement was to set these European fears at rest. Mr. Reagan told the Europeans flatly that no NATO weapons would be used except in response to an attack. In other words: they will retaliate if attacked. They will not launch an attack first. In this sense

UWI Libraries

the Reagan statement is an acknowledgement of the European fears and an assurance that those fears need not be entertained. And this, like it or not, represents some sort of psychological victory for the anti-nuclear forces, certainly in the short run. The politicians who are leaders of Europe in the NATO alliance will all be as relieved as West Germany's Chancellor Schmidt whose very political survival seemed at stake over the business of nuclear weapons in Europe. One of the real catches of the nuclear horror is the question: will any retaliation be possible after a first nuclear strike? And America is now committed not to strike first. But this, I suspect, might be offset by the political initiative the Americans have now so firmly seized by the Reagan proposal to cancel their Pershing 2 and ground missiles if the Soviets in return would withdraw their nuclear weapons from Europe. Only the experts can really tell what is involved here; but it is, on the face of it, an excellent propaganda point which could easily be used to put the Soviets in a bad light. If the Soviets really do have an advantage of 6 to 1 in weaponry over the NATO forces then they will obviously have to give much more in any such deal as Reagan proposed. And if they refuse to do so then, I suspect the Americans hope, the West Europeans will brand the Russians as the real warmongers and nuclear cowboys. Whether the Americans can make this kind of propaganda work with the highly sophisticated and politically savvy West European is another matter again. But I suspect that the Russians are going to have to make some sort of matching gesture if only to try and avoid being blamed by the Europeans for any further nuclear build-up. And perhaps, just perhaps, by this kind of playing on the wish of each superpower to want to be seen as peace-monger, West Europe may be turned into a nuclear-free zone. [illegible].

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

People, Politics & Economic Development

NEWS COMMENTARY
For braodcast on Monday
November 16, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The manner of the death and burial of the two Kingston Technical High School students, and the two young policemen who were ambushed in Vinyard Town, has provoked the kind of reaction and discussion in the society which tells us that a very raw nerve in the Jamaican body politic has been laid bare. Bishop DeSouza, the Reverend Canon Smythe and Mr. Robert Lightbourne, among others, have all commented on aspects of this matter. And, in fairness let it be remembered that almost all those who deplored the manner of the killing of the two students also deplored the killing of the two young policemen with equal concern and firmness. And the Jamaica Council for Human Rights has again, in the light of these and other recent happenings, reminded us of its long-standing call for the establishment of what it calls a 'proper' Citizens Complaint Board. And daily, our two radio stations have, through their invaluable call-in programmes, given us some measure of how deeply many citizens are concerned about the killings, whether by elements in the police or by the lawless ones, and about the continuing and at times bitter divisions within the society. And you know something, if we do not succeed in healing or at least minimising these divisions, and if we do not bring the killings under control, our chances of achieving the economic turn-about that we all say we want will be that much more difficult. So what are we to do? First, I suggest, we had better all of us try to get away from the intensely partisan postures which tend to divide the nation into 'friends' and 'enemies', into those who voted 'for us' and those who voted 'against us'. For one

UWI Libraries

thing far too many people who traditionally support the PNP voted for the JLP last year/October, and to miss the/~~this~~ significance of this is, I think, to completely miss the nature of the mandate this government was given by the people. So let there be an end to the propaganda of divisiveness. Every citizen has the Constitutional right to freedom of association: it is not a crime, it is not subversive, it is not un-Jamaican to be a member of any political party - be it capitalist, socialist, communist or any other 'ist'. And guilt, let us remember, is related to wrong-doing which is established by due process of law. Under our system only a court of law can determine a person's guilt or innocence. And we abuse and we undermine the stability of our system whenever we try to bypass this cardinal principle. And none of us, no matter who we are or what position we may occupy, are above the law and can bypass the rule of law without damaging and undermining the whole system. Nothing justifies the breaking of the law: not need, not poverty, not political interest, not ideological interest, not the holding of power. And this is so because our system and our Comstitution does allow for change within the law. The only justification for ever going outside the law is if there is no way of getting rid of a great injustice or a great tyranny or a manifest evil within the framework of the rule of law. And this is why not even the police must take the law into their own hands And this is why I hope we will have a Complaints Board. And I think such a Board could, for both convenience and effectiveness, come under the department of the Director of Public Prosecutions. But the really important thing is for all of us to try and rediscover the the key things that unite us and make us one community of free people, differing in political outlook, disagreeing on some things, but united in respect for our laws and for the rights and freedoms and responsibilities they confer on each citizen of Jamaica. Without this there is no real progress. / Goodnight

UWI Libraries

America & the World:
1) Haig & Central America
2) Bush & West European Allies
~~3) Exxon & the African Connection~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
November 13, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: At one point during the course of yesterday's Congressional hearings in Washington on American foreign policy, a Congressman invited U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig to make it clear that the United States would not seek to overthrow or to destabilise Nicaragua. Mr. Haig refused to give any such assurance; and the Congressman remarked that if he were a Nicaraguan Mr. Haig's answer would alert him to start preparing for the worse. And so the reports and rumours which have been circulating for weeks now that America was contemplating some sort of military action - possibly a blocade aimed at Cuba and Nicaragua for their alleged support of El Salvador - were given a certain credence from the very highest quarters in Washington itself. In face of this it is no longer easy to dismiss as propaganda the repeated Cuban charges that America was planning aggression against Cuba. Indeed, the general talk among informed political circles is that Mr. Haig's refusal to rule out the possibility of military action by the United States in Central America is part of an plan to go onto the offensive against the so-called leftist and progressive regimes and movements in Central America and the Caribbean. Cuba and Nicaragua are seen as examples of what could happen and of what is possible if popular mass-based leftist groups are allowed to come to power. So the containment and undermining of Cuba and Nicaragua are seen as key elements in stopping the leftist spread in Central America. To this end there is even talk of the Organisation of American States setting up its own

UWI Libraries

military force in order to contain the left in Central America. In theory this force would only come to the aid of governments threatened by 'external subversion'; but, as that very highly respected American journalist, I.F. Stone said in New York a few days ago: "The struggle in Central America is one of a land-owning aristocracy to retain ignorant cheap labour. When labour complains it is blamed on outside agitators". So it would not be difficult to find 'external subversion' behind any popular protest and invoke intervention once such a force is set up. All this was there as a kind of backdrop yesterday as members of that Congressional hearing questioned Secreary of State Haig about U.S. foreign policy. And the Europeans and Asians and Africans and others who were far from Washington but who are as concerned over American foreign policy as any American, because that policy affects them also, were not comforted much by the apparent American determination to confront and smash down so-called leftist subversion in any corner of the world. It was this cold comfort that most West Europeans find with current American foreign policy that led American Vice President George Bush to remark recently that the Kremlin was succeeding in persuading many people in Western Europe that they had more to fear from the United States than from the Soviet Union. It is of course not Soviet propaganda that has succeeded. The Europeans are much too politically mature for that. What has succeeded in frightening the Europeans, and others, is what I.F. Stone described as ' a dangerous new mood of "machismo abroad" building up in the United States'. It is a state of mind in which 'the good guys' patrol the world like quick-draw stiff-legged marshalls seeking out the 'bad guys to drop 'em.

The catch is that this kind of trigger-happiness, or its bluffing equivalent, can in today's world set the whole earth on fire. All it needs in one miscalculation, one badly called bluff. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Trinidad after Eric Williams
~~2) President Reagan & His European Allies~~
~~3) Russia: A Good Hand, A Bad Play~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
November 11, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: One of the measures of the quality of any man's leadership is what comes after him: and by that measure the massive electoral victory of the People's National Movement in Trinidad yesterday tells us a great deal about the quality of leadership Dr. Eric Williams gave to his country for a quarter of a century until his death earlier this year. For the People's National Movement was the creation of Eric Williams in a way that no Jamaican political party can be said to be the creation of any one man. The PNM was literally made by Eric Williams alone, and without any little group of like-minded friends and supporters to back him up/ in the beginning. I still remember the sight of the self-contained little man all by himself on that platform at the'University' of Woodford Square, where the People's National Movement was born out of a series of lectures he gave when that was the only way he could reach his people: and what a way it was! He assumed that his people were adult and mature enough to be closely reasoned with; and he reasoned with them./ It was literally an open-air university where the great scholar explained the social, political and economic problems of the country in a world context, without talking down to his audience and without making any kind of concession to political platform showmanship. He spoke clearly, quietly, simply, without gestures and without raising his voice. And his people listened as I have not seen political audiences listen in any other country I have visited. I remember wondering at the time, as I watched and listened, just how far Eric Williams would get with this brand of

UWI Libraries

political austerity. The people he was up against in those days were, after all, highly colourful, astute and, when need be, ruthless political operators. Colonial Trinidad in the 1950s was dominated by a number of tough-minded political and largely ethnic chieftains of whom Albert Gomes was perhaps the best known outside. The wheeling and dealing had racial and religious overtones and with some of the finest colour gradations I had encountered. Politics and money went together and I still recall the great displeasure, verging almost on fear with which a certain Colonial Office type spoke about an Indian millionaire who was both a religious and political leader and had connections with Indian sugar workers as well. How, I wondered, would Eric Williams who was disliked by both the British and the Americans , stand up against these tough cookies who had all the goodies to give away in exchange for votes. Well, we have known the answer for a long time now. He outfought them all and he straddled Trinidad politics as no other Trinidadian had. When he died earlier this year, I remembered how it was before he gained power, and there were some indications that things might return to what they were before he took over. There were signs of the emerging of the racial politics with its religious and tribal undertones; and you had the money politics; and you had the sprouting of parties as vehicles to power for ambitious men. And he had been in power long enough for all the failures and shortcomings of the moment to bury some of the great achievements. So for me the question was whether that broad political structure which he had created, the People's National Movement, which cut across race and class and colour and sex and religion, whether that structure would survive him without him. If it did survive him then it meant he had laid foundations that went deeper than the man. And this, it seems, is his proud legacy to his people. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Reaction to Sugar Co-ops Closure
2) The Dilemma of the Rule of the Gun
3) Drying-out & the Utilities
4) International Notes

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
November 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The weekend drying-out process after last week's heavy rain has not been helped by the state of our utilities. We have experienced massive electricity outages -- in our neck of the St. Andrew Hills people had no current yesterday from the time they woke up until about half-past five in the evening, which was something in the region of a straight twelve-hour stretch. And water was not much better; most of us were without all day and only got a trickle in the evening. And it is not easy to clean up and dry out without light and water. And, you know, our utilities are going to have to do very much better if that hoped-for good winter tourist season is to be the kind of success which brings visitors back again. People in search of rest and relaxation are not going to spend their hard-earned money in places where they are often short of light and water. So having utilities that function well is more than just a matter of your comfort and mine, important as that is; it is also an important part of the effort to earn our economic troubles away. Electricity, water, transport and communications are essential components in the effort to turn the economy around; and right now they are not really pulling their weight. I have not, for instance, been able to make a telephone call from my phone since the 19th of June of this year. You and I may have to put up with this kind of service: but no visitor has to, and most visitors will just not return if they are subjected to this kind of service. Then there was the depressing news of the ambushing and killing of the two

UWI Libraries

young policemen in Vinyard Town last Friday. All the information suggests a careful and deliberate plan to murder. And coming after all the other gun-killings of recent days and weeks it does look as though the rule of the gun threatens to replace the rule of law in the society. The really hard dilemma of the gun is the way in which it feeds on itself. When the lawless ones can set up and ambush for a police patrol and kill two of its members it is difficult to expect the police not to want to shoot first and question after. And yet, when the police shoot first and question after you may end up with the kind of killing which snuffed out the lives of those two young Kingston Technical High School students. So where do we go from here? What do we do? How do we handle what has now become an ugly and dangerous situation which feeds on itself, in which gun-killing beget gun-killing? If we arm the police to the teeth and let them loose what is to prevent the lawless ones from doing the same? And how many more innocent ones must be gunned down in persuit of the lawless ones? And where will it end? And what becomes of the rule of law in the face of the barking guns? Ultimately, the only answer is the return to due process where our courts, and only our courts, determine guilt or innocence. The hard question, the question which is going to test to the full the good sense and abilities of the political directorate, is how to move from where we are now to that desired position where only our courts dispense justice. Let us pray that we do this within the context of our democracy. And finally the sugar workers co-ops. As expected, reaction to the closure was strongly against, especially among the older sugar workers as yesterday's Exposure programme made clear. But you cannot just say that a loss of $82.6-million is not a sufficient reason. Bankruptcy, no matter who is to blame, is always a sufficient reason for closing a business. This is the sad but inescapable reality. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

After the Raim

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
Nove,ber 6, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening:· After the terrible wetting we have just been through most Jamaicans will welcome the weekend to try and dry out and get back to normal: and for some of us it is going to need all of this weekend and some more to come to grips with flooded homes and damaged furniture and appliances. One worries particularly about low-lying places like Portmore. The last couple of days have underscored the critical importance of the Prime Minister's announcement on Tuesday of this week
in parliament/that Portmore would have a major drainage system built. That is something that cannot come too soon. And our roads, especially in the Corporate Area, have not stood up as well as most of us would like. One result is that most people experienced some dreadful delays in getting from hoem to work and back; and it was particularly hard on the children. The great blessing was that there were no reports of major and fatal road accidents, and if this holds, if there are no late reports to upset this, then we will have come through this particular spell of bad weather in reasonably good shape as far as life and limb are concerned. And for all the loss and damage we can be thankful that it was not worse, that Katrina did not hit us directly. And I think we ought to note, too, the quiet speed and efficiency with which all the agencies dealing with disasters and relief went onto the alert. So, while we dry out/ourselves and our possessions let us remember that there is much to be thankful for. It could have been much worse. Instead of just the wetting we got/and the damage it brought, the storm could have passed much closer causing much greater damage; or, it could have hit us directly and

UWI Libraries

brought us the most terrible grief. So we have good reason to count out blessings. But while we count out blessings let us take note of the weaknesses in our system which were shown up by the heavy rain. And the relative ease with which so many of our roads break up is one of our greatest weaknesses. If you look at the damage caused to roads by the last 2 days downpour and then imagine what it would be like if the downpour were two or three times heavier and accompanied by either a closer passage or a direct hit by a hurricane, you can imagine how much worse it would be. And anything worse than we have now would mean a mashed up road system. And this is not a danger that we are only now facing. It has been with us for years; and for years we have been relatively lucky. Storms have passed us; storms have come and looked as though they were going to hit and then, somehow, they have turned away and spared us the maximum damage they were capable of. And this has happened so often that some of us have come to believe that we are more blessed than other people in other islands. And perhaps we are: perhaps there is someone up there looking after us in a very special way. But I am not sure that gives us the right to become careless about our own safety and security. The saying that the Lord helps those who help themselves applies here, I think. Sooner or later, one of those storms will not veer away or pass us by and if we are not prepared for it, if our roads and houses and gullies cannot stand up under the full force of a hurricane then we will be in bitter trouble indeed. Our engineers know what to do about the roads; our builders know what to do about the houses; those who plan against disasters know what to do to minimise loss and damage. It is up to us to ensure that that promised remedial road programme is carried out seriously and carefully and is not yet another piece of contract or fish-head politics. The national intersst demands it before we are hit by a storm. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

End of Sugar Workers' Co-operatives

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
November 4, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The announcement by the Minister of Agriculture of the shutting down of the Sugar Workers Co-operatives comes as no surprise. The Co-operatives - and indeed the entire sugar industry - have sustained some grievously heavy losses in recent years. At the same time we have experienced a steady decline in sugar production. It was, in fact, costing more and more to produce less and less sugar. So drastic measures had to be taken if the decline was to be halted. And the ending of the sugar co-operatives is one of those drastic measures. For those of us who believe in the co-operative principle - and there are millions such throughout the Western world- the death of any co-operative is always sad. But however sad it is I really do not see what else the government could have done in the face of the staggering losses of the co-ops. We are told that the co-ops now have debts amounting to over $82-million. And I think that those people who talk so easily about 're-orggnising' the sugar co-ops had better ask themselves who would be prepared to carry that debt burden and, in addition, pump more millions into trying to make the sugar co-ops viable. I don't think the Jamaican taxpayers would be willing to do so: and I doubt whether the majority of sugar workers themselves would be prepared to take on that kind of burden. So, an excellent, enlightened and progressive idea has to be scrapped because it has turned out to be a hopeless failure in practise. The sugar co-ops are dying because those who ran them bungled the process and turned a thing of noble ideals and objectives

UWI Libraries

into a miserable and disastrous economic mess. And no matter how noble or lofty or high-minded any idea may be if it is not carried out successfully, if it is not properly executed, if it fails, it is of no practical value. And if it fails at the kind of staggering cost shown by the sugar co-ops' debt load then it becomes a disaster and a burden. And this, I think, is perhaps one of the most telling criticisms that can be made, and that has been made, against the previous regime. Again and again it has come up with excellent ideas and then messed them up hopelessly by the poorest, most inept and, at times not-all-together-honest management: often it has allowed self-serving individuals to debase it reputation in the marketplace. And thus some of its most noble ideas - such as the sugar co-ops, and public ownership of public transport - have ended up as heavy burdens on the public purse. And to the extent that these noble ideas have come to be associated in the public mind with mismanagement and failure and heavy financial losses they have been given a bad name. And so the very socialism in whose name these things were done has been given a bad name: and deservedly so on performance. Co-ops of all kind can and have succeeded in the United States, Britain and Western Europe; so has public ownership of public transport. So the failure is really not in the ideas but in the execution. The hard question is: Have the PNP brand of socialists learned from their failures? Have they learned that high-sounding ideals are not enough unless backed up by cool and hard-headed and efficient business management? After a year inopposition and after some of their reactions to the end of the Sugar Workers co-ops I am not so sure. And I am not so sure that the workers in these heavy-loss enterprises have yet fully learned the lesson that every enterprise, whether publicly or privately-owned, must either pay its way or die: there is no ideology about this one. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Of Friends, Enemies and Interests:
A Foreign Policy Perpsective

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
November 2, 1981, 6.10p.m

There is something terribly wrong with any law-enforcement system which results in the kind of killing of 2 innocent Kingston Technical High School students. But more on this later when all the information is in.

Good evening: While most of us were preoccupied with the pros and cons of the Jamaican Government's decision to break off diplomatic relations with Cuba, a complex and subtle shift of American Middle Eastern policy was starting to fall into place in Washington. And though, at first blush, it is difficult to see any connection between America's foreign policy in relation to the Middle East and Jamaica's breaking of relations with Cuba, there is a connection which has to do with states of mind and the perception of interests, which are the backdrop to all foreign policy decisions: and I think it might be wise for our leaders to ponder this connection as we move further away from the type of non-aligned foreign policy persued by the previous administration. So let us explore the possibility of such a connection by examining the beginnings of this American policy shift. Saudi Arabia, some time ago, proposed an alternative plan to the one known as the Camp David process. The Israelis were opposed to it; Anwar Sadat was still alive; and American policy had Egypt under Sadat as the cornerstone in the business of dividing the Arab states into 'moderates' and 'extremists', with Sadat as the number one 'moderate' who would gradually lead the other 'moderates' into first a peace, then an alliance, with Israel and, finally perhaps, a united front of against the 'extremists'. In this scenario America would be the backer supplying the economic aid and military hardware. In this context the Americans showed no interest in the Saudi plan which proposed that all the Arab states participated in finding a solution

UWI Libraries

to the Palestinian problem by way of establishing an independent Palestinian state, after which the right of all states in the region to exist, would be guaranteed. So the Saudi plan looked dead. But then, less than a month ago, on October 6th, Sadat was killed. And for all the talk about what a great statesman he was, and about his great initiatives continuing with full American backing, U.S. planners quickly and quietly began to explore other foreign policy options. They were acting on the bedrock principle that when it comes down to the nitty-gritty, a country has neither friends nor enemies, only interests. And the conclusion seems to have been reached that the Camp David process had run its course as the best instrument serving American interests in the Middle East. Egypt, under its new rulers seemed ready to rejoin the Arab family Sadat had so deeply divided. And American interests dictate that she adjusts and adapts in order to be able to go on doing business in the fast changing new climate. It is the same kind of change of political gear that made it possible for the arch-anti-communist Richard Nixon to open the way for relations with China after over thirty years of isolation. And so not even the powerful pro-Israeli Jewish lobby could stop the Sale of AWACS to Saudi Arabia. In the crunch, the perceived American national interest was clearly more important than any commitment to Israel. And this is of course why the Europeans continue to mount their anti-nuclear demonstrations which could bring down some European governments in the days ahead: in a crunch, nations have no friends, only interests; and they serve their own interests. And so if, three or five or ten years down the line, it suits American interests to normalise relations with Cuba, we with our knee-jerk anti-Cuban responses may find ourselves out in the cold, but on a grander scale than the loss of the sale of a million tons of bauxite to the Soviet Union and the free service of Cuban doctors Its all a matter of serving our own long-term interests. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The JLP's First Year in Power:
A Perspective on Deliverance

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
October 30, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Today marks the first anniversary of the Jamaica Labour Party's massive elecoral victory of last October 30 when the JLP literally wiped the floor with the PNP. The JLP, you will remember, campaigned strongly on PNP 'mismanagement', on the communis threat inherent in the PNP's close relations with Cuba and the Cuban Ambaasador's alleged involvement in the internal affairs of Jamaica, on crime and violence, on the bad relations between the then government and the security forces, and, most important, on the grave economic problems of the country. In the popular partisan graffiti of the day I.M.F. meant 'It Manley Fault' and some very low and nasty blows were struck by both sides though, looking back, I think some of us really plumbed the depths in the personal smears against Manley with those against Seaga only fractionally less nasty. And when it was all over at the end of this day a year ago Deliverance had come and raised expectations were riding high. And you will remember that one of the first acts of the new Government was to call on the government of Cuba to withdraw its ambassador to Jamaica. Now, on its first anniversary in power the government of Jamaica has severed diplomatic relations with Cuba. The timing fits in too neatly with the anniversary celebrations to be a coincidence. So the anti-Cuban drive can now be said to have been completed. The threat of the
/Cuban involvement in the internal affairs of Jamaica, whether real or not, has now been eliminated. So from here on it would be difficul to use Cuba as a propaganda scapegoat in our internal politics. What

UWI Libraries

effect this break will have on our regional and Third World associations only time will show. And the linking of the PNP with the whole matter which led to the break is really not all that different from the PNP, when it was in power, linking the then opposition JLP with allegations of CIA involvement in the internal affairs of Jamaica. In both cases it was and is hard to know where concerns of national interest and national security begin or end where partisan ideological point-scoring begin or end. What is a great pity is that our parliament is being made to appear to be the forum where the guilt or innocence of accused individuals is to be settled. So let us repeat the call that what has become known as the Paul Burke affair be dealt with by our courts of law. That is where individuals are supposed to be tried and convicted or discharged. Not in parliament and not in the press. Still, the Cubans have now been removed and this can be marked up as a success for Year One of Deliverance. Another success, I think, is the relative easing in violent crime, especially political violent crime. And for me personally a signal success is the very marked muting of the screaming and shouting and sneering and jeering and personal abuse and character assassination which passed for political debate. Who takes credit for this particular success is another question again. I do not think the report is in yet on better management. The disease of 'mismanagement' identified by the JLP in opposition are still very much with us, and we have seen some awful and unnecessary bungling of late. So I suggest we wait and see if we can come to grips with 'mismanagement' in Year Two of Deliverance. And I think Jamaicans are being a bit unfair in complaining about not seeing the fruit or seeing too little of the fruit of Deliverance. I think the government has been very clear on the matter. Deliverance must begin at the top and trickle down. So those at the bottom must wait until those at the top have had enough for some to trickle down. That's what we voted for last Oct.

Good night

UWI Libraries

1) JOS & Learning From Our Mistakes
2) ~~The Importance of Continuity~~
3) ~~Party & Nation: Conflicting Interests?~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
October 28, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This morning's Roadbeat programme on this station gave us the very revealing answers of some JOS workers themselves on how to deal with the problem of the future of the JOS. There were a number of suggestions but the main one, given by three or four of those questioned, was to return the bus company to private hands like those of the English company which ran the JOS before the government take-over of 1974. Some of the other answers were: get rid of the robots and minibuses so people will have to use the JOS; pump more public money into getting more buses; and, rather half-heartedly, I thought, let the workers run the buses. As far as the troubles of the JOS are concerned they were due to weak management which allowed the unions to dominate and dictate to it. The one thing not one of those workers seemed prepared to entertain was the possibility that their own poor performance may have had a critical bearing on the troubles of the JOS. In this sense it seems that the JOS workers have learned nothing from their own experiences. And those who do not learn from experience - be it their own experiences or the experiences of others - are doomed to make the same mistakes over and over and over again. And it is this that makes the JOS situation such a depressing affair. There really was no need for this kind of collapse. All that was needed to avert it was for the workers at the JOS to do their jobs at least as adequately as those jobs were done when the company was privately owned. Indeed, the pay and fringe benefits under private ownership were not as good as they became under public ownership; and, most

UWI Libraries

important, job security became something of a sacred right under public ownership. You would have thought that in these circumstances of good pay and excellent fringe benefits and freedom from the fear of losing his or her job the JOS worker would perform at the level that we are told the happy and contented worker is capable of. Instead a poor service went from bad to worse; and if any of the workers or their unions worried about what would happen to them as the company sank deeper and deeper into the red, they did not let on. They behaved as though the feeding tree would never die even after they mashed up its roots. So what private investor would now want to take up the mashed up JOS and its enormous debts? And when will the workers face the brute fact that they are as responsible, if not more so, for the collapse of the JOS as anybody else. I do not myself think the fault is in public ownership: I think the utilities should be publicly owned. I think the fault lies in the general attitude of most Jamaican workers to public ownership. They tend to see public ownership as providing a free and easy ride, especially in the context of having the backing of a strong trade union movement. Anything publicly owned they seem to think, does not have to pay its way and turn a profit: if it gets into trouble the public purse will bail it out; and they seem to forget that the public purse really means your pocket and mine Until the workers of the JOS and indeed of all utilities and government-owned companies learn the lesson that they have to pay their way by either turning a profit or providing the quality of service that amounts to profitability they will, sooner or later face the kind of collapse the JOS is now facing. And starting afresh is never the same as continuing something which has been working well. And the workers who have had a share in the collapse of one enterprise are most unlikely to be called to take part in any new one. So whatever happens in public transport, the prospects are bleak for the JOS workers

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Europe's Anti-Nuclear Demonstrations
2) Greece Joins the Non-Aligned

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
October 26, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two events dominated the weekend news. Both took place in Europe; and each represents a serious setback for global American foreign policy. The first was the massive wave of anti-nuclear demonstrations which swept through the main cities of Western Europe like a wild bushfire. The second was the confirmation by Mr. Andreas Papandreaou, the new Greek Prime Minister whose Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement gained electoral power last week, that Greece would withdraw from NATO's military wing, that Greece would renegotiate the matter of the maintaining of American bases on Greek soil, that Greece would accord diplomatic status to the P.L.O. (the Palestine Liberation Organisation), and that Greece would move from being politically aligned with America and the West,, to being non-aligned. In short, Greece will cease to be one of NATO's last two forward bases on the edge of the Soviet bloc. Until the fall of the Shah of Iran Greece, Turkey and Iran were NATO's eyes, ears and forward military posts on the edge of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. When the Shah fell only Greece and Turkey were left: now Greece is opting out and only Turkey is left. And how long Turkey will remain as the now isolated and lonely member of NATO in that volatile part of the world is anybody's guess. What is certain is that the latest developments in Greece represent a major setback for United States policy in the area. Mr. Papandreou has been very careful and diplomatic about it all: he has been neither threatening nor provocative. He has assured the Americans that he will not act unilaterally on the matter of the American bases. He wants to start

UWI Libraries

renegotiating the terms for the bases early in the new year: and the two/points he has stressed are the duration of the existing agreement and the right of the Greek Government to full information on what is going on at the bases. The Greek Government, he said, cannot be in a position of having diplomatic relations with a country and be ignorant of the likelihood of that country being attacked from Greek soil. I think this last point is going to be a really tough one for both the Americans and their NATO allies. And when some American reporter suggested to Mr. Papandreou that it sounded as though he was quitting the Western camp in favour of the Soviet bloc, he said flatly that Greece was not simply switching from one power bloc to the other; Greece was joining the non-aligned world. And whether the supporters of power blocs believe it or not, the non-aligned movement is very real, and it is growing, and it is, increasingly, refusing to be used or manipulated by either of the two main power blocs. This is something that most Cold Warriors either cannot or will not/or choose not to believe Which is why the seem not to know what to make of communist Rumania's President joining Europe's anti-nuclear movement by calling on both the United States and the Soviet Union to withdraw their nuclear weapons from Europe. The hard fact is that genuine non-alignment transcends ideologies: it includes regimes from the far right to the far left; the unifying factor is the refusal to be used and manipulated by the super-powers. And those demonstrations which swept across Europe over this past weekend (thanks to Mr. Reagan) were not either anti-American or pro-Soviet, as some would make out; the Europeans were, quite simply being pro-themselves. They do not want their lands to be turned into nuclear battlefields to the greater glory of either capitalism or communism, of either East or West. Sooner or later, as in Greece last week, Europe's political leaders will get the message from their people ~~The catch is that it may already be too late.~~ Let us/the hope they act on it before it's too late. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Cancun & Third World Poverty:
The Politics of Economic Aid

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
October 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The meeting of ~~22~~ the representatives of 22 rich and poor nations at Cancun in Mexico was designed to seek a frame-work for what has been described as 'global negotiations on Third World poverty': and on the face of it the meeting has ended on what appears to be a note of success. American President Ronald Reagan has agreed to such global negotiations - but with a very, very big proviso which would in effect ensure that the New International Economic Order for which the Third World is calling would go on being a distant, unrealiseable dream. Mr. Reagan wants Third World countries to grapple with the problem of poverty by 'freeing up' their economies and inviting more private investment by creating conditions that would attract private investors into putting their money into these countries. He wants no new international financial or aid institutions to be set up; and he wants the IMF and the World Bank to continue to be the main organs of the international financial and monetary systems. And he wants the global negotiations to take place in a co-operative atmosphere rather than one in which views become polarised. If these conditions, or 'understandings' as the Americans call them, are accepted then the United States would be willing to engage in a 'new prepartory process to see what might be achieved'. So, even if the Third World accepted these conditions the most America is prepared to do is join in the process to see what might be achieved. In short, the Third World countries must commit themselves in advance to opening up their economies to private investment - which really means foreign investment - on favourable terms

UWI Libraries

to private investors; and the major private investors in today's world are of course the world-embracing multinational corporations who are very interested in the deregulations of the economies of the countries in which they operate. So in order to get the United States involved in these global negotiations the Third World countries would have to commit themselves to the capitalist road of economic development. And this, in terms of the politics of economic aid, is a logical position for the Americans to take. They want to see the capitalist, free market, private enterprise economic system in control throughout the world; it therefore makes both economic & political sense for them to use all the methods at hand to further that system: so they give aid to some regimes and deny it to others. It does not, from their point of view, make sense to help and strengthen a Tanzania which is socialist and determined to control the key factors of its own economic life; but it does make sense to use aid to help and strengthen a Kenya in which foreign investment is welcomed and capitalist private enterprise is encouraged. So Kenya gets the real aid and Tanzania a token gesture. Conversely, the Soviets for whom aid is as much an instrument of political and ideological as it is for the Americans will use their resources to help communist regimes and socialist and non-aligned regimes that could be influenced to move in their own non-capitalist direction. Just as the Americans do not want to help strengthen communist or socialist regimes so the Russians do not want to help strengthen rightwing or capitalist regimes. In thise sense aid is, and is used as, a tool serving political interests. And this is one of the key factors which makes the search for a New International Economic Order so much more difficult of achievement. Each side in the ideological cold war wants any new order to serve its interests; so non-alignment is often at odds with both, and both often try to manipulate non-alignment just as they manipulate aid. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

A Limited European Nuclear War:
Reagan's Serious Blunder

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
October 21, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Last Friday, while we were preoccupied with our own National Heritage Week and preparing for National Heroes Day, American President Ronald Reagan committed what was arguably his worst diplomatic blunder since taking office. Mr. Reagan is reported to have told a group of American newspaper editors that a limited nuclear war could be fought in Europe without necessarily leading to all-out nuclear attacks on each other by the United States and the Soviet Union. In other words, the two super powers could engage in a limited nuclear war on European soil without doing any nuclear damage to either Russian or American soil, or doing damage to Americans and Russians in their own countries. Europe would be the theatre of war; the damage, whatever it is, would be confined to Europe; the dstruction such as it is, would be confined to Europe; the death, such as it is, would be restricted to those who are in the area where such a limited nuclear war took place. In fairness to Mr. Reagan, he did not spell it all out in this kind of detail; indeed, he may not even have thought it out in this kind of detail. All he did, in response to a question from one of the editors, was to say that a limited nuclear war could be fought in Europe without involving America and Russia in a wider nuclear conflict. But inherent in this statement were all the other implications, and more, whether he had thought them out or not. And the Europeans were quick to see and to dwell on those implications, and to react to them with passion and with anger and with fear and concern. The Europeans had twice experienced the horrors of war on their own European soil within

UWI Libraries

a time span of less than thirty years. Some of the survivors of the First World War had also gone through the devastation of the Second World War in which more civilians than soldiers, more women and children and old folks were killed or maimed or made homeless. So for the Europeans war on their own soil is no abstraction; they have known its horrors at first-hand; their lands and homes and industries have been devastated and occupied. And they know the bitterness of it all in the way that only those who have experienced it can. It is glib and easy for American spokesmen to talk about the Europeans 'over-reacting' to what Mr. Reagan said, or 'exaggerating' its implications, or 'distorting' its meaning. The fact is that by what seemed an off-hand and not thought-through remark the American President has conjured up for Europeans the spectre of a Europe reduced to ruins while the two super-powers continue their delicately balanced power game, mashing up the rest of the world while making sure, or trying to make sure, that they themselves and their lands are not touched by the horrors they let loose on the rest of the world. American spokesmen are now trying to soothe these European fears and to reassure America's NATO allies that the President did not mean what his words imply. America, they say, has half a million Americans in Europe as members of the NATO forces and their families, and America will not abandon these people to a limited nuclear war in Europe: so why should she abandon her NATO allies. And the more and the louder and the faster they talk trying to explain away the President's remarks, the angrier the Europeans seem to become. It seems that in one stroke the American President has fuelled the mounting European anti-nuclear movement in a way America's bitterest enemies could not have done in a year of Sundays. And that is a major diplomatic blunder. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

National Heroes Day, 1981:
Our Heroes: Symbols or Examples?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
October 19, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: "Let us now praise famous men and our fathers who beget us"....And, having done that, let us try and see the National Heroes and what they stood for, and what they fought for, and what they represented in today's context and from today's Jamaican perspective. It is, of course, easiest to do this with the last three of our heroes, with Marcus Garvey, Alexander Bustamante and with Norman Manley: for very many of us these three are as real as the people you buck up against any day of the week. Indeed, it is not all that many years ago that that was precisely what happened. It is a little more difficult to have this sense of immediate connection, of having met and seen and perhaps sat down and broken bread with earlier heroes like George William Gordon and Paul Bogle: and it is most difficult with the earliest ones, with Sam Sharpe and With Nanny of the Maroons. Anyway, let us try and look at them and what they represent from today's perspective and so get some measure of just how true we are to the values for which they struggled. Bustamante was, essentially, the working man's man, the father of the trade union movement as we know it today. And there is absolutely no way that we can truly honour Alexander Bustamante and at the same time to divide or try to break or weaken or destroy the Jamaican trade union movement. To do that is to go against everything Bustamante stood for. That is, of course, if we take Bustamante, National Hero, as an example of what the society aspires to, rather than just as a meaningless symbol which is trotted out on ceremonial occasions. And there are among us. people, some in very high

UWI Libraries

places who say they honour National Hero Alexander Bustamnte but who, at the same time, try to undermine and weaken and destroy the unionised labour movement which is Bustamnte's great work. And then there was Norman Manley, the great architect of the Jamaican Constitution with its delicately balanced protection and safeguards for the rights and interests of all sections of the community through the brilliant device of putting the rights of the individual at the centre of it all. He was, more than any other single individual, most responsible for the manner in which parliamentary democracy in Jamaica has evolved between the achievement of adult suffrage and the present. In this of course he and his great cousin Bustamante were the point and counter-point: but without the massive violence and bloodletting and vicious victimisation those who came after them have let loose on the land in the name of parliamentary democracy and the two party system. There are many who say they honour Manley but whose behaviour go counter to everything Manley stood for: and you do not find them in one section of the political community only. The recent disgraceful behaviour in the nation's parliament would have drawn the roundest condemnation from both Norman Manley and Alexander Bustmante had they been there. But what would probably have saddened and angered both heroes most are the systematic attempts at undermining and manipulating of some of the key institutions underpinning the democratic process. We do not honour these heroes truly by turning our democracy into a party spoils game in which winner takes all: that was not their way. And you certainly do not honour the life and struggles of Marcus Garvey by selling or mortgaging the Jamaican patrimony and the Jamaican future to Americans or Russians or Chinese or Cubans or anyone else in return for a quick foreign exchange fix. For to Garvey freedom meant, above all, being your own black man, carrying your own burden, finding your own salvation by hard work.

Peace and love. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The State of the Jamaican Heritage:
1) The Arts; 2) Politics; the Judiciary

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
October 16, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: As National Heritage Week moves to its climax let us pose, and ponder, the question: What is the state of the Jamaican national heritage? How are the key parts that make up that heritage standing? There are any number of ways in which this question can be asked and answered, depending on the particular interests of the person who asks and answers the question. The muscian or the writer or the painter or the dancer would almost certainly answer the question in terms of the arts: and I think that it would be a proud and optimistic answer promising a bright future. The arts in Jamaica are, generally speaking, in a very healthy and very vigorous state of which all Jamaicans can justly be proud without any hint of chauvinism. I certainly do not know of any other country in the world the size of Jamaica and with its population which has produced a dance company of the calibre and quality of our own National Dance Theatre Company. It is unique and it is of exceptional quality. The local threatre, too, is more alive and throbbing than you would find in many metroplitan countries. Jamaican writing, too, is very alive: older established writers and poets are honoured and respected far beyond the borders of Jamaica, and I think we have every right, based on the record, to expect a younger generation of Jamaican writers to emerge and follow honourably in the footsteps of Roger Mais and Vic Reid and poets and playwrights like Mervyn Morris and Dennis Scott. And then there are the artists and the muscians: and I am particularly excited by the collecting and recording of the folk-music of the island carried on by people like Miss Olive Lewin. So, all-in-all

UWI Libraries

the Jamaican heritage in the arts is healthy ~~and~~ vigorous and independent and bespeaks a bright future. Regrettably, we cannot say the same for the Jamaican political heritage. Out of the struggles of the past had come a lively, exciting spirit for debating the social and political issues of the day: peaceful and usually friendly argumentation and debate fed and nurtured the evolving democratic process of which the multi-party parliamentary structure is the formal manifestation. And there was a time when most Jamaicans were convinced that some of the political things that happened elsewhere in the region - the dictatorships, the repressive and tyrannical regimes, the gaining of power by violence and murder and torture - could never happen here. And then, in recent years, we saw these things starting to happen here. And in the last few years we had the ugliest, most devisive and destructive run-up ever to parliamentary elections in which anything approaching 1,000 people are said to have been killed. The 1980 election was more like a political civil war than the kind of parliamentary election campaigns Jamaicans had known in the past. And this, I think, is the single most dangerous threat facing the Jamaican political heritage: it is the now clear and present threat that the use of violence as a political tool would totally overwhelm and wipe out the parliamentary elective process. The two cannot co-exist for long; they never have. The political violence is either stopped or democracy dies. And it is a very bad sign for the survival of our democracy when the unruly rump of the government's parliamentary backbenches makes it impossible for a senior opposition spokesman to complete a speech. So I see the Jamaican political democratic heritage as in great danger. Jamaica ignores this danger at its own peril. Jamaicans may find increasingly that their only sure protection from the spreading intolerance and injustices generated by our polarised party politics is to turn to the judiciary as the final and most trusted protector of our rights & freedoms under the Constitution. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Heritage Week:
The Freedom of the Individual

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
October 14, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Of all the many and varied elements that go into the making of the Jamaican National Heritage, perhaps the single most important of all is the place that heritage accords to the Jamaican person as an individual. It is all summed up as the freedom of the individual, and it is enshrined in Chapter Three of the Jamaican Constitution. Indeed, there is a sense in which the freedom of the individual is the central theme of the entire Constitution. The laws, restrictions, limitations, prohibitions, and definitions are at bedrock all concerned with the rights and freedoms of the individual and with the inevitable responsibilities which go with those rights. And so it is the individual who has the right to life, to liberty, to the security of the person, to the enjoyment of property, and to the protection of the law. It is the individual who has the right to freedom of conscience, to freedom of expression and of peaceful assembly and association, and the right to respect for his private and family life. And so the individual has the right to join or not to join; he has the right to agree or to disagree; to go with the majority or to stand aside or even go against it; freedom of expression is not a right conferred on a newspaper or a radio station or a television station, it is a cardinal right of the individual. And the moment we put it in that way we can see just how limited in terms of access to the media this right of the indivdual to freedom of expression really is. But the radio or television station or newspaper is just the outlet for that freedom of expression which is the right of the individual. And if any individual or any

UWI Libraries

group of individuals feel strongly enough about it they have the Constitutional right to establish their own outlets for exercising their right to freedom of expression. There is no obstacle to doing this as far as newspapers and magazines are concerned: all you need is the money and the necessary skills and you can go into the newspaper or magazine business: you may lose your shirt and everything else on the venture, but you have the right to try it. This is why I am rather surprised that those individuals who feel so strongly about having their own radio or television stations have not challenged the Constitutional right of the government to deny them this. A strong case can surely be argued that such refusal constitutes a denial of the right of the individual to exercise his constitutionally-guaranteed right to freedom of expression. I certainly hope that such a test-case will be mounted to challenge the government's monopolistic control of television in Jamaica. And this brings us to one very serious administrative and judicial limitation on many rights which are Constitutionally guaranteed to the individual: and that is the matter of cost. The individual has to be very rich or to have very rich backing to challenge, for instance, the government's right to retain a monoply on television. So for most Jamaicans this right of the individual is effectively denied because they do not have the money. It seems to me that we need here some device, something along the lines of the legal aid clinics, to which an individual without means can turn for assistance on constitutional issues involving the freedom of the individual. These are blemishes on a rich heritage of Jamaican individual freedom which I hope we will remove in time. What we must not allow is for anybody or any group, no matter who, to interfere with the right of the individual to think for himself, to hold and change opinions and parties, and to think unpopular thoughts if he wants. That is the freedom of the individual, part of the Jamaican heritage. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Opposition and Subversion:
Where is the Line?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
October 12, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: In the course of his address to the 43rd annual conference of the People's National Party Mr. Michael Manley spoke about 'subversion', a word which in one form or another, has become a major party political cuss-word of late. Mr. Manley said: "As long as I lead the party Norman Washington Manley founded, we will never lead anyone into subversion". The question is, and I think it is high time we ask the question out loud and then think about it, what is subversion? Who is a subversive? And the reason why it is important for us to ask the question, it seems to me, is because the words 'subversion' and 'subversive' are often used in such a way as to be interchangeable with the word 'opposition'. Often, to oppose is to be seen as being subversive: so political opposition, especially from the far left, is damned as subversive; trade union action even, has been denounced as forms of subversion. Let me hasten to add in fairness that when the PNP was in power the political cuss-words were 'sabotage' and 'destabilisation' and these words, too, were at that time used as interchangeable with the word 'opposition'. So is 'opposition' and 'subversion' really the same thing? Is 'opposition' and 'sabotage' really the same thing? Is 'opposition' and 'destabilisation really the same thing? Is 'opposition' and 'terrorism' really the same thing? Indeed, we can even stretch the questions a little further. Is communist the same thing as terrorist? What is certain is that strenuous attempts have been made and are being made to plant in the public mind the notion that these political cuss-words

UWI Libraries

are synonymous with the word 'opposition'. And so you get the suggested thought-pattern: to be in opposition to the government of the day is to be subversive of the policies of that government and is to want to sabotage or destabilise those efforts. And once this thought-pattern is successfully planted and takes hold in a society, it is only a matter of time before any opposition to the government of the day becomes dangerous and subversive of the national interest, which is of course the same thing as the interests of the ruling party, and therefore that opposition becomes fair game to be destroyed by any means, fair or foul. And once a society is on this path then it is only a matter of time before our form of multi-party parliamentary democracy comes to an end and is replaced by some other system which does not allow for any opposition of any kind. So I think it is most important for those who want the multi-party parliamentary democracy we now have to continue to draw a very sharp and a very clear line between opposition and subversion. So where do we begin? First, I suggest, by realising just how far things have deteriorated when the Constitutional leader of the Opposition has to declare that he and his party will never lead anyone into subversion. For all the talk of subversion and terrorism the Opposition has been so quiet since last October as to be almost non-existent. So what is the point of it all? Is it fear that they might threaten to lock-down the country tight as a sardine can? Or go in for statements about overthrow or underthrow? And if they did, would that be subversion So how do we decide what is subversive? And who does the deciding? I think we had all better be very careful indeed in how we answer all these questions. On our answers may depend the type and nature of the political system we carry into the future. And the future, like Jamaica itself, does not belong only to the politicians or the political parties; it belongs to all the people of Jamaica, so they must decide.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Egypt & the Arab World After Sadat:
The Problem of the 'Radical' Leader

