

212.	Birds Eye Foods	-	1st	November
213.	Road Accidents Telephone Warning by Wills Isaacs	-	2nd	"
214.	The Potato Debate	-	3rd	"
215.	Parliament, the People and Politics	-	4th	"
216.	Manley on Race and Colour in Jamaica	-	5th	"
217.	Khrushchev and Internal Russian Politics	-	7th	"
218.	After the U.S. Elections	-	8th	"
219.	Government to buy Squatter Land	-	9th	"
220.	After the U.S. Elections	-	10th	"
221.	U.S. Bases in W.I. Talks	-	11th	"
222.	KSAC and Garbage Clearance KSAC Councillors and the Police	-	12th	"
223.	Internal Party Conflicts	-	14th	"
224.	" " "	-	15th	"
225.	" " "	-	16th	"
226.	Is there real conflict between Town and Country?	-	17th	"
227.	The Price of Bread Road Signs and Road Users	-	18th	"
228.	The Air Freight Problem	-	19th	"
229.	The P.N.P. Annual Conference	-	21st	"
230.	The Rastas and the African Mission	-	22nd	"
231.	The Citizen and His Society	-	23rd	"
232.	The Weight of Bread Teacher Training	-	24th	"
233.	Unrest in the Caribbean Sea	-	25th	"
234.	The Congo and Intervention	-	26th	"
235.	Bo ¹⁰ roadcast on P.N.P. Conference	-	28th	"
236.	Manless World	-	29th	"
237.	Williams-Adams run-in KSAC Finances The Voting Age	-	30th	"

whether last week's total of accidents was average or above average or below average, it is a dreadful and depressing state of affairs. And I think one of the most dreadful things about it is that we seem to be getting used to this sort of think. Many of us look on it as though it is natural for people to be killed and maimed on our roads. And so many of these accidents are head-on collisions, which means that nobody involved wanted to give way to the other person on the road. I really think it is time we motorists took stock of ourselves and find out whether we really are the thoughtful and decent and responsible people we like to think we are. We must put an end to this horror on the roads.

And now let me deal briefly with another touchy subject. A listener has asked me to comment on Mr. Wills Isaacs' warning, which he gave out on Tuesday of last week, that the Jamaica Telephone Company may be replaced by one of the largest and most efficient telephone companies in the world. My listener wanted to know whether Mr. Isaacs was speaking for the Government and whether Government is thinking along those lines. My answer is that I frankly do not know what the Government's thinking is on this subject. I think Mr. Isaacs was expressing his own personal opinion. But I also think that when a Minister of Government expresses a personal opinion there is likely to be more to it than when a private individual does so. I certainly think Mr. Isaacs expressed a very popular opinion when he complained of the inefficiency of our telephone service. My own hope is that the Telephone Company will take this to heart and try to establish better relations with the public. At the moment its relations with the public are certainly not the happiest. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: In these days of high and rising prices it is very interesting to know that there are places and products where prices are actually going down. I know people in Jamaica will find it a little hard to believe, but it is a fact. One international food company has this year cut the prices of 23 of the items it puts on the market.

The company is called Birds Eye Foods, and it does an enormous and world-wide business in frozen foods. It sells meats, fish, vegetables and fruit in frozen packages. Indeed, I am sure many of you have seen packets of Birds Eye Foods in your favourite supermarkets.

Now Birds Eye is just one of a number of companies doing business ⁱⁿ ~~with~~ frozen foods. And frozen foods, as you know, has become really big business. Last year the frozen food business earned £35 million in Britain alone. This year earnings up ~~up~~ by £10 million and it is estimated that people in Britain alone will buy £46 million worth of frozen food. This is big business and Birds Eye Foods controls about 70% of that business.

One of the reasons why Birds Eye Foods is going so well is because its prices are popular with the consumers. Competition in the frozen food market is stiff, and the English or American housewife compares prices very carefully before she buys. She wants the highest quality she can get for the lowest possible price. And so dealers in frozen foods have to compete for her custom by offering her the best quality at the lowest price. Birds Eye has so far offered her more attractive shopping at more attractive prices and

and that is why it still controls 70% of the market. Also, Birds Eye offers the housewife ~~more~~ more than 40 different products from which to choose. It is possible for a housewife to get everything she needs - starting with soup or fish, going through a meat course, with salad and fruit~~e~~ and ending up with the most delicate sweet - it is possible for her to get everything she needs for a 6 or 8 course dinner party out of Birds Eye packets, And she can get all this at a price which would make Jamaican housewives green with envy.

But in spite of all this Birds Eye has so far cut its prices 23 times this year. The prices on some items were cut by as little as a penny a packet and others by as much as 8d a packet. The price of a packet of frozen raspberries - for instance - was cut from 3/2d to 2/6 last month. Can you imagine anything like this happening in Jamaica today?

The company says it can do this because ^{its} ~~the~~ workers have developed more skill at their jobs, and because it has developed new techniques. It also says that the more it sells of any single item the smaller the price it can charge for that item. In other words, efficiency and volume means a reduction in prices. And these people know that they are making a goodwill investment when they transfer these gains to the consumer by cutting their prices.

I think there are many firms and organisation in Jamaica which can gainfully follow the Birds Eye example. Many of our prices are unnecessarily high because our merchants want a killing profit every time: and the cost-of-living goes up and up. It can be brought down.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Last week I decided to try and keep a day-by-day record of the number of accidents on our roads for one week: so between Monday and ~~Friday~~ Saturday of last week I kept a note of every accident which was reported in the press. The list is in front of me now and it makes depressing reading.

there were that

On Monday/16 people were hurt in a collision between two trucks near Bath in St. Thomas; and also a report of a collision between a police truck and two cars in Manchester. On Tuesday two accidents were reported: one on the Lime Hall-St. Ann's Bay road and the other one two miles from Pay Pen. On Wednesday we had a collision between a kerosene-tanker and a car on the Bog Walk Road and a car overturning two miles from Yallahs. On Thursday there was no report of any accident, but on Friday a sideman was killed by the truck on which he worked. On Saturday a J.O.S. bus was reported to have knocked down a man who later died and a car killed a ten-year-old schoolgirl.

So there you have it. In six days we had nine accidents on our roads. In most of them people were injured. In three of them people died. This is a frightening state of affairs. It is a dangerous state of affairs. The question is: was last week exceptional? Is it exceptional for us to have nine accidents on our roads a week? Is it exceptional for us to have three people killed and a score or more injured on our road a week? I cannot give a clear hard and fast answer without a lot more research, but already in one day - on Monday of this week - two people have died in road accidents. The truth is,

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am sure most of you will remember that on Friday and Saturday of last week I dealt with Sir Alexander Bustamante's views on race and colour prejudice in Jamaica. Sir Alexander, you will remember, had written an article in the Gleaner under the heading: "This Menace to our Future". In that article he had set out the two great principle which had guided his political life. In that article he also called on Mr. Manley to join him and denounce the racial prejudice which seemed to be creeping into Jamaican life. This dangerous development of racialism in Jamaica, Busta felt, should be treated as an issue that was above party politics and party loyalties. He wanted it treated as a bi-partisan national matter on which both major parties are agreed.

It now turns out that this is, in fact, an issue on which the two parties agree. On Monday of this week Mr. Manley reminded us, in a statement to the Gleaner, that he had stated his position and the position of his party as far back as on September the 18th, roughly a month earlier than Busta's article was published. And of course, the moment I saw Manley's statement in the Gleaner I remembered the statement he had broadcast on September the 18th. I am sure most of you remembered it too. It was broadcast over both radio stations. Do you remember his words:

"Ugly forces are rising in our country. All over the land people have begun to preach race hatred - colour against colour, race against race. Movements are being formed dedicated to the destruction of the very idea of inter-racial harmony. I could understand that

"Dear Sir, I listen frequently to your news commentary and I found the series on your impressions of Trinidad very interesting. the one that struck me most however was the one during which you told of Radio Trinidad giving an hour-long broadcast of the daily happenings and speeches in Parliament.

"I was glad to know of this as for a long time I have been wondering why something like this was not done here in Jamaica. So often we hear it mentioned that not enough persons attend the meetings of the House of Representatives. This I dare say is because most Jamaicans have very little or no interest at all in politics and what goes on at Duke Street. This I think is a great pity, as if more people were indeed interested in politics not only at election time but all along, I dare say a good number of the persons now in the House would never be there and some of the rather undignified behaviour would be eliminated from the meetings of the House.

