

NEW YEAR'S EVE, 1982:
A Season of Hope

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
December 31, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: In a little under six hours from now the year 1982 will come to an end and the year 1983 will begin; and everywhere, in most corners of the earth, and allowing for the differences of time, the peoples of the earth will come together in spirit, and toast in the New Year in a worldwide expression of hope for better times and better things. This is how it is and how it has been for year after year as far back into the human past as the oldest among us can remember. It is a kind of ritualistic seasonal looking back and looking forward with hope. No matter that the past year, now fast dying, has been a hard and difficult one for most ordinary people all over the world; no matter that unemployment is massive and still growing everywhere - for instance, the U.S. steel giant, Bethlehem Steel will start the New Year by cutting back and laying off up to 10,000 of its workers -; no matter that there is hunger and downright starvation and lack of water in vast sections of Asia and Africa and Latin America; and no matter that the forecasts of the experts are anything but rosy; people go into the New Year with hope, for this is the season of hope. And hope is not a bad thing to have at this time, for you cannot go forward if you have no hope; you cannot build anything if you think it is pointless to make a start. And we in Jamaica, and we in the human race, are

going to need all the courage and all the love of country and of fellow-citizen and all the will to adapting and improvising, if we are to hold on to our hopes in 1983 and bring them anywhere near realisation. There are going to be no easy or quick or slick solutions to social and economic problems. C.B.I. is going to be delayed, if it comes through, and even then we are going to have to produce and compete for the few markets it will open up. And poor and unemployed Americans are as unlikely to spend the little they have on imports from the Caribbean as our own poor are likely to spend on American and European imports. There is hope in the fact that our leaders are facing key issues less ideologically. Bartering is no longer a dirty communist device; state trading is no longer a dangerous economic heresy. Changing names is saving face. The witch-hunting too, seems to be muted which is the beginning of recognition that it needs the skills and the commitment and the hardwork of all Jamaicans to deliver Jamaica. There are obstacles of course: the non-essential imports that cripple or kill local enterprise: food, sweets chocolates, even soft drinks and beer. We hope attention will be given to these, in 1983, and especially to a greater effort to feed ourselves land, from our own ~~resources~~ which is the true beginning of any effort at relative economic self-sustaining growth; but growth is going to be difficult, just holding our own is going to be an achievement. And we must hope for greater recognition of the exemplary services of our nurses and our young doctors and our teachers, and for an end to the shameful victimisation of some teachers because of their politics. If you become like your enemy, if you use his methods to fight him, then what is it that you fight against? We must hope that principle will be our guiding light, not a tool of convenience. And we wish for peace and love among us because it is the season of hope. Happy NY. Goodnight

Christmas Eve, 1982

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
December 24, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Christmas Eve, 1982, is a peaceful and quiet time up in the hills of rural St. Andrew; but then it usually is. The Christmas 'breeze' blows through the hills almost everyday and the nights have been cold enough over the past few days for people to need thick sweaters and warm blankets on their beds. It is a time of preparation for family get-togethers; and the most bitter complaint this year is over the lack of water. It could be one of the most waterless Christmases ever. And one woman's most fervent wish for this Christmas is to have enough water to have^a/really decent warm bath on Christmas morning. The absence of rain means that even the drums of collected and stored rain-water has run out or is running out. The failures in our utilities are still plaguing us, despite the promises; and water is basic, all year round, but especially at Christmas. Still, the land is more peaceful this ^{Christmas} year than in a long time and for this I think a passing thought of appreciation should go to the political opposition which has left the government alone to get on with the business of governing. There have been no fires, no threats, no shaking up of the society. In other respects, too, we can be thankful. For instance, a stark note on American radio news this morning said that ^{nearly} ~~at least~~ half a million poor Americans will not have heating oil for their homes this Christmas because the

cannot pay for their heating oil and the companies have cut them off. Many of these people, and many who are homeless and undernourished, will die of the bitter cold this Christmas. The very poorest in Jamaica will at least have the blessing of a kind and warm climate. So for us, this is a Christmas of mixed blessings: we are not as badly off as many others in supposedly better places that we are called to model ourselves on. But things are not as rosy as our political spokesmen, for reasons of their own, try to make out. Those who have to spend hours searching for water, those who are worried lest the next power failure ^{some} mashes up/precious appliance or spoils the Christmas joint, those who have the daily hassle of just getting about, and, above all, those who have to struggle harder and harder just to survive and earn a bread - they know how rough things really are. And this is where one of our big problems lie. If your leaders tell you how good things are and you yourself know how bad they really are, a credibility gap opens up between the leaders and the led. We are getting into such a situation now and I hope government spokesmen will find the good sense to tell it like it is, unvarnished, ungilded, before it is too late. Perhaps they still believe that a faithful adherence to the Reagan-type deregulating free-market/~~xxxxxxxx~~ ^{conservative} economic prescription is the answer to our problems. The trouble is the thing is not working in America/^{itself} and it has played havoc with our own local manufacturer and producer: look at all the foreign toys for Christmas, the cards, the shoes the clothes on our streets today. Our own producer cannot compete so ~~the~~ local toy-making is virtually killed, as is so much else by the free inflow of foreign goods. Our fate now, as the CBI business shows, is not determined by what the Jamaican parliament decides but by what happens in the American Congress. And the outlook is not good. Perhaps it is time once more to ^{let} rediscover ourselves and our own interests. Have good Christmas of Peace and love. Goodnight.