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
October 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The political after-shock following on Tuesday's assassination of Egyptian President Anwar Sadat continues to reverberate around the world; and there is now distinct concern inside Egypt itself over yesterday's eruption of violence in one Egyptian city: the nagging question is whether this violence is isolated and can be contained, or whether it is the first spark of a brushfire. There is also reported growing concern for the security of the many Western leaders and dignitaries who will attend the funeral tomorrow. Mr. Menachem Begin, heading a delegation of Israel's top governmentax and military leadership was reportedly already in Cairo earlier today; and by this time the three former American Presidents, Mr. Richard Nixon, Mr. Gerald Ford and Mr. Jimmy Carter should also have arrived. Among the Europeans will be the heir to the British Throne, the President of France and the Chancellor of West Germany. The one notable absence is that of the current President of the United States. Mr. Reagan is not going and is not sending his Vice President, for security reasons, they say. The Israelis are reported to be very bitter about this because they think it detracts from the needed show of/support for Western continuing the 'peace process' under Egypt's new leadership. The reasoning is that only the current/American President is the manifestation as well as the symbol of American power and American commitment: only Mr. Reagan is in power and has the power to make major decisions on the Middle East. So his decision not to go to the funeral could be interpreted, especially by America's enemies and critics, as a downgrading of the importance of Egypt and, therefore,

UWI Libraries

of the peace process; and this would not help the new men who succeed Sadat, to either stick to Sadat's policies or succeed in carrying them through. I think there is much to this business of showing support and showing solidarity in times of crisis: and from that point of view it would have been good politics and good geo-political diplomacy for Mr. Reagan to be there in person, whatever the security risk. After all, Sadat risked and lost his life in persuing what was, after all, a policy which served American interests; and if a European heir to a throne and European heads-of-state and governments were prepared to take the security risk, why not the American President. But there is a much deeper aspect to the Sadat death and funeral which touches on the very nature of the problem of the Third World political leader who adopts the 'radical' course of breaking with the historical traditions of his society. For this kind of 'radicalism' to succeed in the long-run the leader has to carry his people with him; he must sell them his own vision of where he is going and what is in it for them, and he must sell it to them to the point where it becomes their own vision. It is only when the leader has achieved this psychological break-through and 'sold' his vision to his people that there is the possibility of long-run success, of his ideas and policies continuing after he is no longer on the scene. And this, I suggest, was Anwar Sadat's greatest failure. He 'sold' his vision to the Western world but it now seems that he failed to sell his vision to his own Egyptian people - so we get reports out of Egypt of a populace in a state of reserved and contained silence, waiting and watching to see what happens next. And what comes through even from biased Western journalists is the sense of the Nasser vision in the background. Nasser died in 1970 and the entire Egyptian nation and the entire Arab world were plunged into despair. Nasser had sold his people a vision. Sadat had not. And no leader no matter how good or able can succeed if he does not stir & inspire his own people. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Middle East After Sadat

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
October 7, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: What are the likely consequences of yesterday morning's dramatic and highly public assassination of Egypt's Anwar Sadat? What happens in the Middle East now? What happens to what has been described as the 'Camp David peace process'? What happens now to American foreign policy interests in that part of the world? Just mentioning these questions underscores the extraordinary extent to which American Middle Eastern policy has been built around the personality of Anwar Sadat and on the political survival of Anwar Sadat. Dr. Henry Kissinger summed it up yesterday when he described Anwar Sadat as the only one of the people involved in the Camp David 'peace process' who was indispensible to that process. American President Jimmy Carter was removed from office and the 'process' continued; if Menachem Begin had been defeated at the last Israeli elections the 'process' would still have continued; but with Anwar Sadat dead there are deep fears in both the United States and Israel that the process will come to an end. I think myself that it is almost bound to come to an end; not immediately, perhaps, unless there are further and more startling upheavals in Egypt over the next few months; but certainly, over the next year or two or three, the Camp David process will grind to a halt. Then Egypt will return to the fold of Pan-Arab nationalism, perhaps an updated version of Gamal Nasser's brand of Arab socialism. But that lies in the future. For now, American Middle Eastern policy has been reduced to a shambles by the killing of Sadat. America now has no other major Arab ally in the region. And the so-called 'moderate' states like Saudi Arabia and Jordan are now so much more embattled that they have even

UWI Libraries

hesitated to express regrets at the killing of Sadat: they know, and the Americans know, and the Israelis know that so-called Arab 'moderation' has been dealt a devastating blow by the killing of Sadat. I am not sure myself that things would have ended any differently for Sadat if Israel's Begin had been more flexible over such key issues as the rights of the Palestinians and Jewish settlements on the West Bank: more tangible political successes in the 'peace process' might have bought Sadat more time, might have stilled his opposition longer thus making last month's sweeping arrests unnecessary at the time, and so perhaps delayed the assassins' bullets. But I think that in the end, sooner or later, the showdown had to come. Sadat was an Arab leader in the Arab world who had broken with Pan-Arab nationalism. Not even when his relations with the Soviet Union were at the closest did Nasser turn his back on Pan-Arab nationalism: the ideological differences among the Arab States of those days were all within the framework of Arab nationalism. Nasser received massive Soviet aid but never became a client-state of the Russians in the way Sadat became a dependent client of the Americans in recent years. In this sense the Sadat break was both with Pan-Arabism, Naaserite Arab socialism and Nasserite non-alignment. And to give this kind of fundamental break any kind of hope at all of succeeding Sadat had to show to both his people and to the Arab world some very glittering successes. The Americans came through all right, with aid running into the thousands of millions of dollars and matching their military and Economic aid to Israel: the Israelis did not do a fraction as well at the political level. So there were no dazzling political victories to buy time for Sadat. And economic miracles always take much longer. And yesterday time ran out for Anwar Sadat, thanks, in part only, to the shortsightedness of his Western friends who wanted to see the profits before investing any more. The American dilemma is where to go from here in the Middle East. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Protecting the Jamaican Economy

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
October 5, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: On Saturday night acting Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, Hugh Shearer, discussed the problems of protecting the Jamaican economy in a speech to an awards dinner of a local manufacturing enterprise. Mr. Shearer reportedly told his audience that Jamaica could become the dumping ground of foreign companies with profitable home markets who want to get rid of their surplus products. A wide range of such goods could be dumped here if the only concern was the question of the price of such goods. And then he went on to say, and now I quote: "But think of the consequences It would mean massive unemployment and the reduction in spending power and destruction for the Jamaican economy. This is therefore not in the national interest of the country...Developing countries have to recognise their national interest and protect it. We in Jamaica have to recognise that we have a national interest to protect." There was a lot more to the speech but I think that quotation goes to the heart of the matter. Protecting the national interest, means protecting the national economy; it means protecting Jamaican workers from massive unemployment; it means protecting spending power which is just another way of containing inflation. I am glad that Mr. Shearer, as the most senior Minister in this government next only to the Prime Minister, has made this speech. Almost since the elections of last October there has been some pretty wild talk among some government propagandists about throwing the Jamaican market open to foreign goods. The argument was that the so-called 'free market' economy meant literally that: you opened up your markets and local manufacturer

UWI Libraries

either competed with the imported goods or went out of business. It was a cruel kind of joke to suggest that some small/or medium local manufacturer of, say, shoes or garments, could ever compete successfully with his or her giant U.S. competitor, or could successfully undersell the sweat-shop products from the Far East: and yet the suggestion was made in all authorative earnestness. And for a time it seemed that the government was inclined to follow that direction. Goods did indeed appear in the shops; prices did indeed come down on some of them. But our local manufacturing felt the squeeze. And the stepped-up supplies of food even hurt our farmers. Being an open dumping ground may indeed see goods flooding in and prices coming down. But it will not help to build the Jamaican economy; it will not create employment; and the unemployed will not have the money to buy all the suddenly available and reasonably priced imported goods. So that cannot be in the national interest. And this is the reason why almost every country in the world imposes varying degrees of restraints and restrictions and supports to protect its national economy. But the entire period of the last PNP government has shown that this was not enough. You may recall that some business people got very angry with me in January of 1980 for making public statistics showing that between 1972 and January 1980 the PNP Govt. had provided the manufacturing sector with a total of $1,500-million worth of foreign exchange for raw material; and that that sector had earned back for Jamaica over that seven-year period only $426-million of foreign exchange. Even if you say they had created 100,000 new jobs as well (and the record does not show this) it would still have been a most unacceptable situation: hence the years of negative growth. This present government obviously will not repeat that PNP blunder. So protecting the Jamaican economy is also going to require radical changes of attitudes on the part of our manufacturers. The challenging question is: Will our manufacturers respond more productively to the efforts of this govt. than the last?

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The State & the Political Parties:
Where to draw the line?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
October 2, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: On Tuesday of this week Dr. D.K. Duncan, the Member of Parliament for East Central St. Andrew, told Jamaica's Parliament and thus the Jamaican people, that the chairman of the PNP Youth Organisation had been picked up by "the Operations or Eradication Squad" the day before and subjected to four hours of a "line of political questions". Dr. Duncan's speech made it clear that he regarded this action as police harassment of the PNP and its affiliate The following day the Police High Command issued a statement denying any campaign of harassment against any group in Jamaica. The police statement said two tapes had been found in the possession of the PNP-YO chairman and on one of them the voice of a Most Wanted Man was recognised. And the reason why the PNP youth leader was held was that because of recent unrest in the Wareika Hills area the police had stepped up surveillance and spot-checks and Paul Burke had been held in one of these checks. Then, yesterday, Paul Burke himself issued a statement about the tapes taken from him by the police. He said one tape contained the proceedings of a private PNP meeting and the other tape, (both tapes were apparently played by the police on Monday in his presence and in the presence of his lawyers) was a blank tape with no recording on it. He said it was only on the following day, when the tape was again played that he heard what was purported to be a message from the most wanted man to his girlfriend. The suggestion here is clearly a plant and the truth or falsehood of it can only be ferreted out by due process. I have set it all out here because it highlights once again one of the most disturbing problems this society has to come to grips with if it is not to be mashed up by that problem: and that

UWI Libraries

is the problem of where, and how, to draw the line between the party political process and the operations of the nation-state. If you examine the Jamaican Constitution you will see that it makes absolutely no mention of the Jamaica Labour Party or the Peoples National Party: the parties are associations of people like any other associations that can be formed under the Constitution. In practice though, they loom larger than other associations because they have been formed for the specific purpose of fighting and winning elections Beyond that, in Constitutional terms, they have no more power, no more authority, than any other group in the society. It is a complex and sophisticated concept under which the government of the day is very much more than just the party which may have brought it to power: its responsibilities are greater, its powers are greater. And so that government betrays its premise and trust when it tries to apportion work on the basis of partisan loyalty, or apportions scarce benefits on that basis. The Constitution does not accord citizens equal rights and justice on a 60-40, 70-30 or even 50-50 party political basis. Similarly, certain key institutions are presumed to be above partisn politics: the judiciary, the civil service, the security forces. Today, however, with the exception of the judiciary (and even here there are politically-motivated strong efforts to undermine our noble tradition of judicial independece and impartiality) the politicians of all parties have seriously eroded and undermined that non-partisan tradition in nearly all of our public services. At the root of it all is the notion of the interchangability of the party and the government: the party wins the election and become the government so the government and all its comms agents must serve the interests of the party and the good civil servant and the good security officer are those who serve the interests of the government which serves the interests of the party. And so we lose sight of the fact that the interests of the party are not always the same as those of the government or the nation.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Third World Economic Dilemma

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
September 30, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Yesterday's news out of New York of strong buying on Wall Street has reportedly steadied and stopped the wave of panic selling on the world's stock markets: share prices are reported to be up in London and Tokyo as well as on Wall Street; and although the experts are careful not to make any optimistic forecasts, they do say the strong buying is likely to go on for the next few days. So, for the present at least, the wild panic on the world's ~~stock~~ money markets has been stemmed and investors are back at the business of buying rather than unloading. But all this is not of much help to those people and institutions whose holdings were largely wiped out or else grievously depleted in the panic price collapse of the past fortnight. Only the big and the strong would have been able to hold on and ride the panic and survive and, indeed, buy up at basement bargain prices those depressed stocks and shares which individual small investors and small institutions were so anxious to get rid off as their prices tumbled. Now, in this new rally, those small investors, or most of them, will not have the necessary margin to buy back what they had sold, so they will be out in the cold; and the big and the strong ones will be a little bigger and a little stronger and a little richer: in this kind of situation the rich get richer and the poor get poorer and thousands of millions of dollars worth of stocks and shares have been transferred in this way from the comparatively poor or not-so-rich to the very rich and the very strong. Market forces, it would seem, always favour the rich and the powerful over the poor and the weak. And this is

UWI Libraries

so within countries as well as between countries: you have the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' within rich metropolitan countries, and this, it seems to me, is one of the factors Third World countries overlook at their own peril. We of the so-called Third World sometimes behave as though our economic problems can be resolved quite simply by a transfer of resources and of technology from the rich countries to the poor countries. And so our political leaders devote much time and energy pressing for a more just and equitable economic order. But why should rich America or rich Europe transfer to us, what they are not prepared to transfer to their own poor? Why should they treat us any better or with any greater consideration than they do their own poor? We have no greater claim on the British Government or the American Government than have the British people who are poor and in need and the American people who are poor and in need: and the rich in Britain and the rich in America are not inclined just to ransfer some of what they have to their poor fellow countrymen. Those countrymen sell their labour; they sell their skills; they unite together and use whatever pressure they can muster to get a share of the wealth; and, of course, they use the political pressure of the ballot. What can the Third World countries now meeting at the IMF or at Melbourne do to compel an increase in the amount of IMF loan funding? What muscle? What pressure? Mr. Reagan alone can outvote their combined voting strength; so the IMF does what Mr. Reagan wants, whether we like it or not. This, I suggest, is the real dilemma faced by the Third World in its economic dealings with the rich Western countries: almost every Third World country always negotiates from a position of weakness so it is always at a disadvanatge. It is patronised, turned into a satellite or proxy or instrument of someone else's global policy and its leaders usually end up aiding and abetting the process. The hard question is how to break out of this structural trap and still remain free. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Chaos On World Money Markets:
What it means for the Third World

NEWS COMMENTSRY
For broadcast on Monday
September 28, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Thday's main news reports are of chaos on the world's money markets. From London, Hong Kong, Melbourne, Singapore and elsewhere in the world's capitalst business centres this morning came news of shock upheavals in stock market prices. Everywhere, it seemed, share prices were dropping. At one point the index of leading shares on the London Stock Exchange fell by 30 points in a matter of minutes. And similar declines were reportedly going on on other stock exchanges. And when you have this kind of upheaval on the world's stock markets it means that thousands of millions of dollars worth of share can be, and usually are wiped out. But this morning's news is not really all that new. The stock markets have been in this state of upheaval for the best part of two weeks now, after the American Stock Market, Wall Street, began its massive new round of selling a fortnight ago resulting in falling share prices. What is new is the apparent endlessness of the upheaval. Usually, some particular incident may trigger a round of panic selling on the stockmarket; this may last for a day or even a few days, but then the so-called market forces come into play, the market steadies, and things return to normal. However, this time around 'normal' seems to be an exceedingly long time coming: a fortnight is a very long time indeed for world money markets to be in this state of volitality and instability. And the things which has triggered this latest panic selling and plungeing share prices is the skepticism on Wall Street over President Reagan's economic policies which are designed to cut income taxes, increase military spending, and balance the budget, all between now and 1984. The Wall Street reaction was

UWI Libraries

and is a simple statement, in deeds, that they do not believe this can be done in the way Mr. Reagan says or in the time Mr. Reagan has set. There is, of course, more to it than this: there is, for instance, the matter of the American government's years of massive borrowing to cover deficit budgeting - for instance the 1982 budget year which begins on October 1st will, by Congressional estimates carry a deficit figure of close to $60-thousand-million. Not even the great United States Govt. can borrow $8-thousand-million a week of short-term financing interest rates and not feel the repayment pinch. So how do you cut taxes 30%, increase military spending, and still reverse this situation? So Wall Street, and then the rest of the world money markets, protect what they have as best they can; interest rates remain high; investment money is tight. And this, as far as the borrowing countries of the Third World are concerned means grief. When a Third World country has to borrow ten or twenty or thirty million dollars at interest rates of between 17% and 20% over a short term of five or seven years, into what can that money be put to earn enough just to service that debt? Not much. And yet if investors in metropolitan countries can earn that kind of return by putting their money into some high-interest fund, why go to the trouble of investing it in some foreign country? The investor who goes to the Third World country expects to do much better than if he left his money at home, especially in the context of scarce money and high and soaring interest rates. These are some of the ways in which the current chaos on the world money markets affect us, almost as directly as though the disasters took place here at home. And these are the things our financial leaders do not always make clear to us, partly because it is not politically expedient, and partly because of the self-serving notion that 'good news' even if it is only half true, may encourage better performance. The line between fact, propaganda and encouragement can be very fine. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Problems of The Rule of Law:
1) Terrorism, Violence, Subversion

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
September 25, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Minister of National Security and Justice, Mr. Winston Spaulding, on Wednesday told Parliament and the nation that there was a large volume of information which indicates that a concerted effort to disrupt the plans of the government regarding economic recovery and national security. Mr. Spaulding spoke of a 'crime school' and 'crime factory' with ideological and political motivations and he called on the patriotic and law-abiding people of Jamaica to show a national will to come to grips with this menace once and for all. This is not all that Mr. Spaulding said: I just summarise what struck me as the highpoints of a very strong and very important statement, because the problem of national security and the problem of the rule of law are of more than usual concern at this time. Whether we think of terrorists allegedly bent on frustrating the government's efforts at recovery; or whether we think of a mob of angry citizens, as in Braeton recently, beating a housebreaking thief to death and then burning his body; or/the beating to death of a praedial larcenist by a mob in some rural area; or whether we think of the far-too-frequent reports of some police officer shooting a suspect to death for allegedly attacking him with a knife or a stick or a stone; we are, all of us, caught up in a general concern that the whole concept of the rule of law itself is increasingly under seige. This concern is not always as sharply or as clearly perceived as when one says it; but it is there for all that, has been there for many years now, and is widespread and, I fear, it is growing. When

UWI Libraries

a community is robbed repeatedly and its citizen molested and harmed and nothing is or appears to be done by the local police the impulse to resort to rough community justice is strong: it results in the spate of beatings-to-death we have had lately. When a police officer is personally convinced of the guilt of some thief or larcenist and sees the slow processes of our legal machinery and the skill of our lawyers combine to free such a person, the impulse to take the law into his own hands and 'drop' the guilty one is strong: it results in all those shot-and-killed-while-resisting-arrest or killed-while-attacking-the police-with-a-knife or stick or stone, cases. And so, just as the frustrated citizens so the frustrated law-enforcement officers take the law into their own hands, and place the concept of the rule of law itself under seige. Mr. Spaulding made mention of this aspect of the problem on Wednesday. The hard question is: How do we get out of this situation? How do we restore or instil - whichever you prefer - respect for the due process, that painstaking step-by-step process, on which the rule of law is based? There are no slick and easy answers to this one, no quick political fixes here. And the events of the past few years - the political violence and lawlessness and downright bad mindedness and the encouragement to undermine and subvert the efforts of the government of the day - have not helped. You do not have a sudden change in old attitudes and habits because there is a change of administration And this is one of our hardest problems. I warned again and again in the past that those who sowed the wind might reap the whirlwind. Now we must cope with it, but within the framework of the rule of law, I suggest. If people, be they JLP or PNP or communists or Maoists or Trotskyites or fascists or nazis or racists, break the law then they must be dealt with by due process, under the rule of law; not by witch-hunts or mob rule. They must be judged and if guilty convicted for what they do, not what they believe. That is the way of the Jamaican Constitution. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Bi-annual Economic Survey: Decline Halted?
2) 'Deliverance' Oversold - Mike Henry.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For bboadcast on Wednesday
September 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two headlines in this morning's Daily Gleaner almost command attention. The first is the main page-one headline which reads 'Economic Decline Halted - survey'. And the 'survey' which is referred to is the first-ever half-yearly Economic and Social Survey of Jamaica, which we are told is now going to be published twice a year instead of only at Budget time. This innovation of a six-monthly Economic Survey is most welcome and should be a great help in bringing a more up-to-date and factual basis to the discussion of economic and social matters between one year's budget and the next. Remember the recent cross-talk between people who are supposed to know about whether the economy grew or declined in the first five months of this year? Well, the conflicting views and interpetations of that one have not yet died down; and we must hope that the publication of a twice-a-year Survey will help to put this kind of cross-talk, and the confusion it inevitably spreads, to rest. Clarity and confidence are essential if the society is to succeed and work its way out of its troubles: and the Social and Economic Survey has a long and honoured reputation as one of the most reliable documents put out by our National Planning authorities under both PNP and JLP governments. So if that document says the economic decline of recent years has been halted then it is very good and very important news. I have not myself seen the document itself yet so I hesitate to say much more about it. I note though that the 'substantially improved economic performance' for which the basis

UWI Libraries

has now been reportedly laid, is still to come; an increase of roughly one per cent in the Gross Domestic Product is projected for 1981: it has not been achieved yet. We are told that the consumer price index shows a marked slowing down compared with the same six-month period of last year. I think many people would be very interested in seeing a detailed breakdown of prices of consumer items to justify this claim. Anyway, try and get hold of a copy of this new half-yearly Economic Survey for yourself because the economy is everybody's business these days. I hope that the API finds it possible to give this document wider circulation by publishing it as a supplement in both our morning papers. The second, and I think only slightly less compelling headline, on page six of the same paper this time, quotes Mr. Mike Henry as saying: 'JLP might have oversold "deliverance" Reportedly speaking at a seminar put on by the Jacks Hill Community Council on Community Development and Youth, Mr. Henry who is the Minister of State in the Youth Ministry, said the economic condition was not there to satisfy all demands on the government at this time, and it was at this point that he was quoted as saying "... it appears we oversold deliverance.....There is so much pressure to solve the problems in ten months which were created over the years." This is the realism that comes with responsibility. It is easy to promise, easy to make dazzling, election-winning promises; it is less easy to fulfill them, especially in the short-run; and, indeed, they may not even be fulfille in the long run. And people usually judge those whom they have elected to rule for a period not only by performance, though that is most important, but also by the gap between the promises and its fulfilment. The common assuption is that balancing the books and making national housekeeping figures come out right will reflect itself in an improved quality of life for most Jamaicans. I think those who promised deliverance would be wise to address this aspect. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Challenge of Belizean Independence

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
September 21, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Belize, Britain's last remaing colony in Central America, and a dependency of colonial Jamaica until 1884, became a sovereign independent state at midnight last night. And so the Commonwealth Caribbean and all other members of the Commonwealth will warmly welcome sovereign Belize to its ranks: the United Nations, too, has indicated that Belizean membership of the world body is a foregone conclusion. And yet there is a shadow over Belize's celebration of her independence: that shadow, as most of us know, is Guatamala's claim to at least one-quarter of Belize's territory -/a claim dating back to the dark and doubtful days of imperialist expansion when vast chunks of real estate changed hands through conquest and occupation only to be reconquered and re-occupied. What became the colony of British Honduras - present day Belize - came into formal existence in 1670 when Spain, through the Treaty of Madrid,, recognised British occupation of the area. But for all that recognition Spaniards continued to raid and attack the area under British occupation - and it is on this dim and distant bit of history that the Guatamalan claim is based. And yet, Guatamala today consists of a massive land area of about 45,452 square miles /supporting a population of roughly 6-million people. So there is no land-hunger involved in this claim. Indeed, one of the problems of Guatamala is/underdevelopment and under-use of the vast land they have. Belize for its part has a land area of 8,600 square miles of mainland and roughly 266 square miles of cays and islands and a population of

UWI Libraries

roughly 140,000 people. So the shadow over Belize's independence is the claim by big neighbour Guatamala of a quarter of the land, and the fear that Guatamala may, at some point or another, perhaps when its rulers cannot cope with their serious internal political and economic problems, invade Belize. It would not be the first time that a bigger country has resorted to aggression against a smaller and militarily weaker one to distract attention from internal problems. So I think the Belizean fear is a very real one and should be taken very seriously. The leaders of the countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean have indeed been very clear and very firm on the matter of Belizean independence and the territorial integrity of Belize. What I think is needed is a series of commitments, preferably by regional organisations and groupings, to go to the military defence of Belize in the event of an invasion by Guatamala. If the countries of the Commonwealth Carbbean were to make such a commitment, and if they were to persuade the Organisation of American States, or at least some of its key sub-groupings, to make such commitments publicly, it would act as a mighty deterent to any Guatamalan impulse to military adventurism in Belize. For the present Britain is guaranteeing Belize's security from external attack; but this, of necessity, is a short-term matter and should be. I think it is the ultimate responsibility of the region itself to resolve regional problems and to ensure the territorial integrity of the countries of the region, especially of the smaller, weaker ones. If this is not or cannot be done within the region then the region will continue to be at the mercy of external great power manipulation. If Britain, America or the Soviet Union or China were to guarantee Belize or any other country's territorial integrity, that country, willy-nilly becomes the client-state of the guarantor. Done on a regional co-operative basis, real relative independence becomes possible: that is the challenge to the region of Belize's independence. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) U.S.-Saudi AWACS deal in trouble
2) Military-Economic Aid for Angola
3) Soviet Call for Action in Poland

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
September 18, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: We round off the week's comments with a look at some of the more ~~key~~ critical developments on the world scene, those developments which can make all the difference between war and peace in the world. And the Middle East continues to be perhaps the touchiest area of such developments. Yesterday the American Secretary of State, Alexander Haig, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that if the American Congress over-ruled the Reagan Administration's decision to sell five highly sophisticated radar early warning planes to Saudi Arabia the consequences could be "immense and unpredictable". What Haig meant was that the Saudis, the most conservative Arab state in the area, and up to now America's staunchest ally there, ~~might~~ are sure to interpret any refusal to sell them these Airborne Warning and Control System planes as an anti-Arab and pro-Israeli act on the part of the United States. And, indeed, the Saudis have made it clear that they see the sale of these planes to them as a critical test of American friendship. The trouble is that the Israelis do not want any Arab state to have control of these planes; for with these planes working against them it would be impossible for the Israelis to launch any surprise or 'pre-emptive' attack against any of their enemies; their enemies would know every military move they make and would be able to react and respond quickly. So Israel has mounted a fierce and bitter lobby against the sale of these planes to the Saudis; and, as usual, the Jewish 'lobby' in the United States has gone into full swing with devastating effect. And if there were to

UWI Libraries

be a vote in the Congress on this matter today, all the indications are that the Administration would be defeated. Whether Mr. Reagan's much vaunted powers of persuasion can turn a majority in the Congress around between now and next month's voting on the matter is anybody's guess. What is for sure is that if he does not America will lose her last important ally in the Persian Gulf area; and all the rich little Emirates would follow Saudi Arabia - and the consequences for American interests in the Middle East could be, in Haig's words, "Immense and unpredictable". In as volatile an area as the Middle East Saudi Arabia's turning away from the United States could easily set off a new round of violent upheavals. So this radar plane sale to the Saudis is one to watch closely. The other potentially explosive area continues to be Angola following on the South African invasion. Reports out of United Nations headquarters yesterday spoke of an emergency relief plan for the next six months of some $12-million-US to help the victims of the areas over-run by the South African. And out of Africa itself has come reports of stepped up plans to provide direct military help to Angola, with Nigeria and Tanzania playing leading roles in the mobilising of such help. One key move is to minimise South Africa's air superiority by getting Libya and Algeria to send Russian-made MIG fighter planes. And so, out of bitter necessity, a Pan-African defence capability may yet be forged. And here again, how the West reacts, on whose side it comes down and whom it helps, may determine the nature of the brewing explosion in Southern Africa. And in Eastern Europe the Soviet Union has now bluntly called on the communist rulers of Poland to take action against the Solidarity movement which has lately taken on a straight political opposition and anti-Soviet posture. This was how things developed in Hungary and Czechoslovakia earlier. Will it be any different this time?

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Employment: Equal Rights & Justice for Whom?
2) MPs Salaries: No Quorum in House
3) Cost of Living: Up 0r Down?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
September 16, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: There was a small but ominous little flare-up of partisan violence between JLP and PNP supporters over how jobs on a $5-million sewerage scheme are to be allocated. According to news reports this is a small project that will not use many workers; only something of the order of three crews of fifteen persons each. And since four workers in each batch will reportedly come from the contracting firm handling the job only 33 new hands would seem to be needed when the work is in full swing.
And it was over these 33 available jobs and how they are to be shared out that yesterday's violent clash erupted in which, according to police reports, guns and stones and bottle came into play. We are told that there was no serious injury; but the work had to be halted.
I think it is important for us to note the location of this flare-up. It is in the political constituency of East Central St. Andrew; and the sewerage project itself is at the intersection of Lyndhurst Road and Maxfield Avenue. If you know the area you will know there is a high and visible concentration of unemployed young people. So you begin with the point that there is bound to be a fierce scramble for any available jobs that might turn up, even if there is no partisan politics involve
Where partisan politics is involved, or appears to be involved, the situation immediately becomes highly volatile and potentially explosive. And there are areas like this in many parts of Kingston and St. Andrew, and indeed, in many parts of Jamaica. In the context of high unemployment the desperate scramble for a handful of jobs can easily erupt into violence where partisan politics come into pla

UWI Libraries

In this particular case, according to this morning's Daily News, the PNP supporters in the area wanted the available jobs shared on a fifty-fifty basis between JLP and PNP; the JLP supporters wanted it to be 60% for the JLP and 40% for the PNP; and sombody who claimed to speak for the union involved said the union had agreed to 55% for the JLP to 45% for the PNP. And this, on the 15th of September, 1981, was the stuff of one of the first, if not the first, small but violent partisan clashes in the life of the new regime. I sincerely hope that it is seen and understood for the warning signal it is. The young in particular are desperate for jobs; and the greater the desperation, the greater the danger of violent eruptions whenever they have to scramble for the few jobs that do appear; and when that sense of desperation is aggravated by notions of partisan discrimination the whole thing could easily become explosive. But there is an even greater injustice inherent in this 'spoils' formulation of the two parties. Whether it is 50-50 or 60-40 or 55-45, the two parties and their supporters seem to take it for granted that they and they alone add up to the total Jamaica: so there is no concession, no allowance, for those who are not of either party. What happens to the unemployed who are neither PNP nor JLP? And, lest we forget, those who are of neither party still make up the majority in this country. I think our two-party political system may in fact be destroyed, not by subversion, but by the selfish greed which even sees 'equal rights and justice' as part of the party political pork barrel. But right now there are not even enough jobs to satisfy that narrow pork barrel interest. So heed that small warning please. And can any member of Parliament really talk about a 70% pay increase for MPs on a day they cannot make a quorum and after public servants have held strain at 9%. And there is an interesting piece called Cost of Living Ginnalship in todays Daily News. Check it for yourself. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The JOS Once More:
Prescription for Disaster

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
September 14, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Jamaica Omnibus Company is in the news again; and again the news is not good. Reports are that the workers are what is described in trade union circles as 'restive' and on a sick-out because the company, and the government which owns it, have not made any response to new wage and fringe benefit demands on behalf of the workers. You may recall that we had a strike at JOS in January of this year because an Industrial Disputes Tribunal refused to make a wage award because the Tribunal was satisfied that the company was unable to pay any wage increase. The workers and their unions - the BITU and the NWU - flexed their muscles then to the great discomfort of bus users and then went back to work when they realised that their strike could result in massive lay-offs. They did not go back to work either because they got the wage increase they demanded or because they were concerned about the terrible discomfort and inconvenience they had caused hundreds of thousands of Corporate Area bus users; they went back because they were frightened by the prospect of wholesale job losses. It would seem that that fear has now been eased: a couple of hundred workers were laid off and the rest now seem to feel as safe and secure about their jobs as they did before that one week's strike in January. Or, at least, they feel it is worth 'taking a chance' in hopes of increasing their pay and fringe benefits The fact that the Minister of Public Utilities last week said the company was continuing to decline and that it had sustained losses amounting to roughly $9-million last year, and that its total debt

UWI Libraries

now stodd at some $37-million - all this seems not to mean anything to the workers and their unions: their company is losing heavily but they demand greater rewards. It seems that they could not care less where the money is to come from, as long as they can get what they want. In this, it seems to me that the JOS and its workers and their unions have not learned a thing from the warning signals of last January. And this inability or unwilling ness to learn may turn out to be just about the greatest prescription for disaster for the JOS as it is now constituted and for its workers who now behave as though higher benefits are their due/no matter how poorly they and their company perform. You may recall some of those figures I gave you back in January. In 1955 the company, then privately-owned, used a staff of 600 people to keep its 315 buses on the roads: and it made a profit for its owners. Today, and after this year's lay-offs, the now publicly-owned company's staff is still close on 2,000 to keep roughly 100 fewer vehicles on the roads than were on the roads in 1955. Do you wonder that the company/now keeps losing money and is still declining? And still the workers and their unions demand more - or else. There is a kind of madness at work here which seems to suggest that anything publicly-owned need not pay its way or make a profit. And this is what gives public ownership and any form of worker management a bad name. It is a form of social and political backwardness which feeds the myth that only a special class of people are born to manage affairs. Unless the JOS workers break out of this one, and do so quickly, and work to make the company as viable as it once was, or alternatively,/make it so socially useful that a small subsidy becomes justified, there is no future left for it. In any case, there is not much time left for the JOS as it now is: which is what makes the present union-worker muscle flexing so pathetic and sad. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Challenge to Manage: The Promise
of Better Management

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
September 11, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: One of the most important, and one of the most non-political, promises on which the Jamaica Labour Party was swept to power last October was that they would do a better job of managing the nation's business than the PNP had done. So a fair question is: "how is the new government managing, nearly one year into its term in office?" I think most people would agree that it has done a good job in the very important areas of mobilising the foreign exchange the country so badly needs: there may be quibbles about detail or about the long-term price we may have to pay, or about the likely end-results; the fact remains that foreign exchange has been mobilised, scarce food has been brought in, raw materials and spare parts are coming in in greater flow than in recent years. And foreign investment money is being attracted. At this level, the level of business and financial management, the government has done well. But that is only one facet - albeit the most important - in the nation's affairs. Many of the other - and socially equally important - facets which have been in the news recently do not seem to have been as well managed. The new school year has got under way with all the usual problems which have plagued the society for a very long time: schools are not opening; schools have been vandalised; parents have trudged from school to school seeking a place for an anxious child. As last year, and the year before and the year before and the year before forward planning for a smooth opening of a new school year has been more of a desert mirage than

UWI Libraries

in the bad old days of 'mismanagement'. It was depressing indeed to learn, only yesterday that the Jamaica School of Agriculture would not re-open this September (and we are into the second week of September) and would remain closed indefinitely while three committees determine this very important institution's future. I, for one, sense here again the kind of belated scrambling to pick up the pieces after things have been allowed to fall apart. Surely, such committees should have been set up/months ago and working when the Minister of Agriculture delivered that very pointed address at the Jamaica School of Agriculture itself where he raised such grave questions about its future. That would have been good management and intelligent forward planning: what we have now is not. And is it true that, as the National Union of Democratic Teachers claims, that 361 out of 489 graduating teacher from our teachers colleges are without jobs? What kind of management is it that allows this level of teacher unemployment in the context of a claimed teacher shortage? One of the simplest yet most important measurements of good management is how it uses or wastes its available skills and its available resources. And good manegement would not, I suggest, find any great difficulty in setting up a small office at say the Divisional HQ of the police in Montego Bay to process applications for passports by citizens in that part of the country: the issuing work would still take place at the central Kingston office to have records centralised. The Montego Bay Office would simply eliminate the need for applicants to travel to Kingston. This sort of thing is done in most countries: all that is required is a little intelligent management and use of available skills. And the same sort of commonsensical management at government level could and should be applied to our utilities, some of which seem in a worse state now than they were under PNP mismanagement. So where is the better management? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) The Egyptian Purge
2) EEC, USA & Namibia

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
September 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two new developments on the international scene are of greater-than-usual interest; and both bear significantly on the role and position of the United States in the world today. A country, any country, no matter how big or powerful, can only be the leader of a grouping for as long as that grouping accepts its leadership willingly, or else because it can impose its leadership on that grouping. In other words, for the Soviet Union to be the leader of the communist grouping in the world it must either be accepted as such by that communist grouping or else it must use brute force to impose its will. In the same way for the United States to be accepted as the leader of the capitalist grouping in the world it must either be accepted as such by that capitalist grouping or else it must use brute force to impose its will. In practice, of course, it is rarely as simple and clearcut as that. In the case of both the Soviet Union and the United States their particular leadership of their grouping derives from a combination of acceptance, a measure of subtle imposition and the perceived self-interest of members of the particular grouping. Over the years we have seen Yugoslavia, China, Albania, Rumania repudiating Soviet leadership even though they continued to be communist. Way back in the time of Charles DeGaulle France also repudiated American claims to leadership of the capitalist world without becoming non-capitalist. And now, this week at the United Nations, and on the crucial matter of Western capitalism's policy on Southern Africa, the Western countries of the European Common Market have taken a stand which amounts to a repudiation of American policy for that area. They have

UWI Libraries

blamed racist South Africa, and South Africa alone, for sabotaging United Nations efforts for Namibian independence. And this is a sharp and clearcut break, not by one or two countries, but by the entire European Community, with America on this matter. And the big question now is: when the leader of a grouping is that much out of step with his followers, what happens? In this case he does not have the brute force to impose his will on the EEC; so what does he do? I think myself that there will be some sort of compromise worked out between America and her Western allies; the interesting thing is the nature of that compromise. Who and what is going to give most. What seems for certain is that America's influence is bound to be damaged in the process. Then there is the matter of the massive political Egyptian/purge which began last Wednesday and reached its peak on Monday with a crackdown on all religious activity in Egypt, both Muslim and Christian Coptic. Reports are that somewhere around 2,000 have so far been detained: among them a former deputy Prime Minister, former Cabinet Ministers, a number of journalists including Mohamed Heikal former editor of the influential Al-Ahram and onetime close friend and adviser to the late President Nasser. Among the number of women detained is Nawal Saadawi, perhaps best known outside Egypt among the country's women writers because one of her 15 books was published in English last year. She is a doctor and was Egypt's Director of Public Health during the Nasser days of the experiment with Arab Socialism. Political observers have not missed the fact that President Sadat ordered the purge so soon after his visit to President Reagan and even American journalists have joked about his getting Reagan's clearance for the crackdown, much as the Africans suggest that South Africa had tacit approval before invading Angola. Here again, the American image is being allied to repression: not a good image for the wouldbe leader of the world democratic grouping.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) The Caricom Conference
2) ~~British TUC Conference: Unemployment~~
3) ~~Labour Day Parade, U.S.A: Reagan not invited~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
September 7, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Caricom Foreign Ministers who have been meeting here in Kingston over the past weekend yesterday announced the setting up of a technical group to work out the details of Caricom's own proposed input into what has become known as the 'Caribbean Basin Plan' for economic development under which the United States, Canada, Mexico and Venezuela will provide aid. The hope is that this aid will be of a scope and scale that would help to set this region on the path of self-sustaining economic growth and development. The United States, Canada, Mexico and Venezuela have already committed themselves to such a plan, though no details of what they propose have so far been made public. And this was one of the points to which Mr. Lester Bird, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Antigua, referred at the opening session. I think a point to note is that if these richer countries had come forward with a cut-and-dried and detailed development plan for the Caribbean Basin they could, and probably would, have been accused of economic imperialism. So the fact that the richer countries have not foisted or appear not to have their own plans on the region should be seen as something positive. It at least suggests that the Big Four expect the countries of the Caribbean Basin to themselves make a major contribution to ~~the~~ a 'dynamic and balanced' development plan. And this, it seems, is what the weekend Caricom meeting has in fact agreed on. And then, beginning today, the Caricom Foreign Ministers will have meetings with other regional

UWI Libraries

Foreign Ministers who, although not part of Caricom, are part of the Carbbean Basin. Having worked out the broad principles of a Caricom approach, the hope is that the Caricom group can now achieve a similar broad agreement with the other regional states. If achieved this would make it possible for the governments of the Caribbean Basin, as a group, to present a single agreed-on development plan to the four donor countries who would have to contribute substantially to help get the plan off the ground. So the very first thing is for the Caribbean Basin countries themselves to agree on the kind of development plan they want for the region. The donor countries have already declared their willingness to help, so that is no problem. What may turn out to be a key problem later is the level of funding needed to get the plan off the ground, and how the funding will be mobilised; and here political perceptions and ideological commitments could lead to difficulties. I give you two examples. First, private inveestment for profit is by its very nature concerned with the making of a profit first and foremost: if in the process other benefits derive, as they usually do, well and good; but the making of the biggest and best profit comes first. If there is no profit to be made, or if the profit is not 'good' enough, the private investment may either not come or else may soon go away again. So what kind of private investment is attracted is almost as important as the size of it. And then there is the politics of it all: will only parliamentary democracies participate in the plan? Or all the countries of the region? Will the donor countries exercise some sort of veto as to who can benefit from their own particular donations? If the leaders of the Caribbean Basin countries are themselves very clear about all these matters they may, ultimately get a good and workable plan and the help to get it under way. And, of course, the people of the region will have to make any plan work; which is the challenge of education and mobilisation. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Southern Africa: Washington's Gamble.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
September 4, 1981, 6.10-.m.