"So I do hope that you may be able to persuade the Directors of R.J.R. to follow the example set by Radio Trinidad. I know that approval may have to be had from the Government but I hope it will be adopted so as to make our people more politically conscious. This is needed all the more with the question of Federation and the forthcoming referendum very much in the air."

That is all I can quote from this very interesting letter. Do let me know what you think of it. This listener also suggests that Forum on Federation be on another night as most people want to go out and have fun on Saturday nights. I think this question of the relations between the people and their parliament is a very important one; so please let me know what you think. Goodnight.

So his potatoes arrived here on October 26th - five days before the permitted date. This means that Mr. Hosang had clearly broken an important condition of his permit. Now, the position of the Trade Administrator was very clear. He is there to see that all potato importers bring in their potatoes on terms of equality, that no one gains any special advantage over anyone else; he is also there to see that anyone who breaks these rules are punished. From his point of view Mr. Hosang has broken the rules; and so Mr. Hosang's potatoes were held up till yesterday morning. As I have said, my sympathies are with Mr. Hosang and I have gone into this whole matter carefully: and my opinion is that ^{there} was no special discrimination against Mr. Hosang. The important thing from the consumer's point of view is that the potatoes are in the island and in the stores. On Monday and Tuesday people were being charged 8d and 9d and 10d a pound for potatoes. This was open profiteering because there was a shortage. Today we can get our potatoes at a reasonable and sensible price.

The second aspect of this debate is something unhealthy in our society. Yesterday there was news that the farmers were attacking the Ministry of Trade and Industry and Mr. Wills Issacs in particular over the potato issue. The attack took the form of agriculture being against the merchants. To me this seems like carrying the struggle for the leadership inside a political party into our daily national affairs. This is wrong and dangerous. Inter-party struggles should be kept inside political parties. They should not be mixed up with the national life of a country. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: You will remember that it was on Monday of this week that I told you about the potato debate. Well, since Monday there have been some very interesting developments in the great potato argument.

First there has been the case of Mr. Dudley Hosang whose shipment of potatoes started off the debate. You will have seen in your papers of yesterday morning that Mr. Hosang claimed that his potatoes had not been released to him up to Wednesday morning. I had been following this particular case very carefully and I know that well before noon yesterday morning the Trade Board was ready to release Mr. Hosang's potatoes. In fact, around noon the Trade ~~Board~~ Administrator's office took the unusual step of sending the release documents around to Mr. Hosang's office because they could not get him on the phone to let him know that he could collect his potatoes. I also know that Mr. Hosang has charged the Trade Administrator with discriminating unfairly against him because other shipments of potatoes were released on November 1st while his shipment was held up until November the second.

I have a great deal of sympathy for Mr. Hosang's position. He was enterprising, he ordered his potatoes well in advance and he risked a big chunk of money. He was obviously trying to be the first in the market and that is good mercantile initiative. But he made some mistakes as well. His most important mistake was that he did not inform his shippers that his permit stated very clearly that his potatoes were not to arrive in Jamaica before the first of November.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: You will remember that it was in the week beginning Monday October the 17th that I told you about my trip to the south Caribbean. On Tuesday and Wednesday of that week I told you of the great changes which have taken place in Trinidad since Dr. Eric Williams' rise to power. You will remember I also told you how Eric Williams had used radio to bring the parliament of Trinidad and the people of Trinidad close together. Each evening when the Trinidad parliament was sitting, I told you, Trinidad's two radio stations carried an hour-long report of the proceedings in the house. In addition to this Eric Williams holds a weekly press conference where press and radio people can question him on any subject they liked. The only questions on which he wanted advance notice were those which required some research before he could answer them; apart from that the press and radio people were free to throw any questions they liked at him.

A number of people have expressed great interest in these comments of mine from the South Caribbean, and I have received a number of letters on the subject. One of these letters has struck me so much that I am going to read the important part of it to you. I should very much like you, the listeners, to let me know what you think of the ideas put forward in this letter. I am not going to give you this listener's name because he has asked me not to. Incidentally, I will never use anybody's name if they do not want me to, but it is important that I should know who my correspondents are. I cannot and will not use anonymous letters. Now let me read you the letter:

sort of thing 20 years ago, but today I say bluntly that it is a dangerous throwback into the past that threatens to undermine and destroy one of the greatest and finest things we have ever tried to achieve."

Manley's was as clear and uncompromising and noble a statement as was Busta's. Indeed, I think it is fair to say that on this question of race and racial discrimination the records of both leaders are noble and clean. They have neither of them preached hatred and prejudice. At the same time both have frankly recognised the fact that there was a time in Jamaica when the Negro was discriminated against, when he had hardly any opportunity, and when most of the best jobs and opportunities were closed to him. And both have worked mightily in the movement which has ended this state of affairs. So I think we can fairly say that Manley and Busta are agreed on this matter.

Why then had most of us forgotten Manley's statement by the time we read Busta's? I think there are two reasons. When Manley made his statement the country was just beginning to recover from the shock of the Red Hills-Sligoville manhunt for the Americans who wanted to bring a racist revolution to Jamaica; and Manley's words at the time were lost in the pattern of alarm and uncertainty. The other reason is ^{the shortness of men's memories & the ephemeral quality} ~~that his words were only broadcast. They were not of the spoken word.~~ ^{Building up a storehouse of} ~~printed. The spoken word is allusive, leaving an impression, whereas~~ ^{impressions & knowledge over a long period of time.} ~~the printed word is a little sharper. So it would seem that we need both for something to stick in the mind.~~ Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: It was on Friday of last week that we first heard and read of the rumour. The rumour said that Mr. Khrushchev, the Russian Prime Minister had been deposed. The rumour said that Mr. Malenkov, who was the first man to become Prime Minister after the death of Stalin, had replaced Mr. Khrushchev. It also said that Marshall Zhukov, Russia's most famous living military hero, had worked with Mr. Malenkov and had been appointed State President. These rumours first started in Vienna, the capital of Austria, and quickly spread throughout the world. And oddly enough they started in the highest Austrian government circles. This, of course, was big news. While the rumours lasted they overshadowed everything else. Even the American Presidential election news took second place on the front pages of the world's newspapers.

The Russian news agency, Tass, which is no more and no less than an instrument of official Soviet propaganda, denied these rumours and called them a lot of nonsense. But nobody in the outside world paid much attention to the Tass denial because everybody knew that Tass could only say what it was told to say by Russia's propaganda bosses.

Then, on Saturday, Mr. Khrushchev showed himself at Moscow airport at the head of a welcoming committee to greet the president of Communist China who had gone to Moscow to take part in the celebrations of the 43rd anniversary of the Russian Revolution. Khrushchev took the opportunity to tell the Canadian Ambassador, Mr. David Johnson, "Well, I'm still here".

In the light of all this, what are we to think? What conclusions are we to draw. Some people are inclined to say that there was nothing to the rumour. Khrushchev is still in the saddle and everything in the Russian garden is lovely. I am not so sure that is the right conclusion to draw.

In Russia things do not happen as they do in Britain or the United States or even ~~xxxx~~ here in Jamaica. When there is a fight among Ministers in our government it soon becomes public property. The same sort of thing applies in Britain and the United States. In these countries the governments do not control what goes into the newspapers or over the radios. In Russia nothing goes into the newspapers, nothing goes over the radio without it first having been approved by the government. They have even reached the point where they control rumours. So I am satisfied that this rumour only got out to Austria because some highly placed person or persons wanted it to get out. I think a fair and reasonable guess is that a group did try to take away power from Khrushchev. I think they hoped for success and so they made their bid and let out the rumour. And then I think they failed. I do not know if we will ever know how they made their bid for power unless the Russians want us to know. All we might hear is that something has happened to certain leading Russians: on the other hand, Khrushchev and company may want to make a show of the whole thing and there might then be a spectacular trial. But I feel certain there must have been some fire behind the Russian smoke of last Friday. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Some time ^{tonight} ~~this evening, if we do not already~~
~~know it,~~ we will know the name of the next President of the United
States. Now the question is: does it, in terms of our own interests
here in Jamaica, matter very much to us whether the next President of
the United States is Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy?