- 1) Lame Duck Congress & C.B.I.
- 2) No jobs programme; no MX funding
- 3) Mexico Devalues Again
- 4) Burials & Explosions in South Africa

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
December 20, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The 'lame duck' session of the United States Congress, now drawing to its close, appears to have been kinder to the governments of the Caribbean and Central America than to its own unemployed American workers. We will get our C.B.I. before this Congress goes out of existence; the American unemployed workers will not get either the \$5.4-thousand-million jobs programme proposed by the U.S. House of Representatives or the smaller \$1.2-thousand-million ^{one} proposed by the U.S. Senate. President Reagan has made it plain to Congress that he would veto any ^{money} bill which contained either of the two jobs programme proposals. So the Congress gave in and dropped ^{its} their jobs programmes. But ~~they~~ ^{Congress} also took ^{the} their revenge. The House of Representatives, which had already ^{last week} rejected the \$26-thousand-million inter-continental ballistic missiles, MX, ^a Reagan request was yesterday ^{ed} join by the Senate. So the Government funding bill which will go to the President for his signature today will have no provision for either jobs or the building of the MX missiles. So Mr. Reagan, too, has suffered a significant setback which could have serious implications for his rather confrontationist foreign policy postures. And

the new Congress which takes over in Washington next January will be a very different one from the one now coming to the end of its life. For one thing the new Congress will not have the coalition of conservative House Democrats and Republicans to ensure that the President has his way on all crucial issues. I think the Great Persuader is going to have to do ^{a lot} ~~quite~~ more dealing and ^{horse} trading and compromising for whatever he wants: the price of his MX programme may well be a much bigger jobs programme the next time around. So we do look like being the only beneficiaries, in the short run, at least. But I think it would be a grave mistake for us to see the C.B.I. as any sort of ^a ~~v~~ miracle cure. Give credit where it is due, by all means; but always remember this is just an opportunity which ~~we~~ must exploit in a context of fierce competition: if ~~our~~ products can't compete C.B.I. won't mean much. And oil-rich Mexico, an economic giant of the region yesterday devalued its currency for the third time this year. The Mexican Peso is now worth just a little over a quarter of what it was at the beginning of this year. Much of the blame for this terrible state of affairs is, of course, Mexico's massive spending spree based on her ^{new-found} oil riches. But there are those who also wonder to what extent a deliberate squeeze play has contributed to these developments. If there was any such it is not likely to come out for many years. Remember how long it was before the true facts about 'fain~~g~~ing Mossedeck' and Iran came out? And finally and briefly, there were six massive explosions in South Africa on Saturday; two were near nuclear power stations; material damage was great but no people were hurt. The African National Congress was ~~str~~iking back for the killings in Lesotho; and Saturday was the day when the victims were buried. Perhaps this kind of ^{economic} destructive/response will inhibit the racist South African killers just a little. Goodnight.

Christmas & Caring:
The Poor & the Unemployed

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
December 17, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: There are just ^{shopping} seven/days left to Christmas - if you include Sunday, and you have to since so many places are open for Christmas shopping; the pace is becoming hectic, the road traffic a little dangerously frenzied. We are told that there is over a ~~xx~~ hundred million more dollars in circulation than last year; and so for some of us it will be a bumper Christmas with colour television, video games, crissy cars, and all the parties we can attend. We can make it all look deceptively glittering, as some of us are already doing. So what is wrong with having fun and games and joy? Nothing,, if you can get it. But what of those Jamaicans who will not, this Christmas, be able to afford a decent Christmas dinner, let alone the fun and games associated with Christmas? What about the 300,000-odd unemployed Jamaicans? If these 300,000 unemployed were in Europe or even in the United States, they would get some sort of relief assistance from their governments. And, much more important in terms of our common humanity, there would be places where the really desperate and the really lonely would be able to go ~~to~~ on Christmas day and receive a decent meal without first having to go through some of the deep personal humiliations associated with charity in