Good evening: The centre of attention on the explosively brewing Southern African crisis has shifted, for the time being, from racist South Africa's invasion of southern Angola to the United Nations where a special emergency session of the General Assembly, demanded by the African group, opened yesterday. The African group wants the General Assembly to agree to a motion or motions ordering South Africa to comply with the U.N. decision which set out the steps by which Namibia should move to independence or else be subjected to rigid mandatory sanctions. There is absolutely no doubt that the U.N. General Assembly will agree to the imposition of sanctions on South Africa. Unlike the case with the Security Council, the five Permanent Members of the United Nations do not have any veto power over General Assembly decisions. The ironic twist is that whatever the General Assembly decides must, if it involves something as important as economic and military sanctions, have the approval of the Security Council. Without that approval there is no way that sanctions can be made to work; indeed, even with that approval making sanctions work would be very difficult. The former racist Rhodesian regime of Ian Smith defied U.N.-imposed sanctions for years and got away with it. In this sense this current special session of the General Assembly will not succeed in imposing meaningful sanctions on South Africa. But I think the sponsors of this latest session are acutely aware of this. After this week's U.S. veto of the Security Council resolution which condemned South Africa - but did not call for sanctions - for its invasion of Angola

UWI Libraries

nobody is in any doubt that the present U.S. government is determined to aid and support the South African regime. The really interesting thing about that Security Council vote was the fact that the United States was alone. Britain abstained; France supported the resolution. So , as well as risking a loss of friends and of influence in Africa and the Third World generally, America is also risking a split in the Western alliance on this matter. So why is America risking becoming almost as isolated as South Africa? In part, I think, it has to do with the American perception of their struggle against what they see as the forces of world communism. And so we have had the not-so-subtle South African propaganda of the past couple of days around the killing of two Russian officers and the capturing of one in Angola. It has been trotted out and played up as though the Russian presence in Angola is a sinister new revelation. In reality the Angolans have made no secret of the fact that they have a number of Russian and other East European advisers and technicians helping them in a number of fields including military training; there are reportedly something in the region of 1,000 Russians and between 2,000 and 3,000 other East Europeans as well as the 15-17,000 Cubans. They are there at the invitation of the Angolans; and they have been there since that first attempt by the South Africans to topple the MPLA in the early days under Aghostin Netto. Netto had turned to the United States for help in those early days. If he had received the kind of sympathetic understanding that Robert Mugabe later received from the Carter White House, the troops and advisers and other foreign technicians might well have been Americans and West Europeans. The Americans blew that one in the name of fighting communism. It seems they still have to learn that the Africans, and indeed the Third World, are not pawns of either Soviet communism or Western capitalism and that in their own interest they will use help from wherever they get it. Goodni

UWI Libraries

Future of Jamaica Daily News

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
September 2, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: It ic clear from news reports carried over this station over the last couple of days, as well as from elsewhere, that the future of the Jamaica Daily News as this country's second morning paper is very much in the balance right now. Anyone of a series of decisions or non-decisions could easily spell the death of the Daily News. Let me list two or three of these. If the Government's Divestment Committee takes too long to make up its mind to whom and at what price it will sell the paper the delay itself could lead to collapse. No business functions well under this kind of cloud of uncertainty; and the longer the uncertainty continues the harder it is for the business to remain viable. And what is true for any business is doubly true for as specialised and sensitive a business as a newspaper: cast the slightest hint of doubt on a paper's ability to survive and advertisers and subscribers desert it. This, in addition to all its other problems, is what the long delay in divestment is bringing about. If all that is intended is for the government to sell the paper, and if buyers have been identified, then there should be no further delay in the divesting of the paper. We are told that there are two buyers in the market, one of them being the rival Gleaner Company and the other the cooperative set up for that purpose by the Daily News workers. If the Gleaner buys then, whatever it does with the paper, it would not, if it continues publication, be the same paper in an editorial sense that it now is. Like it or not, ownership does determine slant and direction. If, on the other hand, the workers buy, that alternative 'second' newspaper voice would continue to be heard in the land. That is, of

UWI Libraries

course, provided you divest a living rather than a dead newspaper; and for all its troubles the paper and those who put it out seem determined to keep it going, provided the ground is not cut from under them. And next to protracted delay, insisting on a price that your buyer cannot/or will not meet may also lead to collapse. Reports are that the workers have offered a purchase price of$800,000 but have been told they must more than double that offer. Now, the people at the Daily News have a pretty shrewd idea of the worth of the article they want to buy and the question is: What if they are not prepared or if they are not able to pay the price the government committee wants? And what if nobody else tops the workers' offer? Or, alternatively, what if the Gleaner offers a figure which is only marginally higher? In short, is the government prepared to let the Daily News die, either directly or by absorption, if it does not get the price it wants? Is nothing, and the losses accompanying that nothing, preferable to the offered $800,000? It is on questions like these that the survival or collapse of the Daily News hangs. And right now the answers to all these questions lie with the Government of Jamaica and its Divestment Committee: they have the power of decision and they must assume the responsibility for the consequences of any decision they make. If their decision results in the successful divestment of the paper and its continuation as a second and alternative newspaper voice in the country, then the credit and the honour must be to them too. If, on the other hand, their decision results in the collaspe of the Daily News then the blame must be theirs too. That is the inescapable connection between power and responsibility. For Jamaica's sake, I hope they use their power wisely on this matter. You cannot be in favour of against the notion of a one-party state but for the notion of a one-paper state. The trouble is some of us are. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Vernon Arnett
2) Iran: Death of a President & Premier
3) The U.N., South Africa, Angola.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
August 31, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The weekend news of the death of Mr. Vernon Arnett thins even further the ranks of the pioneers of modern Jamaican nationalism and of the founding fathers of Jamaica's political independence. Soon now, perhaps by the end of this decade, none of the men and women who were trade union or political activists during the terbulent 1938 period would still be with us. So it would seem wise for the trade union movement and for the political movement to quickly collect and document the first-hand recollections and remembrances of the remaining few who are still with us. I think, for instance, that Ken Hill's recollections of those early days should be taped and recorded as soon as possible; and so, I think, should be the remembrances of people like Lady Bustamante and Miss Edith Nelson of the early beginnings of the BITU and the JLP. A history of the founding and the evolution of the PNP by Vernon Arnett would have been such a valuable legacy because he was there from the very beginning and because his perspective would have been free of any hint of self-service or special pleading. One of the rarest of human qualities which I personally found and greatly admired in Vernon Arnett was his constancy: he was the same quiet, unassuming but completely committed man at all times; he was the same in power as out of power; the same in victory as in defeat; a man who knew himself knew what he valued, and lived by those values. And I think our modern day young politicians can, if they only will, learn from his example that they do not have to be rude or crude or coarse and loud &

UWI Libraries

vulgar in order to impress or look good. Indeed, a little more quiet from some of the big mouths will bring back dignity to our parliamentary system. Anyway, if Vernon Arnett's death this past weekend stirs the political and trade union movements into collecting and recording the remembrances of the last remaining pioneers of modern Jamaica's early independence struggles it would be a very welcome tribute to him. I hope they do it. Death of another kind, and in faraway strife-torn Iran, also took place this past weekend. Yesterday a bomb exploded right in the office of the Prime Minister of Iran, killing the newly elected President who succeeded Abolhassan Banisadr and the new Prime Minister whom the new President had appointed. Only a week or so ago Banisadr who is now in exile in France had mentioned the names of four or five men whose deaths could plunge the country into a major crisis and possible open civil war. Among those names were the two who died in yesterday's bomb last. And so Iran is again without a President and the Islamic Republican Party, Khomeini's party of the islamic clergy, is again without a leader. Its first leader, the Ayatollah Behesti, was killed in a bomb explosion in June which also killed 70 others. So it would seem that Iran's revolution is now busy consuming its leaders. And when you reach that point political chaos is not very far away. The hard question is: what will follow the chaos. And in the wake of South Africa's invasion of southern Angola a group of Third World countries, Mexico significantly among them, has called mandatory sanctions against Souht Africa. The United States seems certain to veto such a move. It would be interesting to see if the U.S. can persuade other Western powers- and which of them - to join in the veto. But if she has to use her veto alone, she will because of what has been described as Reagan's 'ideological affinity' with South Africa. What can the 3rd World then do? Goodnight

UWI Libraries

South Africa, Namibia, Angola, the U.N.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
August 28, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The latest news out of Southern Africa is that the white South African racists have halted their invasion of Angola and are in the process of withdrawing back to Namibia. Please note that they are not withdrawing back to South Africa; just back across the border between Namibia and Angola. And so, on the face of it, what was latest euphemistically described as South Africa's "incursion" into Angola is coming to an end; and the racists have even had the gall to invite the U.N. Security Council to come and see the situation for themselves So those of us who cherish the notion that it was the pressure of an outraged world opinion had better think again. The so-called incursion (what a soft and mushy word compared to invasion) had obviously served its purpose; so it was allright for the racists to appear to bow to the pressure of world opinion, and even to invite the members of the Security Council to come and look. So what was the real purpose of the large-scale invasion which was launched against Angola ~~xxxx~~ on Tuesday of this week? Reports are that it was a heavily armoured force of between 40,000 and 50,000 men supported by intense aerial attacks by French-made Mirage fighter-bombers and South African-assembled Buccaneer fighter-bombers and helicopter gunships. The South Africans themselves only admit to an invading force of 30,000. So even by their own self-serving figure it was no small 'incursion'. And the point: Quite simply , to go on with the campaign of making it difficult to the point of impossibility for the MPLA government to manage the country which in turn would lead to the collapse of MPLA. And in Pretoria's grand design the collapse of the MPLA should

UWI Libraries

lead to the coming to power 'of a friendly, non-Marxist, moderate' group under the leadership of Jonas Savimbi whose UNITA has been South Africa's principal black ally in Angola. And, of course, if there is a 'moderate' and friendly government in control in Angola the SWAPO freedom fighters of Namibia would not be allowed to have base-camps in Southern Angola and the South African racists would be in a so much stronger position to wipe them out. So the ultimate target in this particular case is the destruction of Sam Nujoma's SWAPO forces. This was why the South Africans deliberately scuttled that U.N. Conference on Namibia in January of this year where a date for elections leading to independence was to be agreed on. With a new and much more friendly government installed in the United States, and knowing that SWAPO would win massively in any free and fair U.N.- supervised elections, the South Africans changed their policy: they wrecked the Geneva conference; and they went back on the agreement they had worked out with the so-called 'contact group' of five Western powers. Under that agreement more or less the same processes which led to Zimbabwe's independence would have been put in motion under U.N. supervision. And when the South Africans went back on this agreement the U.S., in particular, seemed anxious to give it support. The invasion and violence of this week in Angola is no more than a continuation of the new hardline policy decided on after the Reagan victory in the U.S. Marxist Angola must be destroyed in order that SWAPO could be destroyed so that Namibia would remain securely under South African dominance. And this, of course, fits into the overall Reagan-Haigh foreign policy of confronting the communists and their friends wherever they are and beating them down. The real ~~trouble with~~ irony of this policy is that in the Third World context it nearly always equates fighting for freedom with communism - to the ultimate advantage of the communists. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Africa & the West:
A Fallout between France & her Allies?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
August 26, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Earlier this week the Quay D'Orsay, the French Foreign Ministry in Paris, let it be known that France's Ambassador in South Africa had given up his efforts to organise a united protest by all the Western diplomats in South Africa against the forcible removal of over one thousand Africans from a squatter settlement near Cape Town to the arid scrublands of the Transkei, one of the poorest of the so-called Bantustans. Among the more-than-one-thousand people who were forcibly taken into what would be described as 'internal exile' if it happened in the Soviet Union, were 470 women and 175 children, more than half the total of those transported. They were packed into trucks, driven to the borders of the Transkei and dumped to fend for themselves as best they can. I know the scrublands of the Transkei, and scratching any sort of living from it is harsh and savage for even the hardiest man; God knows how women and children would fare. And it was to protest against this forced dumping of these people that France's representative in Pretoria tried to rally the other Western diplomats and failed. The British, the senior and leading member of our Commonwealth, said that it would agree to the protest provided the other Western powers did so too. The Americans and West Germans flatly refused to have anything to do with any protest, so the British also refused. And so the French had to give up the attempt: but the French let it be known that they had made the attempt. And how did the Western news media deal with it? Some of them carried the news of the French attempt, and failure, in very low key and almost as though unrelated to that large expulsion of

UWI Libraries

human beings from that squatter settlement. And yet, if you had had, say, a similar large-scale expulsion and transportation of over a thousand Russians, especially if they were Russian Jews, or Poles, or Czechs, or Hungarians, or East Germans, Western news media reaction would have been dramatically different, and the Western response to the French initiative would have been very different indeed. The double standard that is at work is glaring; and it may, in the long run, turn out to be a major contributing factor to the steady erosion of West European and American influence in black Africa. For those who believe that everything can be dealt with by the use of muscle and might such a loss of influence may now seem not all that important; if you have guns and bombs and tanks you don't need friends, or so it seems. I am not so sure myself that the world's geo-political power relations can be resolved on such simplistic terms. Guns and bombs and tanks kill, to be sure: but what happens after all the killing? What happens when the white South Africans can no longer enforce their Apartheid by the use of might? And what happens when the Americans and the Russians have punched themselves out on each other? The West Europeans generally, and the British particularly, whose dominance of the world seemed so fixed and permanent at one point, punched themselves out on each other, and into second and third class world status in something under fifty years - between 1914 and 1946. Who says that American or Soviet or Western dominance, so apparently permanent now, is likely to be any more long-lived? Anymore permanent? The political wise men, those with a sense of the movement of history have, like the new French President and his new government, are beginning to look beyond the might of the gun and the bomb. And this could lead to a real fallout between France and her allies as the Southern African crisis continues to deepen and to gather momentum. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Sterlisation and Freedom of Choice

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
August 24, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Ever since the National Family Planning Board announced that it would launch a voluntary sterlisation programme through its clinics there has been persistent discussion of the matter; from time to time the discussion has become loud, public, overt - as when ordinary people express themselves by way of the welcome radio outlets now available to them - more often it has been subdued, carried on in small groups in private places and from time to time on buses. And, generally speaking, the mood is negative, people do not like the idea of sterlisation, even with the word 'voluntary' attached to it. And now, over this past weekend, the Committee of Women for Progress, has brought something of a political dimension to the discussion on voluntary sterlisation. And one of the very important points the Committee of Women for Progress makes is that sterilisation is irreversible: once a person has been sterilised, it cannot be undone; the person stays sterilised for life. So let us look at the case of a young woman of, say, sixteen who already has two or three children and who has a hard time getting food for herself, let alone her babies. If such a young woman went to a family planning clinic in a mood of desperation it would not be very difficult for any health worker to persuade her that she would be better off being sterilised, since one of her hopes for food and shelter may mean 'pleasing' one or a number of 'boyfriends'. The idea of sterilisation, of being free to 'sport' without the risk of making pickney, could even seem attractive in our very permissive environment. And so,

UWI Libraries

under certain social and economic circumstances the sixteen-year-old with three children from three different fathers could be persuaded to voluntarily agree to sterlisation. The hard catch may be that five or six years down the road, when she is twenty-one or twenty-two or older she may meet a man who wants a stable and permanent family relationship and who may want a child of his own making to cement such a relationship. This kind of emotional need and desire is not restricted to any one special class of people only. And it is at that point that the young woman may turn around in bitterness and curse the Board and the system which had, for the best reasons in the world, made it impossible for her to cement what looks like or could be a permanent and stable relationship by having a child by a good man. And in our socio-political system it is at least arguable that the denial of a basic right of the citizen may be involved. One of the cornerstones of our elective political system is the right of the citizen to choose the government he or she wants; and inherent in that right is the right to change his or her mind. And so we choose one party to be the government for a period; and then we change our minds and turn them out and put in another party: we did that last October. To be denied the right to change your mind, to say that you must live permanently with any one decision, is to totally change the nature of our socio-political system. And sterilisation, be it voluntary on not, denies the person concerned the right to change her or his mind. Family planning, the use of contraceptives to control pregancy, does allow for the person to change their minds. This, I suspect, is why the University Hospital some years ago reportedly refused to sterilise any young woman under the age of thirty unless the circumstances were exceptional. I think we need to be very careful not to take from any of our citizens, no matter how poor, no matter Ross Mack, how depressed, the right to change their minds. Sterilisation would take away that right. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) OPEC: Decline of the 'oil weapon'.
2) Libyan Planes Shot Down; What Response?
~~3) Jamaica, the Seabed Authority, 3rd World~~
3) A Soviet Oil Weapon?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
August 21, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The oil Ministers of the OPEC countries now meeting in Geneva appeared to have failed to agree on a common base price for the oil they sell to the rest of the world. A majority of the OPEC countries had suggested that the base price should be $35-US a barrel. Saudi Arabia has resisted this and after intense negotiations and consultations the Saudi oil Minister has said that his country is not prepared to agree to a basic price of more than ~~$4~~ 34-US a barrel. And there the matter stood earlier today. If there is to be any agreement by the OPEC oil countries on a new base price it is going to have to be that Saudi Arabia figure, because the Saudis are the single most powerful member of OPEC. They produce something of the order of 50% of all the OPEC oil and so they can effectively influence what happens on the world oil market. For instance, one of the main reasons for the present glut on the oil market was the Saudi decisions to produce some ten million barrels of oil a day: the Saudis flooded the oil market and sold their oil at $32-US a barrel. The other OPEC countries sold their oil at anything above that figure, going as high as $40 and $42 a barrel. So those who bought the oil naturally bought the 'cheaper' oil from the Saudis first and only then 'topped up' whatever they needed from the more expensive producers. The result was that the oil sales of the more expensive producers slumped. Most OPEC members had to cutback on production as well as on their massive spending programmes based on oil money. And this, in turn, held oil and therefore energy prices

UWI Libraries

at reasonably stable levels - which is why we have not had the wild and dramatic oil price surges of a few years ago over the last three years or so. Saudi Arabia has, single-handed, held back the wild price increases most of the other OPEC members wanted. And, of course, the meetings in Geneva this week were not only concerned with price; much more important for some countries was the effort to persuade the Saudis to cutback on their level of oil production because as long as the Saudis go on flooding the market with their oil it will be a buyers market and prices will go on being relatively depressed. And on this very important aspect of the business - the cutting back of Saudi production - very little has so far been made public. So even if there is agreement to a ceiling of $34 as the base price for a barrel of oil, without a cutback in Saudi production the high priced producers would still have to sell in a glutted, buyers' market and so be at a relative disadvantage. Th Saudis are, of course, adopting this line as political one: they do not want any further radicalisation of the Middle East; and they see the United States as their best bet for countering the Soviets penetrating the area; also, when those whom they see as the wild men of Arab politics have less oil money to play with they may be less inclined to finance Arab radicalism. Which is why I think there will be no United Arab response to the shooting down by the Americans of the two Libyan planes. So the OPEC 'oil weapon' has been greatly blunted. And this morning's reported agreement under which Mexico will sell 110-million barrels of oil to the U.S. for strategic stickpiling at about $32 a barrel, will reduce the OPEC oil weapon to near impotence. And then, in the offing, there is the Soviet Union which is now the world's largest oil producers. When she starts exporting on a large scale, and using oil as a Soviet 'weapon' the world may enter yet another new stage of power play.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Wanted: A Schools Text on
Marcus Garvey

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
August 19, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Throughout this week here in Jamaica we, or some of us, have been commemorating the 94th anniversary of the birth of National Hero Marcus Garvey. On the day itself, August 16th, there was an official ceremony at Lawrence Park in St. Ann's Bay; and since then there have been a series of seminars and discussions on the life and work of the great man. People who knew Garvey, people who worked with him and spoke with him, members of his organisation , the Universal Negro Improvement Association - the UNIA, some Garvey scholars from here and abroad, all came together to take part in this commemorative ceremony. Garvey is, after all, the first of Jamaica's proclaimed National Heroes which makes all this ceremonial a proper and fitting way of enlarging and enriching Jamaican national consciousness and self-respect: and/consciousness and self-respect were perhaps the most important qualities Garvey wanted to instil in his people. And yet, for all the ceremonial and for all the talk and for all the fine thoughts that were expressed this week about the man and his work, the ordinary, literate Jamaican citizen seems to know very little really about Garvey as a person or about his ideas, except in the most general sort of way. And one key reason for this, I suggest, is because there is no formal and official schools textbook in existence here in Jamaica about the life and work of Marcus Garvey. So our children do not learn about Garvey or about his ideas as part of there general education. His life and work is not found in any literature setbook , or as a history text or even as biography: in short he is just not part of the learning

UWI Libraries

process of Jamaican school children. And the once-a-year ceremonies are not and never can be a ~~xxxx~~ satifactory substitute for making the life and work of Marcus Garvey an integral part of the cultural baggage of every Jamaican schoolboy and schoolgirl. Until we do this for Garvey, and indeed, for all Jamaica's National Heroes, we are open to the charge of being more interested in using our National Heroes as self-serving symbols than in spreading the knowledge of what they really were and what they really stood for: and this is particularly so in the case of Marcus Garvey. Already, all manner of political animals have laid claim to the Garvey legacy: and only the most carefully researched truth about the man and his life, and the greatest possible knowledge about it all among those who can be described as Garvey's children will protect the legacy from the claims that are fraudulent. So an authoritative schools text on Garvey, commissioned by the Ministry of Education for use in all our schools, is a first essential. And this, I think, has to be done by a Jamaican in order to set Garvey in the Jamaican context. If an American were to do it the context and the perspective would be that of the black American; if an African were to do it that context and perspective would be African - for Garvey is, historicallly, the most universal black man of this century whose vision and teachings cut across national boundaries: but he is Jamaica's National Hero so a Jamaican writer with very deep roots here should put him into a Jamaican context for the present and coming generations of Jamaican schoolchildren. There are many Jamaican writers who could do a superb schools text on Garvey, and the name of Vic Reid come automatically to my mind because he is a uniquely Jamaican writer who also understands the Garvey vision. But, whoever writes it, let us have that schools text on Marcus Garvey and so give Garvey's children the tools with which to fulfil the Garvey dream

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Problem of Ideology & Perspective:
1) Slavery in Ethiopia
2) Overthrowing of Unpopular Regimes
3) Assault on Institutions

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
August 17, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Last Friday that old and venerable research organisation, the London-based Anti-slavery Society told a United Nations panel on slavery sitting in Geneva that Ethiopia was using slave labour. It said it had received information that Ethiopian authorities had rounded up some 45,000 people to do forced labour in the north of the country; and it said that as a result of this forced labour and the very harsh conditions under which the people had to work at least 1,626 of them had died; and it urged the United Nations to call on the International Labour Organisation to make a formal investigation of the charge. In response to this charge the Ethiopian ambassador to the United Nations European Office asked the panel to ignore the report of the Anti-slavery society because it was based on information received from sources which were against the Ethiopian government. We must all hope that the United Nations will call on the ILO to investigate this charge of slave labour in Ethiopia. And I personally hope that the Jamaican Government will lend its weight to that call at both the U.N. and I.L.O. levels. Ethiopia is of course not the only place against which the charge of using slave labour has been made. Charges of actual slavery, as well as of forced labour, have been levelled against a number of other countries in the Middle East and North Africa. And when I was a youth growing up in South Africa, forced labour was a commonplace. I remember the police swooping down on an African village and rounding up all the able-bodied men and checking for their Passes, those pieces of paper without which

UWI Libraries

a black man was automatically both stateless and guilty. And since each man had to carry several of these Passes there was nearly always one that was missing or out of order or out of date or not properly endorsed. And so the men were bundled into huge cattle trucks and driven off, not to be seen by wife or girlfriend or friends and relatives for a year or two or three, if at all. They were usually indentured in small groups to remote white-owned farms where they worked for shelter and keep and, if the farmer was kind, a few shillings a month which was usually 'saved' for them until they were released. Others were kept as prison gangs breaking stone and building roads for the state. That is how it was when I was young in South Africa. My information is that the system has been somewhat refined today, and is less obvious, but the system of forced labour based on the Passes is still at work. So Ethiopia is not alone. The difference is that Ethiopia under the men who overthrew Selassie's feudal state makes claims to being socialist and enlightened and a part of 20th century progress. And, ironically, precisely because of its ideological posture, many people on the left who would normally denounce forced labour will somehow try to defend it or excuse it or be silent. In much the same way that many so-called believers in human rights on the right of the political spectrum, have been and continue to be silent about the forced labour in South Africa while denouncing the Soviet Gulags. Strong ideological commitment to either the far right or the far left can lead to a most dangerous brand of political corruption. It can lead those who claim to believe in sovereign self-determination for Jamaica to call for outside interference to overthrow the government of Grenada for instance; and it can lead progressives to being silent or defensive about the fact that the people of Grenada have not yet been given a chance to express themselves on the new regime. And it can, for partisan reasons, lead to a dangerous savaging of such key institutions as the office of Chief Justice. Good

UWI Libraries

1) Reviving the Economy
2) The Dangers of Suppressing Dissent
3) Putting People at the Centre of Things

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
August 14, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: One of the more nagging difficulties we face in the current efforts to revive the Jamaican economy is the prevailing sense of confusion among large numbers of us about just what is really happening. We have been given figures which show a decline in productivity in certain important sectors. These have then been immediately contradicted by the presentation of another set of figures to show that there really had been no decline in those sectors or, that if there had been any marginal decline it had been offset by increases in others. And these conflicting figures have usually been followed by the backers of one set of figures launching rather personal attacks questioning the motives and intentions of those who put forward the figures they object to. And in this welter of conflicting figures and the politicking and politricking around them, most of us are left in a state of confusion and many of us are turned off and call down a curse on both their houses. And this, whatever else it is, cannot be good for the effort to revive the Jamaican economy. If it is true that it is going to be the Jamaican people themselves who are going to have to put in the effort to revive the economy, then the Jamaican people are going to have to be absolutely clear about the problems they face, the dimensions of those problems, and what it is going to take to overcome those problems, and what effort is going to be demanded of them. I think that without this clarity of persepctive it will be monumentally difficult, of not impossible, for the Jamaican people to cope successfully with their economic problems.

UWI Libraries

It is a truism that people, all people, usually cope better with matters that they undestand. When you do not understand a thing you cannot understand its significance and you cannot know how best to handle it. In this sense, getting at the true facts is critical to the economic revival. It seems to me that at the moment the true facts, whatever they are, are almost completely buried under the conflicting avalanches of self-serving interpretations. So, is the economy reviving? Or is it not? Was economic performance for the first five months of this year up or down compared with the same period last year? Surely, it should be possible to have agreement on the hard statistical facts even if there is disagreement on the interpretation. And those hard facts should be available to the people, simply & all this, of course, assumes that the Jamaican people as the key producers of the national wealth, such as it is, are the ones who are going to solve the problem. If, on the other hand, the assumption is that somebody else is going to solve our problems for us, and that we ourselves are to be marginal and more-or-less passive participants limited to carrying out instructions, then it is not very important for us to know or understand the nature and dimensions of our problems and what it needs to deal with them: so nobody rewlly needs to tell us all the hard truth; after all, someone else will do it for us; all we must do is give them the mandate and then leave them to get on with the job. And if they don't deliver to our satisfaction then, when the next elections come along, we will throw them out and try another lot. And this, it seems to me, is at the heart of ecoomic dependence, this business of someone else solving your problems for you so it is not all that important for you to be given all the hard facts or for you to try and understand them and grapple with them. Until we break out of this one we will not break out of economic dependence, and economic revival and recovery will continue to be somebody else's business, somebody else's responsibility, and mainly in somebody else's interest.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Chemically Treated Food Imports
2) When Not to 'Hang Tough'
3) ~~The Politics Of Credibility & Confusion~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
August 12, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The reports out of St. Thomas of the latest outbreak of food poisoning, and the reported statement by one of the governments medical officers that the illness experienced by the people was consistent with chemical poisoning, again raises the question of how to safeguard the Jamaican community from imported food which has been treated with possibly harmful chemicals. Five years ago, also in St. Thomas, one Jamaican family was almost completely wiped out by , losing six members through the eating of imported food which had been chemically contaminated. I still recall the shock and distress at the time, and the strong talk about the tightening up of inspection. So if the cause of this latest outbreak does turn out, on investigation, to be chemically contaminated food, what has happened to the inspection system which was supposed to have been tightening after the poisoning of five years ago? You cannot have a tight inspection system only for as long as the event which highlighted its necesssity is in the headlines, and then, when it is no longer 'hot news' got back to things as they were before. Chemicals, some good, some dubious, some downright dangerous are all being used by metropolitan producers to protect their produce from pests and to give them as long a storage life as possible. And not all the metropolitan countries have the same strict rules about the use of chemical preservatives and pesticides. So it is up to the Jamaican health authorities, at all times, to ensure that whatever food is brought in is not a health hazard. This is our responsibility, not somebody else's. So let's make that tightened-up inspection a

UWI Libraries

permanent thing, before we have a large-scale disaster in which hundreds may die. We have been relatively lucky this far; let us not push our relative good luck. Next, did you see where Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has announced that her government will contribute £27-million or $48-million-U.S. to help the local government authorities to repair the damage caused by last month's rioting. Estimates of the total cost of the damage to the British cities hit by the riots is £45-million sterling or $80-million U.S. So, for Mrs. Thatcher's government, and for the British local government authorities - and therefore for the British taxpayer - the cost of Mrs. Thatcher's toughness is coming high. If Mrs. Thatcher had spent half that amount of money on job-creating programmes, it is at least arguable that last month's riots may not have happened or may not have been on quite such a destructive scale. So now she and the local authorities have to find this kind of money for a repair job when they said they could not or would not find it for what should and could have been both economically and socially more productive. There are times when national leaders must 'hang tough' in order to bring home the reality of a situation to their people. At such times they must endure the unpopularity of the moment in expectation that the rightness of their stand will be understood later. And, always, when 'hanging tough' they must ensure that the cost of hanging tough will not outweigh the likely future benefits: and this is a thing of judgement and of 'feel' which is what leadership is all about. To hang tough and then have to pay more than you would have if you had not hung tough, is bad political judgement, bad leadership. It is being very costly to Mrs. Thatcher and the British taxpayers. Mr. Reagan, as Governor, hung tough in California and forced state government employees to back away from a strike. The cost was worth it then. Will it be the same when the air traffic controller affair is over? Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Arms Raee & the Neutron Bomb

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
August 10, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: American President Ronald Reagan's weekend announcement that the United States will, after all, go ahead with the production of the so-called neutron bomb has sent shock waves reverberating through all the world's political and military nerve-centres. First reaction from America's Western allies has, generally, been rather guarded. Soviet reaction, on the other hand, has been predictably hot and angry and violently hostile. The Russians described the American decision as a "step designed to bring the world closer to a nuclear catastrophe". And they describe the new weapon as "the most inhuman type of weapon of mass annihilation". And the anti-war groups, worldwide, have started to mobilise for what is almost certain to be a worldwide campaign against the neutron bomb. Such a campaign may create some problems for the Soviet Union which has already said that it would have to respond to the challenge posed by the American decision to produce the neutron bomb: for the only meaningful response would be for the Soviets to produce their own version of the neutron bomb. And if both super-powers are producing the neutron bomb then the anti-war movement will either have to target both America and Russia or stand accused of hypocracy. So the politically motivated screams against America's neutron bomb may be short-lived if the Soviets decide on a socialist neutron bomb to counter the capitalist neutron bomb. As far as the rest of us, the non-aligned of the world and those without the technology to produce this new refinement in death-dealing, are concerned the ideology of the neutron bomb is cold comfort. What is depressingly certain is

UWI Libraries

that this latest decision is bound to step up the already galloping arms race. A recent issue of Time Magazine, the issue of July 27th, had a chart comparing the growth of American and Soviet arms between 1976 and this year 1981. In 1976 the Americans had an almost three to one lead over the Soviets in strategic nuclear warheads; today the lead has been dramatically reduced even though the American still have nearly 1,000 more nuclear such warheads. In nuclear launchers, in submarines, in large warships, in artillery, in combat aircraft, the Soviets are ahead of the Americans. And in tanks the Soviet superiority is massive: they have 48,000 tanks to the American's 11,560. And in manpower you have 4.8-million Soviet soldiers to America's 2.-million. One important omission from this chart however is the size and strength of the forces of America's NATO allies. It can be argued that the same point can be made about the Soviet's Warsaw Pact allies. But there are, I suggest, profound qualitative differences. Still, on the face of it the Soviets appear to have the edge in firepower over the Americans. And in the kind of anti-Soviet Cold War climate now being generated by the Reagan Administration, that edge in firepower is a deadly threat that has to be neutralised as quickly as possible. So why not this 'clean' neutron weapon which kills by radiation which can penetrate buildings and steel and kill the people in them without damaging the buildings or the machines. With such a weapon you can, in one fell stroke, neutralise the massive tank superiority. This is the logica behind the Reagan decision to produce the neutrom bomb. What it does not seem to have allowed for is the Soviets also producing that weapon and capping it with something even worse. And of course, when you have this scale and quality of arming by two sides each of which fears and distrusts and sees the other as the devil, then the time when they use those weapons, in self-defence of course, is not too far away. And they are a small minority of the human race. Goodnight.

UVic Libraries

U.S. Air Traffick Controllers Strike:
Some Likely Consequences

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
August 7, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The strike of American air traffick controllers, which started at the beginning of this week, now looks like developing into a most interesting test of wills and of strength between the Administration Reagan and sections of the American labour movement. The first thing to note is that the air traffic controllers involved in this strike are Federal government employees, and such government employees in the United States are forbidden by law to strike. So when negotiations for a new wage contract between the Federal Aviation Administration, on behalf of the government, and the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Orggnisation, on behalf of the controllers, broke down there were only two possible ways out of the impasse. The workers could accept the government offer, which was a world away from what they had demanded, or they could break the law and strike. Their professional organisation decided on strike action and indications so far are that an overwhelming majority of the 13,000-odd controllers were firmly behind their organisation. The government reacted firmly and foreefully. President Reagan himself announced a deadline by which the strikers had to return to work or face dismissal. All the power of government pressure and governemnt propaganda were let loose against the strikers. But when the deadline passed the strike still held, with the government side claiming that like one thousand controllers had gone back to work but with the union spokesman saying only about 400 workers had gone back. But whether it is 400 or 1,000 it is a very small number indeed outof 13,000. So the strike was holding and the President had to make good

UWI Libraries

on his dismissal threat. And so dismissal notices started going out by post. Latest reports are that somewhere in the region of 5,000 such notices have gone out. But it is going to take at least a month for the dismissal process to be completed. So what happens in the meantime? The government is deploying air traffic controllers from the army and scaling down some of the operations. Government spokesmen claim that air traffic is operating at 75% of normal. The airlines, on the other hand, talk of losses of $35-million a day, and of travellers avoiding air travel in large numbers. And the official thinking is said to be to hang tough until the strike is busted by what is known as decertification - which in effect is the equivelent of our loss of bargaining rights. At first blush it did in fact look as though Mr. Reagan had the necessary muscle to bust what was, after all, an illegal strike. The courts imposed heavy fines on the union, its leaders and striking members. The rest of the American labour movement seemed stunned into immobility; and then, very slowly, the AFL-CIO gave its backing to the striking controllers, partly, I think, because other union-represented government employees like the 200,000-strong American Federation of Government Employees saw it as threatening their own interests as well. The American Federation of Government Employees is currently making no headway in its negotiations with the government for new contracts. If the union of the air traffic controllers is busted today, what is to prevent the American Federation of Government Employees being busted tomorrow? And so the concerns in the labour movement are widening. And earlier today we had the news that the International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers may be advising all its affiliates not to provide their services to American aircraft. If this were to happen the Reagan hand on this matter may turn out to be not as strong as it seemed.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) The Gambia and Senegal
2) Iran: ~~The Revolution Consumes its own~~
3) ~~New Moves in Southern Africa~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
August 5, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: While we in Jamaica were preoccupied with the celebrating of the nineteenth anniversary of Jamaican independence much was going on in the outside world. In the tiny West African republic of the Gambia, which became independent in 1965, a short three years after Jamaica became independent, a reportedly bloody little coup attempt was launched last Thursday while the President was in London for the royal wedding. Other and perhaps wiser heads of unstable governments had sent their wives or their deputies to represent them in London: the Gambian President did not so the political dissidents seized on his absence to make a grab for power. It looks as though they have failed, thanks mainly to the intervention of Senegal, which sent in half of its army to put down the coup. If Senegal had not done this the popularly elected government, which has been in power, under the same leader, continuously since independence, and which had won each successive general election with increased majorities, would have been overthrown and elective democracy would have come to an end. But that raises the interesting question: What kind of a democracy is it which has to be supported and kept in power by outside military force? The answer to this, I think, is what makes the Gambia such a very special case. If you look at a map of the West coast of Africa you will see that except for its short coast line the Gambia is entirely surrounded by Senegal. You will see too that the Gambia River one of the finest waterways in West Africa, is the dominant feature of the Gambia. In fact, what is now the Republic of the Gambia was created by the British way back in 1588 in order to exercise control

UWI Libraries

over that great waterway which cut like a broad finger nearly 300 miles inland and on which the ships of the times could sail almost all the way. That river was of crucial importance in the European scramble for Africa of the time; and in that scramble the French held on to most of the land, which is now Senegal, but the British could not be dislodged from the great river and the stretch of land on either side of it. And so a majority of the people of modern-day Senegal are of the Woloff tribe, and a majority of the people of the Gambia are also of the same Woloff tribe. But for the divisions imposed by the European colonisers what is now Senegal and and what is now the Gambia would have been one geographic whole: the Woloffs of both speak the same language; so do the Fulanis; so do the Mandingo. Only the official languages are different: French in one instance; English in the other. Apart from the great river, the Gambia is poor in natural resources. The groundnut or peanut is its main crop. And although it has a land area of 4,003 square miles (which is not very much smaller than Jamaica) it has a population of less than half a million people. The events of these past few days have dramatised the artificiality of the imposed separation, which both the Senegalese and the Gambians have recognised since as far back as 1963, when they jointly invited the United Nations to send a team of experts to advise on future possible links between the two. The Gambian government then said that it wanted union with Senegal provided it could retain a considerable degree of autonomy as well as its association with Britain and the Commonwealth. At that time the great Leopold Sanghor, who felt as strongly about Senegal's association with France, was President of Senegal. Senghor is now off the scene. Dawda (formerly David)Jawara has just been saved from a coup, not by the British or the Commonwealth but by his historic kin. So perhaps the long-talked of union will come out of the need to survive. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Our Water Troubles
2) The Present State of the JOS
3) On Becoming Obsessed

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
July 31, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Independence weekend is on us and the Jamaican community approaches the 19th anniversary of Jamaican independence in what can only be described as a very mixed mood indeed. That sense of purpose and unity we had, most of us, hoped for after last October's elections has not, so far, manifested itself. To be sure the festival activities of this week have gone a long way toward muting the things that divide and accenting the things that unite. And, but for that unpleasant outburst of nastiness in parliament this week, even the political scene has been relatively subdued. The worrying thing about what happened in Parliament, for me at least, is that the substance over which that row flared up may be completely lost under the heat and fury of the row itself. And the substance, lest we forget, concerned the question about the conduct of some members of the police force; and this is a matter that is of serious public concern with which we do not want to play partisan politics. The police, and the building up and the maintaining of good relations between the public and the police are critical to the peace and order of the society: so we want to eliminate anything which undermines such good relations, and strengthen anything which reinforces them. And scoring partisan points - no matter who does it - is not the way to achieve this end. Still, it does promise to be a politically peaceful long Independence weekend. I hope, too, that our water problems, especially in the Corporate Area will be greatly eased after today's meeting. The KSAC's rural water supply has not been much better of late than the Water Commissio

UWI Libraries

Some of us up in the hills of West Rural St. Andrew who are supplied by the KSAC have for weeks had long stretches of being without water and then, when it finally came had only a trickle. And to compound this, the KSAC , which had not sent out water bills for this year so far, then instituted a programme of lock-offs. If a water worker had not told me that we were on a lock-off list we may have had to spend this Independence ~~weekend~~ without water. And the funny thing is that the last year's amount for which my supply would have been locked-off had been paid and I had the receipts to prove it. So I went down to the offices and my name was removed from the list. I wonder how many other people were in similar situation and are now without water. I think the Local Government Ministry could eliminate this kind of mix-up by having lock-off lists (with lock-off dates) displayed at post offices and postal agencies so that people could have a little advance notice, either to pay up or to prove that they have already done so. Just cutting off people's water without notice is bad enough; it is made worse when it turns out that the authorities are at fault. Do better than that. Another worrying thing is the claim by JOS supervisors that the company is grinding to a halt. Some of us have warned the JOS workers and their unions for years of this possibility, and they ignored our warnings and squeezed the milch cow dry without thought for the morrow. Now the morrow is here. And still they blame each other for what is wrong. It is a sad situation for the travelling public who deserve and have paid for better. What happens now is anybody's guess: what is for sure is the endless subsidy can't go on. And finally, I sometimes wonder how our ~~so-called~~ self-styled trenchant columnist would fare if he did not ride other coattails and leech off other folk's work. Peace and love and have a good long Indepedence Weekend. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) The Royal Wedding: A News Spectacular
2) Banisadr Escapes the Mullahs
3) Youth Unemployment in Britain

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
July 29, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: News is what happens: and that royal wedding which took place in London earlier today was the one happening which has commanded the primary attention of almost all of the world's news outlets today. So, like it or not, approve of it or not, that wedding is today's number one news story, overshadowing everything else that happened in the world today. In other circumstances I think the successful escape of former Iranian President Abolhassan Banisadr to France, where he has now been granted political asylum, would have been today's major news story: it is certainly more important, politically, than any wedding no matter how royal. But that wedding is, because it has been turned into the world's number one news story today. We were told by the BBC's special commentator that 750-million people all over the world were watching the telecast and listening to the radio broadcast of that wedding while it was taking place in London. I don't know how they arrived at that exact figure of 750-million but if they are correct then something in excess of one-fifth of the entire human race must have watched and listened to the broadcast of that wedding ceremony. And that is a massive audience by any measure you care to use. But for me personally by far the most important aspect of this entire matter was the extraordinary quality of the production at every level. Those of you who watched the ceremony on television this morning must have been struck by the startling clarity of the pictures and by the obviously superb quality of the technology that made possible the instant transmission of

UWI Libraries

managed
that masterly/spectacle across thousands of miles, so that you could even see the twitch of a person's face four thousands miles away and as it happened. What if that wonderful technology, or at least part of it, were to be put to other and more socially useful and creative purposes? What if those wonderful scientific skills, that ability to transmit sound and image, were employed to instruct the drought-stricken nomads of the Sahel how to resist and force back the creeping desert; or teach the Africans on the vast grassland plains how to produce more and better food; and how to fight the many diseases of ignorance and poverty. As far as I know India is the only country making serious efforts to put this kind of high level, high quality, methods of communication to serious social use for the common good. Elsewhere in the world, and especially among those who have this technology in abundance, it is being used primarily for sport, light entertainment and as the vehicle for selling those things the developed world wants to unload on the Third World. Please don't get me wrong. I am not quarrelling with sport or light entertainment or the Big Sell. All I am saying is that in addition to these this great technology should also be used to bring socially useful help and instruction to that three-quarters of mankind who are in desperate need. The catch is there are no sponsors for that type of programme, which is why the Third World is pressing for a New Information Order, which would put at least part of that great technology we saw in use at that wedding this morning, to the service of the poor and the dispossessed of the earth. And of course, one uneasy backdrop to this morning's spectacle and one which made many people sigh with relief when the drive in the open carriage was over, was the fear of rioting by unemployed young people. The government there seems belatedly to be relaxing its stiff-necked monetarism. I hope we get the message. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

37231

Independence Week, 1981:
Divided & Exploited.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
July 27, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: We are at the start of another Independence Week/ celebration which will reach its climax next Monday, August 3rd, with observation of the 19th anniversary of Jamaican Independence. Yesterday/many of our churches throughout the country held Independence Anniversary Thanksgiving services, and at one of those services, at the Coke Memorial Methodist Church here in Kingston, the Anglican Bishop of Jamaica, the Rev Neville DeSouza, spoke about independence and division and exploitation. He said there could be no true independence if the nation was divided and exploited. He said wherever people are so divided that the privileged and the under-privileged are opposed and in conflict there can be no integrity. He said there were many Jamaicans who have rejected the possibility of a Jamaican culture and who have assimilated the cultures of other places and other spheres of influence. And he said culture is the values people live by, as they will live with the realities of their environments. And the reality of our environment (and please note I am paraphrasing and not quoting Bishop DeSouza) is thatwe will have to reckon with those who have power and who would like to perpetuate and extend that power and dominance. And so, for our independence to be meaningful and real the nation must put an end to the division and the exploitation. The hard question raised by Bishop DeSouza's very timely call is: How do we stop the division? How do we end the exploitation? Between Independence Week last year and Independence Week this year, much has changed and much remains

UWI Libraries

the same. This time last year the Jamaican society was in the grips of a terrible bloodletting: guns barked nightly and people, especially in the ghetto areas, lived and worked and slept in fear because our democratic politics had turned savage and brutish and violent and the political gun had become the substitute for the political debate; and even journalists had functioned as verbal assassins of the 'enemy'. We had adopted the totalitarian concept of the 'enemy' as someone to be wiped out by any and all means; and any and all means were justified in the drive for power. Now, a year later, there is blood-letting of a lesser and different kind. The political guns are silent; the fear is reduced; but the tension and uncertain seem to linger. The hopes and expectations which led to the democratically carried political out/changes of last October seem to be evaporating. And still people seem to look to one man to do for them what they must really do for themselves. The myth that this or that political party, that this or that leader, that this or that class, can solve the nations problems persist and has, since this time last year, been reinforced by the super-myth that the Americans will solve our problems for us. In this respect we are worse off than we were this time last year. We still try to evade the harsh truth that only we can solve our problems - and even with the best help of our friends we must do it. So for all the loan inflows our economic independence has been diminished and the well-stocked supermarkets are cold comfort to those who cannot buy what they have. There are, relatively, more unemployed now than we had this time last year. And we are yet to learn the painful lesson that just as you cannot win or borrow your troubles away, so you cannot vote them away. You may vote for new policies and direction but you still have to work to make them succeed. This time last year Community Enterprise Organisations held a very faint promise of economic democracy. In this Independence Week, there is great uncertainty and a disturbing ambivalence about where we are and what we are at. Goodnight,

UWI Libraries

1) How to Stop a Strike
2) Lay-offs at Guiness, Coca Cola
3) Unemployment: A Dangerous Time-bomb

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
July 24, 1981, 6.10.p.m.

Good evening: The quick end of the strike by engineers and supervisors of the National Water Commission is, I think, an object lesson on how to stop a strike. Here you happen to have a government Minister who happens to understand the psychology of the workers, and who was prepared to move quickly to get workers and management to talk face-to-face, even if it meant an all-night session, and who was prepared to be reasonable and conciliatory rather than big, strong, tough and officious. And so what could in other circumstances have turned into a long drawn out affair ended as one of the shortest strikes we have had in an essential utility in a very long time. I think the Minister of Local Government deserves great credit for the speed and good sense with which he handled this particular situation, as well as for how he handled the brewing water troubles in Montego Bay a day earlier. Let us hope that others, both inside and outside the government, learn this lesson and take a leaf from Mr. Charles' book when they are faced with labour problems. Worker do not, generally, resort to strike action or even the threat of strike action lightly or frivolously; they are not, as some would have us believe, the pawns of political subversives using the strike weapon. They are, generally, sober and sensible people who have, or who sincerely believe they have, some legitimate grievance. And getting tough or threatening people who are already embattled and who feel their cause is just, is not the best way to achieve industrial peace and harmony. The best way - and Mr. William Isaacs showed us this during the life of

UWI Libraries

the previous regime, and Mr. Pearnel Charles is showing now - is the way of reason and conciliation and of treating the workers as sober and responsible people worthy of respect and serious consideration even when there is disagreement with them. The sooner the 'get tough' johnnies on the other side of the industrial relations understand scene/this cardinal point, the sooner will industrial peace and harmony become realities. There is no way that anybody in today's Jamaica is going to bully or threaten or frighten Jamaica's organised labour movement into cowed submission. Indeed, such a state of things would not even be in the interest of greater productivity or the turning around of the economy; a sullen, discontented work force with a sense of grievance is most unlikely to be very productive; it will only do as little as it has to for as much as it can get. Like the other sectors in the society, like the investors, the savers, the merchants and manufacturers, ~~it is~~ work are best motivated by incentives of one kind or another. One of our major problems is that while we have incentives for these other sectors we are asking the workers to hold strain and, indeed, to accept more unemployment and reductions in their living standards. Just today some 213 workers were laid off from two bottling companies to join the growing ranks of the army of the unemployed Who/ assumes any responsibility for those workers and that vast and growing army of unemployed? Does the society have any obligation to give them a chance to earn an honest living?/There was a time when it seemed to, a time when the Minister of Labour even talked about some form of job sharing. What has come of that talk? The ranks of the unemployed keep growing and we, as a society, do nothing about it at our own social peril. For unemployment is a dangerous social time-bomb that ~~will~~ must explode if it is not defused. And not even armies have been able to contain that kind of social explosion. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Economics of Survival:
End of the Political Honeymoon?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
July 22, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The President of the Jamaica Exporters' Association yesterday revealed that there had been a drop of 7.8% in Jamaican exports during the first five months of this year. And Mr. Vaswani predicted that for the whole of 1981 we were likely to end up with a total drop in exports of 5%. And this, he reportedly said, was the first decline Jamaica's exports have shown since 1976. And this, however you look at it, is a bad omen for the projected 3% real growth in the Financial Year 1981/82 set out in the government's Economic Policy Memorandum to the I.M.F. In fairness, though, let us note that the Memorandum said; "With the plant and equipment now in place, real growth of 3 per cent. can be achieved in FY 1981/82". So there was no statement that such growth will be achieved only that it can be achieved. Indications now are that we are unlikely to reach that tentative target. And if it is something which was seen as achievable as recently as March and April of this year, why does it now, a scant three months later, seem so unlikely of achievement? Partly, I suggest, because all of us, in our different ways, have become the victims of our own wishful propaganda. The private sector wanted to be 'freed up' after the years of regulation and restraint. But being 'freed up', for them, did not mean the freedom of having to compete with trailer-loads of goods from countries which produce for much larger markets and which can therefore treat us as something of a dumping ground for their surplusses: being 'freed-up' meant, ideally, an end to regulation and restriction but a continued

UWI Libraries

protected market, and all the foreign exchange needed, without too many questions. The unionised workers for their part wanted to be 'freed' from the shortages and the scarcities and the shrinking their buying-power of wages: they wanted more goods in the shops and supermarkets; more wages and greater fringe benefits for roughly the same level of performance and output as they had given during the past regime; and they wanted job security, and all the social services. And all of us looked to the government or to somebody else to turn the economy around for us. And, indeed, the government itself seemed to think, or behaved as though it thought, that once it had dealt successfully with the IMF and freed-up the economy its major job was done and that it was up to the private sector to create employment opportunities. The government's only major other task, it seemed, was to attract foreign investment, and for this and for the IMF we need to have a workforce that is not quite as militant about its rights as is our present unionised workforce. Put all these together and you come up with a local private sector which sees itself under pressure and which is not too happy: sales are down; consumers are not buying or buying foreign; there is a meat glut; exports are down; production is down; foreign exchange is short. You have a workforce that feels embattled and jumpy and ready to flex its muscle at the first hint of provocation. And you have a government obsessed with being sabotaged and destabilised. All not very different from how it was in the last two or three years of the previous regime. So we have an unhappy private sector, an unhappy work force, a not too happy government, and a not happy general populace. Whatever else this mix is: it is not conducive to the kind of human effort that is needed to turn the economy around. All it is is the end of the political honeymoon. Now we need to settle down and tackle our problems realistically; the Americans cannot do it for us, nobody else can. When do we begin?