First let us see in what areas we can be affected. The most
important single point where all of us can be affected is of course
the question of war and peace. If the next President of the United
States handles foreign affairs in such a way that it leads to war
between Russia and the United States then we will all be affected.
War in today's world cannot be a sort of private scrap between the
two great giants of the world. Whether we like it or not we cannot
escape getting involved in any war that breaks out. So our first
question must be: How do these two men stand in relation to war or
peace? I think if you look at their records and at what they have
said during their election campaigns you will find that there is
really very little difference between. They both want peace; they
both want disarmament and both have pledged themselves to make one
final try at getting Summit meetings going with Russia. The one point
of difference that came out was over the Chinese off-shore islands
of Quemoy and Matsu. Mr. Nixon thought these were to be defended in
the event of a Chinese communist attack; Mr. Kennedy thought they
were not worth a single American life. But even this point of difference
was soon overcome once they started explaining what they really
meant. So, I think there may be differences in method but basically

their approaches to war and peace will be the same.

Next there is the question of United States relations with the outside world in general and the so-called under-developed countries in particular. On this point I, for one, saw a subtle but important difference. Mr. Kennedy, you will remember, has made an important issue of United States prestige today. He has said United States prestige, especially in Africa and Asia and Latin America is not what it could and should be. I got the impression that Mr. Kennedy was thinking of the attitudes of the ordinary peoples of these countries towards the United States. Mr. Nixon denied this charge that United States prestige was lower than it should and could be. He, I got the impression, was thinking more of power arrangements and nations rather than in terms of the ordinary people. On this particular point I think that if Mr. Nixon is the next President the United States will carry on much as it has been doing over the past 8 years. And please do remember the United States has given a considerable amount of aid to underdeveloped countries over the past eight years. But in spite of all this there has been no really responsive warmth to the United States from the underdeveloped countries. With Mr. Nixon in the White House I would expect this attitude to continue more or less in the same way. Mr. Kennedy, on the other hand, seems to have the Roosevelt touch for arousing enthusiasm. Something about him makes for responsive warmth and I am inclined to think that he probably would project a much more attractive American image to the under-developed world if he were in the White House.

choice

So there it is: and before this night is out the great ~~decision~~ will have been made ~~between~~ between Nixon and Kennedy. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am very glad to see that the Government is going to buy up certain areas of land in the Corporate Area on which people have been squatting. A new Bill giving this information was published in the Jamaica Gazette over the weekend. The Bill says that the Government wants to amend the Land Bonds Law in such a way as to make it possible for the Government to pay for this squatter land by Land Bonds. And the Bill explains that certain ~~xx~~ pieces of land in the Corporate Area which have been occupied by squatters have created a range of problems which demand action. The government feels that before it can deal with these problems it has to own the land concerned.

This action, as I am sure most of you know, is a direct result of one of the recommendations of the three-man University team which reported on The Ras Tafari Movement in Kingston. Recommendation No. 6 of the team's report read: "Government should acquire the principal areas where squatting is now taking place, and arrange for water, light, sewerage disposal and collection of rubbish." I am certain this new Bill was framed with this particular recommendation in mind; and I think it is a very good thing.

But where do we go from there? What happens next? Will the government buy this land, clear it, put in light and water and hand it over to the squatters?

I hope not. I hope the Government will do much more than that. If it only buys, cleans up and hands the land over, we will not solve a single aspect of the squatter problem. Indeed I think we will

only complicate the problem more if the land were just to be handed over to the squatters.

I think that after the Government has bought this land it should set about the problem in a businesslike manner. First, I should like to see it setting up rehabilitation centres into which squatters can be moved for the time being. Then it should move a section of the squatters into these centres, pull down the shacks in which they have lived, and put up quick low-cost government houses. When this operation is completed it can move the squatters out of the rehabilitation centres and into the new houses. It can then repeat the same process with another batch of squatters: and it can keep on doing this until the problem is licked.

Equally important, I think, is the question of rental and the upkeep of the houses. I think a certain minimum rent must be fixed, as well as certain minimum standards of cleanliness and upkeep and occupation. The government or the Corporation Council should be the landlord and there should be inspectors. And anybody who does not pay his or her rent or who does not observe the minimum standards, would lay themselves open to prosecution and the loss of their tenancy. I think in this way we will make a start in solving both our housing and social problems. I think the time is ripe for us to take drastic measures and I think these must include the power to make the squatters do what is good for them and for the country. To let this matter drift would only be to invite trouble in the future. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: So Mr. John Kennedy will be the next President of the United States. For myself, I am glad of this choice. If I were an American voter I would also have voted for Mr. Kennedy. I would have voted for him in the first place because of the liberal record of the Democratic Party. But if his opponent had been Mr. Nelson Rockefeller instead of Mr. Richard Nixon, I think I would have been more inclined to vote for Mr. Rockefeller. Certainly, my personal preference would have been for Mr. Rockefeller. And yet, when you come to think of it, Kennedy has proved himself a tougher fighter than Rockefeller. You will remember that in the early days of jockeying for the Presidential nomination Mr. Rockefeller showed that he would like to be the Republican party's candidate. But the big bosses in his party had decided on Mr. Nixon. They did not want Mr. Rockefeller, so Mr. Rockefeller climbed down. The same thing happened with Mr. Kennedy. The big bosses in his party did not want him. Ex-President Truman expressed his opposition to Mr. Kennedy in his usual blunt way; and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt also doubted the wisdom of having Mr. Kennedy as the Democratic Party's candidate. But instead of climbing down, as Mr. Rockefeller had done in the face of opposition within his party, Mr. Kennedy went out and fought. And how he fought! I think this fighting quality of Kennedy's was something that impressed and attracted large numbers of American voters. We all of us admire a good and fearless fighter; and this Kennedy has proved himself to be.

Now, what else does this Kennedy victory mean?

You will remember I told you last week what an impression it made on me when Kennedy spoke about 17 million Americans going to bed hungry. It made the Americans suddenly more human than they had ever been. They became people like ourselves: people who face the same kind of problems that we face; problems of schooling, problems of housing, problems of work, problems of hunger and unemployment. And this is very important. We are all interested in people who have to face the same kind of problems we have to face. We develop sympathy for such people. They become part of us, part of the human race. We do not look on them as a kind of superior master group who have everything we do not have. And so we try to understand their problems and see with them. Already Kennedy has started to help us see the American people as ordinary human beings like ourselves, having the same faults and weaknesses, the same points of strength and the same desires that we have.

Then, by choosing Kennedy, the American people have largely accepted Kennedy's criticisms of the past eight years. He said American prestige had dropped and something needed to be done about it. They agreed with him and gave him the job of doing something about it. He said America should do more to help the under-developed parts of the world. They agreed with him and gave him the task of seeing that this was done. They proved that they ~~WERE~~ are not complacent and self-satisfied and that they wanted change. Electing Kennedy promises that the people of the United States and the peoples of the world will walk together a little more closely and in greater harmony: and this will be good for all of us. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: The first part of the talks on United States bases in the West Indies which have just been completed in London, ~~xxxx~~ has got off to a good start. You will remember that it was a week ago yesterday that the talks began. The United States, the United Kingdom and the West Indies Federation were represented at the talks. Sir Grantley Adams led the West Indies delegation, Mr. Ian Macleod, the Colonial Secretary led the British delegation, and Mr. John Hay Whitney, the United States Ambassador in London, led the American delegation.

In addition to the three main delegations, you also had a Jamaican delegation led by Mr. Manley, a Trinidad delegation led by Dr. Eric Williams, as well as delegations from Antigua, St. Lucia and Barbados. The reason for the presence of these Units at the conference is the fact that there are American bases on each of them. Mr. Ian Macleod acted as chairman at these talks which were held behind closed doors

I do not think that I have to remind you that this question of American bases on West Indian soil has been a sore and touchy subject especially in Trinidad, where Dr. Williams has been very forceful in his demands that Chaguaramas should be returned to Trinidad. Chaguaramas, as you know, was selected by an independent group of experts as the best possible site for the capital of the West Indies. And when I was down there a few weeks back I thought it was a lovely piece of land which would make an impressive setting for the Federal Capital, and I told you so in one of my commentaries.

Well, how did the talks go? And what was achieved at the end of this first stage?

From the statement issued on Tuesday night of this week it is clear that neither Chaguaramas nor any one of the other bases was discussed specifically. Instead, in this part of the talks, there was a discussion of first principles. The representatives of the Federal Government and the Unit Governments were out to establish an important principle. This principle was that the governments of the West Indies were the only fit and qualified governments to decide whether there should be bases in their territories and where these bases should be. If there are to be bases in the West Indies, they should decide it. If there are not to be bases, this too they should decide.