our society; nobody would patronise or talk down to them or check out whether they belong to the right political party or trade union or religious denomination; nobody would want to know how and why they lost their job or when they last worked and for whom. They would be welcomed with respect and they would be allowed to eat a Christmas dinner with dignity. These places are run by people who do not talk about caring but who act out their caring. They are usually found in church halls; but education and labour associations are also involved in this kind of sharing with those who are in need. And it is usually a vastly different thing from the local 'treats' for the old or for children in which getting media attention seems such a prime consideration. You do not see newspaper or television pictures of some toothless old lady or gentleman in the act of pushing a spoonful of food into their mouths. Being poor and being in need is not turned into an embarrassment and a shameful state. I can, for instance, see one of the once highly-paid but now laid-off bauxite workers, if he were in Europe, taking his family, all dressed in their Christmas best, to one such place where they can sit together and have a decent Christmas meal without humiliation other than a proud family's personal sense of humiliation at not being able to afford it for themselves. Here in Jamaica such a worker would, if he had no family or very good friends, have nowhere to turn and Christmas, for his family, especially his children, would be bleak. And believe me, it will be bleak for very very many Jamaicans. Even those in jobs will find the going tough if you consider that only some ^{82%} ~~18%~~ of the entire ^{employed} Jamaican workforce earns an average of ^{less than} \$100 a week ^{over} ~~and over~~, according to 1981, Labour Force figures. We still have seven days for groups like the Jamaica Council of Churches to think about ^{helping to} feeding the needy with ^{charity} dignity this Christmas. Goodnight

- 1) European anti-nuclear demonstration & MX
- 2) Dangers of War in Central America
- 3) Angola, South Africa, Namibia & the Cubans

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
December 13, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The massive anti-~~nuclear~~ demonstrations which began in Britain/~~yesterday~~ ^{and West} Germany yesterday, and which today spread to France, Italy and other West European countries is continuing manifestation of the profound and deepseated worry of most West Europeans about the nuclear arms race and the likelihood of their countries becoming the first battlefields of a nuclear war. THE immediate cause of this latest protest is given as the fact that some 572 U.S. made/^{nuclear}cruise missiles are to be based in Western Europe from the end of next year, 1983. But this is a fact which has been known for some time now, and earlier this year the West Germans began what became a Europe-wide massive wave of demonstrations. So why the repeat now? Two new factors, I think. First there was President Reagan's latest request to the American Congress to vote some \$26-thousand-million to begin deployment of 100 massively powerful new intercontinental ballistic missiles. Each of these missiles is over 70feet tall and is designed to carry ten nuclear bombs; and each of those ten nuclear bombs is at least seventeen times as powerful as the atom bomb which was detonated over the Japanese city of Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945 killing an estimated

100,000 Japanese in one searing fireflash. So Mr. Reagan's MX missiles, if deployed, would be able to kill seventeen times as many people as that early atom bomb. Do you wonder that the Europeans are frightened of their countries being the battlefield for that kind of devastation. The second new factor was that the U.S. House of Representatives last week rejected the President's request for that vast amount of money to deploy the MX. To be sure they turned it down on a technicality, rather than because they are opposed to it in principle; and the U.S. Senate has still to vote on the matter. But if this conservative Congress is not willing to go with Reagan on his MX spending, next year's very much less conservative Congress will be even less willing. And if the waves of demonstrations, which are a message to political leaders everywhere, spill over to the U.S., the influence could be crucial. Another factor is that very few people, most military experts among them, accept the Reagan Administration claim that the Soviets have a nuclear superiority over the West. The experts think there is rough parity with the Americans enjoying an edge in sophistication of nuclear weaponry. In any case, the Russians have said that if the Americans go ahead with the MX, they will build their own. The Europeans, and most people, want less, not more, nuclear weapons in the world. Then there is Central America where it looks as though Nicaragua and Honduras are being pushed closer and closer to^a war in which Honduras will in fact be an American proxy. And finally, those^{publicised secret} talks between the Angolan and South African Foreign Ministers. The Angolans will demand ironclad guarantees of the territorial integrity before even thinking of asking the Cubans to leave. They have no illusions about racist South African intentions. Goodnight.

The Law of the Sea Convention:
A Political Postscript

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
December 10, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The historic Law of the Sea Convention was adopted with pomp and ceremony/^{here}~~today~~ in Jamaica today at one of the most successful conferences ever organised by the United Nation, and I think Jamaica can just be proud of its part in this affair. But, in a fundamental sense, the success of this conference was a success for the peoples of the Third World in particular, who have had least control over their own as well as the world's resources, and for all mankind in general, who will now enjoy a greater and more equitable control over such resources through their chosen representatives. And this, I think, is bound, in time, to deepen the participatory decision-making processes ~~between~~ nations and within nations, even where these are at their weakest now. When an event is as truly historic as this one, its after-influences and after-effects are usually very much more far-reaching than these involved can see at the time. The changes, following on the adoption of the Convention and the later signing and ratification of the Law of the Sea, are going to be profound and long-term, even though they may not seem so in the short-run. Consider the power political equation The United States, Great Britain, West Germany and a few others are the odd-men out in what is otherwise a worldwide consensus.