Goodnigh

UWI Libraries

Agricultural Production
& Price Supports

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
July 20, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: In the midst of our preoccupation, last week, with massive water shortages and electricity blackouts, many - if not most - of us paid only passing attention to a bit of startling information on the agricultural front. It was carried on the frontpage of Last Thursday's Gleaner under the heading 'Too Much Meat for the Market'. According to that item there is piled up in our cold storage facilities some two million pounds of pork, some two-and-a-half million pounds of chicken meat, and roughly one million pounds of beef for which there are no buyers. And so the livestock industry, we are told, is in a state of near panic over this mounting glut in meatkind. Jamaicans are not buying the meat, or, at least, they are not buying enough to reduce the stockpile. And the fear, indeed, is that the stockpile is growing. And you know, and I know, that in very very many Jamaican homes people are not getting enough meatkind to provide their families, and especially their growing children, with enough meat to make up a rounded and balanced diet; old people, pensioners on small fixed income, the poor and the children of the poor all suffer to varying degrees from protein deficiency. And our cold storage facilities are full to bursting with chicken and pork and beef; and our livestock producers are desperately searching for markets. The Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Broderick, told last week general annual meeting of the Jamaica Agricultural society that the government stood to lose close on half a million dollars on the buying of roughly two million pounds weight of meat which is now in cold storage. And he reportedly

UWI Libraries

warned the farmers that the government had no intention of becoming a main buyer of these meat products, so the farmers had better go out and find markets for themselves. Fair enough. That is sound theory in terms of the free play of market forces. In theory, when there is a glut prices come down, and if the glut is great enough and prices tumble low enough, large numbers of farmers lose their shirts and often their land as well and go out of business; and agricultural production collapses and shortages return and the country cannot feed itself. And the farmers who have been hurt before refuse to go back into the same business which had mashed them up so badly. It was because the free play of market forces had this kind of destructive effect on agriculture that even the most committed capitalistic free enterprise societies instituted systems of agricultural price supports to stabilise prices and so stabilise production. The United States has one of the oldest and most elaborate agricultural price-support systems in the world, dating back to the time of the great depression. The U.S. government buys up and stores thousands of millions of dollars worth of surplus agricultural produce each year in order to keep prices stable. The British, the French, the West Germans, and indeed most other European countries, all have agricultural price support systems because they know, from experience, that without such price support systems, and a measure of rationalisation of production, agriculture would be in constant chaotic state of boom and bust, of glut followed by shortage followed by collapse. If, in our zeal to prove our commitment to the so-called free play of market forces, we remove the limited supports and restraints we have provided our agriculture up to now, we may live to see and to mourn the day of the collapse of our fledgling livestock industry and much else. So let us copy the American capitalist practice on this one. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Sophisticated Bank Robbery
2) Bad News is Good News: Patterns of Reporting
3) U.S., Cuba, Jamaica: What Type of Relations?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
July 17, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: This dismal week of water shortages and power outages remained true to form with yesterday's massive and obviously well planned robbery at the Mona campus branch of the National Commercial Bank. Let us hope there is no other disaster before this week is out, and that we can put it behind us as you do a bad dream. The bank robbery made banner headlines in both of this morning's papers: one paper has it as: "Gunman rob bank of $½-m"; The other says: "Kidnap-robbers in $¼-m Bank Heist". So even here, in a non-controversial, non-political, news event there seem to be two versions of what happened, or, at least, of the amount of money involved. Did the robbers get away with a quarter of a million dollars? Or did they get away with half a million dollars? And why the discrepancy in the two figures? Were the two papers provided with different sets of figures in the same way that different sets of figures were provided about the Jamaica-Soviet Alumina deal? These conflicting figures are not good for building and maintaining public confidence in what should be reliable information from recognised sources. And if people cannot be sure of the accuracy of the facts given them from the floor of their parliament or the frontpages of their newspapers, then where are they to turn for the truth, undoctored? Confidence, or the lack of it, in the information from public institutions and public persons can make all the difference to the life or death of our kind of open political system. And then there is the matter of the high degree of skill and sophis ication behind yesterday's robbery. I am not sure

UWI Libraries

that any gang of professionals in Chicago or New York or Paris or Berlin could have carried out yesterday's operation any more neatly. I deliberately leave out London professional gangsters because of the gun factor: the British crooks, especially the highly skilled professionals, are as opposed to the use of firearms as are the British police. Which, incidentally, would explain why there was not a single reported death after ten days of rioting in Britain. But that is by the way. The real point is that the kind of skills used in yesterday's robbery, obviously and based on what television teaches us about how these things are done in the metropolitan centres, is the kind of transfer of technology we could well do without. The trouble is it is here, and there is no way it can now be shut out. There is only one way to stop an idea, and that is by a better idea. Do we have any idea that can channel the skilled planning and action that went into yesterday's robbery into more creative and constructive activity? Suppression will go some way; but it is not the cure. And this is a problem which is likely to grow rather than diminish. And making 'bad news a media event also has a bearing. Another of this morning's headlines said 'Production Falling'. What had happen was 8 of 15 commodities showed a decline in production; 7 others showed increases. Three of those that declined were foreign exchange earning, but one of those that increased was a greater foreign exchange earner than all three combined. Inshort, on examination, increases and declines just about balanced out. Only the headline did not. And finally, I received a letter from a friend 'up North' a sentence of which said: "I read in the papers recently that Reagan has decided to return Guantanamo to Cuba and my first thought was that a deal may have been made to hand over Jamaica to Reagan". Remember how it was a year or two ago? Only in reverse. And I see the Cuban doctors are still with us and very welcom The French have a saying for it all. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) A Trying Time
2) Cutbacks in Alumina/Bauxite Industry
3) The Unsettled Labour Scene

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
July 15, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The past few days have turned out to be exceedingly trying ones for most Jamaicans at the level of day-to-day living. Light and water are necessities: without water life itself becomes impossible; long spells of water shortage can, and often does, make any semblance of civilised and comfortable existence very difficult. When people cannot wash their bodies or the clothes they wear; when they cannot flush the indoor toilets they use in crowded cities and tenement yards, then they and their environment turn into an almighty and oppressive stink. And when people go to work with their unwashed bodies clothed in unwashed garments there is irritation and frustration at work. And no amount of scent or bay rum is able to hide the basic discomfort. Add to this the often long wait for public transport to go to work in hot and overcrowded buses and the whole thing becomes a most dismal experience. And this is how it has been for all those hundreds of thousands of Jamaicans, especially those in the Corporate Area of Kingston and St. Andrew, whose homes or workplace or both were without water for long spells over the past few days. I am not sure that even the very affluent or the luxury apartment dwellers have completely escaped the dismal discomfort of being without water these past few days. And then there is the business of electricity. Urban living is artificial and refrigerated. Working people do all their main shopping once a week, when payday comes around. They refrigerate and freeze the week's food, expecting it to stretch till next payday, with only minor additions during

UWI Libraries

the intervening days. When ~~xix this~~ carefully structured household storing pattern is thrown out of gear, as it was these past few days, by scheduled and unscheduled power outages, the result can be widespread grief, with food becoming spoiled or contaminated and costly appliances becoming damaged. And most ordinary Jamaican households have had to go to considerable trouble to be able to buy a refrigerator or a freezer - which is generally seen as a once in a lifetime investment. And this, too, is how it has been for very, very many Jamaican households over these past few days. And this context of acute and often costly physical discomfort for much of the society's work force is not conducive to the kind of productivity we all say we agree Jamaica needs at this time. If we really want Jamaica's workers to produce to the best of their abilities then the society is going to have to make sure that they do not dissipate quite as much of their productive capacities and energies grappling with physical discomfort, as they have had to do these past few days. This is no more then enlightened economic self-interest. And I am glad that the telephone strike now really appears to be over; perhaps it was belated recognition of where enlightened self-interest lay. And in terms of trials of strength, it would obviously not have been in the enlightened self-interst of the workers in the bauxite/alumina industry to go on strike at a time of cutbacks and huge stockpiles. The companies could easily sit them out. But there still remain the important questions of whether just raw muscle, all by itself, is the ideal means to ease the unsettled labour scene; and the other important matter raised publicly yesterday which is whether the Industrial Disputes Tribunal is in fact bound by the 9% wage ceiling of our agreement with the IMF. If it is, it would explain the reluctance of unions to take that route. So, is it? Goodnight

the S~~T~~.D. says it is not, what do the unions say?

UWI Libraries

The British Riots

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
July 13, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The weekend has been relatively quiet here in Jamaica, but it has been turbulent and violent in most other parts of the world. And nowhere has it been more violently unsettled than in normally staid and law-abiding and peaceful Britain. For this morning's reports are that it is no longer just English rioting; there has been an eruption in Scotland as well, on this 10th straight day of British urban rioting. And what began, or was seen as, an outbreak of racial violence in the London suburb of Southall ten days ago when white neo-Nazi youngtoughs known as Skinheads attacked the Asian, mainly Pakistani, community in the area, has now escalated into something a great deal more than just racial friction. There are reports of black and white and Asian youngsters standing shoulder-to-shoulder as they hurl petrol bombs or Molotov cocktails or bricks and stones at the police; which suggests that, for the moment at least, the racial and colour element has been submerged by another and stronger driving force. Reports are, too, that some of the rioting has been turned into a sort of media event, with television being the medium most catered for. Rioters, or some of them, put on their best and most ferocious performances when the T.V. cameras are present; and some journalists have reportedly been questioned by riot leaders to check whether their 'show' was better than, say, last night's riot in some other city. To say this is not to suggest that there are not very serious and profound reasons for these outbreaks; it is simply to suggest that there are also opportunists always ready to seize on such occasions and exploit them. We saw some of this

UWI Libraries

opportunistic exploitation of a situation here in Jamaica during the petrol price riots a couple of years back. And as in Britain now, the media was the messenger, and the message created its own ripple effect. There is nothing unusual in political opportunists exploiting a situation - be they of the Right, the Left or the Centre - they have always done it and they will always do it in open societies. Only closed societies forbid this and go in for witch-hunts. Anyway, what is important is that the British appear not to be sidetracked by these opportunists into not look at root-causes. Even Mrs. Thatcher drew a neat and careful distinction between the 'criminal hooligans' and the 'trouble-makers' and those with real and deep frustrations. And one of the new phrases to come out of what seems to be an agonising search for an explanation to these eruptions is "moral deprivation". These young people, they say, are suffering from a sense of 'moral deprivation': the cities in which they live are run-down and running down; the economy is shrinking and cannot provide them with jobs or even the prospect of jobs for as far ahead as they can see; the people to whom they look for leadership and explanations and answers - seem unable to give these; even the material goodies of the welfare state, which were supposed to cushion them from the 'cradle to the grave'are diminishing: and so there is this growing sense of'moral deprivation' which led to the wanton riots of these past ten days. I am not sure myself that the notion of 'moral deprivation' is the whole explanation to what seems from this distance a very complex situation. Getting tough with the rioters, as Nothern Ireland has shown, may not by itself help matters very much. The Thatcher policies obviously have a bearing on the mood of discontent. But is that all there is to it? And can we in Jamaica with our own morally deprived young people learn from it in good time?

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) The Industrial Scene
2) Cooling Partisan Passions
3) KSAC Roads & Works Committee

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
July 10, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Prospects on the Jamaican industrial scene continue to be gloomy and unsettled. What looked like a breakthrough at the Telephone Company did not last long. The telephone workers and their union last night reportedly rejected the company's offer to pay the workers 30% of full pay for the period they were on go-slow: the workers demand full pay for the 12-day period. So the telephone strike was on again this morning, despite the company's re-opening announcement in both this morning's newspapers. And unless the impasse in the bauxite/alumina business can be resolved this weekend the industry may shutdown next week, and whoever else wins, Jamaica will suffer and the economic recovery we all say we are so anxious for will receive yet another setback. The question is: How do we put an end to this economically debilitating season of industrial discontent which is now at work in this society? Not, I suggest, by what has now become a sort of pre-rehearsed stream of denunciation of some communist conspiracy to incite labour unrest. I think it is the responsibility of those who claim that such a conspiracy does exists to prove it beyond reasonable doubt. Just to go on slinging mud at the entire labour movement in hopes that some of it may stick could end up making the unions and their members much more angry and embattled than they need be. It is the sheerest nonsense for anybody to suggest or to imply that the leadership of the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union, or the National Workers Union or JALGO or the Trades Union Congress, are either being used or manipulated by

UWI Libraries

the communists in order to sabotage the efforts of the Seaga government. It would be the grossest insult to the intelligence of these people to suggest that they are being so used without their knowledge, without their being able to see through it. Indeed, it is no secret that one of the factors which led to the decisive swing against the PNP last October on the part of large segments of the organised labour movement was the perception by union leaders, all the way down to the shop-floor level, that the PNP was co-operating too closely with the communist WPJ. That, like it or not, was and still is the basic position of all four major unions. And to tell them now that they are either communist or being used by communists because they press for some economic betterment for their members, is simply to creat a mood of embattlement and confrontation. So I would suggest that all the hot partisan propagandists cool it a little. The best climate in which to work for industrial peace is a cool and quiet one, not one which has been artificially heated up by other people's self-serving need to hunt witches. Jamaica's labour movement is no more perfect and flawless than any other institution in the Jamaican society: there is much in it - as there is in other of the society's institutions - which can be improved to the benefit of the general good. But there is no way that anybody or any group can or will bludgeon labour into such improvement. So let us try a little cool self-interested co-operation . It might just put an end to this season of industrial discontent. And finally, did you see the news that Monday's meeting of the KSAC Roads & Works Committee fell through because there was no quoram? And that this was the fourth time this has happened since the March Local Government elections? Since these are monthly meetings it means there has been no meeting of that committee since the elections. Is this the better management we were promised?

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) The Bauxite Impasse
2) Our Economic Prospects
~~3) KSAC Otts. Re Quebec~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
July 8, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The good news is that the telephone strike is over and that with any sort of goodwill from both sides telephone subscribers and other telephone users should begin to get their services back by next week. And this, of course, means that the action taken by the Jamintel workers in support of their telephone company colleagues, will also be ended and work their will return to normal. Another piece of good news is the report out of New York that Jamaica's Prime Minister yesterday signed a loan agreement for $71-million U.S. with a syndicate of 25 international banks. This was the main reason for Mr. Seaga's current trip to the United States and a reasonable inference is that all the negotiations for this loan had been successfully carried through before Mr. Seaga left here. That is how these things are normally done. This particular loan has a grace period of three years after which it has to be repaid over a four-year period. The interest rate on this loan is to be calculated at 2¼% over and above the London Inter-Bank Offered rate for six months U.S dollar deposits. So, whatever the inter-bank offered rate is, Jamaica will add 2¼% on to that as the interest it must pay. So, on the face of it, and without knowing what the Inter-Bank offered rate is and what its fluctuations are, this does not look like a 'soft loan'. And that of course makes it all that much more important that it should be put to the most productive use possible. And this brings us, logically, to the not-so-good news, which is the heightened unrest in the bauxite-alumina industry. The union representing the workers in that industry, the N.W.U. yesterday made public

UWI Libraries

its intention to give the five bauxite-alumina companies 72 hours notice of strike action unless the companies return to the bargaining table to continue negotiations for a new labour contract. The old contract between the companies and the union representing the workers expired at the end of January. Negotiations for a new contract had in fact started back in November of last year. You may recall that one of the sticking points in those very early negotiations was on the question of retroactivity: the companies wanted the life of any new contract to begin from the date of its signing; the union wanted it backdated to the expiry date of the old contract - which is the traditional custom. This same issue, you will remember, also came up in the offer to public sector workers, where the government proposed that instead of April the life of the new agreement should begin in July. Anyway, negotiations had been dragging on, and in April of this year the Minister of Labour referred the matter to the Industrial Disputes Tribunal, even though the union insists that there was no industrial dispute in existence. On the face of it it looks as though the companies would prefer the Tribunal to arbitrate a new wage agreement; perhaps they think that in the new climate they would get a better deal from the tribunal, that they would have to give less than they would in direct face-to-face negotiations with the union. After all, in this context, the matter of 'ability-to-pay' does favour the union side, when you consider the level of company profits. If there is any principle involved here, it is the principle of free bargaining in the marketplace, with state intervention as a genuine last resort rather than as a convenience to be manipulated by the one side or the other. If this principle breaks down over the bauxite-alumina wage business, or any other, then the chances of our achieving that 3% real growth this fiscal year, on which the Prime Minister's loan programme is predicated, may be in jeopardy, no matter who wins. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) End of School Year
2) Pay Increase for Parliamentarians
3) ~~The U.S. and the P.L.O.~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
July 6, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Another school year has just ended; and, all things considered, upwards of between 20,000 and 30,000 young people will not go back to school when the new school year begins in September. The overwhelming majority of these young people will join the ranks of Jamaica's labour force. Only a handful of the more fortunate may go to university or for further technical training, here or abroad; and a very small number may have jobs waiting for them. The overwhelming majority will join the ranks of the unemployed in the labour force. And the Labour Force, 1980 report of the Department of Statistics says, and now I quote: "In November 1980, 56 percent of the unemployed labour force was under 24 years of age. The growing tendency is for the greater portion of the unemployed to be found among the young. At the same time, the educational level of the unemployed is higher than in previous years. Thirty-two percent of the unemployed had post primary education and of these, 56 percent had never worked." End of quote. And this is the dismal situation into which most of the 20,000-plus young people who have left school permanently will now move. These are frightening figures when you consider their implications for the social stability of the society. More than half the unemployed in Jamaica today are under 24, and nearly one-third of that lot have had some sort of secondary education - which is a higher general level of education than is to be found spread throughout the society. So where do these young people go? Do we, as a society, have any responsibility for

UWI Libraries

them? Or are they on their own, economic outcasts to whom we can offer no hope? And if that is our answer; if we can offer them no hope, or only hope deferred indefinitely, are we prepared to accept the possible consequences? And if the sophisticated and obviously well-planned robberies, especially bank robberies, are anything to go by, then those consequences could be dread. In its own best long-term interest this society had better look to this growing problem and the social dilemma it poses: you cannot turn out 20,000-plus educated youngsters a year, with expectations heightened by the very education you have given them, and then dump them on the scrapheap of unemployment without some dread social reaction; and it is too late for you to just stop educating them. So the education which feeds the heightened expectation must go on building up the bitter unemployment frustration which is bound sooner or later to explode - unless something is done to relieve that pressure, and done soon. It is not a question of coddling or pampering anybody; it is straight national survival self-interest. And history has and is still showing us that suppression, however forceful, is not the answer. So what are we to do? And who is responsible? The elect of the people, I suggest. The private sector can help but the primary responsibility must be with government. Indeed, their election manifesto acknowledge that. So what are they doing?

And talking about the government, I agree with those who are now calling for increased pay for our parliamentarians: they deserve it as much as our junior doctors and our nurses and our teachers and our other public sector workers. So give them the same offered $29 a week across the board over the next two years as other public sector workers. After all they are supposed to be public servants too. But I'm not sure most of them will do half as well if they moved to the private sector as would our teachers, nurses and doctors. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) N.W. Manley Remembered
2) Defining the National Interest

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
July 3, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Jamaica today is in desperate need of some point of reference that could be used to foster a sense of unity and of common purpose, a sense and understanding of what is the 'national interest'. And so, for some of us at least, the need and the time and the occasion summon up the memory of Norman Washington Manley, the anniversary of whose birth will be observed tomorrow, July 4th, at his birthplace at Roxborough in Manchester, by way of an official ceremony put on by the government of Jamaica. This sort of ceremony honouring the birth of Jamaica's National Heroes has become something of a tradition and its primary virtue is, or should be, the fact that it makes for a sense of unity which accepts and transcends the political diversity within the society. The fact that this ceremony has not always achieved this desireable aim, the fact that political hotheads, both high and low, have at times marred and tarnished it for cheap short-term partisan advantage, does not detract from its primary virtues as one of the most important unifying factors in the society, and one which can only grow stronger as time passes. The ceremonies honouring Manley and Bustamante and Garvey and the other National Heroes are likely to go on uniting Jamaicans and building a sense of common purpose long after all the self-important and divisive elements which now loom so large are forgotten. A time may well come when other political parties and persons have replaced the JLP and PNP and their leaders, and only the ceremonies honouring the National Heroes will remind other generations of Jamaicans that there once were a JLP and a PNP and

UWI Libraries

political and labour leaders like Donald Sangster and Hugh Shearer and Michael Manley and Edward Seaga who/each had the distinction of being Prime Minister of Jamaica at one time or another. The real continuity the real striving after a national unity within/our diversity, and encompassing, is in the symbolism of the lives and achievements of the National Heroes. Of course there will be those who will try to use and to manipulate the National Heroes and the national occasions associated with them. But that is no matter; time has a way of dealing with these petty power plays, of showing them up for what they are. For instance, Garvey is not a National Hero because a few Jamaicans decided to bring his body home and to proclaim him the first of our National Heroes. He is a Hero in spite of that; and the only credit that can be claimed is that these Jamaicans had the good sense and the historical understanding to proclaim him such, however belatedly. Jamaica, not Garvey, is the beneficiary of any honour bestowed on Garvey. And so, with the other National Heroes. And so, for many of whom I am one, with/for Norman Manley who put down, with his great Cousin Alexander Bustamante, the structural foundations on which modern Jamaica stands. Jamaica, not Manley or Bustamante, is the beneficiary of their being honoured: they do not need the honouring; Jamaica does. For honouring them/it bespeaks the real Jamaican aspirations, and it points the way to unity and co-operation and all the things among us/others seek by looking outward, to other shores and other people, as though Jamaica itself has no inner resources. The inner resources are here; the challenge is to mobilise and unleash and give direction to those resources. That is what the generation of Bustamante and of Norman Manley, whose birthday we honour tomorrow, did and did so well without mashing up the house and without sowing hatred. If we can rise to that challenge the national interest will define itself. Have we the leadership?

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) The Labour Scene
2) Some Tricky Foreign Policy Issues
~~3) The Israeli Elections~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
July 1, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The first half of 1981 is now behind us, and the labour scene continues to be just about as unsettled as it can be. And we must really wonder whether any worthwhile level of productivity is possible in such an unsettled labour relations climate. The Telephone Company workers are still out, and those at JAMINTEL continue their work-to-rule (which is not the same as a go-slow) in support of the telephone workers. The public, in the meantime, are without these vital services and that cannot help productivity or commerce or any other business. And I am frankly not sure that just screaming "communists" at the workers Telephone Company/in a threatening manner is really going to help resolve this matter. It seems to me that Mr. Alva Ross's way of conciliation quiet/conciliatory diplomacy is more likely to bring about long-term results than the confrontationist sounds that come from some other quarters. I still think that there is need for clear and specific rules to be laid down and agreed to/in labour contracts on sick-outs, ~~work-to-rule~~ and go-slows. These are the morally dubious gray areas in labour relations: they strike at the basic principle of a full day's pay for a full day's work. And there really is no principle worth anything involved in workers anywhere expecting or demanding a full day's pay if and when they do not put in a full day's work. But these morally dubious gray areas have become an accepted/part of the labour scene, not only in Jamaica, but/throughout the capitalist world. So you have the ~~work-to-rule and~~ the sick-out and the go-slow in Britain and the United States and France and West Germany and Canada. And there, as

UWI Libraries

is the case here now, workers have and will strike if they are not paid for resorting to these morally grey areas of labour practice. To treat this problem in terms of conspiracies, whether real or fanciful, is to miss its essential seriousness and the need to deal with it and to find solutions for it within the framework of union-management labour agreements. We can begin with the simple question: If workers in any enterprise feel they have the right to clock-in or report for work and then do no work, what is to prevent management from shutting down the place until the workers are prepared to put in a full day's work for a fully day's pay? In other words: Why should not a shutdown be an acceptable response to a go-slow ~~or work-to-rule~~ or sick-out? Is the one any more morally defensible than the other? Our labour laws are pretty sophisticated and refined and I am sure that the additional refinement on this particular point will present no difficulty - given the will on both sides. And once people have full knowledge of the consequences of their action the tendency to a test by industrial 'muscle' may be reduced. The matter between the bauxite-alumina companies and the NWU is an entirely different matter again and I hope that Mr. Ross's coaxing of the parties back to local level negotiations will succeed even after he gives up his acting post. As a principle/tribunals should be genuine last-resort reference to moves/ and not because the one/side or the other thinks it would get a better deal by that route. The trouble is that this principle assumes a non-adversary relationship between management and labour: and that is the ideal, not the reality. And finally, the Commonwealth Secretary-General's comments yesterday on U.S.-South African relations and how the Africans see these, and Cuba's reported calls for improved diplomatic relations with us, and Washington's anti-Cuban hardline and the co-operation treaty between Mexico and Cuba - all these could raise some tricky foerign policy issues for Mr. Shearer. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Calls for Unity: Politics of Unity
~~2) Successful OAU Summit~~
~~3) Bombing In Iran~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
June 29, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: According to Prime Minister Seaga Jamaica has easily and comfortably passed the first quarterly IMF test, which is welcome though not unexpected news. There is, on the face of it, no reason why all the future IMF tests should present any more problems than this first one because the present government and the IMF are in basic agreement on what is to be done. And when people or institution are in agreement then what has to be done is usually done much more easily and successfully than if there were discord and disagreement. There was discord and disagreement between the previous government and the IMF; there is none between the present government and the IMF. And this point about the relative ease and success with which difficul problems can be resolved where there is agreement applies to Jamaica's internal problems as well. There is, presently, a call for unity coming from many sections of the Jamaican society. We must, these people say, pull together, produce together, work hard together, sacrifice together, to turn the economy around and to tackle the deep social problems facing the nation. The elections- both national and local - are behind us for at least the next four years or so and there is no need for the strident and ugly/partisan politics of the recent/ past. I think we must all welcome this call for a national unity of purpose, for a putting of the interests of the nation above the interests of any section. But how do we turn this into reality? How do we make it more/than just luncheon-or-dinner-circuit or party political platform chat? First, I suggest, by accepting and respecting the hard fact of the very real differences of interest and of outlook which

UWI Libraries

exists in this society at this time. For instance there are people in/or supporting both the PNP and the JLP who have a vested interest in the politics of the 'ins' and the 'outs';/people who see nothing wrong with "the spoils to the winner" syndrome. When they are 'out' of power they withdraw and bide their time, passive at best, negative and destructive at worst, always unwilling to help the 'ins' succeed. And this is not something that came about last year or only in recent times. So how do we deal with this? How mobilise/this large segment of the society, and the various talents in it, which is unused or underused at any given time? I do not think we do it by telling them how treacherous or subversive they are: I think we do it by changing a system which corrupts and divides. The trouble/ is there is not enough spoils to go around to satisfy the expectations of the supporters of the 'ins' let alone catering to/the needs of the supporters of the'outs'. So the spoils game persists and the resentment it breeds continues to frustrate the calls for a national perspective and national unity. In this respect we are even further back than we were when Bustamante brought in his 40-40-20 formula for sharing public works jobs: equality of sacrifice presupposes equality in other respects too. If there are any easy answers to this one, I do not have them. But if the calls to national unity are to become more than just chat then the political system must come to grips with this divisive and destructive business of the 'ins' and the 'outs'. Trade unionism is of course one of the major ways in which the 'ins' and 'outs' thing has been checked/ and blunted; but the unionised/ are still a minority, however potent, and/unionism is under fire right now. Some seem to think that calling others unpatriotic and subversive will make this problem somehow go away. Elements in the PNP tried that and failed; those in the JLP now trying will also fail. For the problem of forging genuine national unity is hard, urgent, real. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Some Still Open Questions
2) Everybody's 'Bomb' & Arming 'Terrorists'

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
June 26, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The business of the sale of alumina to the Soviet Union came up again in Parliament this week; and still we/the public are no clearer about the truth of this matter. And this cannot be good for public confidence in what we are told about the nation's affairs. So the sooner this particular one is cleared up, the better. And, if, in the British Parliament any Minister of government had given wrong figures /to the House of Commons he would have assumed a measure of responsibility/for the error even though those figures had been provided by bureaucrats. And then there is the still open question on how much fish was actually imported from Cuba. If Mr. Douglas Vaz gave parliament the wrong figures, as was claimed elswhere, then it is hig parliamentary duty to correct those figures in parliament. And when it comes to the telephone strike perhaps the open question which /has still to be resolved is what people are paid for. Perhaps the way out of this particular problem is to write into every labour contract, clearly and precisely, what workers will be paid for and what they will not be paid/for. I think the go-slow and the sick-out and how they are to be seen and dealt with should form part of the details of any wage contract. And while we have been concerned with these problems of our own the business of guns and bombs and those who make them and sell them, and who should have them, has been much in the news. The Israeli/bombing attack on the Iraqi nuclear installation near Baghdad just over a fortnight ago has raised profound questions, particularly in the Third World, about who can and who cannot have

UWI Libraries

a nuclear bomb. And who is To decide. The Israelis claim that they destroyed the Iraqi installation because Iraq was getting close to the point of being able to make its own nuclear bomb, a so-called 'Arab Bomb'. And for all the public condemnation of Israel most Western powers are not really displeased, not even Mr. Mitterand new socialist government in France. The new French Foreign Minister has made it plain that they would not have sold the reactor to Iraq if they had been in power at the time. And yet, according to CIA reports, Israel herself has had nuclear weapons since as far back as the mid-1970s. And South Africa, too, is reported to have tested nuclear bombs in the Kalahari Desert and the deep South Atlantic Ocean area. And somehow the great powers, East and West alike, seem not a fraction as concerned about Israel or South Africa having nuclear weapons as they are about Pakistan, for instance, or India, or now Iraq being able to develop nuclear bombs. And the idea that Libya's Gaddaffi might finance or buy the makings of a 'Moslem Bomb' gives everbody in the West the 'willies'. So who is to decide who can have ' the bomb' and who cannot. If the Soviets were to supply Cuba, for example with the technology to build its own nuclear reactors will that be seen as a threat to anybody? After all the sale of nuclear technology is big business these days with America, the Soviet Union and a host of other countries competing to sell nuclear reactors. And once any country does have a nuclear reactor, the making of a nuclear bomb is not all that difficult, and can only become easier as time passes. So for how long can the knowledge of how to make the 'bomb' be kept from the Third World? A Think Tank in London told the world this week the U.S. is the greatest supplier of arms to terrorists through thefts from American armouries. That is probably how we got our big supply pre-election M.16s. What happens when it becomes as comparatively easy for Third World countries to get hold of nuclear bombs? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Industrial Scene: Down to a Simmer
2) France, the U.S. & the Communists
3) A Pan-African Defence Force

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
June 24, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The local labour relations scene has changed dramatically over the past ~~twenty-four~~ forty eight hours. The five major trade unions have accepted the government's wage offer on behalf of the public sector workers they represent; the junior doctors went back to work this morning. To be sure the nurses are still reportedly angry at the way they are being treated in these negotiations, and we have not yet heard from the teachers, and there are dark clouds over the bauxite-alumina industry, and the telephone impasse is still with us, but despite all these, the industrial relations pot has definitely change from a fast and dangerous boil to a slow and safe simmer; from something that could spill over and become unmanageable, to something which good sense and tact can bring under sensible management and control. So tensions have eased considerably on the labour relations scene, and the prospects now look better than they did at the beginning of the week. For which give thanks. And this gives us a chance, too, to look at some of the high points of what is going on in the great wide world around us. And two things stand out sharply. First there is U.S. Vice President George Bush's hurried visit to Paris today following on yesterday's news that four communists have been included in President Francois Mitterand's new socialist government in France. The Americans are at once upset, disturbed, nonplussed and angry that the French Socialists have included communists in their new government. There was, after all, no compelling political reason to do so. Mr.

UWI Libraries

Mitterand's socialists had just won another landslide victory in last Sunday's second round of the elections to the French National Assembly and the socialists now have an absolute majority of 79 seats over all the other parties combined. So, from an outside point of view, certainly from Washington's point of view, there was no need to bring the communists into the French government in order to have a working majority to carry through socialist policies. Then, too, in the American view, it sets a very bad example for the entire NATO alliance; after France, Italy where the communists are very much stronger right now than they are in France, and Spain and Portugal might be tempted to follow the French example and include communists in their administrations. If this came to pass, what would happen to the NATO alliance? What would happen to the Reagan foreign policy which sees communism, everywhere and anywhere, as the main enemy to be challenged and confronted and beaten back? The French, for their part, are aware of these American worries but are not impressed by them. The French have never been afraid of ideas and they are not afraid of the idea of communism: for them the French ideal of liberty, equality and fraternity will always be of greater appeal to the overwhelming majority of French people than any totalitarian idea of the far left or the far right. So, as the French Foreign Minister said, if anybody protests the inclusion of communists in their government such a body or bodies will be told, ever so politely, that it is none of their business. That is what national sovereignty is all about. And Mr. Mitterand has shown that in the political power game he knows how to use the communists for the good of France rather than be used by them. And finally, a key proposal that will come from Nigeria to the summit meeting of the OAU which opens today is for the establishing of a Pan-African Defence Force. Nigeria will contribute $70-million to the setting up of such force which is the only language S.A. racism will understand. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) The Labour Scene
2) Ability to Pay or Not to Pay: What Values?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
June 22, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This week could turn out to be a crucial one on Jamaica's labour scene: the decisions to be taken this week when the nurses meet, and when the teachers' representatives meet, and when the special meeting of the Jamaica Civil Service Association is held, and when three of the four special regional gatherings of N.W.U.-represented public sector workers meet - the decisions to come out of these meetings in this one week will be of prime importance to labour relations in Jamaica for at least the rest of this year, if not for very much longer. And if the junior doctors' strike, and the manner in which the developments which resulted in that strike were handled from the outset are any pointers to go by, then the prospects for avoiding all the tricky and delicate and dangerous pitfalls in the way of a meeting of minds are not very good. I, for one, and I know this is the view of very many other people - still believe that a little more diplomacy, a little more tact and flexibility, a little more willingness to meet and talk and make suggested adjustments within the framework of the government's basic offer, could have resulted in either avoiding the strike or in ending it much earlier. If this same attitude of hanging tough, of in effect saying 'take it or leave' is at work during this week's meetings then we may be in for some difficult developments. And there is no need for any of us to minimise or simplify what is indeed a very difficult position for the whole society. I personally think the government was and is absolutely right in putting a clear and firm ceiling on

UWI Libraries

the size of the public sector wage bill. Sooner or later this had to be done, and it is better that it be done sooner rather than later - if the Jamaican economy is to begin to achieve even a modest rate of growth. So the real problem is not with the ceiling on the wage bill. The real problem is with saying that the messenger who carries files or notes between one ministry and the next, or the person who sits all day at a desk in a hallway, or that some clerical junior who carries no responsibility and puts in a less-than-eight-day must all get the same increase as the head of department with all his or her responsibilities, as the nurse who often carries the burdens of life and death, as the junior doctors working ungodly hours to safeguard the nation's health, as the teachers who nurture the young who are this nation's future. This is where the real problem lies. It is a problem of the value of the job, a problem of what scale of value we place on the different categories of work. Is the nurturing and training of young Jamaicans qualitatively the same as, say, sitting at a machine and pressing a lever to cut or package cigarettes? Is saving lives or nursing the sick the same? Is the making of hard decisions and carrying the burden of responsibility for these within the upper ranks of the civil service qualitatively the same as the work done by the clerical junior or senior messenger? It is not a question of belittling anybody's work. It is a question of what value we place on different categories of work and how we express that value. It is at this point that the 'ability to pay' all by itself and applied mechanically, is just not good enough. One of our unions last week condemned a wage award which among other things gave workers of a very profitable enterprise pay increases of $32 a week in the first year and $30 a week in the second, with many fringes. This is more than twice, more than 100%, what the government offers its public servants who include doctors, nurse, teachers, scientists and top administrators. The question is: What values are at work here? What value do we, as a nation, put on exceptional service? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) The Credibility Problem
2) Government Health Services
3) Ken McNeil's Solution

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
June 19, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: What a week this has turned out to be for Jamaicans. First they were told, ~~that~~ last weekend, that the 300 tons of detergents in the Seprod warehouses would be released at 'current prices' but then when the stuff was released this week they discovered that prices had in fact been increased by 5c on the 14 ounce box and by one cent on the 7 ounce box. Why were we told one thing and then presented with another? Why were we not told the truth about the price increase from the outset? Then there was the business of the reported importing of two million pounds of fish from Cuba by the previous government. Mr. Douglas Vaz told Parliament during the Budget debate that 400,000 pounds of this fish was now being held in cold storage and would not be released for sale so as to protect our local fishermen. This week we found out that only 380,000 pounds of fish came into Jamaica from Cuba last year, not to be released onto the local/market frsh fish but to be used as raw material for such products as locally produced saltfish and pickled mackerel and for experimenting with canning fish and smoking fish. Jamaica Frozen Foods had imported this fish as raw material and a spokesman for Jamaica Frozen Foods is reported as describing Minister Vaz's statement in the budget debate as "a tremendous error". I think Jamaicans are entitled to ask: Why this 'tremendous error' when the true facts could be ascertained? And what makes this 'tremendous error', if it is such, so much more serious is the fact that it was presented to the nation's parliament and is therefore permanently recorded in the nation's Hansard. If Mr. Vaz's figures are in

UWI Libraries

fact wrong, as this week's information suggests they are, then it is imperative that the correction be made in Parliament so that the parliamentary record can be set straight/ so that future generations looking to the record for how things went during this period will have the true facts and figures. And this must of course also be done when the true facts and figures about the alumina sale to the Soviet Union are finally sorted out. The now disputed figures presented by the Prime Minister were read into the Parliamentary record; any adjustment or amendment or correction of those figures must, similarly be read into our parliamentary records. Whatever else is done, the parliamentary record must be set right and must be kept straight. There is no substitute for this. And this is why what is said on the floor of our parliament must be, and must always be seen to be, nothing but the unvarnished truth - different from the load-or-half-truth of the party propaganda platform. There seems to have been a blurring of this reality of late. There also seems to have been something of a blurring about who is ultimately responsible for the nation's public health services. The fact is that just as the government of Jamaica is ultimately responsible for our public education service and our public water supply and for the collecting of taxes, so it is ultimately responsible for our public health services. The doctors, and nurses of the government / junior doctors/are the employees/who work in that service. Their responsibility, ultimately, is to the government who is their employer. But it is the government, in the final analysis, who is responsible and accountable to the Jamaican people for the public health service. So trying to make it seem that the junior doctors are responsible is a bit of a three card trick. They are workers who have been badly treated and whose services have been shamelessly exploited. I hope the government takes Dr. Ken McNeil's very sensible face-saving solution; the govt will be held accountable if the public health service collapses.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Parliament, the People
& The Truth

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
June 17, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: What is the truth behind the alumina ~~deales~~ deal made with the Soviet Union by the previous PNP government in July of 1979? And how can the ordinary people, the ordinary voters of Jamaica, get at that truth? The present government, through the Prime Minister, told Parliament and the nation that Jamaica was losing on the deal. He said that for 1980 Jamaica lost roughly $10-million on the delivery of just over 98,000 tons of alumina to the Soviet Union. A statement issued last night by the PNP through the former Minister of Mining describes the Prime Minister's statement as a 'gross misrepresentation of facts' which had served to mislead the Parliament and the nation as a whole. The PNP statement said that when that party left office in October of last year the Jamaican economy had made a net gain of $2.4-million on 73,000 tons of alumina which had been shipped to the Soviet Union up to that point. So we have two sets of sharply conflicting figures here: roughly a $10-million loss according to the Prime Minister, on the one hand; and a profit of $2.4-million according to the former Minister of Mining. Both figures cannot be true. One of those figures must be untrue. The question is: Which is true? Which is not true? And how can the ordinary citizens of this country arrive at the true figures with any measure of confidence? It seems to me that we face two problems with far-reaching implications here. First there is the problem of the figures and how to verify them; and second, and intimately tied to the first, there is the matter

UWI Libraries

of public confidence in the truthfulness and the reliability of the information presented to the nation through the Parliament. The nation's Parliament, especially in a free and open multi-party democracy, is, ideally , the one public forum to which a nation's people, irrespective of party affiliation, can look for the truth on matters of hard fact and statistical information. There will of course always be differences of opinion and of interpretation from both inside and outside Parliament on the facts presented. But the facts themselves are usually accepted as true and reliable because the accepted assumption is that everybody speaks the truth in Parliament. And it is assumed that if any mistake is made and/wrong/~~information~~ any information or fact is given to the Parliament, it will be corrected as quickly as possible. And so the ordinary citizens trusts what comes out of Parliament in a way that they do not trust what comes from party political platforms or statements made outside parliament. Undermine this trust, and we undermine the Parliamentary process itself, and ultimately, we undermine parliamentary democracy. This why, in other parliaments, like the British parliament, a Member who lied to his parliament was, if caught out, forced to resign. The people must have confidence in what they are told from the floor of their parliament. But with the best will in the world the people cannot always know or verify all the details of what they are told: not all agreements or figures are made public or can be made public at all times. So how do they find out what is the truth of a matter when we have the kind of conflicting information which has come out about the alumina deal with the Soviet Union? In this particular case the parliament could itself resolve the matter by the Minister responsible issuing any new clarification that may be necessary. Or the Jamaica Bauxite Institute could be instructed to explain the true facts of the deal with the Soviets to the Jamaican public. Truth and confidence are involved & ~~must be maintained~~. Goodn

UWI Libraries

Kenya on South Africa, Namibia

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
June 15, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: While Jamaicans are, naturally, preoccupied with their own problems - the junior doctors' strike which we must hope the Medical Association of Jamaica's intervention will help to end, the telephone company strike, which we must hope Mr. Ross's intervention will help to end, and the Seprod business which now seems the most intractable - while all this had dominated our concerns, much of great geopolitical importance has been brewing in and about Southern Africa. On the eve of tomorrow's anniversary of the 1976 black riots in the one-million-strong South-Western Township commonly called Soweto, the President of Kenya, Mr. Daniel Arap Moi, has called for intensified armed struggle as he sees that as the only way in which the ugly racist doctrine and practice of Apartheid can be ended. The importance of this call by Kenya lies in the fact that she is regarded by both the Western Powers as well as by most African and Third World countries as being among the most 'moderate' of the African states. She has warm and very cordial relations with the United States and has been held up as a model of the kind of independent African states the United States would like to see all over the African continent. The result has been that Kenya had no problems attracting American and European investment and aid money. And the aid/and investment in Kenya to were sharply and pointedly contrasted to the minimal aid and almost no investment in Tanzania, the leftist regime which supported and provided bases/for African freedom fighters and training camps from then Portuguese

UWI Libraries

Mozambique, white Rhodesia and racist South Africa. I still remember on my last extended East and Central African trip in the 1960s hearing from one of the top leaders of the banned African National Congress of South Africa how their camps in Kenya had been ordered closed because the Kenyan government was developing its special relationship with the United States: this was, of course in the days of the great Jomo Kenyatta. The South Africans moved mainly to Tanzania but some also went to Zambia. Now Kenya, through its new President, is calling for intensified armed struggle against South Africa. And this at a time when an American deputy secretary of State is in Southern Africa reportedly trying, in collaboration with South Africa's white rulers, to work out a new Namibian 'solution' that would bypass the United Nations and that would ensure the establishing of a so-called 'moderate' government in Namibia which is acceptable to South Africa. The South Africans have let it be known that any other solution, any electoral victory by SWAPO's Sam Nujoma for instance, would result in a fullscale South African invasion and occupation of Namibia. This has been the soft-spoken threat which has inhibited the five Western Powers to the point of backing off from their own original proposals for Namibian independence. One big difference is, and it is the geopolitical aspect of national politics which makes yesterday's first round results of the French elections so important, that France under the socialist President Mitterand is not likely to stay in step with America and the rest on Southern Africa. I suspect Canada, too, may think again. SWAPO says it is ready to step up the fighting. The black South Africans are stepping up their own internal attacks. With moderate black states like Kenya urging intensified armed struggle, Namibia in particular and South Africa generally could easily become America's agonising new Vietnam-type situation.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) A/ B_ad Week on Labour Relations Scene
2) Pitfalls of the Confrontation Syndrome
~~3) The International Scene~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
June 12, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This week has turned out to be much worse than most of us had expected it to be in terms of labour relations. At the start of the week there had been some small hopes of some sort of understanding or accommodation between the government on the one hand, and some of the public sector worker groups. The junior doctors had returned to work pending further talks with Ministry of Health officials; the nurses were also meeting with officials of the Health and Public Service ministries. And as long as people were sitting down and talking there was the possibility of some understanding. The nurses, in particular, were not even talking about the wage offer itself at this time: their concern was with how what was available to them would be apportioned and they wanted their priorities taken into account. And this seemed an emminently reasonable position. So at the start of the week a meeting of minds did seem possible. An easing of the tension over the public sector wage issue did seem a possibility. On Tuesday there was a meeting between representatives of the junior doctors and the Government's Wages, Salaries and Fringe Benefits Committee, and it was after this meeting that the junior doctors decided on strike action. The Medical Association of Jamaica then reportedly asked for a meeting with the Prime Minister in hopes of trying to avert the strike, but they were told that such a meeting would serve no useful purpose as the government had already made its final offer. So, yesterday morning, the junior doctors began their strike action: and Jamaica's health services are already feeling the pressure. For how long will this go on? How much suffering must the

UWI Libraries

poor in need of health care endure before this matter is resolved? These are among the most nagging questions. And the unfortunate confrontationist atmosphere which has now developed around this issue does not make for hopeful answers to these questions. I still happen to believe that some sort of understanding was possible within the framework of what the government said it could afford. I thought Mr. Shearer made the point well on Tuesday when he said: "The total amount of the budget cannot be negotiated... we are willing to negotiate within what is available." We have no way of knowing how far this was done on Tuesday before the junior doctors decided on strike action. Did the Medical Association of Jamaica, for instance, have some ideas which could have helped to 'negotiate within what was available? It might have been useful in avoiding confrontation to at least listen to what the older heads of the Medical Association had to suggest. One of the pitfalls of the confrontation syndrome is that it usually invokes the simplistic good-guys-and-bad-guys way of seeing issues. The good guys stand for one thing, the bad guys stand for the opposite: the good guys represent the public interest, the bad guys are opposed to the public interest. Well, it doesn't go so: there are no bad guys in this one. Those who want to keep the budget in present limits are good guys. And those who demand fair and just reward for an important public service are just as good guys. The real need in particular this equation is to reconcile the public interest not to overspend with fair and just treatment of a valued group which serves that interest in a uniquely special way. And confrontation is not the best way to achieve that reconciliation. Of course there are other claimants waiting in the wings ready to jump into any slight opening. This is what complicates the whole thing. But this is the challenge to leadership, the challenge to statesmanship. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Budget Debate: Shearer on Productvity
2) Mid-East Tensions Escalate
3 Top U.S. Delagation In South Africa

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
June 10, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Junior doctors have now decided on strike action: The highpoints of Mr. Hugh Shearer's budget debate speech yesterday were, at least as far as I am concerned, his powerful and reasoned call for increased production and increased productivity; the junior doctors are among the most productive of our workers. his very careful and moderate explanation of the government's plain inability to meet the pay demands of public sector workers; Mr. Shearer gave a and the government's willingness to negotiate within the limitations of what the budget can reasonably and realistically afford. And I thought, too, that his reminder that the IMF will not be here forever and that there will not be an endless cycle of three-year loan programmes, was most appropriate. Sooner or later Jamaica is going to have to buckle down to the business of working its troubles away and earning the things it wants. The hard question is: will it be sooner or will it be later? Will Jamaica have to experience an even more bitter blow than the shortages and scarcities of recent years before Jamaicans become really serious about working our troubles away? For instance, it rained all last night and for most of the early hours of this morning in southern Jamaica: so how many of the 102,000 plus public sector workers stayed off the job or turned up very late this morning? This is what productivity and performance are all about. I went to collect a parcel of books at the parcels post office in Kingston. The place is big and cool and spacious; a good place to work in. It took me something like three-quarters of an hour to collect one small parcel of six books; and it required a half dozen people to handle and process the form while I waited.