The communique issued by the conference said that this basic principle that the West Indies, when independent, would have the right to form its own alliances and conclude agreements on military bases as it saw fit, was accepted by all parties.

In addition to this the American spokesman, Mr. Whitney said that the United States is ready to release unconditionally/^{most of} the areas it now holds as bases in the West Indies. He said the United States would only seek to hold on to those areas which it needs to carry out its world-wide defence tasks. So the principle of West Indies rights has been established. The next stage which will start on November 28th, will be talks in the West Indies on the individual bases themselves. I think we can hope for a settlement at last. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am very happy to see that the Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation Council's Public Cleansing Committee is really trying to get something going on keeping our streets clean and getting garbage removed with a little more method and order. I, and I am sure you too, will be even happier when we see some real results flowing from all this talk and reorganisation. I am prepared to give them a little time to get into their stride with their new plans.

I particularly welcome the proposal to have household rubbish removed from inside people's yards instead of insisting that people should put their waste matter on the pavements or in the streets. You will remember that I mentioned this idea some months ago. It is the practice in most civilised countries for garbage collectors to remove the garbage from a special place inside the yard, empty the garbage bin and return it to the place from where they have taken it. I am sure this will help to keep our pavements and streets much cleaner than they now are. I also think that if this experiment is to succeed then householders must make it their duty to co-operate as fully as possible with the garbage collectors. So please do not put your garbage as far from the gate as possible and please keep it as tidy as possible.

The one decision which I fear will cause some hardship to the poorer sections of the community is the one that every household should have a proper garbage bin with a proper lid. On the other hand we must agree that if we are to keep our yards and streets clean then we must get such bins. To keep our rubbish in old boxes or

open tin cans is not going to help to keep our yards and our streets clean. So, in spite of the hardship that some will suffer, I think this is a necessary move. What I fear is that some smart operator will try to corner the market in proper rubbish bins and sell them to poor people at a fantastically high price. To avoid this I would suggest that the Public Cleansing Department should get a stock of rubbish bins and should itself sell them to householders at a reasonable and non-profit-making price. I am sure that with a little thought and effort this could be done.

Now let me touch on a less happy aspect of KSAC politics. If it is true as charged at Wednesday's Monthly Meeting of the Traffic Committee that Councillors have been preventing the police from taking action against sidewalk peddlars, then we are really faced with a disgraceful and unhealthy situation. The police should not be subject/~~from~~^{to} interference from anybody while they are doing their duty. As long as they carry out the laws of the land, made by the elected representatives of the people, no-one, not a councillor, not a member of the House of Representatives, not a Minister of Government, has any right or any business to interfere with them. No man is more important than the law of the land - no matter how high or how low his position in society.

When I read the report of how the Councillors wrangled over this matter, and how casually they talked about preventing the police doing their duty, I was bitterly disappointed in them. We have a right to expect more respect for the law from all our Councillors. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: The developments in our two main political parties are becoming very interesting. On Sunday morning we heard of Sir Alexander Bustamante's statement that he was not attending the Sunday session of the Jamaica Labour Conference which was to be held at the Ward Theatre. The meeting was then called off. Busta said he had adopted this course of action because he had noticed a growing hooliganism within his party and because there was a small clique in the top leadership of the party who were trying to take over the party and make a puppet of him. Busta he said he will be nobody's puppet and he will not share in anything which is not for the good of his country and his party. He said he would call an island-wide conference later on. And he said something else which I found very striking. He said the delegates from the country parts had had their voices stifled at Saturday's session of the J.L.P. conference and he blamed the clique from Kingston for trying to dominate the country delegates. In other words, what Busta's statement on this point amounted to was a suggestion that there is some sort of conflict between the **townsmen** in his party - or a section of them - and the countrymen in his party.

Quite frankly, Busta's statement came as a bit of a surprise to me. I did not expect this situation to develop at this conference. In common with most of you who take an interest in what goes on in the parties, I knew that there was some ferment inside the J.L.P. I knew that there was jockeying for position and leadership. I knew there was a faction who felt that Busta should more and more become

a figurehead in the party but that the active running of the party should be taken away from him. Some of the people in this faction were plainly ambitious for power. You know, most people go into politics because they are ambitious for power. We sometimes make it sound as though it is wrong to be ambitious for power. This seems to me silly. It seems to me that men who are not ambitious for power make very poor politicians. So I think we must try to stop making it sound as though men who are ambitious for power are a brand of criminals. After all, both Sir Alexander Bustamante and Mr. Manley have achieved their high positions because they were ambitious enough to fight for them. The big thing is not the ambition for power but what the people concerned will do with the power, once they get it. Both Busta and Manley have used their power for the general good of the country. Both you and I know that there have been men who have used such power as they got not for the good of the country but simply and solely to enrich and glorify themselves. So I would say there is nothing wrong with anybody wanting power either in a party or in a country. The important thing for us to find out is why these people want power; what they intend to do with it if they got it. In any case, there is then this faction wanting power in the J.L.P. and I knew of it. What I did not know, what I did not expect, was that they would make their attempt at power as early as this. And so Busta's statement came as a bit of a shock. Tomorrow I will discuss the struggle for power inside the People's National Party about which Mr. Manley talked in his Broadcast on Sunday afternoon. So till then, Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Last night I told you about Sir Alexander Bustamante's dramatic announcement on Sunday morning that there was a faction in the leadership of the Jamaica Labour Party which was trying to take over the party and make a kind of puppet of him.

On Sunday afternoon Mr. Manley, as leader of the Peoples National Party, gave a party political broadcast and in the course of it he mentioned the struggle for power inside the P.N.P. Mr. Manley said frankly that he was glad that the P.N.P.'s annual conference had been postponed to this coming weekend because he hoped the postponement had, to some extent, cooled down the passions of the conflicting factions.

Mr. Manley then went on to name ^{some of} the people who were involved in this struggle for power within the party. First, there is the faction led by Mr. Wills Isaacs which includes Mr. Glasspole, Mr. Seiveright and Mrs. Iris King. Next there is the faction led by Mr. Allan Isaacs which includes Dr. Lloyd, Mr. Roderic Francis, and Dr. Herbert Morrison. And finally there is Mr. Vernon Arnett, who, to the best of my knowledge leads no faction and wants to have nothing to do with power factions within the party. Now, Mr. Manley simply called names and did not divide them into factions as I have done here.

In the case of the P.N.P. the power struggle has taken the form of a struggle for the first, second, third and fourth vice presidencies ~~yes~~ of the party. There is no question of anybody trying to take the top leadership of the party from Mr. Manley. There

is not question of anybody trying to turn Mr. Manley into any kind of puppet or instrument. And Mr. Manley has not declared himself as opposed to anyone contesting any position in the party. In calling out their names he said that these people were all his comrades with whom he had worked for a long time and of whom he is proud. All he was concerned about was that the party should remain intact and alive.

I think it is on this point that we are faced with a basic difference between the two parties. As you know, the crisis in the J.L.P. was brought on because Mr. Clem Tavares, the party's secretary was elected to the position of Third Deputy leader in place of Mr. Robert Lightbourne who did not stand. Mr. Lightbourne, it was said, had hoped to replace Mr. Donald Sangster as First Deputy leader, but at the last minute he did not come forward to contest the position and Mr. Sangster was elected unopposed. The smart folk who have been stying the behind-the-scene struggles say the Lightbourne defeat was planned by Mr. Tavares and his friends and that it was this which upset Busta who wanted Lightbourne. And so, when Lightbourne did not make it and Tavares won the Third Deputy leadership, Busta delcared that he could not work with Tavares and one or the other of them had to go. Manley on the other hand will abide by and work with whoever the party conference elects as First Vice President of his party. Manley believes in collective leadership. Busta has no time for it. Tomorrow I will tell you what I think these party goings on mean for the country as a whole: so till then, Goodn

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: On Monday and Tuesday I told you of the power struggles going on in our two major political parties and the different reactions to these power struggles of Busta on the one hand, and Manley on the other. I told you that I thought the reactions of the two leaders illustrated the basic difference between the two parties: this difference is that collective leadership is more of a fact in the P.N.P. than it is in the J.L.P. But I do not think that is all there is to this matter.