And so, the key leading countries of the Western capitalist parliamentary democracies are, or appear to be opposed to this carefully worked-out and agreed-on worldwide consensus. Indeed, one of the ironic twists of this/^{Anglo-American-West German}~~Western~~ position is that if Mr. Ronald Reagan had not become President of the United States the United States would have signed the Convention and the other two would have followed suit. The sad fact is that unlike all previous U.S. administrations which took part in the negotiations over the years, for this administration 'the interests of the international community' in whose name they raise their objections really means ^{And the} the interests of the powerful multinational mining companies./~~But~~ effect of what they ~~whatever the alternative~~ would be to give them the old power of veto over all Law of the Sea decisions. The world majority does not want this. And so the 'world leaders of freedom and democracy' are moving in one direction, and the rest of the world is moving in another. And as within nations, so on the world stage, leaders without followers, without majority support, soon cease to be leaders. In the long political perspective of history, this week's deliberations and the decisions taken this week at the Law of the Sea Convention, might well mark yet another, and rather major, turning point in the political, economic and moral influence exercised by the western democracies over the rest of the world. Many people, all over the world are questioning the leadership/^{role} of the Western democracies in the light of this highly publicised week at Montego Bay. We may not see the results of that questioning for years; but then the ultimate collapse of ancient Rome began with the apparently small matter of using lead to glaze eating vessels; in time that foolishness and vanity/^{led to the collapse of}~~destroyed~~ an empire. Will greed for seabed nodules lead to the ultimate collapse of the West? Goodnight.

- 1) The Law of the Sea: Who Signs?
- 2) Senior Citizens' Week

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
December 6, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The historic signing session of the United Nations Law of Sea Conference began here in Jamaica earlier today; and who signs, and who does not sign, may, and probably will, have a profound bearing on how successfully and creatively the nations of the world co-operate in the use of the resources of the sea and of the lands under the sea. All the indications are that by Friday's signing ceremony the required fifty signatures will be there and the Seabed Convention will be ^{brought into} ~~approved~~ formal being. There will also be a second document setting out all the details of the decisions worked out during the ^{roughly nine} ~~many~~ years of negotiations leading up to this final session. Those who sign ^{two} ~~these documents~~ only the second document, the so-called 'final act' ~~will not be bound by the terms of the Convention and~~ will not have voting rights in the work of the preparatory commission; ^{leading up to the Treaty} they will however be able to attend as observers. So who signs the Convention ^{can be assumed to be} ~~is~~ ^{ratifying} committed to the Law of the Sea Treaty later; who signs only the 'final act' may or may not ratify the Treaty ~~later~~. The United States and Great Britain are on record as being opposed to the Convention in its present form. And if you bear in mind that the U.S. is the single largest contributor of the money which runs the entire United Nations

operation, then the U.S. move in the U.N. General Assembly last Friday to limit funding for the work of the preparatory commission that assumes the appearance of a threat. The United States moved/the work of the preparatory commission should be financed by only those who sign the Law of the Sea Convention. The Assembly rejected this by an overwhelming vote. But what happens if the United States were to decide, vote or no vote, to use its contribution ^{try to} to frustrate the Law of the Sea? There is no way the General Assembly can force it to pay its dues. This is a disturbing point. Another is Britain's announced decision/ ^{not to sign.} West Germany and Italy appear to be wavering under U.S. pressure not to sign. France and most of the other EEC countries, on the other hand, have decided to sign. So, if push came to shove, will those who sign be willing to make up any shortfall in funding that may be caused by an American and British financial boycott? I hope so; for this may in fact settle once and for all, the notion / that any one power, however super, can frustrate U.N. decisions by manipulative use of its contributions. This is the challenge to all the signatories now at Montego Bay. For the West Europeans, the group with most influence over both the United States and Britain, the challenge is to persuade those two to think again. The resources of the sea and the seabed are indeed the common heritage of all mankind, not just of the biggest or the strongest or the greediest or of the multinationals. They can delay the agreement, they may even frustrate in the short-run, but in the long run the Law of the Sea is an idea whose time has come, and those who oppose it are doomed to fail. And finally, this is Senior Citizens Week. A fitting and real tribute which would would be a simple pass/ ~~to~~ allow them free public transport, a 10% discount on basic food items, and quick and easy access to medical help. That would really be daring to care at little cost. Goodnight.

Economic Recovery, Morality & Sovereignty

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday,
December 3, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: News reports of the free and easy availability of hard drugs, of sex and of thrills at the very highly successful Jamaica World Music Festival, seems to have touched a very raw and sensitive nerve in the Jamaican psyche. Very many thoughtful Jamaicans who are not particularly prudish or self-righteous, are deeply disturbed and frankly worried about where this relatively new blend of music, hard drugs and easy sex is likely to lead the society. At the surface level some are worried about cocaine addiction, a scourge in which people who are totally dependent on the drug will lie and steal and even kill to get the wherewithall to satisfy their craving. Others are worried about the diseases that inevitably accompany the free and easy sex. How many doses of syphilis or gonorrhea or genital herpes have been left behind in Jamaicans in those three days? And once having been brought here, how does the society prevent the spreading of these diseases? And once our young people have been caught up in the mind-blowing thrills of 'free-basting' and getting high on inhaling other people's foul drug-laden breaths, how do we get them to settle down to ordinary, everyday productive and honest living? At this level of very practical concern there are very many thoughtful Jamaicans who