UWI Libraries

I recall there being four or five other customers on my side of the counter, and something between fifteen and twenty apparently mostly casual and idle people on the other side of the counter. The workers outnumbered the customers and the customers had to await the pleasure of the workers. This is what productivity and performance are all about. One of the very real failures of the past government, to my mind, was that it was not as strong on worker-responsibility as it was on worker-rights. What went on at the JOS was a case in point. Yesterday Mr. Shearer made the connection between worker-rights and worker responsibilities very sharply and very clearly. If we are to work our troubles away then all of us, workers and their trade unions, employers and their associations, are going to have to pay more than just lip-service to that connection between rights and responsibilities. Fail to make that connection and we fail to perform and produce, and everybody will blame everybody else for that failure. The politics is or should be behind us for at least the next three years, which is the time the government says it needs to turn the economy around. So when do we begin the serious business of production and performance? On foreign policy Mr. Shearer's firm repudiation of any suggestion of closer political ties with Chile still left open the question of whether what 'Insport' reported Mr. Errol Anderson as saying means closer sporting ties with Chile. And this, I think, is a point that should be cleared up. There was nothing unclear about the condemnation of the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor or about the denunciation of Apartheid and all forms of racism, even the subtle brand that showed up in the elections here. And today, as if to update Mr. Shearer, a top-level U.S. delegation arrived in South Africa to persue the new Reagan policy of so-called 'Constructive engagement' with the racist regime. The topic is Namibia and we may yet have to stand up and be counted. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Avoiding Confrontation

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
June 8, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The industrial scene continues to be unsettled: workers in both the private and public sectors are either off the job, on work-to-rule, on go-slow or in what is described in union jargon as/ 'restive'mood. The general atmosphere on the labour relations scene is one of threat and menace; one of confrontation in the making. Everybody seems bent on 'standing firm' for their own particular brand of rights; everybody/is talking and talking fast on behalf of their own special case; and very few seem to be listening to what the other side in any particular dispute is saying. The supporters of the government in the matter of the public sector wage impasse are loudly denouncing the junior doctors and the nurses, and anybody else who supports these latter groups, as 'unpatriotic', subversive and bent on wrecking the recovery effort. The trade unions are denounced as negative and irresponsible. And these groups, in their turn, are doing their own denouncing and their own warning and threatening and their own name-calling. And so the atmosphere of threat, menace, confrontation continues to build while we talk about the need to serve the national interest and about this being our last chance at national economic recovery. If we are serious about economic recovery, and I believe that the overwhleming majority of Jamaicans do want to see economic recovery, then the way of threat and menace and confrontation will not do. We will not, I think, succeed in making the IMF agreement work if the civil servants and other public sector workers are locked in confrontation with the

UWI Libraries

government. We will not get production going if workers in the private sector are locked in confrontation with their employers. And we will not turn the economy around in a climate of non-performance or minimal performance and non- or minimal production. To begin to have any hope of turning the economy around a majority of the workers in both the public and private sectors must, at the very least, pull their weight. Without that all the loan-money in the world would be just a further waste of resources which future generations of Jamaicans would have to pay for. And for there to be any hope of performance and production there must be an end to the mood and atmosphere of confrontation, there must be a return to a mood of reason and accommodation. But how do you go about creating this mood? First, I suggest, by the parties involved coming together quietly and without any public flexing of muscle or public pressure play. There is a long tradition of this in Jamaican labour relations; it would be worthwhile going back to that tradition rather than to follow those who are hellbent on a showdown trial of strength between management and labour. For one thing, no matter who wins in such a trial of strength, Jamaica will suffer and our hopes of fulfilling the three-year IMF programme may be frustrated. So, avoiding confrontation has to be seen as critical to succeeding with the IMF programme. But does not this put the government and the economy at the mercy of the trade unions and other workers' organisations? This is as hard a question here as it is in communist Poland and in capitalist Britain, and there are no slick or easy answers. Governments, no less than trade unions, need always to remember and to be reminded of the limits on what raw power can do: it is relatively easier, for instance, to use raw power to suppress, break down and destroy. than it is not so easy to use raw power to create a mood and climate of co-operation and concensus. And that mood is what Jamaica needs most right now. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Budget Debate & Foreign Policy
2) The International Scene:
   a) Middle East; b) Southern Africa
   c) Western Europe

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
June 5, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: We have, in recent days, been understandably preoccupied with our own affairs almost to the exclusion of anything going on in the outside world. And yet in his winding up for the Parliamentary Opposition in the Budget debate yesterday Mr. Michael Manley reminded us of just how profoundly what happens in the great big world out there can, and often does, affect what happens here. So while our budget and its designs for national economic recovery are important we should try to see it in the wider context of the ebb and flow and the constant changes on the world scene. And this, I thought, gave strong point to Mr. Manley's criticism of the manner in which the major speeches in the debate were arranged. The two main Opposition spokesmen have now finished their contributions in the debate. The two remaining speakers are Mr. Shearer, the government's principal spokesman on foreign affairs and foreign trade, and the Prime Minister who will of course wind up. Mr. Manley's point was that since the principal government spokesman on foreign affairs and foreign trade had not yet spoken there was no way in which the Opposition could examine and comment on what the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade would say. And I agree that this is not the best way to go about matters if Parliament - consisting of both government and opposition sides - is to inform and educate the nation on the conduct of its own affairs. In the British Parliament, on which our own is modelled, and in Commonwealth

UWI Libraries

parliaments where they do have opposition parties, the general practice in Budget debates is for the Leader of the Opposition to be the last speaker before the Prime Minister winds. And this means of course that the Opposition Leader will have heard the entire government presentation before he speaks; and the Prime Minister would still be left to wind up and pick up any loose ends and answer any questions that he considers important to deal with. In this sense the Parliamentary Budget debate is, and must be, much more than a game of one-upmanship in which any one side 'tricks' any other side. I, for one, am sorry that we will not have this kind of necessary two-sided look at the government's foreign policy posture this time around. Let us hope things will be remedied for next year's debate so that the Opposition would be in a position to bring its own analysis to bear on a stated government foreign policy posture. How, for instance, does the government view the current explosive situation in the Middle East? And are the views of the government and the opposition in accord? Or do they differ? And if they do, in what respects? And what of what is going on in Southern Africa where some delicate new conditions for a Namibian settlement seem to be in the making between Pretoria and Washington? I think we all know that all Jamaicans' government's going all the way back to independence have been consistent in their opposition to Apartheid; but what of the details and the tactics? And would it not give our Minister of Foreign Affairs that much more authority in the councils of the world if it comes right out of our Parliament that he speaks for both sides. It seems important that bipartisan approaches in our foreign policy should be formalised in Parliament. It is a pity this could not be done in this first major parliamentary debate of the new government. There is flux in West Europe. A stated common approach from our parliament would have been a very useful thing at this time. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Budget Debate: Opposition's Mullings
2) Public Sector Labour Scene
~~3) Some International Notes~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
June 3, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The 1981/82 Budget debate continued in Parliament yesterday with Mr. Seymour Mullings opening for the Opposition. Most of us who are interested, and I think most Jamaicans are, listened/or watched the broadcast of Mr. Mullings' speech, so there is no need to repeat what he said. I was impressed by the balance and moderation of his criticism, by his willingness to give credit where it was due, and/the overall absence of nastiness in his whole approach. I think Jamaican politics can only benefit by putting behind us the nasty sneering and jeering and smearing and character assassination all of which passed for political debate not so long ago. I think Mr. Mullings set a fine example for all to follow. And in the straight business of political cut-and-thrust his statement that the Opposition would never seek to malign the country here or abroad, or seek to sell its good name short for cheap political gain, or threaten to lock it down, or call its supporters out into the streets, were sharply pointed and sharply telling because those who listened and those who watched could make an easy connection between what he said and what had happened so very recently. The only hint of anger and passion was when Mr. Mullings said Jamaica was not, never has been, and never will be one huge slum. And I think many people will wait with great interest for answers to some of the questions Mr. Mullings raised about some of the numbers in this Budget. As I listened to Mr. Mullings I got the impression that the Opposition had finally come out of the shock

UWI Libraries

of last October's massive defeat at the polls and was ready to again assume its place and its responsibility in the national life of this country. So all those fears about our parliamentary democracy may be premature, especially in the light of Mr. Speaker's stern insistence yesterday that those on the government benches do not use their numbers to try and hassle the opposition spokesman. In the background to all this, of course, was the knowledge of the unrest on the industrial scene, especially among the health workers of the public sector; and the knowledge that behind the health workers were the unresolved claims of the teachers, the civil servants, and of those public sector workers represented by the trade unions. It was heartening that no one in parliament yesterday tried to gain political mileage out of this unsettled and potentially explosive situation on the labour front. With Mr. Manley and Mr. Shearer, the two most respected and trusted parliamentary figures on the labour front still to speak in the debate, it may in fact still be possible to work out some accommodation to avert a collision between public sector workers and their employers. If no such accommodation is reached, if the situation ends up in hard confrontation then, no matter who wins in the long run, Jamaica will suffer and suffer grievously in the short run; and all the loan money in the world will not solve our problems. Only the people of Jamaica, working together, can solve those problems: and nobody has yet been able to impose a spirit of co-operation on any group or groups of free and self-respecting people. And this is one of our key problems. Perhaps it might be useful for Mr. Seaga to call in Mr. Shearer and Mr. Manley and for the three of them to hammer out some formulation for the representatives of the public sector workers to consider. This may not be good party or power politics; it would be good for the national interest.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Public Sector Wages &
Pressure Politics &
The Health Services

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
June 1, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The weekend danger of what has been described as the likely 'imminent collapse' of Jamaica's medical services appears to have deepened rather than eased. It now seems that if something is not done, and done quickly, to ease the situation Jamaica's already weak and fragile health service will indeed collapse. And if this were to happen the saddest irony of all may well be the comment that it need not have happened. Everybody agrees that the junior doctors, for one example, have been grossly underpaid and grossly overworked for a very long time. I think most of us would agree that not every worker in the public sector who has been offered the government's $29 a week pay increase over the two-year period peforms equally well, works equally hard, or renders equally valuable service to the society. We know that there are very hard workers in the public sector; we know there are time-servers; and we know that there are drones. But by some peculiar logic of our industrial relations practices the good, the bad and the plain no-good as far as work performance and work value are concerned are made the same wage offer. And this is, I think, our first patent piece of labour relations madness when you consider the kind of work load and level of responsibility our junior doctors and our nurses are called upon to carry. And it does not help matters one little bit when people who should know better, and who would be quick to stand up for their own rights, and who would themselves not hesitate to threaten locking down this or that, accuse junior doctors or nurses of being 'unpatriotic' for standing up for their own rights. I really do not think

UWI Libraries

the invocation of the 'national interest' should ever be used to try and perpetuate and justify the kind of exploitation the very skilled workers in our health services have had to endure. So one of the first things I think we need to do is to ease up on some of the pressure play on our health workers. They are not any more unpatriotic than any other group of Jamaicans who demand a fair day's pay for a fair day's work: indeed, they are, by common consent, more deserving than most. And that being the case let there be an end to the/ snide, unfair and undeserved political insituations against them. These people are not/ being as unreasonable as some would have us believe. I know, for instance, that the nurses association is anxious just to get a meeting/ in order to spell out their own considered views on how what is available could be allocated to the best possible advantage. Surely that is a very reasonable position which any reasonable employer would at least listen to. So it is worrying that the nurses' leadership should, rightly or wrongly, get the feeling that their employers are not all that interested in such a meeting, since the entire weekend up to this morning seemed not long enough for them to set a time. Not a very important point, perhaps, but one which could make all the difference between/ negotiating in a climate of accomodation or a climate of confrontation. Now, the problem of dealing with public sector wages is clearly a very hard and difficult one. Somewhere, at some time, someone had to draw the line and slowdown the growth of the public sector wage bill. And how this is done is quite as important as that it is done. Even done the right way, with understanding and co-operation rather than misunderstanding and confrontation, it will be difficult enough. But done the wrong way it could mean grief for Jamaica. So let there be a muting of the pressure politics from all sides, including the government side. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The No New Taxation Budget

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
May 29, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The overwhelming majority of Jamaicans will, I think, warmly welcome the 'no new taxation for this year' Revenue Estimates of the 1981/82 Budget presented by Mr. Seaga to Parliament yesterday. There was of course the warning that this 'no new taxation position' was conditional on the government being able to collect some $35-million of arrears. If that money is not collected then the shortfall may have to be made up in new taxes later in the year. So those who are in arrears would be doing a service to all Jamaica's taxpayers by paying up, and paying up promptly. But the relief that there will be no new taxes is shared by friend and foe alike. If the arrears are collected then the gap in the housekeeping budget of just over $85-million will be closed by the issuing of Treasury Bills. And so it will be possible to balance the budget without any new taxation and without any printing of money without backatif. So there will be no increase in the price of petrol; and no government-decreed increase on such things as cigarettes and beer and the like. This is not to say there may not be increases on the price of these things or some of them, later in this fiscal year; but if any such increase were to come it will not be because of any government taxation policy but rather because price controls have been lifted from most of these things. So no new taxation is the first great relief for us all.

Another area of relief that people in the country parts in particular will welcome most warmly are the complete scrapping of taxes and duties on agricultural trucks and the easing of stamp duty and sales taxes for all other trucks, as well as the increasing of other agricultural

UWI Libraries

incentives which, it is hoped, will lead to greater production, especially for export. I hope to comment further on the agricultural incentives when I have examined the documents more fully but for the present I note only the proposals for increasing the growing of Blue Mountain coffee. There is a world market which is hungering for all the Blue Mountain coffee that Jamaica can produce; the Japanese, the Americans, the Europeans will scramble over each other for all the Blue Mountain coffee Jamaica can provide, and will pay premium prices in foreign exchange for the coffee. If we could produce this one labour-intensive crop to the limits of our capability for it, we would be a long way on the road to solving the problem of our foreign exchange needs. This has been a recurring theme of Mr. Allan Isaacs in and out of politics, in and out of one or the other party, in and out of government, over a very very long time indeed. Let us hope that this time around the concept will become a practical reality to Jamaica's benefit. Another area of relief from taxation that will be most widely welcomed is in the savings by individuals. As well as making life a deal more tolerable and rewarding for the individual saver/the tax exemption on earned interest will or should encourage more saving, especially if inflation and inflationary prices begin to slow down. And these savings could then be used to finance further development. The ~~only~~ one area of uncertainty in/what struck me as an otherwise optimistic and upbeat and hopeful projection for future economic recovery and growth is the/still unresolved matter of the wage claims that were coming of public sector workers. How that matter is resolved, and the spirit in which it is resolved, is quite as important as all the painstaking planning and hard work that obviously went into yesterday's presentation. Once again there is promise and hope, as there was in 1962, as there was in 1972: let us hope that this time around hard work and good sense will lead to success.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Budget Debate: Second Phase
2) Public Sector Wages, Taxation
3) J.T.A. on A Dangerous Circular.
4) Jordan's Hussein in Moscow

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
May 27, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The second phase of the annual budget exercise gets under way tomorrow with the Prime Minister telling the nation how we are going to raise the $2,500-millio-plus which the government plans to spend in fiscal year 1981/82. And one very important question is whether our present level of taxation will bring in enough revenue to cover the nation's recurrent housekeeping of which public sector wages takes such a big chunk? Or, will there be need for additional taxation? And if there is to be additional taxation, what form would it take? If it is indirect taxation in the form of additional charges on consumption then the people in the lower income levels will inevitably feel it most. If, on the other hand, it is direct taxation then those in the higher income brackets will bear the brunt though all income earners will feel the blow. And, of course, yesterday's news out of Geneva that the OPEC oil Ministers have decided to hold oil prices at their present levels till the end of this year does suggest that Jamaican motorists just may escape a petrol price increase this time around. I say 'may' because there can be no certainty about it. If it were just a matter of passing on any oil increase then we would expect the government to follow the OPEC oil Ministers' lead and keep local petrol prices where they now are. But if petrol prices are seen as just another source to be tapped for additional revenue then the government may decide to up the price. What, one wonders, would the Nationalist Patriotic Movement do in such an eventuality? Stage another gas price strike across

UWI Libraries

the country? Let us hope the NPM is not put to the test. Then there is the today's resumed talks between the Minister of the Public Service and the unions and organisations representing public sector workers which may also have an important bearing on how the numbers come out in tomorrow's presentation of the Revenue Estimates. We must assume that the Cabinet has come up with a more 'realistic' offer which the Minister will put to the unions and that some understanding will be reached; the country sorely needs such an understanding quickly if we are to get on with the business of working our troubles away. In paragraph 28 of the memorandum with the IMF the government says: "The government will implement, not later than October 1,1981, aspects of the comprehensive tax reform programme to attain an increase of not less than ½% of G.D.P. on estimated tax revenue for financial year 1981/82". For there to be any hope of realisng this there must be a wide measure of harmony and productivity in both the public and private sectors. And in our situation, like it or not, no one side, be it government, private sector employers or the trade unions, can ruthlessly impose its will on all the other sides, or ram its wishes down their throats. What comes out tommrrow and during the debate will, I hope, reflect this Jamaican reality. Another matter of current concern is the circular from the Ministry of Education which appears on the front-page of today's Daily News and which the Jamaica Teacher Association is reported as describing as 'very dangerous'. Please read it. A person's political and civic activities, carried out in their own time and within the framework of the Jamaican Constitution, should not be the subject of this type of circular. I hope the Ministry of Education follows the advice of the JTA to withdraw the circular. And finally, Jordan's King Hussein's presence and posture in Moscow has created new problems for the Americans in the currently highly volatile Middle East, hence Mr. Philip Habib's call home for consultaions. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Dilemma of the
Public Sector Wage Bill

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast onMonday
May 25, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: A mood of quiet unease has hung like a cloud over this year's observations of Trade Unions Week and Labour Day; to be sure we had warm expressions of goodwill and harmony for the labour movement from spokesmen of all sectors of the society but the quiet unease has persisted. And behind it, and possibly the single most worrying aspect of the labour scene at this time, was the government's wage offer to public sector workers and the rejection of that offer by all the organisations representing public sector workers. The government appears to have accepted the unions' demand that the wage contract be for a two-year rather than a three-year period. So it made an offer of $15 a week for the first year to start from July 1st, 1981, and $14 a week from April 1st, 1982. In a counter claim the unions demanded $40 a week for the first, year, to begin on April 1st, 1981, and $50 a week for the second year. So the government's pay increase offer works out at $29 a week over the two-year period; and the unions' demand works out at a pay increase of $90 a week over the same two-year period. So the distance between the government's offer and the unions demands is very wide indeed. Over the two-year period that gap between what is offered and what is demanded is $61 a week. For the first year the difference between the government's offer of $15 a week from the first of July and the unions' demand of $40 a week from the first of April, that difference amounts to $25 a week and three months of retroactivity. For the second year the difference between the offered $14 a week

UWI Libraries

and the demanded $50 a week is $36 a week. And these, by any standard, are huge differences. In the overall thing the demands of the unions work out at more than three times the government's offer. So where do you go from there? The unions have asked for the government to make a more realistic offer. What, in this context, would be a realistic offer? Would splitting the difference between what is offered and what is demanded be a realistic offer? If the difference of $25 a week of the first year were to be split evenly half of it would be $12.50 which would then be added to the $15 offer, resulting in a new offer of $27.50 for the first year. And using the same method the offer for the second year would go up to $32 a week. This would give us an average weekly increase of $59.50 over the two-year contract period. But stop and think. Just splitting the differnce in this way would increase the public sector wage bill by $618,800,000 over the two-year period. And right now, before any increase of any kind, that wage bill takes up 76% of the recurrent or housekeeping budget. Where would we get this additional money from? More taxation? And yet, the junior doctors, to mention just one group of public sector workers, deserve a great deal better than they are now getting. But let us also face the fact that there are many workers in the public sector who are just coasting along, doing as little as they must for as much as they can get away with. One of the hard and long-standing problems is separating the workers from the drones so that those who perform may be better paid and those who don't be set free; but you do not do this in the context of a wage negotiation. So, where do we go from here? What is a realistic wage offer? And who pays for it? And what kind of service do they get in return? How do we balance the interests of a key group of 100,000 workers against the equally important interests of 2 million mainly very poor Jamaicans? Goodnight

UWI Libraries

End of Trade Unions Week, 1981;
Some hard problems for the future

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
May 22, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: This year's Trade Unions Week ends tomorrow with Labour Day as its point of climax: and I think those of us who had hoped that the major unions would seize the opportunity to offer some new thinking at least on some of the major problems facing the nation must be a little disappointed. We were offered nothing new on the hard problem of unemployment. There was not even mention of cutting out overtime to give a few of the unemployed a small break: there was not a whisper about job-sharing. The standard conventional wisdom that increased production is the way to create more jobs was muted by putting the responsibility for such increased production almost exclusively on the shoulders of management. Management, we were told, must create the climate in which workers would want to increase production. This is, of course, the other side of the negative coin in which management puts the blame for low productivity on the workers. The sad fact is that the performance of both management and workers are pretty often to blame in equal measure for low productivity. I would have felt very much happier about our organised labour movement if at some point during this week one of our leading union spokesmen had talked straight out in specific terms about some of the shortcomings and some of the failures of the organised labour movement. But new thinking and self-criticism are not common or easily come-by virtues, especially by those who feel themselves embattled. Jamaican managements are not in the habit of holding up their failures, shortcomings and mean streaks for public scrutiny, so why should we expect organised labour to do so?

UWI Libraries

Perhaps we have this unfair expectation because we believe that ultimately it would only strengthen Jamaica's organised labour movement if it were to take stock of itself coldly and disapassionately. And I think it is going to need all the realistic strength it can muster if it is to grapple with some of the hard problems that lie ahead. The recently surfaced issue of what is the 'national interest' has opened a tricky new situation which puts almost any negotiated settlement in doubt. In the Pay Policy section of Ministry Paper No.9 dealing with the new IMF agreement, the opening sentence reads: "The Government believes that employers and employees should settle pay claims by free negotiation." But what happens if, after such freely negotiated settlement, or after a Tribunal award, one or the other party can have the whole settlement upset on grounds of the 'national interest'? The unions have declared their determination to call on the government to define the 'national interest'. But even if we were to have a definition acceptable to both labour and management, would that be the end to it? Why the elaborate and costly industrial relations structure when it can all be nullified by one party going to court? And what is to prevent some citizen or group of citizens going to court and asking that in the 'national interest' all overtime be abolished and all jobs be shared in order to do away with unemployment? That would indeed be in the 'national interest' if you see unemployment as our gravest national problem. But to take this course, in the 'national interest', may end up creating more havoc than we cope with. So where do we go from here? Where is the organised labour movement going from here? It seems to me that sooner, rather than later, the organised labour movement is going to have to move beyond just servicing the interests of its dues paying members. If it fails the 'national interest' may yet overwhelm it. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Local Production: Building or Destroying?
2) Syrian-Israeli Crisis
3) Trade Unions Week: Widening Horizons

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
May 20, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Local food producers - the producers of chicken meat, pork products, ground provision - are all bawling that the bottom has fallen out of their markets. Local manufacturers and small business people generally are complaining of fall-offs in their sales and a dramatic shrinking of their markets. And both the food producers and the small manufacturers are blaming their troubles on the new flood of imports into the country. Most of us know about the food because we can see for ourselves that there is vastly more imported food about than there has been for a very long time. The JLP has kept its promise to bring in the food and I think all Jamaicans welcome this. What I am not sure all Jamaicans would welcome equally warmly would be the collapse of our broiler industry. In the years of hardship when food, especially protein, was very hard to come by, the nation's broiler producers kept faith with the Jamaican people. Chicken meat became everybody's meat and was the cheapest meat available. And the production of broiler meat and its expansion, created new opportunities for small chicken farmers who in turn created new regular job opportunities for many people in the rural areas. It has taken years of hard ~~effort~~ work for the broiler industry to be built to the point where in our days of scarcity it was the main source of Jamaica's meat supply. It is now apparent to all of us just how quickly and easily the broiler industry can be mashed up. And if it were mashed up within the next year or so, who will take another chance and build it back again? It is always easier, much easier, to mash up or tear down, than it is to create and to build up. So I

UWI Libraries

sincerely hope that the designers of the new economic strategy will think again before allowing the so-called free play of market forces to mash up local food production and local manufacturing. There just is no way that our relatively tiny broiler industry or pig industry or garment or shoe industries can survive in open free-for-all competition against the large-scale producers of the United States. Those trailer loads of $100-million worth of 'no-funds' licenced imports of which Mr. Vaz spoke the other night could mean the difference between survival or collapse for a number of small manufacturers and those who work for them. It seems to me that when the government said it would allow imports where that was needed to keep a check on unreasonable prices it was on very good grounds and most Jamaicans would support it. Risking the destruction of local food production and local manufacturing is a completely different matter again. Not even the powerful American economy and its managers are allowing their notion of the play of market forces to permit Japan to mash up the American motor industry by way of 'free' competition: so they have agreed to limit Japanese car imports to the U.S. to a fixed number. Even the play of so-called market forces need some management, in the national interest. And it seems to me that this, too, is an area in which the organised labour movement should be deeply interested because what happens here can determine whether the workers they represent have or do not have jobs. So let there be a widening of horizons for the organised labour movement this trade unions week. If they don't they will go on just reacting to situations instead of helping to shape them. And finally and briefly the shape of a solution to the Syrian-Israeli is emerging thus: Israel, who started it all, will undertake, not to make any more armed flights over certain positions and Syria will then withdraw its missiles and Mr. Begin may lose next months elections. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Trade Unions Week, 1981

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
May 18, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This week is being observed as Trade Unions Week here in Jamaica, and it will reach its climax on Labour Day which is this coming Saturday, May 23rd. So there will be a wide variety of activities in honour of Jamaica's organised labour movement and the part it has played in the bringing of Jamaica to the point where she now is. But the question is: Just where is Jamaica today? At what point is she? And, more specifically, at what point is the labour movement which we are honouring this week? We begin with the latest available figures which are contained in the latest Labour Force statistics which was tabled in Parliament at the same time as the 1981/82 Spending Estimates. These figures show that in October of 1980 the Jamaican Labour Force or work force had reached 1,006,900. This was the first time the workforce had topped the million-mark. A year earlier, in October of 1979 it had stood at 962,500. This means that between October 1979 and October 1980 the workforce had increased by 44,400. During the same period the number of workers in jobs went up from 663,400 in October of 1979 to 737,300 in October of 1980, which is an increase of 73,900 workers in jobs. So the workforce grew by just over 44,000 but those in jobs grew by nearly 74,000. To understand this we need to look at the unemployment figures for the same period. In October of 1979 the number of unemployed workers stood at 299,100 but by October of 1980 the figure had dropped to 269,600. In other words between October of 1979 and October of 1980, which incidentally was the last year of the PNP regime, unemployment went down by 29,500, and so

UWI Libraries

the numbers in jobs increased by that same 29,500. So, all the propaganda of the time notwithstanding, there was a small but significant improvement in employment between October 1979 and October 1980. If this improvement can be maintained in 1981, if more people can find jobs in 1981 than are brought onto the labour market, then we should continue to see a small but significant reduction in unemployment. And this, it seems to me, is one of the most important issues the organised and united labour movement must address itself to. Indications are that the position achieved between October 1979 and October 1980 may not in fact hold, that unemployment may in fact be on the increase once more. The price to the national economy of creating those roughly 30,000 new jobs between October 1979 and October 1980 was, obviously, a very high one, and a price that the new administration is not prepared to pay, and one that the country cannot afford indefinitely to go on paying. So a relationship must be established between the creating of jobs and the enlarging of the national wealth or, if you like, the national cake. Up to now the organised labour movement has tended to regard the business of wealth-creation, either at the national or private business level as the responsibility of 'management' or government. Workers did their jobs and collected their pay; others found the capital, did the planning and worried about viability. I think times and conditions have changed so much that this will no longer do. And I am not sure that the 'market forces' business all by itself will do for us either, anymore than the heavy-handed domination of econmic life by a sluggish state bureaucracy will do. We need to think out new economic approaches - a mixture perhaps of enlightened capitalism, co-operative worker participation and with the state playing a largely supporting & sustaining role - in our search for viability and justice. And organised labour should, logically, spearhead that thinking. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) A Dread Week
2) The Police & the Rule of Law
3) The U.S.A opening to South Africa

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
May 15, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: What a dread week this has turned out to be! First we had news of the death of Bob Marley, and then the attempted assassination of Pope John Paul. The tragedy of the Marley death was that he was so gifted and so young: the death of anybody young is always particularly sad because there is, for them, so much of life left still to be lived. And when the young who die are as rarely gifted as Marley was then it assumes tragic dimensions. And the young people of the ghettoes everywhere probably need the example and the symbolism of Marley more, right now, than ever before. They seem to have so little to hold on to; so little to believe in; and this makes it easy to respond with negativism or fanaticism and violence to a harsh and brutal world where might is right and survival, be it political or economic or social, is for the fittest & strong. And you show your own strength by tearing down the strongest one within your reach and within your verbal or actual gunsight. And so the strongest apostle of peace in the world today became the assassin's target on Wednesday of this week. It was a dread week indeed. And on the local scene reports of public concern over how some members of the police force deal with the public have prompted one Minister of Government and a JLP Councillor to write letters of complaint to the Commissioner of Police asking him to investigate certain police action. There is also some concern about an alleged 'secret squad'. One of the worrying things about all this is the impression which, rightly or wrongly, many people seem to have about the law and how it is to be enforced. So let us remind ourselves once

UWI Libraries

again that under our system of government nobody is above the law and nobody is entitled to take the law into their own hands; it does not matter who they are, it does matter what office they occupy: under the law, in the eyes of the law, each Jamaican is entitled to the same rights as any other Jamaican and is subject to the same restraints as any other Jamaican. The police are given certain powers under the law in order to uphold the law: but this does not place them either above the law or outside the law. They do not themselves become the law any more than Ministers of Government or Members of Parliament become the law. These are all agents of one type or another of that high principle of the rule of law. The Parliament makes the laws; the Courts execute the law; the police are the agents who see that the law is observed. It is different in dictatorships and repressive regimes where the so-called secret police may be a law unto themselves. Under our system the police have no business to act as judge, jury and executioner because to do so would be to break the law: and their job is not to break the law but to uphold it in the interest and in the service of the people. Let their deeds measure up to that high principle of democracy. And finally and briefly, the Foreign Minister of racist South Africa has been meeting with U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig and was slated to meet President Reagan sometime today. Their talks are mainly about Namibian indpendence; and the latest formulation is that there must be constitutional guarantees for the white minority before the South Africans will agree to elections leading to independence. The Americans have basically accepted this position and have been pushing it at NATO. What everybody is very quiet about is Namibia's vast mineral resources, but I am sure there is some agreement on that too. And, of course, South Africa has now come in out of the international diplomatic cold, thanks to Reagan's people.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The New Pricing Policy

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
May 13, 1981; 6.10p.m

Good evening: Ministry Paper Number 11 was tabled in Parliament on the same day that the Spending Estimates for the financial year 1981-82 were presented to Parliament. In the event, Ministry Paper No. 11 tended to be overshadowed by the Budget Estimates. And yet, as far as the ordinary consumer is concerned Ministry Paper No. 11 is a matter of over-riding importance because it spells out in some detail the government's policy on prices and it gives lists of the items which have been removed from price controls or have been so reshuffled as to be effectively removed from direct Ministerial control. List 'A' is the one in which the Minister sets the prices and those prices can only be changed with his approval. List 'B' is the one where the producer or marketer of an item has to notify the Prices Commission of an intention to increase the price on that item. If there is no objection from the Prices Commission within 30 days the producer or marketer is free to increase the price. And list 'C' is the one on which prices are based on a percentage mark-up to the seller. Ministry Paper No. 11 spells out what items are or remain on which list. And the most important changes are on the items on list 'A' which were under specific price control. The following items, say Ministry Paper No. 11 have been decontrolled from list A: Cheese, cigarettes, liquid detergents, industrial gasses, red rums, salt for industry, stout, yeast, school uniform materials, and biscuits. All these items are no longer under price control and the producer can now put any price they want on these items, if they think the market can stand it. If they over-reach themselves and if alternatives

UWI Libraries

are available they may end up pricing themselves out of business. But however it goes in the long run the consumer is bound to feel the pressure of increased prices on this list of completely 'freed-up' items. Next there is a shifting of some items from list 'A' to list 'B' - that is from being fully controlled to being items on which the producer must give 30 days notice to the Prices Commission of the intention to increase prices. These are: Beers, butterin/margarine, cement, whole chicken, dry detergents, cooking gas, liquid cows'milk, overproof rum, reinforcing steel bars, Milo and Malted Milks. Here again, many prices are almost certain to go up after the 30-day interval. I think we need to bear in mind, though, especially as far as the food is concerned, that the government has also declared itself prepared to increase imports if that became necessary to keep local prices at reasonable levels. One catch here - and it is something over which local chicken, broiler, pork and other livestick producer (as well as small farmers) have already started to complain - is the fear that largescale importing of cheap food could easily undermine and even kill local production. And there just is no way that even the most efficient local producer with his relatively small operation can hope to compete successfully with say, a huge American chicken producing combine, if that combine were to decide to take over the Jamaican broiler market. Where 'market forces' are given free play the big fish have a way of either swallowing up the little ones or driving them from the feeding ground. The final items removed from list 'A's specific price controls and transferred to list 'C' with its set mark-up are: contraceptives, lumber, certain hardware items, locally made batteries, locally made tyres.. These are the major changes in price controls. There is much other information on prices in Ministry Paper No. 11 which it would be worthwhile to get hold of as the 'market forces' come into play. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Change of Power in France:
Some Implications for the World

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
May 11, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The single most important political development on the world scene this past weekend was the change of political power in France with the socialist Mr. Francois Mitterand defeating conservative former President Mr. Valery Giscard d'Estaing: this event overshadowed even the dangerously nasty confrontation shaping up between Syria and Israel over the basing of Syrian ground-to-air missiles in the Lebanon after the Israelis had shot down two Syriam helicopters. Unless the Americans and Russians between them can persuade the Israelis and the Syrians to back off, their confrontation could easily erupt into fighting which is almost certain to suck in the entire Middle East and, perhaps, others as well. But for the moment even this explosive situation has been forced to play second fiddle to the dramatic outcome of yesterday's final round of the French Presidential elections. And this is so because Mr. Mitterand's victory changes the political equations not only in France but also in all of Western Europe; and Western Europe, like it or not, still exercises a major influence on world events. It was the Foreign Ministers of Western Europe, for instance, acting as a united group who only a week or so ago 'persuaded' the Reagan administration to back away from its hard cold war posture and agree to resume disarmament talks with the Soviet Union. And France, along with Britain and West Germany, are the key members of this powerful group. So the change of power in France is of profound concern to all the other West Europeans, and I am sure that at their meeting today Mrs. Thatcher and Chancellor Schmidt will have words on this change and some of its

UWI Libraries

implications for relations with the United States on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. The French, since the days of the great Charles DeGaulle, if not before, have, generally speaking been much more distrustful of the Americans than have been the British Indeed, Britain's perceived closeness to America was one reason why the Gaullists kept her out of the European Community for so long. So I expect the Mitterand Presidency to be rather less willing than Giscard was to go along with some of the Reagan hardline postures such as the worldwide anti-communist crusade. On the other hand, I think Mitterand will want to keep his distance from the local French communists of whose spoiling and takeover tactics he has had first-hand experience during two previous tries at the Presidency. And I do not think he will quickly forget the veiled Soviet comments in favour of Giscard during the campaign. The French socialists have traditionally been much more international -ist in outlook, much more supportive of freedom struggles than have been the British socialists. So the chances of a France under a socialist Executive President joining Britain and the United States to cast a veto at the Security Council as was done over Namibia last week is not a foregone conclusion. And this could create new problems for America's Southern Africa posture of supporting the white racists. On the other hand, the French socialists have traditionally been more pro-Israel than Giscard ever was and so are likely to support the Camp David accords more strongly. So America is going to have walk a rather more delicate new line if she hopes to get on as well with the new French President as she did with the old one. All this is of course based on the assumption that when Mr. Mitterand calls new elections to the National Assembly, reportedly for next month, his socialist party will win as big as he did yesterday. If they do then West Europe will indeed be set on an interesting new course. Goodnigh

UWI Libraries

1) The First Storm Passes
2) $2,500million Spending Budget
3) British Local Govt. Elections
4) Death of Bobby Sands

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
May 8, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Tropical Storm Arlene - coming unexpectedly and surprisingly early in the year - has passed us by with first reports suggesting comparatively minor damage. We must hope that later reports will confirm that the damage was indeed comparatively light; which would be cause for thanksgiving. And then we must prepare ourselves for anything that might happen when the Hurricane season comes fully into force. It is always better to be ready for an eventuality which does not take place than to be caught unprepared. Next, while it is still too early to have digested the massive of figures of yesterday's spending Estimates, one or two points do stand out. $2,500-million is, by almost any measure, a vast amount of money for a small and relatively poor country like Jamaica to be planning to spend in one single year. If we were paying our own way in the world we would be expecting to earn the bulk of that money from our own efforts - mainly from the taxes we pay, and any other, non-tax revenue earned by government-owned entities. If that were the case then the money the government borrowed, both locally and from overseas would be to make up the shortfall between what we ourselves have generated by our own efforts and the little extra we may need to generate more of our own earnings. And this, of course would mean that our earning, rather than our borrowing, would represent the bulk of the government's revenue and the basis of its planning. But, going by past figures, it is most unlikely that the government's revenue from taxation will amount to as much as half of the proposed

UWI Libraries

$2,500-million we will spend. Indeed, it is most unlikely that our taxes will be equal to the $1,600-million of Recurrent or house-keeping/spending which is earmarked for this financial year. And yet this first spending Budget of the new JLP regime is only some roughly $100-million more than last year's revised Spending Estimates of the then PNP regime. And the world inflation, during the course of that one year, has continued; costs of food, energy, machinery, spare parts, consumer good, have all continued to rise. So this year's $2,500-million Spending Estimates, may, in terms of real buying power, be somewhat less than last year's revised figure of $2,400-million. So things look still like/being pretty tight; and it might be wise for the partisan propagandists to try and avoid the same foot-in-mouth exercise which led them to paint such glowing pictures of tourism "now that confidence has been restored" and which has just blown up in their faces. To be sure confidence, from whatever source, is important; but national self-confidence, and a national will to/work unitedly our troubles away, are more important. And for these we need a rather special kind of unifying leadership. And finally, Britain's Conservative government is under pressure on many fronts; yesterday's local elections are a setback for Mrs. Thatcher; American seamen are planning to boycott British ships because of the death of I.R.A. hunger striker, Babby Sands, in prison, and even loyal little Barbados is angry with her over the Nationality Bill. Of all these the death of Bobby Sands is perhaps the most tragic and most/potentially explosive The sad thing is that from the age of/eighteen when Sands' family were forced out of their home becuase they were of the wrong faith, and he was/forced out of a job as an apprentice for the same reason, and then sent to jail for five years for armed robbery - all between 1972 and 1973 - the course of this young man's life seemed set for the final tragedy. Although the people are the same colour they practice something pretty close to Apartheid in Northern Ireland. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Budget Day, L981
2) Labour, Management & Govt
~~3) International Notes~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
May 6, 1981, 6.10p.m

Part One

Good evening: Tomorrow, is Budget Day, when we have the ceremonial opening of the new session of Parliament with the Throne Speech outlining the government's policies for the year 1981/82, and, later, with the tabling of the Estimates of Expenditure for 1981/82. But again we will have the long-standing business of having only the spending Estimates. We will not be given the Revenue Estimates at the same time. So we will not be able to see the Budget exercise in the round, as one single whole. We will know how much the government plans to spend and on what; but we will not, at the same time, know how the money which the government says it plans to spend will be raised. And so, for most ordinary Jamaicans, there will not be that sharp connection between what we, as a nation, spend, and where the money is to come from. Obviously, the Budget makers must have it all pretty clear in their own minds, and indeed, must have it down on paper as well. But for most ordinary citizens the spending is somehow made to seem only vaguely and remotely related to the harsh reality of having to find, and how you find, the money, that you plan to spend. It may just be that this way of making our Budget is one of the obstacles to a sharper appreciation of the business of having to pay our way in the world. If you get the notion that you can spend first and only worry about paying afterwards, when you have already done the spending you are almost certain to overspend. If, on the other hand, you know precisely what you have to spend then you are likely to plan more carefully in order to avoid over-spending. Budget makers sometimes seem to forget

UWI Libraries

that they need the intelligent and understanding support of the entire society - unionised workers, housewives and higglers, as much as managers and investors - to make their economic policies work. This requires careful explanation; careful action. I think, for instance, that getting our trade unions to really understand some of the hard budgetary problems of spreading a fixed amount of money to try and satisfy a multiplicity of demands, including those of public sector workers, is likely to be more effective than all the threats and bluster now directed at the labour movement from some quarters. And I think the best way of doing this is to consult before final decisions are made rather than after. Here again it is a matter of levelling honestly, of showing what is available, how it is proposed to use it, and listening to suggestions which might improve the use of it. If we are to come to grips with the challenges facing Jamaica and overcome them to the benefit of a majority of Jamaicans, through the elected government, then we are going to have proceed by way of a combination of clearcut explaining amounting to a national exercise in basic economics, we are going to have to so organise our budget presentation as to almost force people to understand the cost of every penny spent, and we are going to have to strive after cooperation and consultation and understanding between labour, management and the government. And this will not come through confrontation or through this or that side beating the other into the ground. Whoever might win in such a confrontation, Jamaica, the Jamaican economy and the economic aspirations of the majority of the Jamaican people will be the ultimate sufferers. Let us hope tomorrow's new session of Parliament will point us in the direction of clear explanation, consultation and then co-operation to earn our troubles away in a climate of genuine equity.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The British Nationality Bill

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
May 4, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Britain's Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, yesterday took the unusual step of appearing on a BBC programme aimed at immigrants communities in the United Kingdom to defend the British Government's highly controversial ~~Rixx~~ Nationality Bill which is now before the British Parliament. This is the measure which most non-white communities in Britain, as well as many other groups, have denounced as 'racist' in concept and intent. Indeed, a week or so back Mr Errol Barrow of Barbados after a visit to Brixton in Britain, also denounced the British Nationality Bill as discriminatory against non-whites in Britain. And Mr. Barrow was particularly critical of Caribbean governments for not having raised their voices over the Nationality Bill, or the Brixton riots, or the burning of a building in which 13 young West Indians died. Mr. Barrow said: "Britain is not going to do anything positive for its resident black population unless they get very strong protests from the West Indian governments. So, rightly or wrongly, the British Nationality Bill which Mrs. Thatcher's government is now trying to rush through Parliament by cutting down the time allowed for its debate, is not being seen in isolation from the general troubles now being experienced by the non-white communities in the United Kingdom. For instance, I think Mrs. Thatcher is on good ground when she argues that every country has the sovereign right to decide who to let in or to keep out of its borders. This is a right exercised by all independent countries. Jamaica decides who can or cannot come in; so does Trinidad and Tobago; so does Barbados; so do the United States and Canada. But

UWI Libraries

there is - or, shall we say there has traditionally been - a catch where imperial powers are concerned. 'Mother France' cannot constitutionally and legally keep out of the 'mother country' the citizens from her colonies. And mother/~~Britannia~~ Britannia too, until as recently as the 1971 Immigration Act, recognised the 'right of abode' and 'exemption from control' of citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies born or connected with Britain or who are children or grandchildren of such, or from overseas (one of the colonies) resident in Britain for a continuous period of five years. This would ofcourse cover/the parents of those youngsters who were involved in last month's Brixton riots, and therefore the youngsters too. And, of course, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, that neatly disguised last American colony, also enjoy this traditional right of free entry into the 'mother country'. So, the question of racism and the control of racial minorities apart, there is the other matter of breaking with an accepted tradition that was once almost as sacrosanct as diplomatic immunity. Whatever else things were like in the colonies, the enterprising colonial who could find his or her way to the 'mother country' had automatic right of abode once there. We do not have the text of Mrs. Thatcher's Nationality Bill but reports are that under one of its three types of citizenship even people like the young black Britons born in the 'mother country' will not have this automatic right of abode. And this, if it turns out to be true, could open up all sorts of cans of worms. What, for instance, if other countries were to adopt similarly racist forms of definition of nationality which restricted the right of abode to people of a particular skin colour or a particular ethnic background? How would it affect the white minorities in Africa or Asia or the Caribbean? It is questions like these which make the longterm implications of the Thatcher Bill so disturbing. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Montego Bay, City
2) Tourism & Hotel Ownership
3) Namibia: Western Veto
4) Saudi Arms Sale: Reagan backtracks