Why is this power struggle so dramatic? Why does it arouse so much national interest? And why is it taking place at the same time in both political parties? Why does it seem to be all of a pattern?

I think deep down in our hearts we all of us know the answers to these questions. I am not saying that we can all give voice to them just like that: but deep down and almost instinctively we know that very radical changes are creeping up on us, and the most important of these radical changes has to do with the leadership of this country.

For twenty-two years Manley and Bustamante have dominated the political life of this country. They have fought its political battles and shaped its political life and thinking. To a remarkable degree these two men have shaped modern Jamaica in the image of their own ideas, of their own thinking, of their own ideals. They have fathered the two-party system in Jamaica in its modern form. They have each had a powerful hand in creating the vast spirit of racial tolerance which makes Jamaica such a rare example to the rest of the world. And of course, more than any other men in our

time they have led Jamaica on the road to freedom to the point where Jamaicans are now masters in their own land. For twenty-two years Manley and Busta have towered over the life of this country like a couple of great giants. In the first phase Busta had the reins of power; in the second phase Manley took over the reins of power.

And now, after this long period, there is an awareness creeping up on us that this great period cannot go on forever. Among men, as among animals and plants - as indeed with all living things - the great rule of life is change.

A few years ago nobody in the Jamaica Labour Party would have dreamed of questioning Busta's leadership of the J.L.P. But today there are many voices questioning and challenging because they sense the coming change, and the struggle is, I think, not against Busta, but rather it is a struggle to decide who will take up the reins of leadership after Busta.

It is basically the same struggle in the P.N.P. We are going to ^{on} vote/whether ~~the~~ Jamaica should stay in the Federation or not in a few months' time. If Jamaica stays in it is likely that Manley will go into federal politics. Who then will lead his party in Jamaica? And in any case, whether he goes or not, there is still the question of who will take up the reins of leadership after Manley. Basically, this unrest in both parties is an expression of a great national concern. When the great era of Manley and Busta comes to an end, as it must, who will take their places? And what will it mean for Jamaica. This, I think, is the heart of this matter. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Since I spoke to you last night there have been two interesting new developments in the power moves within the two parties. The Executive of the Jamaica Labour Party has met, without Sir Alexander Bustamante being present, and it has decided that it is going to wipe out everything that happened at its conference last Saturday. The elections and the appointments are all cancelled and all power is handed back to Sir Alexander Bustamante until such time as he calls an island-wide conference of the J.L.P. In other words, and thinking in terms of Jamaica's own past political history, The J.L.P. Executive has decided to surrender all its powers to Busta in much the same way that the Jamaican parliament decided to surrender all its powers to the Colonial Office after the Morant Bay rebellion. And if we take this parallel a step further then, just as Jamaica became a Crown Colony of Britain after surrendering its constitution, so the J.L.P. now becomes a sort of Crown Colony of Busta's.

I frankly think this is a sad step backward for the party. I think that if the J.L.P. is to be the vigorous and effective opposition it should be, if it is to be forceful enough to be considered as our alternative government, then it must become much more democratic than it now is. It must allow room for bright young men of ambition and talent to come forward and try out their ability to lead. Democracy needs this if it is to flourish and grow. And this is something that matters to all of us - whether we are in the J.L.P., the P.N.P. or in no political party. That is why I am sorry about this new J.L.P. move.

The other interesting development was Mr. Manley's statement to

explain to the farmers just how the government arrived at its policy decisions. Before any department of the government carried out any policy the matter is first discussed in the Cabinet. It is no secret that all the Ministers of government do not always see eye to eye on all matters. Some times they disagree quite vigorously. But when a matter is decided on by vote then the will of the majority becomes the policy of the government.

I think the reason for Mr. Manley giving this explanation is to be found in the recent potato fight. The farmers, or at least the political element among the farmers, had used the potato issue to launch attacks on Mr. Wills Isaacs. There was some wild talk about Mr. Wills Isaacs being either a tool or agent of the merchants, and there was even some suggestion that there was some sort of conflict between the country areas and the towns. This, incidentally, was a point Busta also brought up when he talked about the events of the first day of the J.L.P. conference. You will remember I talked about this matter on Thursday, November 3rd. I told you then that I felt the inter-party struggle had been allowed to creep into our daily /^{nation} affairs and that this was not good for the country. Well, Mr. Manley has now set the matter straight. Mr. Wills Isaacs acted on a collective Cabinet decision, not on the orders of any merchants. And what of the conflict between town and country? I personally hope that nobody will try to stir up trouble and conflict between town and country for purely personal political gain. Anybody who does this would not, in my opinion, be fit for leadership in Jamaica. A good leader does not split and divide; he brings together, he unites his people for their own good and for the good of the land. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on
Friday Nov 18 at 6:15 p.m.
Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: So, beginning on Sunday we are going to pay more for our daily bread. The Bakers' Association met on Monday of this week and decided on this move. The Secretary of the Bakers' Association, Mr. 'Bunny' Chen, blamed the increase on the fact that a new set of minimum wage rates for bakery workers has come into effect. He also blames the rise in the cost of flour, the cost of sugar and delivery costs. In other words, wages are going up and so the cost of our daily bread is going up too.

But the way in which the bakeries are going to raise the price of our daily bread is quite clever. They are going to make it seem painless to us. They say that not only the price but also the weight will go up. They say we have been paying 1/- for a loaf of bread which weighed less than one pound - which weigh about 13 to 14 ounces. And now they say they are going to bring it up to the full one pound and charge us 1/3d for it. Quite frankly, I feel that I have been had. I always thought I was paying 1/- for a 1 lb. loaf and now I learn differently. And I don't like it. And however clever this may look, the central fact is the same: the price of our daily bread is shooting up by 25% at one time.

Now I know that neither you nor I like this: none of us like this shooting up of the cost of living. And I think it is particular bad in the case of bread. It seems to me that Jamaica's bakery owners as a group are doing particularly well. But there are some questions I should like to ask Mr. Chen and our bakery owners.

First, I should like to know ~~why we have been misled into~~ *how it has come about that we have* believing we were paying 1/- for a one pound loaf? Second, will the

workers in the baking industry have their wages increased by a quarter? And what were the margins of profit over the past five years of the members of the Bakers' Association? I think it is only if we know these facts that we can make up our minds on whether this increase is fair and reasonable or not. So, information please, Mr. Chen.

And now let me welcome Mr. H.R. Wallace's move in the House of Representatives to try and get the Government to do something about our road situation. I think the government's ~~intervention~~ to stop this maiming and slaughter on our roads is long overdue; something should have been done about it a long time ago but I would in any case welcome any action which would reduce and put a stop to this situation which makes ours the most dangerous roads in the world. If there is to be a national campaign, let us have it as soon as possible.

In the meantime, there are a number of things our police can do to try and contain the high accident rate. First, let them go after the smart people who disconnect the stop-lights at the back of their cars. Driving behind one of these people is one of the most dangerous exercises I know. You never know when they are going to slow down or come to a sudden stop. These cars without stop-lights are responsible for a very large number of accidents. Our police seem singularly uninterested in making sure that all cars have their stop-lights connected. Another thing which is becoming too common is the driver who jumps the traffic lights. Here too, I think the force of the law ought to be used. But basically the problem can only be solved when the man behind the wheel behaves like a socially responsible adult, and for this we need education on a national scale.

Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: As you know, Christmas is not very far away any more and Jamaica's merchants are getting themselves ready to supply us with the goods we are going to want. Already some of you have decided on the presents you are going to give this year. Maybe the mother in the family has already chosen the present she is going to give her husband; and perhaps husband and wife have already made up their minds on what they are going to give the kids. But a large number of us will leave our Christmas shopping to the last minute. But not so the merchants: they know that there is generally a great demand for imported stuff at Christmas time and they must get their goods in now and start making up their window displays, pricing their goods and be ready when the Christmas shopping rush starts. But the merchants are not happy this year because they are having great difficulty in getting their goods into Jamaica. They have recently seen the Minister of Trade and Industry about their difficulty, and the Jamaica Chamber of Commerce and the Jamaica Industrial Development Corporation are doing everything they can to get over this difficulty.

Now what is their difficulty?