~~are very worried~~

are very worried that we may be putting a bitter blight on the future of a huge segment of one generation of Jamaicans in exchange for a bucketful of dollars. And yet we need that bucketful of dollars desperately so we cannot just cut off what looks like being one of our biggest dollar earners in these hard times. So what are we to do? I do not think we can pretend, as some among us would do, that this thing will somehow leave our own young people untouched. Sooner or later they will be affected by it; indeed many are already being affected. Ganja is no stranger here so we need not adopt any holy-holy postures; but the uglier and nastier versions of drug use and drug addiction which we have been spared up to now will increasingly become more available to our young, and it is in the nature of youth, especially where there is no central point or purpose to life, to experiment and to play with fire. There are others who would want us to keep our own people away from such festivals, just as there were those who felt that casino gambling would be alright if Jamaicans were excluded. That is the way of apartheid, and I think most of us are against it. So what then? I do not think there are any easy answers, but I am sure ways can be worked out to minimise the impact of the uglier and more negative effects of these festivals. But those ways will not be worked out unless we all recognise the need for them. As long as we pretend that all is well in the best of all possible worlds we will do nothing. Very many people are worried about this thing, and the government had better believe it. The Prime Minister once talked of a moral crusade; I would urge him to consult with our church leaders and our social workers and then mount such a crusade. And despite his junior Minister I would also urge him to meet with the Press Association, for that too, has to do with morality & Jamaican sovereignty. Goodnight

- Gas Cylinder Deposits End*
- 1) ~~CBE & the 'Lame Duck' Congress~~
 - 2) Mr. Reagan Runs into a 'firestorm'
 - 3) The GATT Statement
 - 4) The End of Solidarity

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
November 29, 1982, 6.10p.m

Weekend

Good evening: The best and most welcome ^{report} news for Jamaican households was undoubtedly ~~that~~ the ~~news~~ that Minister of Industry and Commerce, Douglas Vaz had ordered the cooking gas distributors to put an end to the business of demanding deposits on gas cylinders. As far as consumers are concerned the government seemed to have taken an awful long time to get around to ^{stopping what} ~~this business~~ most of us saw as a straight rip-off of consumers. For it is a rip-off to ask any group of consumers to contribute directly to capitalise any company over and above the normal profits such a company makes from its sales of goods and services. The customer is not there to directly finance or subsidise the maintenance or improvement or enlarging of the stock-in-trade of any business. That must come from the profits of the business or the pockets of its shareholders. That is how the market system is supposed to work. So the question now is: What of the large deposits that have already been forced out of people? Will these deposits be refunded, either in cash or as advance payments for gas? To just order this 'illegal' matter to stop without also ordering that the money already collected by it be also refunded, is to part-condone this rip-off. So please Mr. Vaz, let those who were forced to pay get their money back.

On the North American scene, President Reagan's people put out what journalists would call a 'flyer' - a sort of checking to see how people would react to an idea. The idea was that unemployment and social security benefits should be taxed as one means of finding money to create more jobs. The reaction was instant and total - a kind of political 'firestorm' that found even staunch Republicans denouncing it in the bitterest terms. Within twenty-four hours of the idea first being put up Mr. Reagan himself denounced it as not the sort of thing he wanted. But many Americans saw this as yet another sign of the President's insensitivity to the plight of America's poor; only, they used stronger words than 'insensitivity' and ^{some} speculated on what he would have done if there had been no violent outcry. The mood there is almost as sombre as the mood here among the poor and the unemployed. And the outcome of that GATT meeting in Geneva will not improve things. The Europeans, and France in particular, dug in their heels, and refused to give an inch in making it easier for American agricultural products to be sold on the European market. The French know, and they let it be known, that American agriculture is protected and subsidised on a scale greater than that of the Europeans, despite all the fine calls for free trade; so there was no agreement and the Europeans are keeping their food markets to themselves, and keeping their agricultural workers at their present levels of employment. And in East Europe the weekend signalled the final defeat of the Polish Solidarity movement when its leaders called off further agitation. Perhaps Solidarity would have gained more for the Polish people if it had not been ^{by the Americans,} manipulated/into confrontationist challenges against a regime that does not believe in 'ideological pluralism'. Goodnight.

- 1) The Sugar Workers Lay-off
- 2) Agricultural Troubles at GATT
- 3) Namibia & The Cubans in Angola

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
November 26, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: That bitter rearguard action by the trade unions of which I told you on Monday, has now resulted in 677 instead of 900 sugar~~s~~ workers being made redundant. The unions have managed to save the jobs of 223 - for the time being. And other reports of lay-offs and staff cuts, and projected lay-offs and staff cuts in other areas of the economy continue to come in almost daily. It is just twenty-eight days to Christmas now and it would be a gift of sorts if all employers were to declare a moratorium on any further announcements of lay-offs or projected lay-offs until after Christmas. Let people at least have as pleasant a Christmas as possible: do not let them go into Christmas shattered. And since it seems that we are now beginning to realise in earnest that there are no shortcuts to 'deliverance', no quick fixes through hand-outs from those who approve of our new political posture, it might make sense for us ^{to} cut the fraudulent upbeat chat and take sober stock of where we really are, and what we ourselves need to do to work our troubles away. And the first thing, it seems to me, that we need to do is to honestly face the hard fact of our growing unemployment and try seriously to do something about that. Even Mr. Reagan, whose unemployed have the cushion of social security, is having second