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
May 1, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: And an especially warm salutation to the celebrating citizens of the newly proclaimed City of Montego Bay. May their city's new status help to bring them all the good things they are striving for. But the operative word is 'strive'; good things do not just happen, people have to strive after them, work for them; at times 'struggle' for them. And to get the tourist trade on which they depend so heavily into as good and healthy a shape as possible strikes me as just about the single most important thing for the people of the City of Montego Bay, and indeed for all those whose livelihood in one way or another depend on tourism, to strive after. Working hard is most important, of course: but it is possible to work hard in a wrong way, in an ultimately self-defeating way. One example of the wrong kind of hard work is the type of road and gully work which is washed away each time we have heavy rain. That is the kind of work which drains away, rather than build up, resources. And I am one of the many people who are concerned about the obvious industry with which the political heads of our tourist trade appears to want to sell off some of our tourist hotels. Please don't get me wrong. I do not question the government's right to divest itself of those assets which it feels are a burden on the Jamaican taxpayer, especially where they can be operated more successfully and efficiently and to the profit of Jamaica than they now are. But I think that in the case of most government-owned hotels it is important for us never to forget how they came into government or public ownership in the first place. It was

UWI Libraries

because of any policy decision or fixed ideological posture that the past government acquired these hotel. The brute fact is that when the tourist trade slumped and things turned bad, the former foreign owners left without looking back: they just cut their losses and ran. So the government stepped in and took over at great public cost and held the trade going during the bad and bitter years. If a new generation of foreign owners were to come in have we any reason to believe that they will not do exactly the same thing if there is another slump in the tourist trade a few years down the road? I frankly don't think so. I think they will behave in exactly the same way and the government of Jamaica will again be faced with either again going in for a costly salvage operation or standing by and watch tourism collappse. For this basic reason hard-headed pragmatism would suggest that we enter into either lease or management arrangements, but that we do not sell, except, perhaps to native Jamaican interests who cannot just cut and run when the going gets rough. And given the present world economic climate the going will get very rough from time to time in the years ahead. The government had better be very careful about how it balances short-term and long-term interests. The life and future of a country is not to be planned or measured solely in the short-term interests of the lifetime of a particular government. Next, two brief notes on international developments. By vetoing the sacntions proposals against South Africa in Security Council yesterday, the United States, Britain and France have in fact tacitly endorsed South Africa's violation of what was originally the Western powers' own plan for a settlement in Namibia. It was this kind of political bankruptcy that led in another generation to the collapse of the League of Nations which set the stage for World War Two. And according to the Third World interpress Service the powerful Israeli-American Jewish lobby has forced President Reagan to put off the sale of spy planes to Saudi Arabia. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

No Division on the Trade Union Front

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
April 29, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The apparent rift between our two major trade unions over the government's Pay Policy as outlined in Ministry Paper No.9 is fast disappearing. The five major trade unions have taken a united stand against the proposed three-year pay plan for public sector workers. They insist that it continue to be a two-year wage contract. So there is, in clear and precise terms, no division there. But what of the apparent disagreement in the two statements in one of which Mr. Lascelles Beckford for the BITU welcomes the ending of wage guidelines, and in the other Mr. H.O. Thompson for the NWU rejects the policy as disguised and harsher guidelines? My information leads me to believe that the difference is more apparent than real. You will remember that in my comments on Monday I pointed out how very guarded and conditional the BITU welcome was: they had not yet examined the agreement in detail, they had not yet consulted their delegates. A fair conclusion must be that they had not at that time examined all the detailed implications of the proposed Pay Policy, but welcomed the news of the end of wage guidelines. The NWU statement, remember, came several days later and after obviously closer examination. So what if the closer BITU examination leads to the same conclusion as that arrived at by the NWU? Do not forget that all our major trade unions are on record as being opposed to wage guidelines. If it turns out on closer examination that the terms of the Pay Policy do in fact add up to a new form of wage guidelines then all the major trade unions, as well as most others, will be opposed. So the real issue hinges

UWI Libraries

on how the terms are interpreted. And already it is becoming clear that the big five trade unions are moving toward a uniform and common interpretation. So the drumbeats announcing the great coming division in the house of ~~xxxxxx~~ trade unionism had better be muted. My information is that there was an important meeting in that house last night, and there was no division. I suppose it is reasonable for the enemies of labour and for those who feel that the unions have grown too big for their britches, to seek out and seize eagerly on any sign or hint of division. The name of the game is divide and conquer, divide and rule. But our unions are sufficiently mature and sophisticated to know this and to see through attempts to play up any rifts which are bound to appear from time to time; and I do not think they are going to be deceived by the use of party labels. In this sense , Jamaica's trade union movement has progressed further along the road from political tribalism and cannibalism than have the political parties. If it feels itself threatened by union-busters, no matter from what quarters, then it will close ranks and put up a bitter fight. I think those who seem anxious to 'teach the unions a lesson' would be wise never to forget this central fact. Jamaica's trade union movement was nurtured in often bitter struggle, and for all its signs of the 'fat' that comes with success, it is still a formidable force: which is why I think that this government, like all those of both parties before it, will meet and talk and negotiate rather than confront. The hard problem for the future is not, I think, to divide the labour movement and so weaken it, or to try and bust its back, but rather to convince the ranks of the labour movement that they have as great, if not a greater interest, in increased production, better performance and profitability. How this is done, and how successfully this is done, is the great challenge to leadership this government faces.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Division on the Trade Union Front?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
April 27, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The National Workers Union, through its President, Mr. H.O. Thompson, yesterday rejected the government's Pay Policy as outlined to Parliament last week by the Prime Minister in his statement on the new I.M.F. agreement. You may recall that earlier, on Thursday of last week, the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union, through its Vice President, Mr. Lascelles Beckford, had welcomed a key aspect of that Pay Policy - the ending of wage guidelines. So here, on the face of it, there would seem to be the beginnings of division between the Big Two in the broad trade union united front which has stood Jamaica's organised labour movement in such good stead in recent years. The question is: How seriously should we view these first signs of an apparent rift? If the BITU supports the Pay Policy and the NWU opposes it, what will it mean for labour and for the unity of the labour movement? It seems to me that the very first thing we need to note is how very conditional the BITU statement of welcome was. The Managing Committee of the BITU, Mr. Beckford's statement said, had not yet examined the Agreement in detail or consulted with their delegates and so was unable to comment totally. However they did welcome the lifting of the wage guidelines and hoped that employers would bargain with trade unions in good faith to ensure increased production which the country is in dire need of at the present time. So the possibility clearly exists that after a more detailed examination of the policy and after consultation with their delegates the BITU could adopt the same posture as the NWU, which is that " the ability to pay"

UWI Libraries

stipulation cancels the government's claim that a state of free bargaining without guidelines had been restored. If the BITU does finally arrive at that position then the apparent rift will disappear and a united trade union movement will mobilise its energies to ensure that the workers do not get the nastier end of this particular arrangement. The NWU is afraid that the 'ability to pay' stipulation could set the stage for compelling workers to subsidise all the failures, and inefficiencies of managers, and to bear all by themselves the entire burden of increasing production, while facing the constant threat of being blamed and penalised for any failure, even when the responsibility lies elsewhere. This is a very real workers fear which should not be ignored. But against it should be set the equally real fact that in the so-called market system bad and ineffcient managers would be as quickly thrown on the scrapheap of unemployment as any worker; so they may have as great a vested interest in success as any worker or union leader. Indeed, in circumstances where workers see themselves as having a right to the job, no matter how poorly they perform, managers may have a greater vested interest in success. So it would seem that how the matter of "ability to pay" is defined is of critical importance. Clearly, under the new dispensation, no worker can expect to keep a job, let alone demand increased pay when an enterprise is genuinely unprofitable. Like it or not, that which fails will be closed down. That which succeeds will survive. The important thing is to ensure that the burdens and the benefits are shared in just proportions. There is no need for any division in the ranks of trade unionism over this. Let us hope there will be none. And it looks as though the JOS workers and management are going to be the first to learn the harsh lesson that survival depends on what must now be the three cardinal Ps of Jamaica: Production, Performance, Profitability: by all, not just some Jamaicans. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) The New IMF Deal
2) Namibia
3) U.S. Arms to Saudi Arabia

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
April 24, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The terms of Jamaica's new arrangement with the I.M.F. are now public and available for everybody to examine: the important document is Ministry Paper No. 9 which the Prime Minister tabled in Parliament on Wednesday. It would be wise to get hold of the text of that Ministry Paper and keep it for future reference. What I think would be futile in the extreme is for anybody or any group to go through the same interminable debate we had the last time around. The new agreement is in place; no amount of hot chat can undo that. And Jamaica has to make it work if we are not to sink deeper and deeper into a pit of economic hopelessness. Make no mistake about it, it is not going to be easy and there are as yet no winners. The only guarantee of there being any winners at all is going to be performance. The trade union movement has been given its demand for an end to wage guidelines and a return to free bargaining on the basis of ability to pay. Implicit in this is the responsibility of the trade unions to ensure that their members are sufficiently productive to make the enterprise for which they work a profitable enough to keep them on and satisfy wage demands. In the truly free market system those who do not produce and those who do not operate profitably are scrapped and driven out of business. This is the new challenge to labour at every level, and bad habits sometimes die hard. The private sector has been freed up to do its thing and to really be the 'productive sector' in deed as well as word. But the other side of being really freed up is the loss of protected captive markets and the responsibility, ultimately,

UWI Libraries

of satifying your own foreign exchange requirements by way of foreign exchange earnings. And this is going to be brutally tough on those sections of our 'productive sector' who felt threatened by the puny little higgler trade. How will they fare when our markets are opened up to high-quality, low-priced goods from places like Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore? And when import restrictions are lifted and consumer items flow in freely how will merchants used to enjoying the high price of scarcity, fare? What will they do when they can no longer charge $30 or $50 for something selling for $10 or $15 in New York? So 'deregulation' and the lifting of controls poses challenges for employers and workers alike. How both groups respond to those challenges will determine how we cope with the social problems - with unemployment, with education, with our housing and health services In other words, like it or not, the crying needs of the poor, the young and the dispossessed are going to depend on how soon and how successfully this programme is made to work. So the sooner we get on with job, the better. And while we were preoccupied with our own worries much of importance was going on in the world outside. For instance a big, and potentially explosive politically row is in the making in the United States over President Reagan's decision to sell to Saudi Arabia five highly sophisticated spy planes. The Israelis are afraid the planes would be used to monitor their military activity and are bitterly opposed to the sale. The powerful American Jewish lobby has swung into action and the American Congress may resist the sale. The Saudis, on the other hand, insist on the sale as a test of American friendship - and they are America's largest oil supplier, which makes it tricky. Only slightly less tricky is Nigeria's warning against Western support of South Africa over Namibia, with its hint of so far unspecified action. Nigeria is America's second largest oil supplier after Saudia Arabia.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

To the I.M.F, Once More

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
April 22,1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Today is I.M.F. day in Jamaica - once more. And already, long before it is really possible for us to truly obsorb and digest and begin to analyse the Seaga statement to Parliament, the hot and passionate debate is already on, and has been on for several days. And the line up is pretty much the same as it was during those previous hot debates/on the IMF during the last PNP regime. Those who were against ~~the~~ an agreement with the IMF then are as hotly and passionate against now; and for the same reasons. Those who were for an ~~IMF~~ agreement with the IMF then, are as passionately for it now, and for the same reasons. And one gets the uneasy feeling that what the Prime Minister said today is not going to make one iota of difference to their fixed positions. In this sense it is a replay of an old political game. But it is when you ask what is the point of this replay that you realise that there are important differences between the debate under the Manley government and the debate now under the Seaga government. For one thing the Manley government was itself ambivalent about the IMF and so the strong/anti-IMF pressure from the political left both inside and outside the PNP was very effective. And it was this pressure, when the going got rough, which finally tipped the scales in favour of the break with the IMF. The/political left had successfully nurtured the notion that there was an alternative path to the IMF; but they did not spell out all the political implications of that path. Why, for instance, should the Soviet Union commit hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign exchange to prop up and salvage a capitalist economy?

UWI Libraries

Or, put in another context, would it be worth their while gambling that kind of money in hopes of winning Jamaica into the so-called 'Socialist Camp'? In short, why should the communist system help bail out a failing capitalist system unless it sees a reasonable chance of winning it over? If it has to remain a capitalist system, then let the big capitalists salvage it. I think the major communist States had no illusions about just how far away from the 'Socialist Camp' Jamaica under the PNP really was, despite the rhetoric. So when the PNP broke with the IMF there was nowhere else to turn: OPEC's Arab members were all right for small, high-interest token loans, but no more. The point is that today, and in light of the massive JLP mandate, which implicitly included a return to the IMF, the opposition from the political left can have little, if any, effect. It cannot, for the foreseeable future, influence the government or any segment inside the JLP, or indeed, any large section of the electorate to mount the kind of anti-IMF campaign which it did so successfully during the PNP regime. In this sense there has been a profound change in the Jamaican political climate. And those who believe in government by the freely expressed will of the people must respect the will and the mandate of the people, whether they agree with it or not. This, now, is the dilemma faced by the anti-IMF forces. To behave now, as they did under the PNP would in effect be obstructive to no point. If and when the IMF prescription should fail to fulfil the expectations of the Jamaican electorate, then would be time enough for such anti-IMF campaigns. For now, I think the IMF prescription should be given a fair chance. Both the government of Jamaica and the majority of the electorate seem to think it might work. So let the political left be as critical as it wants to: but let it be critical support, constructive support. Jamaica's grievous problems cry out for no less.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Easter, 1981

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
April 20, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The long, and,for most of us, quiet and peaceful Easter weekend, will soon be behind us, and the harsh realities of everyday life ahead of us. Compared with Easter, 1980, the most dramatic difference this year is the extent to which the national atmosphere of intense political activity has been defused; things are much more quiet, much more relaxed - with only faint hints so far of an impulse to witch-hunting and to stifle unpopular opinions. Some of the acute problems of this time last year have vanished. I recall Mr. Hugh Small's desperate efforts to have our foreign debts rescheduled following the break with the I.M.F. With the change of government and the return to doing business with the I.M.F. that is no longer a problem and, indeed, the terms of the new I.M.F. agreement with Jamaica will be made public by the Prime Minister this coming Wednesday. So the country's need for foreign exchange, and the need to re-order our debt repayments are not the acute problems this Easter that they were last Easter. But some of the problems have persisted. Unemployment is still very much with us and, if anything, a litttle higher than it was last Easter. But unemployment is one of Jamaica's hardest and oldest problems, and there is no way that any government of any complexion or party can solve it in one or two years or, indeed, in one term. Coping with unemployment is going to be a long and pain-staking process. I do not think there is any one single simple solution, or that any one single sector of the economy can provide that solution: it must be a joint, multi-faceted effort in which the government, the private sector and the labour movement all copera

UWI Libraries

And because the labour movement is most representative of the interest of the working people, I think the labour movement should play a major part in the formulating of a policy for coming to grips with unemployment. It is one of the great failures of labour that it has not faced up to this problem up to now: it is a failure that could cost it dearly in the future if it is not corrected; today's unemployed, when their numbers become sufficiently large and desperate, could become tomorrow's scab, union-busting labour. And their numbers are dangerously large already. Related to this is another of our persistent problems. I recall that this time last year Mr. E. Lloyd Taylor, JALGO's secretary, called for the re-imposition of price controls, for an end to the wage guidelines and for a return to free bargaining between unions and management. Some price controls were in fact re-imposed after the break with the IMF, but not all. Now, this Easter, and with us back in business with the IMF, the same calls are coming from the unions as well as other quarters. Unless this business of wages and prices - and let me add profits - is resolved by way of agreement and understanding, we may not work our way out of our troubles, no matter how much foreign exchange we borrow. I think we are into a bit of a dilemma here. If you are really going to 'free up' the economy, if you are going to lift all controls and give the so-called 'market forces' their full play, then you must free up all the components, not just some of them: if the investor is free to make the most he can, then the worker must also be free to make the most he can; if prices and profits are to be free to find their free market values then so should wages and salaries be - if the system is to be just and fair to everybody. And this way lies disaster. So let us hope for understanding rather than confrontation. Finally, today is the start of Salvation Army Week; pleae help if you can; they help the neediest and most dispossessed in Jamaica. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) IMF Loan Approved
2) Two Newspaper Views: A Perspective
3) Mrs. Margaret Thatcher-Mrs. Indira Gandhi

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
April 15, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: According to this morning's BBC news the Board of the International Monetary Fund has approved the terms of a loan of nearly $~~700~~ 650-million U.S. to be spread over the next three years. So we are back in business with the I.M.F. and our desperate foreign exchange position should be very greatly eased. We do not yet know the details of the terms of the agreement though there is much speculativ comment based on our past experience with the I.M.F. as well as on the experiences of other countries. One of the interesting things we may see, if and when the terms are made public, is just how much the basic approach of the I.M.F. has in fact been changed or modified by the often bitter campaign against some of its previous conditions. That campaign, you may recall, was one in which the previous Jamaican government as well as the government of Tanzania played leading roles. If that campaign has borne any fruit, we should see some of that fruit in relatively 'softer' terms - which does not, of course mean the abandonment of strict fiscal management. The IMF is the capitalist world's international banker, not the capitalist world's internationa aid agency; any 'softening' of terms will be in that context. But getting IMF loans is only one aspect of our economic problem. The other, and ultimately infinitely more important aspect is how we use the loans and what we do after we get them. And our two morning papers of today's date carry two very interesting articles on this latter aspect. There is, in the Daily Gleaner, Dr. Carl Stone's article entitled: "Moving the Economy"; and, in the Daily News, the

UWI Libraries

one entitled: "Justified Eurphoria?" - question mark - by the group who sign themselves 'The Unmuzzled Ox'. I think that between them these two articles put that a key aspect of our problem, which is likely to loom very large in the months ahead, into clear perspective. So please read these articles and then put them up for reference, say, a year from now. Next, the two politically most powerful women in the world meet in Delhi, India today. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Britain, is on a visit to India for talks with Mrs. Indira Gandhi about the political problems of South East Asia, and indeed the world. They are likely to talk about the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, about the United States plan to supply arms to Pakistan, about developments in the Middle East, about the Third World, and about relations between the Western countries led by the United States on the one hand, and the East European communist states led by the Soviet Union on the other. And what Mrs. Gandhi says to Mrs. Thatcher on these matters is bound to have a very profound bearing on what Mrs. Thatcher in her turn will say to her Western allies when next they meet, especially on what Mrs. Thatcher says to Mr. Ronald Reagan's people who appear only to be beginning to realise that international relations and the conducting of international relations are much more complicated than the Wild Wild West notion of the fast-drawing 'good guys' facing down the wicked bad guys. To say this is not to suggest that Britain's Iron Lady will swallow whatever Indira Gandhi says. Mrs. Thatcher may disagree with and dispute some Gandhi views hotly. But, like it or not, those views have to be taken seriously into account because of the enormous influence on Third World thinking and on Third World action exercised by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. So let us hope that Mrs. Thatcher will learn well enough to be able to pass on the tough-minded Gandhi perspective on world politics to the gentleman in the White House. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Brixton Riots
2) White Rhodesian Split
3) Importance of Space Shuttle Columbia

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
April 13, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Brixton riot of this past weekend has been in the making for a very long time indeed, and the warnings of its coming have been there for a long time too. And it is not just a simple race riot either, although racial resentment is a major factor: racism is simply one facet of economic exclusion or exploitation or both. The hard and simple fact is that Britain is in deep economic trouble and it is always those at the bottom of the ladder who feel the pressure most. And the pressure points in Britain right now are, firstly, unemployment, and secondly the social services, housing education and the health services. And unemployment hits the young black Briton hardest of all. He is, generally speaking, the last to be hired and the first to be fired. At the best of times he has great difficulty finding a job; and when he does find a job it is, more often than not, of the casual labourer type. Skilled jobs are hard to come by because it is terribly difficult to gain entry as an apprentice. The trade unions take care of their own; and when there are openings for apprentices in any union shop such openings go first to the sons of union members. So the union closed shop also works against the young black Britons who are seen and resented as threatening the jobs prospects of white young Britons. This is an aspect of the problem which West Indian and African intellectuals and professionals tend to gloss over because when they were in Britain they did not themselves go through the often devastating experience of being treated as unwanted competition on the British job market, especially at a time of high and rising unemployment. And the young black Briton

UWI Libraries

unlike his father and his father's generation, is not and does not see himself as an immigrant: he was born in Britain, he has been exposed to a British education, his values are British. So the resentment at attempts to exclude him from what he sees as his birthright runs deep. There is no way that the Enoch Powells can "repatriate this black Briton from his place of birth; no way that the British trade union movement can forever ignore or play down his presence as a legitimate segment of the British working class: no way, that is, unless they want to experience worse and uglier repetitions of the eruption in Brixton this past weekend. In the past the British have shown an extraordinary capacity for absorbing their problems and turning them into assets. I think they will do so again - relatively painlessly, if they set about it sensibly; traumatically if they don't; but solve them they will. The other interesting piece of weekend news with racial overtones came out of Zimbabwe where Ian Smith's racist Rhodesian Front party appears to be on the verge of falling apart. A leading member of the Front has resigned because he wants to form a party which will genuinely co-operate with Robert Mugabe's black government. Implicit in this is the suggestion that Mr. Ian Smith and company were not really co-operating and were still hoping for some miracle which would restore white-rule. If this move succeeds it would be good for the concept of a non-racial Zimbabwe in which all people, of whatever race or colour, can live in peace and equality. This is what Mugabe wants: now it seems growing numbers of the remaining whites want it too. And finally, the American space shuttle Columbia is now circling the earth. If it comes down as successfully tomorrow as it was launched on Sunday morning it will mean that spaceships will in future be able to go into space and come back to earth in much the same way as ordinary airplanes. And that would be a major breakthrough. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Hostages & the Labour Movement
2) Space Shuttle: problems in Open & Closed Societies
3) African Refugees

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
April 10, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Every now and then some section of the Jamaican labour movement behaves as though it is hell-bent on doing itself as much harm as possible, and on providing it enemies with as much ammunition as possible with which to attack it. This week's report of the holding hostage by unionised workers of a jewellery factory owner in St. Ann's Bay is the latest case in point. And there is really no excuse or justification for it. Even if the workers were convinced that the person in question would close down the factory and leave Jamaica, their holding him hostage, their holding him by force and against his will was not the way to ~~do it.~~ safeguard their right to redundancy. That is the way of utter lawlessness; that is the way of the violation of the rule of law; and whoever violates the rule of law, for whatever reason, undermines and weakens the whole concept of the rule of law. A day may well come when the trade union movement in Jamaica has only the law and the concept of the rule of law to protect it from those of its enemies who want to see it destroyed; and it would be tragic indeed if its past and present violations of that concept were to be used against it. There were other and legal ways to ensure that their right to redundancy pay was protected. I sincerely hope that the trade unions, through their joint committee will deal firmly and quickly with this matter so that it is made absolutely clear to their members that in the Jamaican context there is no need for the taking of hostages as part of industrial action, and that the unions are firmly against it. The taking of hostages of any kind is a form of extreme and violent action associated with warfare and tyranny. We do not have

UWI Libraries

that in Jamaica - not yet: let us not help bring it on by rash, irresponsible and unnecessary action. It is not in the workers' best interest.

Next, the launching of the American space shuttle, Columbia, which was supposed to be shot into space ten minutes before seven this morning was called off a little before ten this morning because of technical problems. A new attempt may be made on Sunday. So, between seven and ten this morning all of the world's scientific community, most of the world's news media and many millions of the world's people, watched and listened while the long countdown was delayed and while U.S. scientists and technicians tried to fix the thing. The world had a kind of ringside or frontrow seat watching the Americans grappling with their difficulties and finally , after three hours of effort, deciding to postpone. This is how things are done in an open society, in the full glare of publicity which shows up everything, successes failures, setbacks, disasters, the lot. In contrast, in a closed society, as is the Soviet Union, we are told only about the successes; the failures and setbacks and problems are dealt with in secrecy and away from the glare of publicity we had this morning. The difference is that in open societies people know what is going on while it is going on, warts and all; in closed societies they only know what their leaders want them to know. And it does not only apply to science or space events. And it is not only communist societies that try to manage the news.

And finally, a word on the UN conference on Refugees which opened in Geneva yesterday. The world's refugee population now stands at some ten million half of whom are African. So black Africa now accounts for the world's largest single group of refugees, five million. The UN hopes to raise $1,200-million. The Americans have pledged nearly $300-million of this, chicken feed compared to the thousands upon thousands of millions they spend on the space shuttle or arms, but still more than the Arabs or Europeans or Russians or Africans themselves. And charity, they say, should begin at home. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Jamaica-Cuba Relations: Foreign Policy Perspective

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
April 8, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The apparently continuing hardline diplomat against Cuba adopted by the present Jamaican government is something that we need to think around rather more carefully than we seem to have done up to now. And I suggest that the point of departure should be the standard perception of foreign policy as the tool of the national interest at the international level. A country's foreign policy, the nature and pattern of its relations with other countries, must be seen in terms of what furthers the best intersts of that country. But who determines what are the best interests of a country? The government, of course, whether it is an elected or an imposed government. And the thing about elected governments in parliamentary democracies is that it is, generally speaking, a rare thing for any two political parties to agree on what is in the country's best interest. So a change of government usually means changes or shifts in aspects of its foreign relations. So the change of government in Jamaica has resulted in a dramatic change in the relations between Jamaica and Cuba, but not in an equally dramatic change in the relations between Jamaica and the Soviet Union. Relations with Cuba under the Seaga government are cool and will reportedly remain so. Relations between the Manley Government and Cuba were very warm indeed. Relations between the previous United States government and the previous Jamaican government, after Andrew Young's defeat, were lukewarm at best and would have turned icecold or frigid if the PNP had been returned to power to deal with the new administration in Washington. And, of course, the new administration in Washington is, if anything, much colder and more hardline in its attitude to Cuba than was the previous one.

UWI Libraries

After all, in terms of the ideological and spheres-of-influence conflict of the superpowers, Cuba is as much a bone in the American throat as a hostile anti-communist Poland would be in the Russian throat. So in terms of Jamaican self-interest and in terms of Jamaica's pressing economic needs, which the policies of the previous Jamaican government had failed to satisfy, the new shift of the new government made sense. The way to regain American confidence and American aid and investment happened to coincide with the ideological posture of the new Jamaican government. The one big difference was that the ideological posture of the Jamaica Labour Party, which has been consistently anti-communist over the years, did not in previous years make it hostile to Cuba. On the contrary Jamaica under a previous JLP government stood up ~~for~~ against Cuba's ~~right to self-determination~~ isolation. A reasonable assumption would have been that once the Cuban government dealt with the Jamaican government on what were seen as normal and acceptable diplomatic terms, relations would be restored to normal. But we seem to be involving ourselves once more, from the other side of the fence this time to be sure, in the ideological and spheres-of-influence business of the superpowers for which the PNP was so roundly condemned. One question is: What happens to us if there is a shift in cold war relations? What if there is an accommodation between Reagan's America and Castro's Cuba? Farfetched? Is it really anymore farfetched than Cold Warrior anti-communist Scourge-in-chief Richard Nixon's accommodation with Communist China? Who can swear that American and Cuban self-interests could not come to such a meeting point five or seven or ten years down the line? And if they do, where would that leave a stridently anti-Cuban Jamaica? The Americans, like it or not, would dump us for Cuba any day such an accommodation becomes possible. Our foreign policy thinking ~~must take~~ ignores this ~~into account~~ at Jamaica's peril. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Latest Developments on Poland

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
April 6, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The latest developments in, and about Poland have taken an interesting new twist. A weekend Reuter-CANA report out of Warsaw talks of the end of the Polish crisis and of the so-called moderates in both the Polish Communist Party and the Solidarity Free Trade Union having won. The Soviet press, on the other hand, over the weekend published strong attacks on Solidarity for fomenting what they described as counter-revolution, and on the Polish communist party for allowing this to happen. So, from the Western perspective the 'Polish crisis' has ended; from the Soviet perspective it has deepened. And this, say observers of the East European scene, is the main reason why Soviet President Brezhnev is in Czechoslovakia today for the opening of a Communist Party Congress there. It is expected that Mr. Brezhnev will use the Czech meeting to once again warn the Poles of the consequences of 'counter-revolution' - and 'counter-revolution' in this context means breaking free, or attempting to break free of the Soviet bloc of East European countries. And the East German and Czech communist leaders and, to a slightly lesser extent, the Hungarian communist leaders, all appear to be as determined as the Soviet leaders to prevent any such counter-revolution. Other communist states in the region, the Rumanians, the Yugoslavs and the Bulgarians, have publicly said they want the Poles to be left alone to sort out their own problems - which is the stated position of the United States and her Western allies. And these are indeed what could be described as 'dissident' communist states. The

UWI Libraries

Yugoslavs were the first to break free of Soviet paternalism shortly after the Second World War and while Stalin was still alive. And one key reason why Tito could do this and get away with it was that Yugoslavia did not border the Soviet Union. Rumania, which does border the Soviet Ukraine, did, very much later, dare to persue a relatively independent path of its own; but it remained very much the orthodox communist state firmly under the control of the party and with a dominant strongman leader. So the Soviets allowed it to go its own way as long as it watched its step. Bulgaria is a relatively faithful satellite despite its great distance from the Soviet borders and power centres; and little Albania on the Adriatic Sea is dismissed as the weirdo among the communist states: she is anti-Soviet, anti-Yugoslav, anti-Chinese; and, of course, anti-West as well. However when, in the 1960s, the Czechs and the Hungarians and the East Germans tried to shake free of the tight hold of Soviet Communist orthodoxy, their efforts were brutally suppressed. The Hungarians in particular suffered heavy losses because American propaganda had led them to believe that their uprising would be backed up by Western military help: that help did not come. The Poles have learnt from all these other efforts, most of which failed; and they have tried to walk a tight rope which Western propaganda has made almost impossible. And because of Poland's crtitic geopolitical location for the Warsaw Pact Powers the Russians and East Germans and Czechs may well decide to move in and nullify the victory of the so-called moderates - if there was in fact such a victory. In historical terms we are witnessing just one more variation of the ongoing process of change in which a dominant force, often of monolithic proportions, as was Catholic Christendom before the Reformation, is tested and challenged and challened again until it is overthrown and there is change. That endless process of change is the constant which our pro or anti communist babble at times obscures. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Basic Food Price Increases
2) 'Sleeping' Policemen
3) U.S. Handgun Killings

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
April 3, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This has turned out to be a depressing week for most Jamaicans. Wednesday evening's bus-train collision near May Pen, in which 11 people are reported to have died, was tragic enough without that added bitter twist of some passing motorists refusing to stop to take up the wounded because they did not want to have their precious cars bloodied up. It brought back very sharply to my mind a commentary I did some years ago, during the Lenten season I think, about a man being knocked down by a car on a California highway. The man got up and another car in the long line of fast-flowing traffic knocked him down again. Again he got up, and again he was knocked down. As I recall it this happened three or four times, and when finally the man could not get up again the traffic just flowed over him. I remember at the time saying that sort of thing could not happen here, and I remember being rather proud of our Jamaican sense of compassionate humanity. But all that was before the Orange Street fire, and Kingston burning, and the Eventide fire, and our terrible party political electoral bloodletting. What happened at the Parnassus Crossing on Wednesday night was not the same thing as one California motorist after another knocking down a man and just keeping on going; but the spectacle of Jamaican motorists leaving the bleeding and the dying on the road in order not to bloody up their cars, was not all that far removed: our compassion and concern for human life, for each other's humanity, appears to have been sadly blunted. Is this the kind of progress we want?

UWI Libraries

As far as minimising such tragic accidents in future, the Prime Minister yesterday promised legislative moves to make railway crossings safer, and made specific mention of ridges or sleeping policemen, wherever possible. The putting down of sleeping policmen, preferably a series of three or four at the approaches to every railway level crossing, could be undertaken immediately and at minimal cost. So let this be a first and immediate move while other plans are worked out. The other matter that is certain to depress the poorer sections of the Jamaican community in particular was yesterdays announcement of price increases on a number of basic food items. Among the seven items whose prices go up from today, counter flour goes up by nine cents a pound, rice by 16c a pound, chicken necks and backs by 18c and chicken meat, which has become the national Sunday joint for most, goes up by 30c a pound. And still, after the increase, chicken meat will still be the most economic meat buy in Jamaica today. Nobody likes prices increases; we would all prefer for prices to either go down or else remain where they are; but there is no way we can have this in today's world. Prices, especially the prices of imported food, are going up everywhere, and we have to pay the increased prices one way or the other, if we want the goods; and, in the case of chicken meat, if we want to continue to have a broiler industry. And, inevitably, the poor will feel it most. Making ends meet on $40 or $60 a week is going to mean grief; surviving on less, or being unemployed, is going to be undisguised misery. So the days ahead do not look rosy and playing politics with our hard problems can only make things worse. And finally, a correction on the American love affair with the handgun. The number of Americans killed by handguns over the past ten years was 210,000, not 110,000. And projections are that 32,000 will be so killed this year. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Of Guns & World Leadership

NEWS COMMENTSRY
For broadcast on Wednesday
April 1, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The attempt on the life of American President Ronald Reagan, a little over two months after he became President, has sent shockwaves through the political centres of the Western European countries in particular. There is great relief everywhere that the President was not killed; but there is also the disturbing knowledge that his survival was an accident, a lucky accident. The bullet which lodged in Press Secretary James Brady's brain could as easily have lodged in the President's; and then the whole course of world events could have been thrown into confusion and, perhaps, even turmoil. For today's America is not just America; it is also the leader of the Western alliance, the leader of the NATO powers, the military shield of Western Europe, the one power that can confront the Soviet Union on terms of relative equality at both the military and political levels. So what happens to America's leader is not just an American affair, and has indeed long ceased to be just an American affair. This is so, whether you approve of it or not, whether you like it or not. And so this attempt on the life of the American President has had the effect of making many Europeans realise, and perhaps more sharply than before, once again just how vulnerable they can be made by some apparently purely domestic American matter such as the prevalence of guns in private hands in the United States. And so, for the first time to my knowledge, some European comment this week has suggested some sort of European participation in the renewed debate on gun control which was triggered by the attempt on Mr. Reagan's life. And the

UWI Libraries

European view, generally speaking, appears to be as strongly in favour of gun control as the general American view appears to be against it. The Europeans tend to be less emotional than the American who favour gun control. They do not invest the gun with special qualities of evil. It is a tool, like a knife or a club or a machete. And it is used by man; it does not use man. This is essentially what the upholders of the right to carry a gun say. But then there is the further point of the availability of the tool. If one person wants to do physical harm to another and the only available tool is a stone or club, or, in domestic quarrels, a frying pan or a kitchen chair, then the tool nearest to hand will be used. In European politics people sometimes vent their feelings on political leaders by throwing bottles and stones and rotten eggs and rotten onions at them. Sometimes the feelings they wish to vent are too strong for these and they wish for a gun: but the getting of a gun is so difficult that most of them end up abandoning the effort. And so the chances of the French President or the German Chancellor or the British Prime Minister, or indeed, even the Soviet President, being shot at as Mr. Reagan was this week, are that much more unlikely. The gun, as a tool, is so much easier to get in America than it is in Europe. And so you have in the United States with its 220-odd-million people something of the order of 55-million guns of one sort or another in private hands. Britain, France, Italy and West Germany whose combined population of some 227-odd-million is greater than that of the U.S. do not have a fraction of that number of guns in private hands. And so it is safer to be a European political leader than an American one because the killer-tool, the hand-gun, is more difficult to get. I do not think that is the whole story but many Europeans think it is a key part and they want to have a say about it because their own interests are at stake.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Eric Williams

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
March 30, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The death of Dr. Eric Williams, Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, in Port-of-Spain last night, will be mourned in many places other than the West Indies, and among many people other than West Indians. He will, for instance, be deeply mourned by that generation of mainly black Americans who came under his influence during the years of his professorship at Howard University in Washington D.C.. And he will be mourned by black American intellectuals who never knew him personally but whose outlook and ways of thinking were powerfully influenced by his masterwork, Capitalism and Slavery, which was first published in 1944 when he was still teaching social and political science at Howard University. For many blacks, both in the United States and elsewhere, his scholarly revelation that colour was little more than an accidental convenience in the business of slavery came as something of a jolt. If they were not enslaved because they were black, then why were they enslaved? The answers provided by Capitalism and Slavery had the psychologically liberating quality associated with the truly creative. Consider this from his concluding section, and now I quote: "The political and moral ideas of the age are to be examined in the very closest relation to the economic development. Politics and morals in the abstract make no sense. We find the British statesmen and publicists defending slavery today, abusing slavery tomorrow, defending slavery the day after. Today they are imperialist, the next day anti-imperialist, and equally pro-imperialist a generation after. And always with the same vehemence. The defence or attack is always on the high moral or

UWI Libraries

political plane. The thing defended or attacked is always something that you can touch and see, to be measured in pounds sterling or pounds avoirdupois, in dollars and cents, yards, feet and inches." In other words straight economic self-interest was always dressed-up in highminded moral or political tones. And "the ideas built on these interests," says Eric Williams, "continue long after the interests have been destroyed and work their old mischief, which is all the more mischievous because the interests to which they corresponded no longer exist....We have to guard not only against these old prejudices but also against the new which are being constantly created. No age is exempt." So wrote Eric Williams nearly forty years ago. And this has been part of the social and political cultural baggage carried by most Third World political and intellectual leaders into their struggles. I know, as personal knowledge, that people like Padmore, Nkrumah, Nigeria's Azikiwe, Kenyatta and the younger Nyerere were all influenced by this masterwork of Eric Williams. And the people whose lives and thoughts they in turn helped shape will mourn Eric Williams as a great Third World thinker; not as the ageing Trinidad father-figure whose political dominance in the view of some West Indians had become something of brake What comes after Eric Williams will tell us whether this is in fact so or whether the long period of pause under him was consolidation and preparatation for a relatively smooth new take-off. My own personal memory of Eric Williams gees back to one evening in 1955 when I joined a vast and silent throng at the University of Woodford Square and listened to 'De Doc' as he delivered one of his famous lectures in his flat unemotional voice. He seemed a very lonely and alone little man, aloof and self-contained, in spite of the vast throng about him. I think history may judge him more kindly than most other West Indian leaders. The Third World certainly will. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Crash Programme, Benefit Politics,
& the Very Poor

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
March 27, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Will the Crash Programme, when it comes back, be more 'productive' than it was under the previous government? Will it be less of a political pork-barrel programme than it was under the PNP? Will it be more equitable than it was under the PNP?
I think the easiest of these questions to answer is the first one. The new Minister of Local Government has made his position clear: people either produce or they lose the work: and once this is made clear to people they tend to want to get on with the job; it is only when people feel they can get away with something that they 'try anything'. So the Crash Programme should be more productive under the JLP than it was under the PNP - to the benefit of the society as well as to the benefit of the between 11,000 and 12,000 people who will get work. Will it be less of a political pork-barrel programme? I have doubts in my own mind because there are some very real and some very practical problems to face here. We are faced with a problem of massive unemployment: there are just not enough jobs to go around, not even for the most willing workers. When the PNP started this programme back in 1974 it was, they said, in order to correct the imbalance of years of unemployment by PNP supporters under an earlier JLP regime; once this historic imballance was corrected, they said, job distribution would become non-partisan. In fact the programme remained a programme mainly for PNP supporters: JLP supporters received only token employment. And still there were not enough jobs to satisfy the demands of all the PNP supporters. Now that it is JLP time, and given the number of JLP MPs and Councillors,

UWI Libraries

the programme will, almost by definition, turn out to be mainly for JLP supporters, with PNP supporters receiving only token employment. Dress it up in any fancy language you like but these are the harsh facts of our system of benefit politics in a context of high unemployment. The brute fact is that even if the JLP were to give all the available Crash Programme jobs to JLP supporters only, there would still not be enough such jobs available to satisfy the demands and the needs of all JLP supporters. And, like it or not, the PNP took care of its own when it was in power. Why should not the JLP do the same now it is in power? So what is equity in such a context? And please note that it is the poorest people, those lowest down on the economic ladder, who bear the heaviest brunt of this situation whenever political power shifts from one party to the other. When one set comes in and the other set goes out it is usually the ghetto supporters of the losing side who suffer most. Life tends to go on pretty much as before for the middle and upper class and moneyed supporters of the losing party. Businessmen and professionals rarely lose their means of survival when their party loses power; indeed, some even flourish. Not so the ghetto poor for whom a Crashie job, or the help of a Councillor or MP, can make the difference between disaster and survival. Party politics and the struggle for political power are often turned into mortal combat at this level, as we saw so clearly in that terrible twelve-month run-up to last October's elections. Will it always be so? Will it always be one set of PNP or JLP poor against the other for the relatively few available Crash Programme jobs and other scarce benefits? Or can we create enough jobs in sufficient time to at least diffuse what is fast becoming an explosive situation? Continuing to deal in a spirit of partisan politics with the hard and difficult problem of unemployment and the ghetto poor is dangerous. Our greatest and most urgent need here, it seems to me, is for some non-partisan mechanism - along the lines of the Electoral

UWI Libraries

1) Zimbabwe's Development Loan
2) New Crisis in Poland
3) U.S. 'Crisis Management' Cttee
4) A Note on the Local Media

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
March 25, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Zimbabwe's search for $1,800-million U.S. in development loan money appears to be very successful. Reports out of Salisbury after the first two days of the five-day conference of donor countries tell of pledges already made amounting to some $1,200-millio So, all things being equal, Zimbabwe should raise the target amount to carry out Mr. Robert Mugabe's three-year plan for land acquisition, reorganisation and development. There had been doubts, both inside the Mugabe government and among outside observers, about the raising of the full amount. The Mugabe government had charged the British government in particular with going back on its promise of massive aid; and their was uncertainty about the attitude of the new Reagan administration in Washington. Indeed, only a few days ago a BBC correspondent at the United Nations quoted Mrs. Jean Kirkpatrick, Washington's new U.N. respresentative as saying about Mugabe: "What, give aid to that Marxist? Not a penny!" But now Britain and the United States have turned out to be the two biggest contributors to that massive aid package, with pledges amounting to nearly half the amount in the first two days. The rest is made up of pledges from the other Western countries. There were no pledges of aid from the communist bloc of countries in the first two days. So there is a bit of a suprise here for those who expected to see the Reagan Africa policy in terms of either or: either being for black Africa and against racist South Africa, or for racist South Africa and against black Africa. Things look like being a deal more

UWI Libraries

fluid and pragmatic than that. The Reagan Africa policy will give comfort to racist South Africa, financial aid to Zimbabwe with a self-confessed Marxist Prime Minister, arms and other covert assist ance to Jonas Savimbi's South African-backed guerillas fighting the Marxist Angolan government. And if there is any linking thread to be found in these apparently diverse strands of policy it is in the anti-Soviet theme. Angola is Soviet-backed and Cuban-backed: Mugabe never was; his wartime guerilla support came mainly from China which is now America's great ally. The real point is of course that America's Africa policy must serve America's interests and will change with the changing needs of those interests. In the United States itself the announcement today of Vice President Bush as chairman of the 'Crisis Management Committee' has again raised the question, so dominant in the Carter Presidency, of who is to manage foreign policy the State Department or the White House, the Secretary of State or someone in the White House? Mr. Alexander Haig is reportedly not happy with learning about this by way of the new media. And so to a word on the local media front where the tendency toward journalistic cannibalism against, which Sealy warned many years ago has taken an ugly turn with rightwing journalists celebrating the silencing of their leftwing colleagues and going even further by calling for the silencing of others of whose views they disapprove. This, all intellectual pretensions notwithstanding, is hatchet-man journalism. The sneering and jeering and intellectually dressed-up nastiness which passes for commentary is not my cup of tea, but I have no particular quarrel with it. After all, that may be all some people can do. However, just as I have nothing but contempt for racists of any kind, so have I nothing but contempt for hatchetmen of any kind, be they political, economic or journalistic hatchet men. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Impact Programme Lay-offs
2) Illicit Imports & Unemployment

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
March 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The start of this week sees a sharp and dramatic increase in the ranks of our unemployed. The suspension of the Special Employment - or Impact - Programme will, according to the Daily News, put some 10,750 people out of work. And that, by any measure, is a terrible lick at one time: it increases the ranks of the unemployed by nearly 11,000 in one fell swoop. The one ray of a kind of hope deferred is that the suspension is temporary and that the Programme is expected to return after review and overhaul. In the meantime this week sees the addition of over 10,000 more to burgeoning ranks of those without any visible and legal means of support. And these latest unemployed are, generally speaking, not the kind of people who are likely to have anything to fall back on; they are not the kind of people who have savings on which to live until something else comes along - you cannot save on $40 a week in today's Jamaica. And there is no unemployment assistance from either the state or the unions to fall back on. So these people will have to join the ranks of those who hustle or do higglering of one kind or another in order to survive. And, of in terms of the cold statistical facts of unemployment, if and when the Impact Programme does return in a cleaned-up and streamlined and more productive form, the nearly 11,000 jobs which were lost this week may, of course be restored. But they will not necessarily be restored to the same workers who lost them. Indeed, the cold and realistic facts of Jamaican political life, the reality of 'benefit politics' suggest that very few of those same workers

UWI Libraries

would get back the jobs they have lost, even where they have been reasonably productive. The new controllers of our local government structure have their own armies of unemployed supporters to take care of: the rewards of victory is the transferring of 'benefits' from the ranks of the defeated to the ranks of the new victors. So, as far as the just-laid-off Impact workers are concerned, this looks like being the start of their season in the wilderness. And even if they turn and try to climb on the new bandwagon, there are only under 11,000 such jobs: nowhere near enough to go around for all would-be Impact workers. So the more enterprising will join the ranks of the higglers or the hustlers. And those who succeed will make the trip to Panama or elsewhere and come back with what people need and will buy: and the 'second' or alternative economy of the 'bend down plazas' will continue and perhaps even flourish, especially if and where they can offer their goods at prices which are competitive or better than those in the 'legitimate' shops and plazas. This is a way people under economic pressure have traditionally tried to survive almost everywhere in the world. Those with no other means of livelihood have taken the notion of the market and the bazaar - among the most ancient pillars of the competitive free market system - onto the sidewalks. The society and the 'first' economy cannot provide them with a livelihood; instead of either giving up in depair or turning to crime, they have fashioned their 'second' economy to compete with the first. In some ways this is as revolutionary as anything that has happened in Jamaica over the past decade. And I think one of the most interesting challenges facing the new government and the newly resurgent private sector is whether they can come to terms with this new phenomenon. It is, essentially a byproduct of massive unemployment and shortages and the will to survive in some dignity. To just try and suppress it could be explosive. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Political Realism:
Management on whose behalf?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
March 20, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The government's decision to print something over $300-million in unbacked money to bridge the gap between the income and spending sides of the 1980-81 Budget has provoked some interesting, and mixed, reactions. The Private Sector Organisation is not happy about the decision because of the inflationary pressures that this kind of financing can let loose in the society. Some political elements were quick to remind us of the JLP's opposition to this kind of financing before it became the government. The JLP, in opposition, described this kind of financing, this printing of money without 'backative' as "monkey money". And if it was 'monkey money' when the PNP did it, then it remains 'monkey money' now that the JLP does it. One question for me here is: How do we get out of this very bad habit of belittling each other and therefore all of Jamaica and all Jamaicans for the sake of scoring some political point? Calling Jamaican money 'monkey money' is belittling; talking about a 'monkey country printing monkey money' is an extreme level of contempt and self-contempt. Almost all countries in the world have, at one time or another, gone in for deficit financing. The great United States has such vast amounts of unbacked U.S-dollars floating about the world that the entire world economy would collapse if all who hold these greenbacks were to demand backative for them. And yet Americans and particularly American politicians do not talk about their money as monkey money. Only we, or some of us, seem to have this compulsive urge to degrade ourselves: and one side of the political fence begins it the other side follows through. When will it end?