Their difficulty is that at the moment there is only one airline - Pan-American Airways - which is permitted to carry goods from Miami to Jamaica. In terms of air ^{Travel} ~~distance~~, Miami is the nearest point to ^{in the U.S.} Jamaica and it obviously suits our merchants to get their American goods from Miami. It should be cheaper and quicker to get stuff from Miami than from New York or Chicago or other points further north. But the difficulty is the virtual monopoly now enjoyed by Pan-American Airways in the carrying of goods.

I understand that many of our importers have goods lying in Miami for the past two months and longer; and some of them have no hope of getting their goods in time for the Christmas trade. Also, ^{and I think it is} because of this virtual monopoly it enjoys, Pan-American has put up its prices for carrying cargo. In the past, because other airlines were ^{also} carrying cargo into Jamaica, ~~Pan-Am~~ the competition forced Pan-Am to reduce its price to 6cents for every pound weight of goods it carried into Jamaica. But then the other airlines were stopped and so from the 15th of this month Pan-Am has raised its minimum rate to 8 cents a pound. And while there was competition cargoes from Jamaica to Miami were carried at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound; but now that the competition has been done away with the rate has gone up to 4 cents a pound.

In other words, it now costs our merchants more than it did before to bring their goods into Jamaica. And since it costs them more, we the consumers are ~~going to~~ likely to be asked to pay higher prices. And so the whole thing comes right back to us and to the cost of living. But I know that in this case our merchants are trying to fight against this thing and are trying to keep prices down. And I understand from them that there are at least five other airlines willing to come in and carry goods ^{at} a cheaper rate; but for reasons of its own our Civil Aviation authority will not permit them to come in. I think this is a matter that is so important that I would like the government to look into it very carefully. It affects our cost of living as well as our young and growing export industry; and these are two matters that are important to all of us. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Many people expected fireworks at the 22nd annual conference of the People's National Party which ended yesterday. Some people thought we might see something similar to the happenings at the Jamaica Labour Party's annual conference a week earlier, when Sir Alexander Bustamante stopped the J.L.P. conference after the first day's session. Instead, the P.N.P. conference went along smoothly with no fireworks.

So what are we to think or say about this conference? What came out of it? The first thing that struck me about this conference was the demonstration of unity within the party. Of course there were and are differences between groups and individuals within the party, and some of these were made manifest. Mr. Manley had to comment on the attempt which was made last year and again this year to split delegates on the basis of town and country. Mr. Manley said that the P.N.P. is one party, not two made up of a town party and a country party. But within these factions there was a sense of loyalty to the party which was bigger than the sectional rivalries. There is, in fact, a kind of diversity under a broad umbrella of unity. And this I think is a sure sign of strength. That was my first impression.

The second has to do with the struggle for power. And here I think Mr. Wills Isaacs maintained his position and fought off the challenge of Mr. Allan Isaacs. Dr. Ivan Lloyd who was Mr. Allan Isaacs' candidate for the First Vice Presidency did not make it. But Dr. Lloyd did maintain his position as Second Vice President, so the defeat for the Allan Isaacs faction was not total and complete. On

the other hand Allan Isaacs himself suffered a major personal defeat when Mrs. Iris King beat him to win the Fourth Vice Presidency of the party. I think this is a very real setback for Mr. Allan Isaacs in his struggle for the position that would make him the next leader of the P.N.P. after Mr. Manley.

I think there are a number of reasons for Allan Isaacs' defeat. First, I think many people felt that he was in too great a hurry to get to the top. Second, the attacks on Mr. Wills Isaacs by farmer friends of Mr. Allan Isaacs angered many of the delegates. The general public ^{were} ~~are~~ so clearly on the side of Mr. Wills Isaacs over the potato issue that it was politically foolish for the Allan Isaacs faction to attack him as they did. And when Mr. Manley declared publicly a few days ago that the policy on importing Canadian potatoes as on all other important matters, was decided by the Cabinet, it completely cut the ground from under the feet of the Allan Isaacs faction. Third, people both inside and outside the party do not know what Mr. Allan Isaacs believes: he has made no clear declaration of faith or principles. I think these three factors have worked against him. But he is still a young man; he has great ability; and I think that if he learns from the mistakes he has made in the recent past he can still win the highest political leadership in his party. But I think he will have to work and work very hard for it.

To sum up then, the P.N.P. has decided that there is no need to change the top leadership after Mr. Manley. It has shown that it is strong enough to contain within it violently opposing factions without falling apart. And it has given a solid vote of confidence to Wills Isaacs and his supporters. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I am not at all happy about the way in which some of the Rastas have responded to Mr. Manley's efforts to get the Mission to Africa going. You will remember that it was on Friday, November 11th, on the very day of his return from the United States base talks in England, that Mr. Manley issued a statement on the matter. He said that while he was in England he had taken the opportunity to start the business of getting the mission going. He had discussed the matter with the Secretary of State for the Colonies; he had discussed the matter with the Federal Government; and he had arranged with the Federal Government to use the facilities of the West Indies Commissioner's ~~xxxxxxx~~ Office in London to make contact with the various African countries and governments. Mr. Manley made it clear that since a number of countries were to be visited arrangements would have to be made on quite a large scale. There are the problems of booking passages, arranging for visas to different countries, booking places for the Mission to stay, making sure that the right people would be available to see them at the right time. All this would involve an enormous amount of work. It would obviously be foolish for the mission to arrive in a place like Ghana at a time when President Nkrumah and perhaps two or three of his key Ministers are out of the country. So the setting up of contacts is important. And all this would take time. This matter, Mr. Manley said, cannot be rushed.

Then, on Wednesday November 16th Mr. Manley announced that he ^{had asked} ~~was ready to see~~ the invited groups and organisations to send

two representatives each so that he could take a final decision on who would be selected to go on the Mission to Africa. One group was to see Mr. Manley at 2.30 in the afternoon and the other group at 4 p.m. on Friday November 18th.

Now remember he came back from England on Friday the 11th and made his first statement. A week later, on the 18th, he was ready to meet the people in order to make his final selection. When you consider everything else the Premier has to do then I am sure you will agree with me that this was remarkably quick work. But on Saturday the 19th there appeared a letter in the Daily Gleaner signed by nine leading members of the Rasta movement. This letter was dated the 17th of November and said that those who had signed it would not attend at the Premier office because they did not want included in the discussions or on the Mission people whom they described as discredited and with no following. They also accused the Premier of lack of faith and said the Mission the Premier planned went against the U.C.W.I. recommendations. They seem to be under the impression that only a Rasta Mission should be sent; and for choice it should be their mission. Well, these are the actual words of the U.C. recommendation: "The Government of Jamaica should send a mission to African countries to arrange for immigration of Jamaicans. Representatives of Rastafari brethren should be included in the mission." It is not supposed to be a Rasta mission; it is supposed to be a Jamaican mission with Rasta on it. I think my Rasta friends want to get their facts right, and I don't think arrogance will serve them well, either here in Jamaica or in Africa. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: There is something which has been worrying me for quite a while now in a quiet sort of way and which was brought sharply to the front of my thoughts a few days ago. I had stopped at a little rumshop for a pack of cigarettes and so I decided to have a drink while I was about it. There were the usual half a dozen or so regular customers in the rumshop and they all seemed to know each other. They were probably residents of the district. I was the only outsider. They carried on with their conversation and drinking and paid me no attention. I got my pack of cigarettes, ordered my drink and leaned against the bar sipping it.

Suddenly, a man dashed into the bar from the street. He looked wildly about him; he saw the door/^{leading}to the backyard of the little bar and shot through it. It all happened so fast that neither the barman nor any of us could do or say anything before the man was gone as quickly as he had come. Then, just as suddenly, another man dashed into the little bar. He looked about him and said: "Where is he? Where did he go? Did he come in here? He's a thief." The newcomer looked at the man behind the bar, then at the group of men, then at me. The man behind the bar shrugged his shoulders slightly. The regulars stared blankly. I took my cue from them and said nothing. But I was suddenly very interested and very curious. A frown of disappointment and anger showed on the newcomer's face and then he walked out of the place.

One of the regulars made a rude remark about the police. The man behind the bar took up my empty glass and shrugged again when he saw me watching him. "Not my business," he said and turned away.

I picked up my cigarettes and went out and I felt very worried.