and third thoughts about his conservative supply-side, trickle-down economic theories and working out ways for his government to take a hand in the creating of jobs for America's vast new army of unemployed. I hope our government will read the lesson before it is too late. Whatever else the private sector may be able to do, it cannot, all by itself, solve Jamaica's unemployment problem. Market forces means the survival of the fittest, the toughest and, often, the most unscrupulous. Governments, elected by the people, have social responsibilities which are not transferable; if they do not discharge these responsibilities they betray the people's trust. We, and indeed most of the Western world, are at that testing point now. Which is one reason why that Ministerial meeting of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade going on in Geneva now, has turned into something of a bitter stand-off between the United States and her European allies over agricultural markets in particular. American agriculture needs Europe's markets desperately if it is to flourish and reduce unemployment. American farmers are so productive they can ^{easily feed themselves &} ~~feed~~ all of Europe, at a profit of course. The Europeans, on the other hand, need their Common Market for themselves. If they open it to the Americans ^{would not be able to} their own farmers/withstand the competition, their own ^{and balance of payments} difficult employment situation/would worsen. So the Americans want ^{in agricultural exports} 'free trade' and the Europeans do not. Each side is concerned with its own self-interest, whatever the fancy language. We are singular, and singularly self-destructive by inclination in our rush to free trade and deregulation. Let us hope we learn in time. And finally and briefly, South Africa's Foreign Minister is in Washington today to again press the case for Cuban withdrawal from Angola as a condition for Namibian independence. If the Cubans withdraw the Angolan government will almost certainly be overthrown or underthrown. Goodnight. *which is the real intent.*

Unemployment: Action Wanted

NEWS COMMENTAR

For broadcast on Monday
November 22, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: My information is that Jamaica's trade unions are, right now, fighting a bitter rearguard action to try and save the jobs of ^{some} 900 sugar workers who are slated to be laid off. These lay-offs may take place any time from now to next January. And of course, if the lay-offs ^{do} take place, it will not simply be a case of a group of men being parted from their jobs. These people have had ^{compulsory} payroll deductions ^{made} for National Housing Trust and National Insurance and other such schemes. Some of them have acquired homes and made mortgage arrangements to pay for such homes; others have bought goods and services on long-term hire purchase arrangements. So for many, being left by the job could also mean being separated from a home or a piece of land or a piece of machinery, or being unable to put children through school. I have already discussed this wider spin-off effect ^{of unemployment} when we had the last sizeable lay-off of bauxite/alumina workers. The same sort of profound personal and social dislocation, the same sort of upending of family life, the same sort of mashing up of human plans and dreams takes place each time workers lose their jobs. And right now, Jamaica workers are losing their jobs at a very disturbing rate. The figures run high; and no amount of optimistic predictions and forecasts can compensate for the reality of what happens to a family when the breadwinner can

no longer bring home the bread, especially if it is so through no fault of his own. And to tell us that there is rising unemployment everywhere else in the world and that we must wait on the turn-around in the world economy, is to beg the real question. In the United States, in Canada, in Great Britain, in Western Europe, on whose systems our system is based, they all provide measures of assistance to the unemployed: you have unemployment pay for a specified time, then you have social security assistance to see you through a particular crisis. The unemployed are not discarded like useless rubbish. So what are we doing? To be sure there will be the traditional Christmas work with its political pork-barrel overtones, and that will ease conditions for those who have come to depend on it over the years. And a few thousand youngsters, mainly the better educated, will get some benefit from the HEART programme. And even though this is a scratching of only ~~the~~ surface of our unemployment ~~pr~~ problem, it is something and ~~it~~ must be applauded. But what of the large numbers of highly skilled bauxite workers, and ~~the~~ agricultural workers, and the middle and lower middle-class workers in the manufacturing and service sectors who have lost jobs since 1980. Does anybody dare to care about them? I still remember Mr. Shearer's eloquent pleas, in opposition, for some form of unemployment pay for a period for workers who had lost their jobs. Now, as Christmas approaches, is the time when the thousands of ^{office and factory and mine} workers who had paid union dues and NHT and NIF and the rest, and who are now out of work, would welcome a few weeks of unemployment pay. So where are you, Mr. Shearer? And what has happened to Mr. J.A.G. Smith's job-sharing plans. Please^s, show us by deeds, not words, who dares to care?

Goodnight.