UWI Libraries

On the question of substance I think there was nothing else the government could do in the circumstances but resort to the printing of that $300-million. Not to print that money would mean either cutting government spending by that amount or else raising new taxes by that amount. Or a mix of both. Where would the cuts be made? In health, which is already in a mess? In Education, which needs more, not less, spending? In government employment, thus pushing the level of the unemployed to a point where it is greater than the level of the employed? Or if that $300-plus million is to be raised by additional taxation, what new taxes? Who would have to carry the additional burden? The poor because it is indirect or the rich because it is direct and above a certain level? These are very hard questions, even for a government with a massive mandate, if that government represents a poor country. This is one reason why the Seaga government cannot go in for the same type of massive spending cuts which the Reagan Administration is now making in the United States. When we talk of seven or eight million or even ten million unemployed in the United States it is in a context of a population of over 220-million people, with a labour force approaching one hundred million; so the unemployed are less than 10%. and even after the Reagan cuts they will receive better unemployent benefits than most of our employed workers get. It is a completely different ball-game and the people here who want the Reagan-type cutting management must remember that a very affluent society gave Reagan a mandate to cut, whereas a poor society with massive unemployment and grievous social problems gave Seaga a mandate to make things better. The American majority, and the Jamaican majority are not the same majorities. The only thing they have in common is that they call the political shots. So, under the present system, our government of whatever party, must manage on behalf our majority or lose its mandate. That, like it or not, is our reality. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Economic Progress, Price Controls
& Social Responsibility

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
March 18, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Should price controls be taken off the basic commodities which are now controlled? On this morning's Roadbeat programme the answer was 'no'; and it was a rare case of a unanimous 'no'. The so-called 'man in the street', the average citizen with an average weekly income of between $60 and $100 on which to sustain a home and family does not want to see price controls lifted. And yet there are those who say that if price controls were lifted and the 'free market system' were given free rein prices would come down. I think that if the so-called average citizen really believed that he or she would have a better break as a consumer if there were no controls the business community would not even have to press for the lifting of controls: the citizens would insist on it out of self-interest. And what applies to basic items would apply to everything else, rentals and all. So it would seem that the average Jamaican consumer, at least, does not accept the proposition that an unregulated competitve 'market system' would serve his or her interest best. Indeed, the advocates of the unrestricted free market system seem to forget that it was a previous JLP governments which pioneered the business of subsidies and price controls in order to cushion the impact of the market system on the very poor of the society. I still recall Mr. Robert Lightbourne's description of the need to regulate the prices of a "all those things in common daily use". And I think it was the JLP, too, which made a beginning in the business of providing houses for poor people; I recall Mr. Wilton Hill's vigorous efforts to collect rents and get a bigger piece of the Budget in order to build more houses for the poor.

UWI Libraries

So it is misleading, if not downright dishonest, to label/price as socialist controls and other regulations designed to protect the interests of the poor and then to denounce them. Indeed, I think some JLP supporters do that party a disservice by making it appear that only the wicked socialists are interested in protecting the poor, and in fairer forms of distribution, and in a measure of equity as between the competing interests in the society. To be sure there are people who would like to see the JLP as the straight capitalist party looking only after the interests of investors and th moneyed-class and the so-called producers (as though the workers do no producing). But I think these are a minority/in the ranks of or of rightist ideologues hanging/on to the coat-tails of the JLP. They are the other side of the coin of the leftist ideologues whose equally strident pressure finally/helped to bring the PNP to grief last October. The JLP will certainly suffer a similar fate as the PNP, but perhaps more quickly, if it heeds the calls of those who want it to play a kind of three-card game with the poor of this land. At one time or another, the poor of this country have elected and rejected both JLP and PNP alike. And I do not think they have done it on the basis of ideology or notions of particular systems. I think they have done it on the basis of what they have seen happening to them and their loved ones as they go about their daily lives. And this has to do with the price of food and rent/and the utilities and whether a person earns enough to pay for these and have a little extra over for a little pleasure. So the creating of jobs is more important to most than is the colour of Mr. Reagan's hair or Dr. Castro's beard. It has to do with a sense of belonging, and of feeling safe and secure in your home, if you have one, or walking the streets. It has to do with achieving self-respect. Attracting investors is certainly important to/this. Jamaican voters have shown they know that; they also know their own interests and will insist on these. All ideologues please note carefully. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

A Dismal GATT Report & Its Implications
For Third World Economies

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
March 16, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The secretariat of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, this past weekend issued a very gloomy report on the state of the world economy. The GATT economists said that last year was the worst year experienced by the world economy since 1975, and that for this year so far world trade is running even below last year's dismal average. And there is, so far, no sign of any revival in world trade. And as it goes in the rest of the great wide world so, almost inevitably, will it go with us and with other Third World countries who are dependent on the economic fortunes of the particular big power in whose shadow the they live and function. All we have to do is look at tourism for an example. If the North American and Canadian economies are booming, and if the American and Canadian people have a lot of money to spend because of booming conditions, then many of them will want to take their holidays abroad and our tourist business is bound to benefit, always provided we offer a reasonably good and competitively priced product. If, on the other hand, there is an economic downturn in those two countries, if there are large-scale lay-offs and the future looks uncertain, people will be much more hesitant about taking holidays abroad; and even those still in jobs and with savings will want to keep what they have in case bad times hit them. And so, through no fault of our own our tourism could suffer because the world economy is in a bad state. And what applies to the North Americans and Canadians applies equally to the British, the West Germans and

UWI Libraries

1) The U.N. Blacklist on South Africa
2) Reagan People think again on El Salvador
3) The Dangers of Arming the Third World

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
March 13, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Yesterday's news out of U.N. headquarters in New York that the United Nations Committee Against Apartheid is planning to publish a list of the names of sporting figures who have visited or who maintain sporting links with South Africa was, for me at least, disturbing. I do not like 'blacklists' of any kind; I do not like the idea of 'enemy' lists such as Mr. Richard Nixon's White House reportedly kept; I do not like 'hit' lists of any kind. Black lists, enemy lists, hit lists, the banning of books, the suppression or sanitising of information, the attempts at quarantining unpopular ideas, all these are totalitarian notions, anti-democratic notions. The South African racists have blacklists, and ban ideas and books and try to lock up ideas by locking up men. The hard question is whether those of us who fight against this social, political and moral evil are justified in using the same methods as the South African racists. It is the age-old question of whether all means justify the ends. And what makes it so difficult and disturbing for me is that it is an arm of the United Nations which is proposing to issue this black list of individuals. This is a different matter from a group of South Africans such as those of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee issuing such a list, or for the U.N. agency to advise member countries of the existence of such a list and even urging them to act on it. For the United Nations to itself issue a blacklist targeting individuals is indeed worrying. Another worrying matter on the international scene, out of

UWI Libraries

other countries. If the world economy does not expand, if jobs and incomes shrink, people have less money to spend and so fewer people travel abroad for pleasure, and income from tourism will reflect the decline in the world economy. The struggle for survival within the tourist business will become fierce, both between one operator and another and one tourism destination and another. So that revelation from the GATT economists in Geneva is as important to us as the job of every Jamaican now employed in tourism here; and is most important to our national effort to earn our way out of our foreign exchange problems. And this is of course how it is for every other Caribbean or Third World country which depends heavily on tourism. And when you have this kind of worldwide economic decline you also have declining production; manufactures are down; food production is down. So workers are laid off and prices go up. In Britain unemployment is now moving toward the two-and-a-half-million mark, and the immigrants and the children of the immigrants are the first to feel the pinch of the mass unemployment. So how do we of the Third World cope with a problem which is giving both the richer and stronger economies of the capitalist West as well the controlled economies of the communist East such a hard time? One natural impulse seems to be for the satellites of the one side or the other to want to tuck up as close to its economic godfather as possible, almost to the point of surrendering sovereignty in exchange for bread. But what if the godfathers themselves cannot provide all the needed bread? What if all they are prepared to do is to use and exploit the Third World resources in order to try and ease their own hard problems? Where do we turn then? To whom do we turn then?

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Washington this time, was this week's revelation of the massive scale on which the United States is planning to supply arms to Third World countries under the just announced Reagan Budget. The American government will spend $6,800-million on arms aid to Third World countries. An Interpress Service report says that this sum is at least $1,000-million more than the U.S. will spend on all its other forms of aid - on its bilateral and multilateral economic assistance programme. And this of course means that almost any Third World country, and especially countries which are considered to be of strategic importance to U.S. interests, will find it much easier to get soft loans, or indeed outright grants or gifts, in the form of military hardware - guns planes bombs and other means of death and destruction - than to get loan assistance to buy food and fertiliser. Even our own Eastern Caribbean countries are now into the military aid business to the tune of over $25-million-US , reportedly because it is now seen as America's 'front yard'. Strife torn El Salvador will receive the lion's share of U.S. military aid for this region with some $66-million worth of military aid. The Middle East, Africans, the Asians,/everybody considered of strategic of military value to the U.S. will be armed to the teeth. The hope is that all this arming will strengthen friends and prevent or defeat so/external communist assault or internal 'leftist' uprisings as in El Salvador, or two years ago, in Grenada. One of the problems with this hope, as we have seen in in Indochina and more recently in Iran, is that all this mass of arms may not in fact be used for the intended purpose. It was, for instance mainly American arms that were used in the Iranian revolution; and Vietnam is now one of best armed countries because the Americans left so much of their hardware behind. In the long run, especially for the hungry of the world, food might turn out a much better weapon than guns. But where is the food? Goodnight

UWI Libraries

What Future For Nurse Parchment?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
March 11, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Tomorrow marks the latest deadline set by the Nurses Association of Jamaica for the Minister of Health to make what they describe as a "final and favourable decision" on their demand that enrolled assistant nurse Mae Parchment be transferred from the Cornwall Regional Hospital in Montego Bay. The Nurses Association warned that the Minister would have to take full responsibility for any action which may result from his failure to respond 'appropriately'. And the words 'favourable' and 'appropriately' in this case means doing what the Nurses Association demands. So the registered nurses have in effect given the Minister of Health an ultimatum:"Remove Nurse Parchment or else face so far unspecified action from us." And the deadline is tomorrow, March 12. I think most of us are familiar with the background of this sad and sorry affair in which an enrolled assistant nurse was accused of assaulting a registered nurse. There was an investigation within the institution; the accusation against the enrolled nurse was confirmed; the enrolled nurse was duly punished. But then, when the enrolled assistant nurse, who also happened to be the trade union delegate for all the NWU-represented enrolled ~~assistant~~ nurses at the institution, returned to work after the period of punishment, the registered nurses refused to work unless she was transferred. The unionised enrolled nurses backed their colleague and the impasse with which most of us are now familiar came into being. So, what happens next? First there is the hard problem of justice and equity.

UWI Libraries

Mrs. Parchment has already been punished for what she has done. The authorities at the Cornwall Regional Hospital apparently did not consider transferring her a necessary part of the punishment at the time when they handed down the punishment. So what we have now is a bit like a group of aggrieved citizens who are not satisfied with a verdict handed down by a court trying to force the judge into imposing harsher penalities. Under the rule of law such people would find themselves in trouble with the judge and his court. But leave this aspect aside for the moment and we face another question: What happens to Mrs. Parchment were the Minister of Health to give in to the demand of the Nurses Association? Mrs. Parchment is now a 'targeted' figure. The entire NAJ is up in arms against her. If she is transferred to another hospital what is to prevent the registered nurses at that hospital from refusing to work with her? And if what has happened up to now is anything to go by, then that might well be the case. And so we come to the key question: Has the Nurse Parchment affair now reached a point where, willy-nilly, she is being driven out of the nursing profession? Please don't get me wrong. I am not saying or suggesting that this is the intention. All I am saying is that this is one direction in which the inner logic of the situation points. And the only counter direction to that would be an absolutely firm prior commitment to Mrs. Parchment's right to continue to function as a nurse, subject only to the restraints and conditions applied to all other nurses in her category. Anything else would be discriminatory. So resolving this problem is not easy and is made more difficult by tough and inflexible positions on the part of either the union or the NAJ. There also seems to be a need for a meeting of minds between the union, the NAJ, and the Ministry on the delicate question of redefining & regulating the relations between the various categories of nurses.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Moneymen Come & Go
2) Tensions between U.S. & her Allies
3) Law of the Sea Conference

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
March 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: There has been a great coming and going of international moneymen in recent days; but as very little information of substance has been made public on these comings and goings there is little to discuss. The Jamaica-United States businessmen's committee has met and talked and dispersed; others have come and looked and talked and gone. A group of donor countries are reportedly meeting here this week to work out the details of the aid they will extend to Jamaica once there is an agreement between Jamaica and the International Monetary Fund. So it would seem that all this coming and going of the international money men is intimately related with our upcoming agreement with the I.M.F., and when that agreement is in place we may then have some of the information of substance for discussion. And by then, of course, everything, or almost everything, will have been decided. The politics of participation is out. But if the new-style politics delivers the goods there will not, I think, be much if any protest from the Jamaican electorate; certainly not in the short run, or while things are looking up. The protest and the preoccupation about participation will only come if and when things turn rough or sour in the months to come. As the defeated PNP should have learned and inwardly digested by now, as far as a majority of the electorate is concerned everything is forgiven those who succeed and deliver; nothing is forgiven those who fail to deliver. So, like it or not, ideology and almost everything else, is subordinate to bringing home the bacon. He who delivers can do no wrong; but heaven help him if he stops to deliver or fails to deliver.

UWI Libraries

or if what he delivers does not measure up to the expectations of the electoral majority. ~~(How to get out of this particular deadend street is a problem which may haunt us for a long time to come)~~

Among other comings and goings, on the international scene this time, perhaps the most significant is today's arrival in Washington of the West German Foreign Minister to brief President Ronald Reagan on two issues on which there are differences of approach by Washington and Bonn. The U.S. Administration recently let it be known that it expected its West European allies to take on a bigger and fairer share of the cost of the defence of Western Europe. It hinted that it would not go on spending more and more on the defence of Europe unless the Europeans also increased spending. And it called for an allied Rapid Deployment Force which could be quickly sent to the Persian Gulf area in case Middle East oil was threatened. Britain's Mrs. Thatcher quickly backed these proposals and announced increased defence spending. But West Germany did not follow suit. Instead, West Germany announced cuts in its projected military spending for the period 1982 to 1984. And it would not take part in the establishing of any Rapid Deployment Force; it would, however, provide host support for any such force operating within its territory. These are most likely the matters the West German Foreign Minister will discuss with Mr. Reagan. It would seem that the Americans did not first consult with all their European allies before their public calls. If they had, there would not have been this apparent setback to Reagan's foreign policy moves so early on in the new administration's term. Another way not to win friends and influence people is the manner in which the Reagan people have announced that they might want to renegotiate some of the terms proposed of the Law of the Sea Treaty already agreed on by the Carter Administration. The impression given is that the interests of the American multinational mining companies must be given preference over all other interests worldwide. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Western Powers to Veto Anti-Apartheid
Economic Sanctions

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
March 6, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: While the storm in the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ sporting-political teacup continues to rage over the so-called Jackman Affair, some very much more important setbacks in the anti-Apartheid struggle look like being ~~overshadowed~~. The British Ambassador to the United Nations yesterday bluntly told the U.N. General Assembly that the five Western powers - Britain, the United States, Canada, France and West Germany - would not support the call for economic sanctions against South Africa for having deliberately scuttled the UN conference on Namibian independence last January. And without saying so outright, it was made abundantly clear to that General Assembly meeting that the five Western powers would veto any resolution to impose sanctions on South Africa: so the overwhelming General Assembly vote will be brought to nought. And this, like it or not, is in realistic and unemotional terms a far greater setback to the struggle against South African racism than anything Mr. Jackman or any other English cricketer has done. The posture adopted by the five Western powers goes to the heart of the matter: it prevents hitting the racists where it hurts most. If the five Western powers were to impose and to seriously enforce economic sanctions against South Africa, it is doubtful whether South Africa would be able to hold out for much more than from twelve to twenty-four months without beginning to dismantle the monstrous edifice of Apartheid. And that kind of economic pressure is in fact the only short-term and non-violent possibility for easing Apartheid without a bloodbath of terrible dimensions. And only the

UWI Libraries

Western powers, with their massive investements in South Africa are able to make economic sanctions bite deep enough to really hurt, rather than just irritate. Without the willing and active participation of the Western powers economic sanctions would be little more than a largely symbolic gesture, even if there were no Security Council veto. Rhodesia showed us that even where the Western powers were supposedly in compliance sanctions-busting was not all that hard when the supposedly complying states were prepared to look the other way. With these powers saying flatly they are against sanctions there is no way that sanctions can work. The Africans and indeed the entire Third World and the entire non-aligned movement cannot hurt South Africa with sanctions because she does not depend on them for trade. The same applies with the communist countries. So this setback is clear and decisive. It is no accident that this clearcut statement from the five Western powers came just a day after President Reagan declared publicly that the United States could not and would not abandon South Africa. And this of course means that the African frontline states who have up to now co-operated with the five Western powers in the attempt to resolve the Namibian problem by way of elections can look for more across-the-border attacks from a less isolated and more emboldened racist South African regime. As part of 'the free democratic world' the South African regime will now/more deal firmly with its enemies both inside and outside, as in Angola and Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Developments in Southern Africa are bound to take a much more sombre turn. The struggle now looks like being longer, more brutal, more painful, more bloody, for many more people than if the West had used it enormous economic might in South Africa to pressure it away from Apartheid. In the long perspective of history I think the West made a bad decision. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Ash Wednesday, 1981:
A New Beginning?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
March 4, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Today, Ash Wednesday, marks the start of the forty-day Lenten period during which Christians the world over traditionally observe as a season of fasting and penance. People are supposed to give up something. Some give up eating meat; some give up smoking; some eat nothing between sunrise and sunset; some forego drinking alcahol or whichever pleasure they enjoy most. The trouble is that in much of today's world almost every day is a day of enforced fasting for a majority of the world's people, be they Christian or non-Christian. It is a cruel kind of joke to ask a malnourished or starving person who owns next to nothing to give up anything for Lent. For at least one third of the human beings on earth today the season of Lent is with them everyday of the year. And there is a sizeable number of them right here in our own Jamaica. The hard question is whether we, as a society, owe these people anything or whether their poverty and their misery is their own fault and the society therefore owes them nothing, no helping hand, no comfort, no sustenance. In the jungle and according to the law of the jungle, it is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. This same essentially primitive view of society has recently emerged here in Jamaica as some sort of fresh new thinking, some sort of newly worked-out realism about our economic & social problems. It is in fact a hoary old chestnut going back to the cavedweller days of our primitive ancestors: it is in fact the antithesis of the Christian notion of compassion and of being our brothers' keepers. That notion does not say we must

UWI Libraries

care only for the gifted or the privileged or the rich or those of one kind or class or colour. Where peoples and societies have departed from this Christian notion of compassion, as Hitler for just one example did, the results have been disastrous, no matter how striking the short-term economic miracles they performed. So it seems to me that we need to be quite clear about the moral aspect of the drive for economic recovery and rebuilding. The new Government has just received the same overwhelming mandate at the local level that it received last October at the national level; and the contentious and divisive business of electoral politics is now behind us for at least the next three or four years, provided we do not upset the socio-political-economic applecart. There is now the very real possibility for the Jamaican society to come to grips with its very many problems. This is clearly what a majority of the Jamaican people want. And I, for one, am not any more worried about the size of the mandate they gave the JLP last October and ~~then~~ again on Monday, than I was when they gave the PNP similarly sweeping mandates in 1976 and 1977. As long as that ultimate power to choose or to reject remains firmly in the hands of the Jamaican people, as long as the people can change their minds and vote out any government, there is little cause for serious worry. If those who govern abuse their power they will, in due time, be removed and replaced. And those who govern must be reminded of this. So the question: Are we going to try for a really fresh beginning now that electoral politics is behind us for the next few years? Not all the signs so far are encouraging. The talk of equal rights and justice is still to be matched by deeds, but it is early yet; care and compassion for the poor and the unemployed is still to be given practical expression; the rich alone, the business sector alone cannot do the job. Above all the govt must be for all the people. Goodnight

Can we make it that I now start?

UWI Libraries

Local Government: Drawbacks of Benefit Politics

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
March 2, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Polls closed a little over an hour ago and it is all over bar the counting. Soon we will know whether the local government elections of March, 1981 have made as clean a political sweep at the local level as did the October 1980 elections at the national level. And while we wait for that knowledge we might usefully look at the kind and quality of service given by the local authorities to the Jamaican people who support these authorities through the taxes they pay, both directly and indirectly. Is the local government system giving the ordinary Jamaican taxpayer value for money?

If you look at the Spending Budget Estimates for the year ending on the 31st of this month, which was presented to Parliament on May 8th of last year, you will see that over $137-million was earmarked for Recurrent spending by the Local Government Ministry; and just under $42-million was earmarked for Capital or development spending. And this gives us a total 1981 Local Government spending Budget of a little less than 180-million. The next thing to note is that the Ministry of Local Government itself took up less than $1½-million for its own general administration as well as the training of people for the local government service: the actual figure is in the region of $1,320,000. The rest of the money - some one-hundred-and-seventy-something-million-dollars is disbursed to our Local Government Authorities to look after the people's business at the local level. And the main services for which the local authorities are responsible are: 1) Public health; 2) Poor relief; 3) Water supplies; 4) Parochial

UWI Libraries

roads; 5) fire service; 6) market; 7) civic amenities like parks and public gardens and playfield and the like. So we come back to the question: Are the local government authorities giving the communities they serve value for money? Generally speaking, I think most Jamaicans will say no, they are not getting value for money from their local authorities. Few of us are satisified with our water or public health or sanitation or parochial road services, and civil amenities are few and far between. Such services as we do get are slipshod and/so bad in the cases of sanitation and road work are often that they keep having to be done over and over and over again, as though the people want to make sure that any particular job never comes to an end and that they can squeeze the maximum amount of money out of it the minimum amount of work that they stretch and stretch. And the nature of our politics and the underlying assumptions behind our elections, be they like today's local elections or last October's national election all contribute to this sorry state of affairs. This is the endless price the Jamaican taxpayers pay for henchmen politics or contract politics or pork-barrel politics in which each winning side has to spend more and more taxpayers money to buy or appease or pay off those who have voted for them. Our local government structure has over the years produced some outstanding public servants, but they are and they will remain hobbled by the system of henchmen and benefit politics until the society decides to purge itself of that system. Till that happens the Jamaican taxpayer is not likely to get full value for his/her tax dollar out of the local government system. How this is to be done or can be done, is the hard problem. There has been much talk about local government reform, usually by the party out of power: once in power the advantages appear too tempting. Will this again be the case after today? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Protecting the Environment:
Guarding Against Disaster

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
February 27, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The speed with which the government of Jamaica reacted to that oil spill from the Shell tanker which ran aground off the coast of St. Elizabeth on Saturday is about the only welcome thing about that event. And yet it took all of three days before we became aware of the gravity of the matter. But for the alertness of those who are responsible for the safeguarding of the Jamaican environment, it might have taken longer, and the risk might have been greater, and perhaps more harm and damage might have been done while we were assured that "everything was under control". The fact that in such circumstances companies involved nearly always want to assure the public that there is really nothing to be worried about and that things are "under control" is a very strong argument for a strong environmental protection agency which will be constantly on the alert and which will act as an early warning system in the event of any threat or disaster. Please don't misunderstand me. We already have a large number of environmental agencies. The latest Economic Survey lists a total of ~~nine~~ eight, of which the Environmental Control Division of the Ministry of Health and the Natural Resource and Conservation Department of the Ministry of Mines and Energy are perhaps the two most important. And yet, except when there is a sharp and obvious disaster of dangerous proportions, we seem to be rather casual about the Jamaican environment. We did not, for instance, have this same speed of reaction to the reported lead poisoning in St. Catherine that we had to this week's oil spill.

UWI Libraries

And yet experts say that the damage that is done by lead poisoning can having long-lasting effects. So what is being done about this danger? Has the Environmental Control Division of the Ministry of Health the power to enforce standards of safety or penalise those who ignore those standards? If not, then no matter how much we bawl about environmental safety the kind of lead poisoning exposed by the Daily News earlier this month will continue, and citizens will continue to demonstrate and put up road-blocks when they can no longer put up with one form or another of the pollution associated with certain types of industrial activity. This is how it is and how it has been everywhere else in the world. Of course nobody sets about deliberately polluting the environment. Tanker people prefer not to have oil spills and do all they can to prevent them: it is good and profitable business not to have these things: so there is no malice involved. But oil spills do happen; the environment is polluted; chemical poisons are discharged into the atmosphere. And when these things do happen it is logical for the businesses concerned to protect their own interests, often by denying responsibility or where that is not possible by downplaying the seriousness of the matter. So the business of safeguarding and protecting the environment is and must be the responsibility of the society itself. And the nine government agencies are in fact an acceptance of that responsibility. The difficulty is in the discharging of it. There appear far too many autonomous cooks in the environmental broth right now, and a pulling together and streamlining of this should be a first step. I think there should be a small tightly knit monitoring task-force with teeth, to police and enforce standards with emphasis on prevention. There is no way that we can prevent all environmental disasters: but we can prevent some, minise others, and respond quickly to the unpreventable. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Foreign Aid as an Adjunct of
Foreign Policy

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
February 25, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The bitter political troubles of El Salvador, the smallest of the Central American countries, have become even more internationalised than they have been up to now. To be sure there has always been the kind of external support for one side or the other which has become a commonplace in the savage little civil wars of our time. Leftist governments tend to support the efforts of leftists in any given civil war; rightist governments tend to support the efforts of rightists. But, usually, this kind of support is covert; and those giving this support usually publicly deny doing any such thing. And the external side supporting the government in power, no matter how that government came to power, usually adopts a moralistic and self-righteous posture in denouncing external support given to the other side. This familiar pattern is now playing itself out in El Salvador, as it has done earlier in Nicaragua, and still earlier in a host of other little countries where they tried to resolve the problems of political power by way of the bullet, rather than the ballot; or by way of a combination of ~~coercive~~ coercive use of the bullet to influence the ballot. The U.S. State Department on Monday released what is described as 'documentary evidence' to support ' its allegation that the Soviet Union, Cuba and communist allies supplied arms to leftist guerrilas trying to take over El Salvador'. And the U.S. vowed that it was determined to put a stop to this flow of communist arms to El Salvador. At the same time it also indicated that it will step up the flow of U.S. military aid to the ruling junta in El Salvador. So, if the

UWI Libraries

U.S. has it way then the flow of arms to the guerillas must stop while the flow of arms to the ruling junta must continue. And if the Reagan administration does have its way in this matter, if the flow of arms to the guerillas does dry up, while that to the junta continues and is even stepped up, then it is only a matter of time before the junta will crush the young leftist militants and win the civil war. So/U.S. foreign policy at this level is the straightforward business of ensuring that the side you back wins by arming it and disarming its opponents. Considerations of human rights and/of the political nature of the regime under which more than 10,000, including an archbishop, American nuns and sundry missionaries, have been killed in the course of last year - such considerations are no longer the important factors they were during the Carter Administration. The question is whether those who, despite all denials, gave aid and comfort to the guerillas are just going to give up and stop the flow of arms or whether they are going to deny/it and carry on as before. My guess is that they will deny/it and carry as before, in much the same way as the Americans themselves did in Angola. That is the way of the world power game. And given this reality I do not see how the Reagan administration will find it possible to cut back on its foreign aid spending, which is perhaps the single most crucial adjunct to its foreign policy of a stepped-up/worldwide anti-communist posture. Foreign aid to Israel is $2.2-thousand-million; for Egypt it is $1,000-million which is the price tag for her loss of the same amount from Saudi Arabia because she made peace with Israel. So there alone you have $3.2-thousand million for only 2 client states. The idea of cutting U.S. foreign aid to $5.4-thousand-million would leave just $2.2-thousand-million for policing the rest of the world against communism And that is not enough to do the job in times of tranquility: it is hopelessly inadequate in these turbulent times. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Carlton Alexander on Youth Unemployment

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
February 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Mr. Carlton Alexander, the retiring President of the Private Sector Organisation of Jamaica, in his farewell address to that body spoke, among other things, of youth unemployment and described it as having reached chronic proportions. Mr. Alexander is reported as saying that the private sector will have to undertake the major initiative to resolve the problem of youth unemployment and he spoke of training young people and bringing them into the workforce, and he spoke of apprenticeship and he reminded his members of an earlier scheme under which young Jamaicans were apprenticed to various firms in in Britain. As I remember it Mr. Robert Lightbourne played a very important part in that earlier scheme of sending young Jamaicans to be apprenticed to British firms and factories. If this scheme is revived it will be an excellent thing from which Jamaica can only benefit. Skills training of every kind for our young people can ultimately only be good for the country - provided it is not turned into some sort of party political or ideological football by political zealots of either side. If where our young people are trained can end up being used against them, if they end up being hounded and penalised by the left for having been trained in a rightwing country, or being hounded and penalised by the right for having been trained in a leftwing country, then it will not help us much: the fact is that skills training is desireable in itself, wherever it is done. But of course these apprenticeship schemes are usually relatively small in size: they rarely run into the hundreds at one time. So while persuing these

UWI Libraries

and acknowledging their crucial long-term importance, we must face the fact that they do little to ease the explosive short-term problem of youth unemployment. The latest available figures, taken from the Economic Survey for 1979, show that in October of that year there were a little/~~more~~ under 129,000 youngsters between the ages of 14 and 19 in the labour force. Only 44,000 of these were in jobs: 85,000 were unemployed. That means that nearly 66% of teen-age workers were unemployed in 1979. I am sure that it is much worse today. The last available figures on Apprenticeship contracts show that there were 254 registered apprentices in 1977. So apprenticeship will help, but the help is small and limited and only touches the surface of the problem of youth unemployment. It seems to me that whatever the private sector does to ease youth unemployment, a very large measure of responsibility must ultimately fall on the government itself. Most of the idle youngsters are without any skill of any kind; worse still, many of them, possibly a majority do not have enough schooling and enough stability in their home backgrounds to be able to fit into the workforce without some prior preparation. Youth camps like Cobla and Chestervale were, in a sense, recognition of the need for this prior preparation. The National Youth Service, in its original concept was another such recognition. And the need for this kind of prior preparation is greater today than at any earlier time. And the old models of Cobla and Chestervale are reminders that properly planned and properly managed such camps can be economically productive to a point of near self-sufficiency. The catch is that the next highest number of unemployed is in the age-group 20-24 with an unemployment rate of nearly 47% in October 1979. Youth unemployment seems to flow into young adult unemployment. And I am not sure the government would be wise to just leave it to the private sector either or to delay tackling this problem seriously.

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) International Economic Scene
2) Labour in an Economic Crisis
3) The Right to Know: A Matter of Variety

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
February 20, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: American President Ronald Reagan this week submitted to a joint session of the American Congress his proposals for massive cuts in government spending and tax ~~cuts~~. Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government in Britain this week backed away from proposals to shutdown uneconomic coal-mines in the face of a threatened international miners' strike. The West German and Swiss governments this week raised their interest rates and took other steps to protect their currencies against an expected fight of capital. In short, almost every major economy in the West, seems to be gearing itself for stormy times ahead. Even Japan, that honorary Western economic giant, is bracing itself for protectionist pressures and actions from its beleaguered Western trading partners. And the path Mr. Ronald Reagan has unveiled to the American people as the road to their economic salvation is one along which Mrs. Thatcher has led the British people these eighteen months and more. And in Britain at least things are still continuing to get worse rather than better. On the other side of the Great Political Divide the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics still appears unable to grow all the grain its people and cattle need. Productivity in all the Eastern Bloc countries is either stagnating or declining. Rumania's President just yesterday confessed that his country paid too much attention to quick industrialisation and not enough to agriculture with the result that they were now up a blind economic alley. Poland is, for all practical purposes a beggar-client of international Western bankers.

UWI Libraries

In the West unionised workers feel their living standards threatened as economies contract and lay-offs and redundancies spread, and the belligerance of the British coal-miners even after their government's back-down is symptomatic of a spreading mood. In the U.S. the AFL& CIO leadership has denounced the Reagan proposals as anti-labour and/as bound to hurt the workers and the poor generally. On the other side of the divide how the workers feel is suppressed or caontained by official unions which are part of the government. Where this has broken down, as in Poland, the bitter anger and discontent of the workers is shown as raw and seething. Is this how the workers in Hunggry and Czechoslovakia and East Germany and the Soviet Union/itself really feel? For how long can the communist leaders contain this? And, on the other side of the Divide, how long can the capitalist leader persuade their workers to accept the lay-offs, redundancies and apparently endless inflation? On the evidence there is little to encourage the view that the capitalist/economic system as represented by the policies of Mrs. Thatcher and the proposals of Mr. Reagan, on the one hand, and the communist economic system as represented by the policies of Mr. Brehzev and the Polish and other communist leader on the other, are capable of solving the present world economic crisis to the satisfaction of a majority of their people. It is alway easier to satify the interests of/minorities than of majorities, which is what both economic and political elitism is all about. The catch is that in the twilight years of the 20th century/majorities are no longe passive or submissive: and there's the explosive rub. And finally, I hope the workers at the Daily News succeed in buying out that pape and keeping it alive. The right to know implies having access to as wide and varied a range of free-flowing information as possible. Freedom of expression, which is enshrined in the Constitution, ideally requires a free, unfettered and diverse press, and radio. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Shake-up at JOS
2) Lay-offs, Redundancies & Overtime
~~3) The Right to Know: Question of Variety~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
February 18, 1981, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Reports of the latest shake-up and the impending upheavals at the Jamaica Omnibus Services Limited come as no surprise. What we must hope for is that after this latest shake-up is over the JOS will settle down to the job of giving its customers a better service and managing its own internal business a deal more prudently than it has since it was taken over by the government of Jamaica back in 1974. The one thing which has, up to now, remained constant under both private and public ownership was and is the general attitude on the part of the company and its workers to the customers who pay for the service they receive. It has on the whole been an indifferent service at best with little regard for the convenience, let alone the comfort, of those who bought the service. I remember being told by one of the last managers when the company was in private hands, as well as one of the later managers when the company was publicly owned, that it was the customers who were really at fault: they damaged the vehicles and were not able to appreciate the kind of service that was common on English buses, for instance. It was on a par with the British tale that if you provide working class people with homes with bathrooms they would use the baths to store coal. Indeed, some did so in the early days of the British welfare state and local govt housing. But it did not take long for the children of those workers to put those bathrooms to their proper use and change the ways of their parents. I suggest that one way to create customer appreciation and careful usage is to try providing a courteous, clean and punctual service, for a change: it may take

UWI Libraries

public relations efforts

a little time but it may just do the trick where other forms of ~~p.r.~~ have not. In any case, the JOS must not continue as though it is there primarily to serve the needs and interests of its workers with the customers being seen and treated as a sort of necessary nuisance. So, in addition to the physical and financial restructuring, there must be a restructuring of attitudes and approach to the customer and to the selling of its service. The question of what happens to the laid-off workers is a societal one on which it is high time for the unions to initiate some serious and responsible discussion. Up to now the unions have largely behaved as though their responsibilities end after they have resisted all such lay-offs down to the wire, and then, having failed to stop them, got the best settlements possible. This, I suggest, is one reason why they have not looked seriously, as a group, at such ideas as that all overtime be banned until the unemployment situation improves, and at the kind of job-sharing where two workers split a five-day week, each working three days one week and two the other. What the society cannot go on allowing is the situation where a man signs-in and does nothing for eight hours because he has no bus to drive and then collects his pay. And the workers, and their unions, as part of the society, have some responsibilities here too. Up to now they have tended to dodge those responsibilities and blamed it all on management. This cannot go on. But as Mr. Hugh Shearer warned before the elections the workers and their unions are not prepared to accept a situation in which they alone must make all the sacrifices. So where do we go from here? Prime Minister Seaga in his address to Parliament the other day called for the represntatives of the workers and the employers to sit down with the government to discuss these matters. It seems like high time for just such a meeting to take place now. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) The Hi-Lo Lay-offs
2) Manley & the Future of the PNP
3) The International Scene

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
February 16, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The closing down of two of the oldest supermarkets in the Corporate Area and the laying off of some one hundred of their workers is a sobering reminder, if any such were needed, that the way ahead is going to be rough and tough and tricky for a long time to come. Like hundreds and thousands of other people over the years I shopped at these two supermarkets and got to know some of their workers very well; I knew some of the older people in the two meat departments particlarly well and the lay-offs are likely to be roughest on them. A man of fifty or thereabouts with responsibilities which may include mortgage and insurance payments as well as seeing two or three children through secondary school is going to have a hard time staying home and waiting in hopes of being called back to the job at some unspecified time in the future. On the other hand, if he were to opt for the lump sum of money he would get with redundancy, he may not be able to find another job in the present poor employment climate. Either way, Maka jook him. And this appears to be a pattern we may have to live with for as long as it takes to get the new economic direction in place and moving. The hard question is; What happens to the vast and still growing army of the unemployed in the meantime? What are the unions doing about the problem? Do they give up on members who have lost their jobs and cannot find new ones? Or do they sustain them? And for how long? I remind our unions once more of that proposal of Mr. Shearer's that workers who have paid social security or national insurance should, on becoming unemployed, receive unemployment benefit for a specified period.

UWI Libraries

When Mr. Shearer first made this proposal I do not remember noting any kind of response from the unions. With so many of their members being laid-off or made redundant, are they still not interested in this Shearer proposal? I hope not; I hope they will press for it. And now that Mr. Shearer's party forms the government of the day, and he is a very senior Minister in that government, will he press his proposal on his Ministerial colleagues in the Cabinet? And will the other former trade unionists who are now Ministers in that Cabinet support him? I hope so. If the unemployed who want to work get the sense of a society caring about their predicament they may be patient and wait: if the sense is of indifference the reaction could be socially explosive. Next, and not totally unrelated is the news that the opposition People's National Party has not fallen apart, after all. Mr. Manley, it seems, remains President and Party leader; and Mr. Anthony Spaulding has reportedly withdrawn his resignation. We must now hope that the opposition party will quickly come to grips with its other internal psychological and directional problems and then settle down to give the country the kind of opposition that a multi-party parliamentary democracy deserves and must have to survive. It would of course be intersting to know what the party has learnt from its massive defeat; but there are far too many other/more important issues facing the nation for that to be the sole preoccupation of the PNP more than three months after the elections. There is, for instance, still growing unemployment and, with 1984 still three years away, there is the fancy new/Orwellian double-talk and double-think/double-standard on victimisation. So will the opposition please come out and do what it is supposed to. And finally and very briefly, there was that terrible tribal bloodletting in Zimbabwe which raises the question whether Mr. Joshua Nkomo still controls his supporters. If he does not there is no basis for a 'coalition'. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Political Purge at the J.B.C.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
February 13, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This week's wholesale firing of journalists makes what is going on at the JBC a straightforward political purge of the kind normally associated with power shifts in communist regimes. When a communist leader or a communist faction is defeated all those who were associated with that leader or that faction are usually purged and replaced by new people who are loyal to the new controllers of power. In democracies, on the other hand, the shift in political power usually results in shifts at the top, at the level of boards of directors and, less automatically, at the level of top management. The new boards then set policy guidelines and the managements, new or old, then set about seeing that these new policies are carried out. And the workers at the lower levels are left alone and given a chance to either carry out the new policy direction or else to quit. It is only if they do neither that they are fired. So the wholesale political purge is not the normal thing for parliamentary democracies: but of course it happens, and it is happening here. Now, I do not think anybody seriously doubted that the JLP would settle old scores with the JBC once it got into power. For some of us the real question was how this settling of scores would be done. And, most important of all, could it and would it be done in a way that did least damage and harm to the institution known as the Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation? Or would it end up being as debilitating to the JBC as was that earlier upheaval of 1964 when the firing of two news reporters led to a strike which lasted for 97 days?