The thing that worried me, and which this little incident had brought to the front of my mind was the attitude of the citizen to the society in which he lives. Does the citizen owe his society anything at all, or is it only the society which owes the citizen something? Is it any of my business or any of your business to help the police to catch a thief? Now, I didn't know and I still do not know whether that first man who ran into that bar was a thief or whether the man who followed him was a detective. All I know is that all of us there shut our mouths and did not even try to find out what had happened. It was none of our business and we did not want any part of ~~xxxx~~ it. And this sort of thing happens almost every day somewhere in Jamaica. Someone steals; he is seen but those who see him keep their mouths shut. Sometimes they keep their mouths shut out of fear, sometimes because they think it is none of their business. And so lawlessness creeps into the society and spreads and one day it is going to hit the very people who say it is none of their business.

The business of keeping order, of seeing that the laws of the land are observed, is everybody's business. We all of us have a very big share in it because it can and does affect each one of us. It seems to me that this attitude of 'it is none of my business' is a very dangerous one. If we see an injustice and we do not do anything about it then we are helping injustice to invade the whole life of this country. If we see lawlessness and shut our eyes to it, then the day may come when we ourselves may suffer from it. For the sake of himself and his loved ones every citizen owes it to his soecity to make the rule of law, of order and of justice his own personal business. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission

On Thursday Nov 24 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: In my comments last Friday I told you about the rise in the price of bread and what I thought about it. I also asked Mr. 'Bunny' Chen of the Bakers' Association a number of public questions which have not been answered yet. However, it is not my purpose to flog dead dough tonight. I just want to add one more question to the questions I have already asked. For the first time since the new prices came into effect, I bought some bread last night. I bought one of the large wholewheat/^{brown}loaves for 2/6d and a white crispie for 1/3d. Now, the bakers had said that not only would prices go up but weights would go up too, so I did some weight checking. I weighed the 2/6d brown loaf and found that it weighed exactly 2lbs. Then I weighed the 1/3d white loaf and found that it weighed exactly 12 ounces or three-quarters of a pound. In other words, the price of the one shilling white loaf had gone up to 1/3d but the weight had not gone up to one pound. Now that Bakers did say that in the case of hard dough the weight of a 14 ounce one shilling loaf would be cut down by two ounces but the price would remain at a shilling. So that if my white loaf is considered hard dough - ~~I don't know the difference between hard and soft dough by the way~~ - then the weight is all right but the price is all wrong. If on the other hand my white loaf is considered soft dough then the price is all right but the weight is all wrong. I should very much like Mr. Chen to let us know ~~which is right and which is wrong.~~ *I understand my crispie is soft dough. So why I am paying 1/3 for 12 ounces of bread.*

Now let me touch on something a lot more cheerful. One of the most interesting functions I attended a couple of weeks ago was the formal inauguration of the Priory Schol Trust. The idea was that

instead of the school being the private profit-making property of Mr. Henry Fowler who founded the school nearly twenty years ago, it should instead become a kind of public institution building up an educational tradition and future that would go on far beyond the life of the founder. As I witnessed the ceremony I felt that I was sitting in on the beginnings of something very important and long lasting. And the Governor's speech, which went a hundred years and more into the future, showed that I was not the only one who had this feeling that we were ~~participating~~ witnessing the start of something which would outlast all of us living today. I think Mr. Folwer has made a very distinctive contribution to Jamaican education and has done it in a most selfless and public-spirited way.

At that ceremony Mr. Glasspole, the Minister of Education made a very important announcement. He said that the government had made another 90-odd scholarships available for people to take teacher-training courses at the University College. This meant that since this government took office it has given well over 300 scholarships to people to take up the teacher training Course at the University College.

I have told you often how important I feel education is to the growth and the development of a country. And I have told you that a country's greatest asset is its people and the skills of its people. And since I think like this, I feel that the education of tomorrow's citizens is the most important single duty of our generation. And for this we need good, competent and well trained teachers. So I ^m and happy at what the government is doing and I should like to see it double its fine effort. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: Over the past few weeks I have neglected the goings-on in the outside world almost completely: in the main this was because so much was happening here at home which was and is of great importance and of great interest. And in part it was because we all of us do tend to be insular. We are much more interested in the things happening immediately around us. We cannot see the sense in concerning ourselves with what happens to other people in faraway lands. The rise in the price of bread here in Jamaica is very much more important to us than the size of this year's citrus crop in Israel. The power struggles within the two political parties here at home are more important to us than the violence which broke out in the Central American Republics of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Guatemala last week. And of course, the making up of the Mission to Africa means more to us than Ghana's present meddling in Congo affairs. And yet each one of these events could affect us personally and directly. If the Israeli citrus crop is of a size and quality with which we cannot compete it may well push ours completely out of the picture in the world market. If the violence in Central America was instigated by Cuba, which is nearly 700 miles away from the nearest of the three Republics, then how very much more easily could it instigate violence against us who are less than 100 miles away. And if Ghana can, through its Mr. Nathaniel Welbeck, meddle in the internal affairs of the Congo in spite of the United Nations and get away with it, then ~~none~~ who is to prevent anybody, using the example of Ghana, to meddle in the affairs of any other country. Venezuela

will then have an excuse and a justification to meddle in the affairs of Trinidad; Cuba will have an excuse and justification for meddling in the affairs of Jamaica. And let us not fool ourselves, there is a small minority in this country who would like to see Jamaica driven along the path that Cuba has taken. There are people who are sufficiently desperate for power that they would not hesitate to try something illegal if they thought they could call on the active help of a country like Cuba. What then of the price of our bread? What then of our two-party system? What then of Mission to Africa or anywhere else? We cannot play ostrich. What happens in the world is our business. That is why it is important for us to keep abreast because only by knowing can we act intelligently.

So let us look at some trouble/spots of the. Last week there were revolts in Guatamala, Nicaragua and Costa Rico. Attempts were made to overthrow each of the three governments and there was fierce fighting. The government of Guatamala came nearest to being overthrown. All three republics accused Cuba of having instigated, armed and led the revolt. They appealed to the Organisation of American States, and Guatamala and Nicaragua appealed to the United States to prevent a Cuban invasion of their countries. Everybody knew that Cuba has received 28,000 tons of communist arms, including artillery and MIG jet fighter planes. The United States sent naval patrols into the Caribbean Sea. Evidence so far shows that no Cubans were directly involved in the fighting. But it is certain that Cuban influence was at work on the economic misery of the masses in the three republics. Was it wrong for the United States to send its patrols into the Caribbean Sea? I will tell this tomorrow and tell a little about the Congo. so till then, goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For transmission on

Saturday Nov 26 at 6.15p.m

Peter Abrahams speaking

Good evening: I ended my ~~xxxxxxxx~~ comments last night with the question: ~~Should~~ Was it wrong for the United States to send its naval patrols into the Caribbean Sea? Now the point of these patrols is to make sure that Cuba does not send assistance to the rebels in the three Central American Republics. The United States has not interfered with what is going on inside the three republics. All it is doing is to make sure that no outside country should come in and interfere. But Cuba and the Russians and the rest of the communist world are shouting Yankee Imperialist intervention. So they obviously see it as wrong for the U.S. Navy units to patrol the Caribbean. I think the question any impartial observer is entitled to ask is why are they so violent if they had no intention of going to the aid of the rebels. I think it is no secret that Cuba and the Russian are in favour of the overthrowing of the present governments in the three republics. Russia would like to see them replaced by governments looking like the government of Fidel Castro. And I think there are genuine economic reasons for discontent in these republics. But I also think the communists want to use the genuine discontent to further the aims of communism. So, for myself, I think that as long as the United States does not interfere in the internal affairs of these countries, I welcome its making sure than nobody else does. It also ensures that nobody can free^{ly} meddle in the internal affairs of Jamaica. This is the Monroe Doctrine in action.

Now let us look at Ghana and the Congo. There the United Nations was called in when the Congolese could not maintain law and order by

themselves. Whatever we may think of Patrice Lumumba - and I don't think much of him - he was the elected Prime Minister. Joseph Kasavubu was the legally constituted President. Those facts were beyond dispute when the crisis broke.

The crisis, you will remember, was no more and no less than a complete breakdown in law and order in the country. Lumumba's government proved incapable of running the country and so he called in the help of the United Nations. Then he quarrelled with the United Nations and tried to ~~play~~ the Russian and Chinese communists off against the United Nations which was doing its best to restore order.