The Caricom Summit:

- 1) Economic Survival
- 2) Ideological Pluralism

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
November 19, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Third Caricom Heads of Government conference which ended here in Jamaica last night, was, from all accounts, a satisfactory and successful affair. This does not of course mean that we are going to see results overnight. It does mean that the regions leaders have decided, very consciously, to tackle regional problems in a much more co-operative spirit than has been the case in the recent past. And to me at least, the single most important signal of their determination to make this co-operation a reality, was the fact that they could set a date for the next Heads of Government meeting, less than a year from now. It was seven years between this week's meeting and the last one in 1975. So for them to agree to meet next July is a great step forward in the business of closer co-operation and consultation. It seems that we are, at long last, beginning to look inwards for finding ~~the~~ answers for some of our most pressing problems. For a time it had seemed that we in Jamaica in particular had decided that our economic salvation lay in being the 'advance man', so to speak, of our giant neighbour ^{to} ~~from~~ the north from whom all blessing^s flowed. And many of our Caribbean neighbours had resented it, and the apparent special treatment we seemed to be enjoying. Now, after this week's conference, things look a little more balanced. To say this is not to advocate regional isolationism. It is simply to say that the Caribbean people and their leaders must,

in the first instance, initiate the plans and programmes that can best answer Caribbean needs. The region must do its own planning and decide its own priorities and those who say they are our friends and want to help can then come forward with their help. That is the kind of aid and co-operation that shows real respect for Caribbean sovereignty. And this conference has taken a great and challenging step to make that possible. There are, of course ~~problems~~ and difficulties; but given the good spirit now prevailing they can be solved.

Even the potentially explosive and divisive matter of human rights and free elections, which some tried to use as a vehicle for punishing and isolating Grenada and Guyana, notably the five major newspaper houses of the region, was muted and dealt with sensibly. I thought the contribution of Grenada's Prime Minister Bishop did much for this sane approach. Mr. Bishop said he was willing to have the preamble to the Caricom Treaty changed to include references to 'free fair and regular elections' provided it also included reference to such other human rights as jobs, food, clothing, health, housing and education. In short, let those who lay stress on human rights include all those rights enshrined in the ^{Universal} U.N./Declaration of Human Rights. And because no country in the entire Caribbean has afforded its people all those rights, the Caricom preamble was not changed. I think the truth is that in this particular instance the issue of human rights was being used as a political ideological stalking horse and so deserved to fail. But the issue of human rights is a very important one, cutting across system and ideologies, and we must always handle it as such. I think we harm the cause of true human rights when we use it as a weapon ^{to fight} against ideological pluralism.

Goodnight.

The Caricom Summit:
The Political Equation

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
November 15, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Caricom Heads of Government conference which opens here in Jamaica tomorrow morning has enough hard and difficult economic problems to face to take up all its time. The entire region is caught in the brutal economic squeeze of the world recession; unemployment is high and rising; markets for our primary products are shrinking - including even Trinidad's oil markets -; and our balance-of-payments difficulties grow worse almost by the day. To devise ways and means of coping with these problems so that we can hold on ~~an~~ hopes of some sort of turnabout in the world recession must be the primary preoccupation of the Caricom heads of government. And yet, the indications are that other, largely political issues, may be allowed to dominate the conference. Nothing wrong with that, if it does not obscure or frustrate or negate our primary concern with devising strategies for economic survival at a hard and difficult time for the poorest people of the Caribbean region.

Perhaps the single most pressing of these political problems is underscored by that Open Letter ^{from} ~~by~~ the five major regional newspaper publishing houses addressed to the Caricom Heads of Governments and headed 'Our Rights are Threatened'. The letter refers to "the human rights situation in Guyana, along with that in Grenada" and it urges the Caricom heads "to take appropriate action" to ease the heavy burden of the people of Guyana and Grenada. And the open

letter recalled that Prime Minister Tom Adams of Barbados had already announced his intention to move to amend the preamble of the Caricom Treaty/~~with regard to human~~ ^{rights and democratic freedoms,} and ~~that~~ ^{to} Jamaican Prime Minister Seaga's statement of ~~being~~ ^{being} free elections/~~the~~ underpinning factors of all other freedoms. The fact is there have been no elections in Grenada since the revolution; and the fact is that the Guyana government has ^{grossly} violated human rights and press freedom. So what 'appropriate action' can the Caricom heads take? First, they can so amend the Caricom preamble as to exclude Grenada from membership. Will everybody support such a move? Will Trinidad, for instance? And, like it or not, the present government of Guyana did come to power by elections, however rigged. And the question might be asked: were those elections any more rigged and managed than the more recent elections in El Salvador, which have been used to confer respectability on that rightwing regime? And if Grenada is forced out of Caricom membership where will it turn? And how will that benefit the people of Grenada? And the same question applies to Guyana. You know, just as you can have leftwing ideological witch-hunts so can you have rightwing ideological witch-hunts. And are we to look too ^{out} ~~the~~ Caricom heads, when they go to Commonwealth conferences, to call for expulsion from the Commonwealth of all those member governments with one-party states, or military dictatorships, as in Pakistan? To be sure, we must do all we can to influence the government of Grenada to seek a popular electoral mandate from its people. And we must express our horror and revulsion at some of the things in Guyana. But this ^{is best done inside, not outside, the} ~~does not give us the right to interfere~~ ~~in their internal affairs.~~ And witch-hunts, whether of the right or left, usually have a dangerous boomerange effect. Goodnight.