UWI Libraries

One very big difference between 1964 and 1981 was in fact the political role played by the JBC in the two periods. In the 1964 straight period you did not have the political partisanship which manifested itself during the 1980 election campaign. For another, there was no strong leftist journalistic presence at the JBC in 1964. The result is that many people who might otherwise be very upset at the political purge now taking place tend to see and accept it as an unpleasant necessity. It is part and parcel of the general disillusionment with the political left which led to that massive defeat last October. So I, for one, am not sure that we will see the same kind of popular support that was shown for the JBC workers in 1964. But the problem of the JBC itself remains. Political purges beget political purges. So five or seven or nine years down the line if there is a change of government, if there is a swing in the political pendulum, the new people in power will try to undo this political purge by carrying out their own political purge. And once trapped into this cycle of purges every time there is a change of government there is no hope of the JBC ever becoming the national instrument that Norman Manley wanted it to be. So where do we go from here? What brand of journalists will want to work for a public medium which must forever be adjusting its perspective to the interests of the party in power? And how do we break out of this cycle? I am not sure myself that just setting up a Broadcasting Commission will do it. I think that so long as the JBC Law requires a Minister of Government to appoint the Board and to give policy directives we will remain trapped in this cycle of purges with every change of government. The hard question is: How to really free up the JBC so that it can flourish as a genuinely free and independent Jamaican medium which earns its way and serves the nation? Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The First Hundred Days

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
February 11, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: In its first hundred days in office the new government of Jamaica has succeeded in mobilising and lining-up enough foreign exchange loan money to close the foreign exchange Budget gap of U.S.$752-million. And that, by any measure you like to use, is an impressive performance. Indeed, the new administration has been able to do in one hundred days what the previous administration had been unable to do in the seven months between March and October of last year - between the time of the break with the IMF and the holding of the October elections - which was to raise enough foreign loans to cover the country's foreign exchange budget needs. Ironically, the previous administration was not even able to command this kind of foreign loan money when it was under the IMF regime and even before it had failed the IMF tests. And a key reason for this was of course ideological. The capitalist lending agencies did not like the political posture of the previous administration and they showed their dislike of that political posture by being exceedingly tough and tightfisted: they were unprepared to help make a system which they saw as hostile to their own interests suceeed and look good. On the other hand, the capitalist lending agencies do have a very strong vested interest in helping the present administration to succeedprecisely because the political posture of the new administration is more to their liking. So it is a little disingenuous for anybody to suggest that ideology played no part in the failure of the previous regime to mobilise adequate foreign exchange, and the striking success of the new regime to do so. But to say this is not to detract in any way from the impressive

UWI Libraries

performance of mobilising this kind of foreign exchange funding in this very short time./The Prime Minister deserves full credit for It is simply to set it in political-ideological context. his obviously careful master-minding of it. But mobilising the money is, of course, only one ~~aspect~~, albeit the most important , aspect of the problem. The other aspect is how productively the money is used to earn/~~more~~ more foreign than we now do. Obviously, if we were earning enough foreign exchange from our mining, our agricultural exports, our tourism, our manufacturing and the like to pay for the things we need to import, then we would not be in our present bind. It is because we do not earn enough of the foreign exchange to pay for/our imports most if not all of that we are in this mess. And no amount of borrowing, no matter how skilfully managed and no matter how concessionary the terms, will get us out of this mess - unless we use the/money we borrow to enlarge our foreign exchange earnings. foreign This is the next and the most challenging stage once the money has been mobilised and put in place. If the second hundred days of this regime could see it coming to grips as effectively with this challenge as it did with the challenge of its first hundred ~~years~~ days then there would be grounds for sober and realistic optimism about our economic prospects. But there will be some price to pay; you do not work your way out of this/mess without paying some price. We must wait to see kind of what the price tag is. And the single most depressing and angry-making aspect of the entire Seaga speech was, for me at least, that catalogue of losses sustained by the government-owned utilities and enterprises. Listening to that recital of the list of losses running into hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars was just about the most telling criticism possible of the whole concept of public ownership. Unless public ownership, except in very special social service circumstances, can be made as ~~viable~~ responsive to the need for viability as any other business, it becomes another burden on taxpayers

Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Arthur Lewis on the World Economy
2) The Non-Aligned 'Split'

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
February 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Sir Arthur Lewis's warning to poor nations that their expectations of the United States making large transfers of money to developing countries is doomed to failure comes at a most appropriate time. Many people of developing countries in the English-speaking Caribbean seem to have high expectations that there will be such a massive flow of dollars from Washington into the region, provided the region shows itself to be staunchly pro-American. Of course, Sir Arthur Lewis was not just talking about the Caribbean region; he was talking about developing countries throughout the world. And he did make the point that some **develpping** countries are likely to be treated more favourably than others. He mentioned allies of the United States and partners in the Lome Agreement; but he warned that any largescale multilateral programme was most unlikely. So there will be no largescale dollar transfers on a sort of global basis. For one thing, the United States does not have any sense of historical obligation to former European colonies. This is the same position that the Russians take. They did not have the colonies; they did not exploit their natural resources; they owe them nothing. But there will be selective self-interested help. If it suits American interests here, or anywhere else in the world, they will use their money to further those American interests. This is in fact what both the Americans and the Russians and their respective groups of allies are doing. And those developing countries which are not of strategic or political or economic importance to one or other of the superpowers and their allies are likely to have a very lean time of

UWI Libraries

it. And those developing countries which may be strategically important to the one side or the other but which are politically 'out of line' will also have a very lean time of it when aid and investment funds are witheld. We have had experience of this here in Jamaica under the previous administration: we were too left for the Americans and not left enough for the Russians so we did not get/the large foreign inflows we needed. With our new posture from either the Americans will come to the rescue. But the American economy is itself in depression/and as Sir Arthur Lewis put it: "When the United States now was booming the rest of the world booms, and the developing countries are prosperous, and when the United States was depressed all other countries felt the pinch". U.S. economists predict a sharp increase in/the cost of basic necessities - food, fuel, housing, transport - the U.S. itself of in 1981. If this happens our/inflation will get/worse; the basic own much food we buy from the United States will cost vastly more. The pinch will be heavy on the poor, especially. So we must try to be more self-sufficient in food and brace ourselves against the cold wind that blows from a depressed America. The one hope Arthur Lewis offers is that the cycle of depressions followed by prosperity will hold and that the depression of the 1970s will be followed by more prosperous times from about 1983 onwards. But what if, like so much else, this cycle is also busted? Anyway, the thing is for us to stop looking for anybody from outside to come and solve Jamaica's problems It is up to us and no one else will do it for us. And finally and briefly, the conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Move-ment opened in New Delhi today. And as at every such conference since the birth of the Movement, the news we get is of splits in the movement, of its collapse, of it death. I can recall no single conference that had a 'good' press from the Western media in particular. But somehow the Movement has survived the apparent deathwish . Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Reagan on the U.S. Economy
2) Unemployment, Inflation & Unions
~~3) Nurses' Impasse: A Question of Values~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
February 6, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Mr. Ronald Reagan yesterday made his first broadcast to the American people since becoming President; and it sent shock ripples through the American nation. The President told the American people that their country faces an economic calamity of enormous proportions; that not since the Great Depression of the 1920s and 30s has the American economy been in such bad shape. And Mr. Reagan blamed it all on Big Government which, over the years, had spent more and more taxpayers' money, imposed more and more regulations, and built an ever burgeoning bureaucracy which stifled enterprise and initiative. And the way out of this economic mess, Mr. Reagan said, was to cut government spending and to allow the American people to themselves turn the economy around. Just how this is to be done Mr. Reagan did not spell out in detail, but he will do so later this month when he addresses both Houses of the American Congress. The one specific thing he mentioned yesterday was his determination to cut income tax by 10% a year over the next three years; and of course that there will cuts in spending in everyone of the Government Departments. Earlier, when he welcomed the former hostages from Iran the President had said that he had ordered a freeze on all new government hiring; but muckraking Washington columnist Jack Anderson has already made public how a few fired bureaucrats have already found their way back into new and in some cases higher paying government jobs in spite of the Reagan hiring freeze. Also, in spite of the announced cuts to be made in government spending, the President has asked the

UWI Libraries

American Congress to raise the National Debt ceiling by an additional $50,000-million. And the Budget deficit for the new fiscal year is expected to go way above the figure left by the Carter Administration and to climb to somewhere in the region of $80,000-million. And this kind of deficit budgeting and the raising of the National Debt ceiling suggests that Mr. Reagan's economic planners expect things to get worse before they get better: it suggests that in spite of the talk about spending cuts there will be increased government spending as a kind of social shock-absorber in the short run. Thus, if unemployment in the U.S. continues to grow - and there is talk in some U.S. circles of unemployment hitting a 10% mark before there is any turn-around - then government spending on social welfare/work relief programmes is bound to go up. Some form of work relief programming may in fact be implicit in Mr. Reagan's remarks about tackling inflation and unemployment simultaneously. If that is the case it would be a dramatic departure from the Thatcher approach in Britain which seems to see massive unemployment as a necessary evil in fighting inflation. And talking of unemployment it might be useful to note for the record that American trade unions at present represent no more than 22% of the entire U.S. work force, and nobody in the U.S. has used this fact to either belittle their importance or cast doubt on their speaking for the American workers. So let us not question the legitimacy of the Jamaican trade union movement on this score: our political parties have even smaller membership bases and we do not question their legitimacy. But back to the Reagan message on the American economy which is obviously going to have an important bearing on how Jamaica fares economically. If things are as tough as Mr. Reagan made out yesterday then American investors and lenders are going to insist on full value for every single dollar they spend here: and delivering is not going to be easy. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Local Government Elections, 1981

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
February 4, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: So Jamaica is to have another round of elections - Local Government elections this time - just over three weeks from now and just about four months after the October 1980 General Elections. Why so soon? Why the apparent rush after the nastiness of the last elections? The answers, I think, are to be found in very careful political considerations and very deliberate political decisions. The present government is at the very peak of its popular power right now: it has just won the most popular mandate in the electoral history of Jamaica; ahead of it are some tough and hard problems which may require tough and hard decisions. Inevitably, the making of those hard decisions is bound to upset or disenchant or alienate some section or other of the Jamaican electorate. And when that starts happening the broad popular base will start to diminish. So if you are going to call local government elections and they must be held sometim/it is better to call them now, at the peak of your popularity. You have a greater chance now of repeating the almost clean sweep you achieved in last October than you are likely to have a year or two years down the road from now. That, I suggest, is the political consideration at its most elementary level. The opposition PNP is still in control of the local government structure which it won so sweepingly back in 1977. Now is the best time and the best chance for the JLP to win that control from the PNP. And the history and tradition of the Jamaican electoral system is on the side of the JLP succeeding in this. In the past the party which won a national general election invariably then went on to capture control of a majority of the

UWI Libraries

local government authorities. In 1977, following on its 1976 General Election landslide victory, the PNP captured every single local government authority. It is this hold that the JLP wants to change on March 2nd. Will it do so? That is the question that only the Jamaican people can and will answer on March 2nd. Much will depend on the mood of the Jamaican voters this time around, especial the mood of certain groups of voters who formed a broad coalition to help sweep out the PNP government last October. For instance, will the large numbers of traditional PNP supporters who voted against their party in October do so again in March? Or will they, or some of them, return to the fold? Will the unemployed, & the young who also deserted the PNP in large numbers in October do so again next month? And what of organised labour which played such an important part in the defeat of the PNP in October? Organised labour was, in the main I think, motivated by fear of the loud-mouthed radical rhetoric of the left both inside and outside the PNP into voting against the PNP; and the shock realisation that trade unions in Poland were struggling for what we took for granted here clinched matters. Now the perceived threat of the left, real or imagined, is no logger a factor; it has been overcome. The fear in organised labour circles now is that the economy and control of the economy is being handed over into the private/investors' hands, and that organised labour may be in for a fight if it is to hold on to the gains won for it by the trade union movement in struggles over these past forty-odd years. The hard question is: Will an organised labour movement that is in this mood/vote, in this worried frame of mind, in March of 1981, as it voted in October of 1980? There is already talk in organised labour circles of this government with its massive madate being too powerful. These are just a few of the mainl political considerations to the upcoming local government elections. Behind these are the economic ones which lie ahead. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Reagan Hardline & Southern Africa

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
February2, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This past weekend's raid into Mozambique by elements of the white racist South African army, has now been followed by an official statement out of Pretoria justifying the attack and promising more such raids into all or any of the African frontline states unless they sign non-aggression pacts with South Africa. And in any such non-aggression pacts the African frontline states would be expected to agree to a clause which would forbid them giving any kind of sanctuary or assistance to what the racist South African regime describes as the 'terrorists' of the banned African National Congress. In other words, the frontline states would be expected to expel all South African freedom fighters from their soil and to stop giving them any kind of aid: if they don't agree to this then the racist regime promises to continue the murderous type of across-the-border raids with which they hit Mozambique last Friday. And, the South Africans say, they are adopting this new posture as their contribution and show of support for the West's tough new stand against terrorism' initiated by the new Reagan Administration in Washington. And so, willy-nilly, the racist South African regime has assigned to itself the task of giving a Southern African reality to the new hardline Reagan foreign policy. Freedom fighters against white racism are branded 'terrorists' and so they become fair game to be 'hit' wherever they are and to hang with the old-style diplomatic niceities of respecting the territorial integrity of any neighbouring country. How are the frontline states likely to react to this? They are clearly not just going to roll over and sign non-aggression pacts with the

UWI Libraries

racist regime and then expel all the South African refugees and freedom fighters in their midst. Certainly, Mozambique will not do so; and Zimbabwe will not do so; and Tanzania will not do so; and Angola will not do so. And even though Botswana is particularly vulnerable physically, and Zambia is economically and psychologically under very great South African as well as American pressure, it is most unlikely that they will sign any such non-aggression pacts. What all of these countries - certainly the first four - are much more likely to do is to accelerate their military preparations for ultimate armed conflict with South Africa. And they will, as the South Africans very well know, receive the backing of the Organisation of African Unity. For the struggle against racism in Southern Africa is the one issue on which there are no differences in the OAU. Where will the United States stand in all this? If the South African racists, in the name of supporting the West's tough new stand against terrorism, provoked armed clashes with its black independent neighbours, will the Reagan Administration side with the white racists? Will it arm them further? Or will it support the black states in hope of keeping out the Russians and their allies? And what are the Soviets and their allies likely to do while all this is brewing? The very fact that the Africans may not, at this moment, be able to take on the military might of the racist regime all by themselves could tempt the white South Africans to pre-emptively try and re-order the shifting political balance by military force. If they do it will not long remain a local war. There is, in geopolitical terms, too much at stake for that. There is currently much talk about the vietnamisation of Central America, and that may yet come to pass. However, my own view is that the vietnamisation of Southern Africa is a far greater likelihood, especially after last Friday's raid followed by the arrogant racist demands. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

The Seaga Visit to Washington &
The Two Facets of Jamaican Foreign Policy

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
January 30, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Prime Minister Seaga's official visit to Washington was, by all news accounts, a very successful one. In international affairs symbolic gestures - who is invited first, who is placed where, who is spoken to first at a reception and for how long - are often seen by the world's political community as very important signals of a government's preferences and intentions. And when any such signal is made by one of the world's two superpowers then the rest of the world pays very close attention. I suspect that foreign ministries all over the world are right now reading this or that meaning or interpretation this or that political implication, into the Prime Minister of little Jamaica being the very first head of government to officially meet the new inaugurated President of the United States. Incidentally Mr. Seaga is our head-of-government, not our head-of-state; Mr. Glasspole is our head-of-state. The confusion on this point among American journalists is understandable: their President is both head-of-state and head-of-government. There should be no such confusion among Jamaican journalists. Anyway, we should not under-rate the political importance of Mr. Seaga being President Reagan's very first official visitor. I suspect that that unofficial pre-inauguration meeting with the Mexican President was the Reagan way of ensuring that that important southern neighbour does not feel in any way slighted by Jamaica's Prime Minister being the first visitor. It is all delicate high-stakes politics with everybody persuing their own self-interests. Jamaica's self-interest is American economic support and the hope and expectations of massive inflows of American investment. This

UWI Libraries

was the premise on which last October's election was won. So the new Jamaican government must deliver in economic terms and the new American government must help it to do so. If the Americans can be made to see the help they are asked to give in terms of protecting their own political and economic self-interet in the region, that help is likely to flow more freely. But there is a political price tag which has come through by some Americans - not only journalists but influential business and administration types as well - referring to Jamaica's Prime Minister as 'our' man in the Caribbean. In an interview Mr. Seaga firmly repudiated the notion that he was anybody's man, but he also recognised the importance of Jamaica itself giving the lie to that notion by the way in which it goes about its business with the international community. And that, I suspect, is not always going to be an easy matter, especially if the two superpowers return to Cold War politics. I give you one possible scenario within the Caribbean Basin. Neither Mexico nor Panama - nor Venezuela for that matter - would approve of or tolerate any sort of U.S. intervention in Cuba, not because they approve of the regime but because they are committed to non-intervention as a matter of principle, and to regional rather than metropolitan solutions to regional problems. If that faction in the U.S. which wants to see us as a kind of American surrogate in the Caribbean had its way we may find ourselves under some very heavy pressure from both the Americans and power groups within the region. This is one of the difficulties with being both 'aligned' and 'non-aligned'. Mr. Shearer earlier this month spelled out our non-aligned position and principles to an ACP meeting in Brussels. I suspect that a majority of the people at that meeting would, at the very least, be most curious about how we reconcile the apparent contradiction of the two facets of our foreign policy. But if it succeeds in bringing home the bacon, most Jamaicans will be satisfied. People only want circuses on full bellies. Goodnight

The hard truth is to deliver,

UWI Libraries

1) New Storm Over JBC
2) A Blurring of Priorities

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
January 28, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The bitter storm now brewing over the Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation can be of no surprise to anybody who was in Jamaica during last year's nasty and savage election campaign. After what had gone on in that campaign there was no way in which a JLP electoral victory could result in anything else but the massive upheaval at the JBC that we now see in motion. And however this upheaval is finally reduced to a state of relative calm, the JBC is bound, as in 1964 a long time and/after, to lose considerable ground and the listening and the viewing public are certain to be the poorer for this. It is a sad failure of our political system and our political/community that to this day the JBC is still seen and used as the political instrument of the party in power rather than as the national instrument of information, education and entertainment as originally conceived by the late great Norman Manley. And so, each time there is a change of government there is also upheaval at the JBC. The fact of the communist presence at the JBC is marginal to this central point of what was supposed to be a national electronic media house ending up as the instrument of the party in power. And it is dishonest nonsense to pretend that one party did it and the other did not. The styles were different but both did it. Until this problem is resolved we will go on having upheavals at the JBC each time there is a change of government. Please don't get me wrong. Change and upheaval are not the same thing and I am not arguing against change: it is upheaval that is ultimately negative and destructive and divisive. In the context in which the JBC is seen and used as the instrument

UWI Libraries

of the party in power, there is bound to be change, each time there is a change of government. But even such changes can be brought about more quietly and without upheaval if a primary consideration is to do as little harm or damage to the instrument as possible. That is what the business of managing change is all about. And it can be done without the morally dubious business of mounting anti-leftist witch-hunts. When communist regimes deprive those who oppose them of their jobs and suppress their right to dissent, we denounce them as being enemies of freedom of expression and violators of human rights. When we do the same thing, for whatever reason, then we too become enemies of freedom of expression and violators of human rights. That is unless we operate monumental double stanards which turn us into monumental hypocrits. But I also think that witch-hunts and witch-hunters are undesireable for the very practical reason that they tend to blur the priorities of an issue. And the primary issue with so very many of our publicly-own corporations and companies is the matter of economic viability, of paying their way and perhaps making a profit for the public purse instead of always being a burden on the hard-pressed Jamaican taxpayer. I happen to believe that it is possible to provide a mix which includes good public service broadcasting which is also economically viable. I am not saying it is easy: it is a hard and difficult task, but it can be done, given the will. I would have thought that grappling with this aspect of the problems of the JBC, would almost automatically put any shifts and changes and cutbacks which were thought necessary, into a wider, more constructive and non-partisan political context. But I am not sure that any Board of Directors appointed by any one of the major parties can do this in the context where the particular station is seen as the instrument of the party in power. That is the real, though often blurred, heart of the JBC issue. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) Petrol Retailers' Profit Margin
2) After the Hostages - What?
3) British Labour's Electoral College

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
January 26, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The single most important piece of local weekend news for Jamaican motorists - and perhaps/Jamaican taxpayers in general - was the announcement at the Gasolene Retailers Association function in Ochos Rios that the government had already decided on an increase in the profit margins for petrol retailers. Now, the thing about any increase the petrol station operators are given is the simple and unavoidable fact that in one way or another somebody or some group or groups of somebodies are going to have to pay for that increase. Either the Jamaican motorists will have to pay by way of new price increases on petrol and petroleum products; or the government of Jamaica will have to pay by way of accepting a smaller tax take from the sale of petrol and petroleum products; or the Jamaican taxpayers in general will have to pay by having the cost of the increase built into general taxation. However it is done, somebody is going to have to pay for that increased profit margin. If the Jamaican motorists are called on to do the paying by way of direct higher prices for the petrol and petroleum products they use, then a number of inevitable consequences will follow. If public transport, be it JOS or minibus, has to pay more for the fuel it uses, the fares charged by public transport will almost certainly have to go up. And all the delivery services, and all the other services which have a transport content will most likely also go up in price: cooking gas, the price of food, building material, anything which has to be transported of which uses petroleum energy will go up in price. And that will of course mean a big new upward

UWI Libraries

swing in the cost of living for all Jamaicans, not only for the private motorist as would seem to be the case at first blush. So, whatever the level of increase in the profit margin to the petrol stations, if the cost of that increase is passed on directly to the consumers of petroleum products, the inflationary impact of it will be spread throughout the society. If, on the other hand, the government were prepared to pay for the increase by accepting a smaller tax take, the impact would hardly be noticed immediately. The big question is: can the government of Jamaica take such a cut in its income and still provide the goods and services which the poor in the society, in particular, have come to expect? Social services are already at a very poor level. Will any loss of tax revenue make them worse? And if it were decided that the increase in profit margin to the petrol station operators should be absorbed by general taxation how will this be done? By direct taxation such as income tax? Or indirectly by increases on such things as cigarettes and beer and rum? All these are questions which makes that announced increase of profit margins for petrol retailers a matter of national concern. On the international scene two events dominated. First there was the question: Now that the 52 American hostages are free, should the U.S. government abide by an agreement which many saw as giving in to kidnapping and blackmail? I think the Americans will abide by the agreement because not to do so could do them immeasurable damage. For one thing Algeria was a party to it and so Alergian good faith is involved. And who other than diehard friends would ever accept America's word if she went back on it this time? And in London the British Labour Party's decision to give the trade unions a 40% voice in the choice of party leader, has provoked all sorts of talk about a leftwing takeover. The fact is that the overwhleming majority of membefs of the British trade union movement is just about as conservative as any bunch of working people can be. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) JOS Workers Resume
2) ~~What Kind of U.S.-Jamaican Relations~~
3) ~~What Price Reconciliation?~~

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
January 23, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The J.O.S. buses are back on the roads again and the latest strike is over; but the problems remain and will not go away until the company's management and its workers and their unions come together to seriously tackle these problems. And as good a point as any on which to begin, if they are at all serious about dealing with the company's problems is this very latest strike itself. The workers struck because a Tribunal refused to make a wage award because the Tribunal was satisfied that the company was unable to pay any increase. The workers have representation on the company's Board of Directors so the workers should themselves have known that the company did not have the money; they should not have needed a Tribunal to tell them this. But they struck; and they made all the motions of a test of strength; and then, when it dawned on them where it might lead, they went back to work. All that inconvenience and discomfort to the travelling public, all the added losses sustained by the company, had really been to no point; they had gained nothing from it. And it seems that they, the workers, did not really care about the discomfort and inconvenience they had caused hundreds of thousands of people between last week Friday and yesterday; and they did not seem to care about the losses caused by the strike;only the danger of losing their jobs seems to have any sort of meaning for them. And as far as the management is concerned the dominant attitude seems to be that we, the taxpayers, must bail them out again. They want the government, which means the Jamaican taxpayers in this instance, to pump some $50-million into the company over

UWI Libraries

the next five years, as if just pouring money into it will solve the company's problems. Given what seems to be the present attitude among both management and workers alike, I personally am not sure that we will not just be throwing good money after bad. With all the respect it the world it seems to me that the attitudes at the JOS are all wrong and until these attitudes are changed the problems at the JOS will persist. And the single most important change that is needed is for workers and management to return to the proposition that the company must pay its way out of its earnings and must finance its development and expansion out of its profits. It can be done because it has been done in the past. I give you one example. As far back as 1955 the company owned 315 vehicles, nearly all of which were on the road. Today the company owns more than 500 vehicles but only 222 are reportedly on the road. If more than half your fleet is idle, for whatever reason, you cannot be profitable. So the company was profitable in 1955 and is unprofitable today because it under-uses its assets. In 1955 the company had a staff of somehwre in the region of 600 people to manage and conduct the business of its 315 vehicles. Today the staff is more than 2,000 even though there are over 100 less vehicles on the roads. This is not the way to economic viability, no matter how much new money is injected. The way to economic viability is for the company to take its present income of just under $500,000 a week, as its point of departure, then to bring its spending as near to that as possible by a drastic stripping down and then to work to build up its income by improving and increasing its service out of its present resources until it is profitable enough to expand. This is obviously not going to be easy; but it can be done because the company has operated profitably before. How painfully or how painlessly it is done will depend very much on how willingly or unwillingly attitudes are changed at the JOS. Goodnight

UWI Libraries

1) January 20, 1981 -America's Day
2) J.O.S. Finances - some questions

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
January 21, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Yesterday was America's day: it was America's day for America's friends and foes alike. For, yesterday and indeed, for the forty-eight hours leading up to yesterday, the attention of the news media of the entire world, and/of every single political power centre/in the entire world was focussed on what was happening in and to and about America. And what was happening was indeed worthy of all that attention. There was a changing of the guard in the corridors of American power that was smooth, undramatic, almost imperceptible: new bureaucrats, new movers and shakers, new spokesmen and women, new manipulators of power quietly took the places of the old ones to whom we had grown accustomed over these past four years. In the long run this may turn out to be more important than the much more dramatic coming in of one President and the going out of the other. The high drama centred around the swearing-in of Mr. Ronald Reagan as the new President and the departure of Mr. Jimmy Carter, the old President: but they were only the outward/and symbolic showing of the real shift of power. And one of the striking things about it all was the broad framework of national unity within which it all took place. In this sense America can fairly be described as being in terms of basic principles and objectives like a one-party state/with two powerful political factions, one slightly to the left of centre, the other slightly to the right of centre only competing for office at election time but completely united once the election is over. And so youhave the former President travelling to West Germany today/as the special envoy of the new President to welcome the 52 Americans

UWI Libraries

who ~~were~~ had been held as hostages in Iran until half an hour after the ~~trans~~fer of power from the Carter to the Reagan administration. And the freeing of the hostages was of course the other thing that made yesterday America's day. After a long and traumatic fourteen months ~~of~~ the American hostages were finally freed yesterday. The agreement which led to their freedom was Mr. Carter's last substantive act as President; but even at the end there was a bitter twist to the whole business. Mr. Carter dearly wanted to personally announce the release of the hostages before quitting office: but because of an alleged short payment of some $130-million ~~in~~ of interest ~~payments~~ due to the Iranians by American bankers the deal was delayed. And in addition to the return of Iranian assets the American Government also had to promise, in writing, not to interfere in any way in Iran's internal affairs in future. But no matter the humiliation of a great power implicit in this, the American people were in a mood of happy euphoria at the safe release of their fellow citizens. The time for anger and, perhaps, vengeance will come later. America will probably not want to sell Iran the military spare parts she so desperately needs, at least not for the present. But what if Iran then turns to others? To the Soviet Union perhaps? America would not want that. So there are practical problems of power politics to face beyond the anger. And the new President and the new men now in charge in Washington's corridors of power are going to find the options and the choices quite hard and difficult and complex as Mr. Jimmy Carter ever did. The limits to power, even for a superpower, will not suddenly go away. But none of this will alter the fact that yesterday was America's day. And finally and very briefly, we are told that the JOS when on the road earns just under half a million dollars a week from bus fares; could we please also be give a detailed breakdown of how much money JOS spends a week? How much for management? How much for workers? How much for fuel? How much for what perks and fringe benefits? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

Showdown Time at the JOS?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
January 19, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Whatever the immediate outcome of today's efforts to settle the latest J.O.S. stoppage which was brought on by the Industrial Disputes Tribunal's refusal to make a wage award because of the parlous state of the company's finances, this stoppage may well be the beginning of showdown time at the J.O.S. But before going on with this matter let us note quickly and in passing that Mr. Jimmy Carter has finally achieved agreement for the release of the American hostages in Iran on his very last day in office as American President. We will talk more about this another day: for now we note that Mr. Carter leaves office on something of a high note. And now for our bus service. We begin with a few key background facts. First: the JOS is in very serious money trouble; it is not paying its own way and so it is getting deeper and deeper into debt. The Tribunal which refused to make a wage award to the workers in effect said the company was in danger of 'grinding to a halt'. Second: few, if any, of the large army of Corporate Area working people are anywhere near satisfied with the quality of the service they are getting from the J.O.S. So we have a business which is not paying its way catering to customers who are not satisfied with the quality of the service they are being sold. If the 2,000 plus workers at the J.O.S. are at all worried about this situation they have done little or nothing to show their concern in any pratical way. The management has a public relations campaign going, but are there any other efforts to seriously deal with the hard problem of a business living within its means and paying its way out of its earning? And, you know, if you

UWI Libraries

look at the record you will see that this selfsame JOS has paid its way in the past and has earned a profit for its owners when those owners were mainly expatriate private investors. So between 1953 and 1974 - a time span of over twenty years - JOS regularly paid its way and made a profit for its owners. When the Jamaican Government bought out the foreign owners in 1974 it left the same basic structure of the company intact: there was no basic change to the structure which had operated successfully before. When the price of fuel went up, fares went up; when special concessions were made they were met by subsidy. And in transport volume means and should mean increased turn-over which should mean increased earnings which should mean increased profits. But there were two big catches. For some unfathomable reason there is a notion that anything owned by the government need not pay its way, let alone make a profit so managements of publicly-owned enterprises appear almost determined to make losses: and workers in such enterprises behave as though the job and the customer and anything else is there for their convenience. And I am afraid the attitudes of the trade unions have not helped matters. And so we have JOS workers demanding massive increases from a seriously faltering company. Neither they nor their unions seem to realise or to believe that 2,000 plus jobs may be on the line unless the JOS pulls itself together and delivers. There has been talk in some quarters of a showdown with the unions to prove who is in charge or strongest. I sincerely hope the unions have the good sense and judgement not to allow themselves to be suckered into a showdown over the JOS. It is both a bad case and a bad issue on which to fight for principle. There is no good principle involved in bad management, bad performance, unfair calls on the tax dollar and the penalising of poor commuters. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Problems Facing 'The Rule of Law'
2) Elective Politics & Political Pluralism

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
January 16, 1981, 6.10p.m

on the Gun Court
Good evening: Those figures/made public by Jamaica's Senior Puisne Judge, Mr. Justice Parnell, yesterday should be of very great concern to all Jamaicans. There are, we are told, 1,267 persons awaiting trial in 1,001 cases pending. And because of the massive escalation of gun crimes in Jamaica had overwhelmed the court it was 'impossible to follow the direction in Section 8 (1) of the Gun Court Act which required that the trial of an accused should begin within seven days of his first appearance before the court'. So, the Judge is reported as saying, fixtures for cases to be tried this year had to be made from as far away as May of last year. Given these and other disturbing statistics we must hope that the Government will act speedily on Mr. Justice Parnell's recommendations to reform the Gun Court.

One of the worrying problems about the rule of law generally is the matter of delay before trial, especially where the person to be tried is held in custody pending the trial. I hope those who specialise in the law will indicate ways in which the society as a whole can help to try and overcome this problem of delay. The rule of law, and the speediest possible carrying out of that law is, ultimately, the only truly worthwhile longterm answer to our problems of crime and violence and general lawlessness. And it is our courts of law, not mobs or gangs, not the police, not the army, who must determine the guilty or otherwise of the accused and the form of punishment which fits a particular crime.

Next a word on the nature of political mandates in free elective

UWI Libraries

parliamentary systems such as those represented by most of the Caricom Countries currently meeting here in Jamaica. No mandate given by the electorate in our kind of system is ever permanent or even ideologically exclusive. And yet politicians, especially in the first flush of victory, almost invariably behave and sound as though their being elected has settled this or that issue once and for all. And so we have the 'now that the direction has been settled...' syndrome; with its disturbing undertones that all dissenting views can now be excommunicated or suppressed or outlawed. We had a considerable amount of this after the 1976 PNP landslide electoral victory. The people, we were told, had chosen socialism and anybody who opposed socialism was going against the 'will of the people'; and some went to the extreme of branding such dissenters as unpatriotic and subversive. Now, following on the October 1980 JLP landslide electoral victory, we have almost exactly the selfsame thing, but from the opposite end of the political spectrum this time. 'The will of the people' now, is for the capitalist free market system and anybody who opposes it is against that will and is therefore unpatriotic and subversive of the national interest./The hard fact of the matter is that the electorate And can therefore be fired or suppressed.
certinly in the case of Jamaica, has shown again and again that it is not prepared to surrender its freedom of electoral choice to any party, be it of the left or the right. They showed in 1976 that they were not frightened by any anti-communist scare; they showed in 1980 that they were not frightened by anti-capitalist scare. They tried the one: it did not deliver according to their expectations; so they changed it for the other. And they will do it again, if they have to. They are, in short, committed to self-interested political pluralism. Meet their expectations and they are for you: fail and they are not. Ideologues of all shades please note. Good night

UWI Libraries

Waiting for Ronald Reagan:
a) U.N. Namibia Conference
b) Middle East Moves
c) Venezuela's Warning

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
January 14, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The United Nations sponsored conference on Namibia, which was supposed to lay the groundwork for moves toward independence by the end of this year, has collapsed in failure: South Africa saw to that. In the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, the crisis surrounding the American hostages seems to be coming to a head; the Iranians seem to be holding their own in the war with Iraq; and Jordan's King Hussein has lashed out unexpectedly against his one-time friend Henry Kissinger's presence and postures in and on the region. And, nearer home Venezuela's Minister of Energy and Mines has warned developing (or Third World) countries not to join any movement sponsored by the developed industrialised countries to mount a campaign of pressure against the oil-exporting OPEC countries. In El Salvador an effort, apparently hurriedly brought forward, is on the way to try and overthrow the military junta before Mr. Ronald Reagan is sworn-in as President of the United States next Tuesday. Indeed, all the developments I have listed appear to have the accessic of Mr. Reagan to the American Presidency as a sort of cardinal point of reference. For example, if Mr. Jimmy Carter had been re-elected I think the South Africans would have played their hand rather differently in Geneva this week. This is not to say that they would have given in or that the immediate outcome of the conference on Namibia would have been any different. But the South Africans would have been less stridently agressive and arrogant in promoting and projecting their puppet 'internal' regime. With Carter in the White House for another four years the possibility of stiffer economic

UWI Libraries

sanctions would be much more real than it now is. Indeed, a Carter Administration in its second term might even have been able to 'persuade' America's Western allies not to veto SWAPO's call for sanctions when it reached the Security Council. Now, with the Reagan Presidency less than a week away such a veto is a sure thing: Britain, France, West Germany, the United States itself - anyone of them or all of them together - will exercise such a veto. And if the matter is handled only at the level of the General Assembly then it would not matter much because the industrial powers will just carry on business as usual with South Africa, and there would be nothing the Third World would be able to do about that. Similarly, the Iranians, except for the hardline fanatics, are hustling to get as much as they can in return for the hostages before the change in Washington. So they may, between now and Friday, settle for less than their original demands because dealing with Reagan's people may be a very much tougher proposition. And if the Kissinger line is reintroduced into Middle Eastern politics then middle-of-the-roaders like Jordan's Hussein may be the first among the victims caught between the two extremes of East-West confrontation. So Hussein's denunciation could be read as a careful and urgent signal to the Reagan people. And Venezuela is simply telling the Third World that if America under Reagan is going to try to mount a crusade of big Western oil-consuming powers to try and threaten and intimidate OPEC, OPEC will resist and it may not be in the Third World's interest to be caught in the economic crossfire. In this sense most events on the international scene this week seem to be a kind of Waiting For Reagan, a positioning and preparing for what may come after what he said. As Governor of California Reagan surprised most people by not doing what was expected. He may just do the same in his new role.

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Montego Freeport Fire
2) The Politics of Means & Ends

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
January 12, 1981 6.10p.m

Good evening. What a relief that that terrible fire at the Montego Freeport Esso installation is out. And what a very disturbing thing that that fire took place at all. The losses are great and grave precisely because petroleum products are both scarce and costly. To lose upwards of $11-million U.S. in one short weekend fire is bad enough; to lose it in the form of petroleum products makes it worse. The one comforting thing is that no lives were lost and the five firemen who were hurt suffered no serious injury. But the disturbing question remains: Was the fire an accident or was it deliberate? In short, there is the nagging question of possible economic sabotage. And I think we will, all of us, remain disturbed and worried until we get some clearcut answer to this nagging concern. And it does not make sense to pretend that the concern is not there. Like it or not, many people are asking whether this was accident or sabotage. And there are others who are fanning these concerns for purposes of their own. So I think it is important for those whose job it is to investigate the origins of the fire, to go about it with the utmost speed and care and to tell us, as soon as possible, whether it looks like accident, or straightforward thieving, or serious politically motivated sabotage. Was the person or persons who removed the bung from that fuel tank thieves who took the petrol they wanted and then went off without shutting it back? If you have ever had petrol syphoned out of your car tank by a thief you will know that the thief usually does not bother to put back your tank

UWI Libraries

cover. He is usually in too much of a hurry for that. It could be something like that. Or it could be sabotage, deliberate and calculated. We cannot rule out either possibility, and it would be both foolish and dangerous to play ostrich. Political sabotage, urban like/guerrilla warfare, is a fact of modern-day life. And it is foolish to pretend that it cannot happen here. We are part of the world and what goes on in the world can go on here too. So let us not say it can't happen here. Indeed, after the events of last year during the run-up to the October elections, and earlier, it would be a very bold or foolish man who would say it can't happen here. The thing is to ferret out the truth and to let the people know. And when the people know what it is they are up against they may also know how to protect their interests. There are many people, everywhere in the world and here as well, for whom all means justify the ends. If the end they have in mind is to do harm or damage to this or to any other government or individual, then they do not care what methods they use as long as they do that damage. Conversely, if the end they have in mind is to do something good, or what they see as something good, then they do not care what methods they use as long as they achieve that 'good' end. And once you have this type of political morality, of lack of it, in play murder, sabotage, assassination, all become acceptable means because they are justified by the end in view. We had some of it here last year; it will not suddenly go away now. What happened at Montego Bay this past weekend may have been one expression of this ultimately destructive notion of the end justifying the means. It is comparatively easy to deal with the immediate surface manifestation of this: you hunt down the thieves or the saboteurs and punish them; and you step up security. The rub is: what do you do about the savage jungle mentality + morality?

Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Wills Isaacs
2) Casino Gambling
3) Prices, Wages, Profits & the Unemployed

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
January 9, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Jamaica this week formally and officially paid its last respects and said a final farewell to Mr. Wills O. Isaacs, one of the handful of genuine pioneers in the shaping of the Jamaica that we know today. He was one of that small and special band of men who were born into a British colony, and who, by determined and sustained political action and pressure transformed the political system and in doing so transformed the lives and outlook of their own generation as well as all future generations of Jamaicans. There never were very many of these special men even in the 1930s and 1940s ; and many of them have died since; and now, today, after the passing of Wills Isaacs, there are even fewer of these pioneer political activists left. When I thought about it while listening to Wills Isaacs' funeral, my list of surviving pioneers of this brand did not quite make the half dozen mark. It is a safe prophecy that before this decade is out there will not be a single one of the activist political pioneers left among us. So how will future generations of Jamaicans remember these people and what they have done for this nation? We know about the National Heroes because there are monuments to remind us; and anybody who is seriously interested can read up on any of them from a reasonably good and growing body of literature. Thus, the National Heroes present little or no problem. But those who worked with them and shared in their struggles are not as well served. What, for instance, does any present-day schoolboy or schoolgirl know about Noel Nethersole and the pivotal role he played? To be sure the Bank of Jamaica is at Nethersole Place. But why is it Nethersole Place?

UWI Libraries

And what kind of person was this Nethersole after whom the site of our National Bank is named? There are very few people left who still remember how easygoing and charming and unpretentious and warmhearted and toughminded and brilliant 'Crab' Nethersole was; and how much Norman Manley relied on him and his judgements. It would be a pity if the humanity of this man, and the humanity of the others like him, who were part of the national awakening and gave it point and direction, were to be lost to future generations of Jamaicans. So it would be a good thing if the government, through the Ministry of Education perhaps, could publish a series of school texts telling the biographical story of each of these pioneers. I think, too, that a simple marble column inside Heroes Park listing the names of these pioneers will be a useful reminder that even our National Heroes needed the support of strong-minded and independent spirits to do their great work. The lives and the work of the pioneers in nation-building is the rightful heritage of the Jamaican people. They should know all about that heritage: only with knowledge of it will come pride in it, and the desire to emulate and, perhaps surpass it.

And finally two brief notes on brewing matters in the news. Talk about Casino Gambling has surfaced strongly once more. It is a matter that is bound arouse deep controversy and division in the society at a time when everybody says the need for unity is paramount. It would be sad if the house were to divide again, so soon after ~~the~~ last year's terrible experience.

Then there are the price increases. Electricity is up, so are drugs, food and many other things; others threaten; bread and petrol for instance. The employed will react with demands for higher pay, so rising wages will chase rising prices in a spiral that seems without end. The question is: what of the unemployed and those who depend on them who have no way of absorbing these shocks? Who cares about them? Are they not Jamaicans too? Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

The Namibian Independence Conference

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Wednesday
January 7, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The United Nations sponsored conference on Namibian independence which opened in Geneva, Switzerland, today is of a geopolitical importance which has not been fully reflected in the media coverage so far. Such reports as we have had have made it seem a comparatively straightforward process of yet another African country's march to political independence. So we have been given a timetable which goes something like this: the conference will last a week and out of it should come agreement for elections to be held round about March of this year, and this will be followed by the country becoming independent by the end of this year. But the first and most serious obstacle to this optimistic scenario is the fact that the racist government of South Africa is one of the two major participants in the conference and it is likely to be the single biggest loser if things were to work out according to this scenario. South Africa has been in physical occupation of Namibia since the end of the first world war when it was given a League of Nations Mandate to administer what was then known as German South West Africa. Tanganyika, then known as German East Africa or Tanganyika, Tanzania was another such mandated League of Nations territory which was administered by the British Government. It was part of the pattern of the colonies of the defeated Germany after the first world war coming under League of Nations control. But in the case of Namibia the South Africans proceeded to integrate the political and economic life of what was supposed to be a trust territory into the South African system. They introduced a local Assembly which functioned much like our own local government authorities, but everything else,

UWI Libraries

customs, taxation, police, education, business, was controlled by the South African government; and they of course introduced their Apartheid system into Namibia. When the League of Nations was replaced by the United Nations after the second world war and the U.N. started the decolonisation process the South Africans refused to give up their mandate and in 1950 they unilaterally incorporated Nambia into South Africa, giving it a number of seats in the South African Parliament. And those seats can of course only be occupied by white Namibians. So for the last 30 years they have defied all U.N. calls to end their illegal occupation. A little over ten years ago SWAPO, the South West Africa Peoples Organisation, began an armed struggle to free Namibia. The Organisation of African Unity and the non-aligned movement generally supported SWAPO and prevailed on the United Nations to recognise it as the only true repreentative of the people of Namibia. And this is where the geopolitical complication began. It has been discovered that under the Namibian deserts lie vast deposits of previous and strategic minerals and South Africa has attracted huge investments by multinational corporations to exploit this mineral wealth. If the South Africans were to lose control what would happen to this wealth? Who would exploit it? Would the Western multinationals still be free to do so? Or would a SWAPO government behave like other independent African states and insist on control of its own resources? And, on the political front, would a SWAPO government 'tilt' in the same direction as Mozambique and Angola and Zimbabwe? And if Namibia were to break free of South Africa, what effect would this have on the blacks within South Africa? And on the future of all Southern Africa? All these are questions of who controls and in whose interest - and there is little concern with principle or morality, only power. So it is a question of which side can command most political muscle in Geneva this week. Goodnight.

UWI Libraries

1) Education in a Context Of Shortage
2) ~~Return to Bartering~~ Energy?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
January 5, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Children all over Jamaica returned to school earlier today as a new school term began; but some did not, and not out of choice. There are very many youngsters who sat the GCE 'O' Level examinations last June and who did not do well at all. Some of these youngsters will have dropped out of their own choice and will now swell the ranks of the untrained and unskilled unemployed young. Others have been told not to return to school because of their poor examination results. It is hard to determine just how many have not returned to school today because of poor exam results because this is a matter which is left largely to the discretion of each particular school involved. But I personally have been told of at least one Corporate Area school where some fifty youngsters who gained less than three 'O' level passes were told not to come back. I understand that these were all first-time failures and that some of the youngsters were not more than fifteen years old. If my information is correct, and I have no reason to doubt the sources, then this is a matter of grave concern which I think the Ministry of Education should look into at the highest possible level. And I particularly hope that Mr. Edwin Allen will bring his vast experience and knowledge to bear on it. It would be cruelly wrong for our, or indeed any, educational system to deprive a youngster permanently of any hope of a secondary and therefore tertiary education because of one exam failure. I know, and I am sure you know, of many young people who failed hopelessly at the their first GCE 'O' level exams and who then went on to do very well indeed and even to become good

UWI Libraries

scholars or successful business people. If those people had been cast out after their first failure at age fifteen or sixteen Jamaica would have been the poorer for it. One of our problems here is the hard and often desperate pressure for space. There seems to be just not enough secondary places for all our children so only the 'best' at the business of passing examinations are filtered through; the rest are bypassed or turned out after a first failure. It was not always like this. I remember a time, during the days when Mr. Glasspole and Mr. Edwin Allen, presided over the Ministry of Education, when youngsters routinely were given a second chance and, in exceptional circumstances such as extreme youth, a third chance. In those days only eighteen-year-olds or really hopeless cases were denied a second chance. And it was during this period when either Glasspole for the PNP or Allen for the JLP presided over our educational system, that the children of the poor, the children of the domestic helpers and the laundry women and the higglers and the ghetto dwellers in general, got their first great opening and access to secondary education. It would be a tragedy for Jamaica if now, under the pressure of shortage, the doors to secondary education were to be even partially closed to these youngsters from poor homes; for that, basically, is what would really happen. Those with money or influence will always find some way of ensuring some sort of secondary schooling for their children: not so with the poor. So give them a second chance at 'O' levels please. And finally on energy. Electricity and petrol prices are bound to go up. And as prices go up consumption is bound to decline. The rich Western countries already show dramatic falls in energy consumption and this is expected to go on. To survive we are going to have to make equally dramatic consumption cuts. The real question is how we do it: in an orderly and planned manner or in a jungle free for all? Goodnight

UWI Libraries

Of War & Peace And Want

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
January, 2, 1981, 6.10p.m

Good evening: In his New Year's Day message to the world, Pope John Paul appealed to all the nations of the world to 'dismantle the destructive forces working towards war.' He said that if only a small part of the money now spent on the arms race were devoted instead to feeding the poor and hungry and to medicine and science, mankind would be vastly better off. In hard statistical terms the Pope was talking about that nearly two-thirds of all mankind who live in the poor countries of the world where per capita income ~~was~~ is $550 U.S. a year or less; where starvation in one form or another - either not enough to feed the body adequately or else straight and outright starvation - is the condition of the overwhelming majority of the people; and where most of the people die before they are forty. There are somewhere in the region of 4,000-million people in our world today and something of the order of 2,800-million of these people live in the poor countries where food and medicine are desperately scarce and where health and social services are at the most elementary levels. And the statistical picture to illustrate the Pope's references to the arms race is equally striking in an ironically different way. Apart from the hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars that the two super-powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, spend on arming themselves, they and their allies also sell vast quantities of arms and armaments to the rest of the world. End-of-year figures just made public in the United States shows that in 1980 $500,000-million worth of arms were sold to countries all around the world. Ironically, two-thirds of that vast outpouring of arms was sold to

UWI Libraries

Third World countries, often to countries that perform miserably at feeding and housing their peoples, and that fail at providing adequate supplies of clean water and decent sanitation. Yet these countries spend huge proportions of the their meagre national budgets on sophisticated high-priced weapons. And usually the rich countries that sell the arms offer better credit and payment terms than they offer on the sale of food and of medicine. And who are these arms merchants/to whom the Pope's appeal was addressed? Top of the list for 1980 / are the two Super-powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, of importance in that order. The order/of the other major arms exporting couhries are not immediately available but a year ago France came third, Britain came fourth and Israel was up there in the first half dozen of the major arms exporting nations. And $500,000-million is a truly staggering amount of money to spend arms at a time when nearly two-thirds of all the people on our earth are living in want and poverty and ignorance. And Pope John Paul reminded his audience that more than 400-million people are physically or mentally disabled in our world today. He said if the arms exporting countries and others spent only a small part of that money on help for the handicapped their suffering could be eased. But the arms race is almost certain to go on because each of the superpowers is convinced that the way to peace is for it and its allies to arm themselves to the teeth. They call this the balance of mutual terror: each has so many and such deadly weapons and each knows that the other has them too; and this knowledge, the thinking goes, will deter the other from striking first. And each time a particular class of weapon is improved on, and replaced the old obsolete stock is sold to the Third World at knockdown prices and so the proliferation of arms continues while two-thirds of mankind remain in want. Do you wonder the Pope has condemned capitalism and communism alike? Goodnight

UWI Libraries