It was at this point that Colonel Mobutu staged his military coup and took power. By now the United Nations was in an almost impossible position. Kasavubu had dismissed Lumumba and claimed that he was the head of government. Mobutu and his young students formed their own government. And Lumumba insisted that he was still Prime Minister. This was a truly sorry mess. The United Nations people in the Congo tried to keep the peace between the three rival factions without taking sides. But Ghana and Guinea were strongly in favour of Lumumba, as were the Russians. And Ghana's Nathaniel Welbeck worked openly and aggressively against both Kasavubu and Mobutu and for Lumumba. As a diplomat Welbeck had no business to do this. He messed up all the efforts of the U.N. and he was only expelled by force after some fighting in which a number of people were killed. I think Ghana has meddled in the affairs of the Congo in a very bad way which has not helped the mess in that unhappy country at all. I fear this mess will go on for a good deal longer still. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: It was exactly a week ago today - on Monday November 21st - that I commented on the 22nd Annual Conference of the Peoples National Party, which had ended the day before. You will remember that in the main my comments were concerned with the struggle for leadership inside the party. Leaders were fighting each other for positions immediately behind Mr. Manley. I told you then that I thought the result of that struggle had been a solid vote of confidence for Mr. Wills Isaacs and his supporters.

I had, of course, in common with most of you, heard and read summaries of Mr. Manley's Presidential Address. Our radios and our newspapers had carried the highlights. But it was not until yesterday that I heard Mr. Manley's speech in detail. I am sure most of you heard it too. It was broadcast over this station at 1.15p.m yesterday afternoon. I think those of you who missed hearing that broadcast, missed something very important. For myself, I think I was more impressed by this particular speech of Mr. Manley's than by almost any other I can think of.

I think there were two basic parts to the speech. First there was the party leader speaking to his followers. Here the politician was reviewing the progress of his party, discussing its problems, explaining its role. This was interesting and instructive; but more interesting to the party member than to the non-party person. And then there was the second part, the part in which Manley spoke to the nation and, in a sense to the whole world. In this part of his speech Manley ceased to be just the leader of the country's ruling

political party. He was that rare thing in the political world: a statesman. I would say that a statesman is a man who has graduated from being a party politician who can only see the interests of his own party to someone who has grown big enough to see beyond the interests of his party. He is someone who can see the interests of the whole nation. He is someone who can hold up a problem and make us see it in a way no politician can. He is someone who can cut through our stupidities, through our fears, through our ignorances and make us face and understand a reality without being afraid. This is no easy thing to achieve and very few men ever achieve it. I think Manley achieved it when he spoke about the four problems facing Jamaica.

You remember the four serious problems he said we face. ~~There~~ First, there is the social-economic problem; second, there is the explosive Back-to-Africa Movement; third, there is the sudden development of movements preaching race hatred; and fourth, there is the Federation of the West Indies. He dealt with these problems in detail: you heard him so I will not try to summarise what he said.

What I will say is that I am very happy about his promise that his government is going to take action to solve these problems. And I am glad that he put the social-economic problem first because I think that is the most important and the most immediate. The problem of the poverty of the mass of the people of Jamaica is problem number one in my opinion. I think that to a large extent problem number two and problem number three stem from problem number one. Poverty and misery can drive people to desperate measures. And I think the clarity with which Manley has seen this and held it up to us is a very great thing. You can only begin to cure a sickness when you know it exists and when you know what it is. Goodnight.

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I wonder how the men of Jamaica would feel if they were told that as men they would one day die out and that Jamaica would become a country populated only by women. I wonder how the women of Jamaica would feel about having to live without men. And I wonder what the whole world would be like if there were only women in it and no men.

Would women in a manless world go to all the trouble of making themselves look attractive for other women to see? Would they fuss about their figures as much as they do now? Would they go to the gairdresser to take the kinks out of their hair or put the kinks into their hair? And what would happen to the world's great cosmetic businesses? What would they do if there are no men to quarrel with for coming home late? Or for having had too much to drink with the boys ~~for~~ before coming home? In fact, would women still be women in a manless world? You, dear lady, can you see yourself in a world without men? And what would you look like in such a world? And what will you do? And why will you do it?

If you think these questions are foolish, then you are wrong. Until last week these questions never entered my mind. I had no reason to think of a world without men any more than I had reason to think of a world without men. But towards the end of last week I came across a news item which forced me to think along these lines. And the news item came from a very respectable and responsible source.

In England there is an organisation of doctors known as the British Medical Association. It is a very learned and highly respected

body which everyone takes very seriously. Well, it was the magazine of the British Medical Association which said last week that the time may come when a race of super-women will rule a manless world. It says that in terms of biology there is no real need for such a large number of men as we have in the world today. The biologist who writes this quotes another scientist, a Nobel Prizewinner, who says that the male sperm could be taken from only the geniuses among men and frozen for twenty years. This sperm can then be administered to carefully chosen women who will produce a race of super-men. Now for this purpose you would only need a few men ~~(of a sort of glorified sperm farm)~~ so you can cut down your male population drastically.

But the scientists do not stop there. They say the women who come out of this scientifically planned set-up will be super-women and only the fittest of these will be allowed to have children. And from there they go even further. A time may come, they say, when these super-women will not need men in order to bring forth their young. This has already happened with certain creatures in the animal world. Look at the green fly, they say. The time may come when a woman won't need to be fertilised. She will bring forth her young without the help of any man, and all the young will be female. ~~xxxxiii~~ The last remaining men ~~(on the sperm farms)~~ can then be done away with and woman will find themselves in a world without men.

I don't know how the women feel about it but a manless world sounds like a dreadfully dull future to me. One thing I know. I should hate to be the last man ~~on the last sperm farm about to be shut down.~~ Thank goodness I won't be around by that time. Goodnight.

- 1) Williams-Adams run-in
- 2) KSAC Finances
- 3) The voting age

NEWS COMMENTARY

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

Good evening: I hope the ladies have recovered from the dreadful possibilities I raised last night of a manless world. I should just like to let you know that the scientists who discussed this thing did it in all seriousness. The one piece of comfort for us is that it may take hundreds and even thousands of years before that dreadful possibility hits womankind. So let's try to forget it and go on to more immediate things.

Las week's flare-up between between Dr. Eric Williams and Sir Grantley Adams on what part the Federal Government will play in the Base talks now going on in the island of Tobago, was a very odd business. Sir Grantley Adams must have known that he did not really have a leg to stand on. As Mr. Manley cabled to Sir Grantley after the public clash between himself and Eric Williams, the whole procedure was agreed on in June of this year. It was agreed that at stage two of the bases talks each unit where there was an American base would be in charge of the negotiations concerning the base or bases on its territory. So why then did Sir Grantley suddenly go looking for trouble?

I think the ~~only~~ reason for this apprently silly row is to be found in the unhappy relations that have grown up between the Federal Government on the one hand and the Government of Trinidad on the other. A week ago on Monday, Mr. Robert Bradshaw, the Federal Minister of Finance, suddenly lashed at at Dr. Eric Williams in the Federal Parliament. The essence of Mr. Bradshaw's attack was that the Government of Trinidad did not have any respect for the Federal

Government. Dr. Williams has been frankly critical of much that the Federal Government has done and of more that it has not done, and the Federal Ministers know this. There have been personality clashes and clashes over questions of status and dignity. The Federal people sometimes lash out blindly because they feel they are not treated with the respect they deserve, and it is no secret that Mr. Bradshaw himself is most unhappy in Port-of-Spain and may quit the federal scene/~~after~~^{at} the next elections. I think this latest flare-up can only be explained in terms of these matters of face and dignity.

Nearer home, I would commend to you Saturday's Gleaner editorial under the heading: Save Kingston. This is a sane and sober plea for more money in order for Jamaica's capital city to give its citizens the kind of services they demand and are entitled to. The paper points out that in terms of the real worth of money the K.S.A.C was spending £6.10. a year for every citizen in the Corporate Area in 1939, and today it is spending only £3.15. for every citizen. The paper says the city needs at least ~~£2~~ two and three-quarter million pounds a year to put it back into the position it was in 1939.

Certainly, we are all of us clamouring for more and better services; but these services have to be paid for. Downtown Kingston needs public toilet conveniences very badly. But all this requires money. And the money must come from us, the taxpayers.

Finally, there is the question of whether 18-year-olds should be allowed to vote. I have very little patience with talk of the irresponsibility of youth. I know some very irresponsible oldsters. If 18-year-olds are fit to pay taxes then I think they are fit to vote.

Goodnight.