Soviet Communism after Brezhnev

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
November 12, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Reports of the death, early yesterday morning, of Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev, led to an immediate and predictable outburst of intense speculation among Western political observers. There was bound, some told us, to be a period of dangerous instability while the Kremlin leaders went through a bitter power struggle to settle the succession. Soviet policy now could be influenced, others said, if President Reagan cooled the anti-Soviet rhetoric and made some friendly gestures. Yet others speculated that the uncertainty among the new leaders could make them more dangerous and so the world had entered a delicate period of crisis in which war could erupt by mistake. Then there was the question of which faction was on top now that Brezhnev was out of the way. Was the army on top? Were the state bureaucrats on top? And whose man would get the top job? By this morning it was all over. Without muss or fuss or any sign of ^a massive power struggle or intrigue or unsettling the world, the Soviet communist leadership elected Yuri Andropov to the most important political post in the Soviet system, the general secretaryship of the Soviet communist party. This was the key political position which had been held by Joseph Stalin, by Nikita Khrushchev, and by Leonid Brezhnev. All the other positions these men had held had been subordinate to that of being the secretary of the Soviet Communist party. So the succession business is over, really, and the ease and speed with which it was carried out tells us something very important about the evolution of the Soviet system in recent

years. When Stalin, who had used his secretaryship of the party to
 feared in 1953,
 turn himself into a dictator, died/his death was followed by a long
 and the communist party central committee
 period of instability before Khrushchev, after a kind of palace coup
 from the top, stabilised the situation. The big thing Western
 observers seemed to miss then, and again missed this time around,
 as indeed they seemed to have done when Khrushchev himself was finally
 removed from power, was that it was not really a one-man coup. The
 palace coup, ~~like~~ after Stalin, always had to have majority central
 committee support. And when they removed Khrushchev they did not send
 him to Siberia, or put him on trial, or exile him to some obscure
 rural job. They simply retired him and he lived out ^{his} life in
 Moscow on a pension. This, I think, was the most significant soften-
 ing of the hard and harsh Soviet face at the top. Soviet communism
 is evolving into something more human and more humane than it ever
 was under Stalin. Loss of favour under Stalin meant death. And in
 this latest transition, the man whom Western observers saw as Andro-
 pov's greatest rival was in fact the one who nominated him for the
 top job. As with early Christianity when dissenters were burnt at
 the stake for many many years before the face of Christianity soften-
 ed and changed to a point where it could allow dissent and diversity,
 so we are, I think, seeing the beginning of the softening of the face
 of Soviet communism. The Chinese communists, as their latest trials
 and traumas after the death of Chairman Mao shows, have not yet
 reached that point. And events in Poland and Afghanistan shows how
 the Soviets ^{themselves} are resisting the softening process. But lest we forget,
 it is not so long ago that the American marines were sent to the
 Dominican Republic; and the fact that Cuba has not thus far been
 invaded has a great deal to do with the public pledge Khrushchev got
 out of Kennedy in 1962. So, everything must change with time, and
 neither communism nor capitalism can escape the process of change.

- 1) The JLP Rally
- 2) Turkey: the Art of Managed Elections
- 3) South African 'Power Sharing'.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday

November 8, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Saturday night's JLP second anniversary rally at Sam Sharpe Square in Montego Bay was a predictably upbeat affair. It is traditional that when the party faithful gather - be they JLP, PNP or WPJ - the affair is always upbeat; they always accentuate positive; they always ignore, gloss over or eliminate the negative; and there is usually little or no room for what is in-between. So there were the achievements, the projected achievements, the targets to be achieved. Nothing wrong with this; this is the way of our brand of party politics, part of our way of life. And yet, some of us had hoped that after that massive/^{and misleading} ~~sh~~ political show at Sam Sharpe Square just before the 1980 elections, with that memorable slogan of - how many thousands was it that can't be wrong?- that there would be a little more caution about predictions, projections and forecasts. After all, we have already seen the ~~initial~~ highly optimistic forecasts ^{the} for/bauxite/alumina industry's performance fall apart; we have seen projections for sugar scaled down drastically. To be sure, we have also seen great improvement on the strictly fiscal side of government management, despite the disastrous business at the Trade Administrator's Department. And as for employment, a PNP spokesperson over this weekend spoke of 15,000 workers losing their jobs, while the WPJ, citing figures put out by the Department of Statistics of the latest Survey of the Labour Force, says that between October 1981 and April 1982, 19,200 persons have been added to the ranks of the unemployed. Set this against the promise that 18,000 new jobs

will be created this year, and where are we? I think our political process faces a very real problem here. Our leaders have to sound upbeat and optimistic in order to inspire optimism and a sense of things moving. Without that optimism, without that confidence, and show of confidence, the followers may not make the effort. This is understandable. The problem is: What happens when the optimistic forecasts fail? What if the projections/^{are not or} cannot be translated into reality? This is the reverse side to optimism as a confidence-building mechanism. And if enough optimistic forecasts fall short, hope may turn to disappointment and frustration and, ultimately, into suspicion and distrust. Another ~~This is a~~ great and ever present danger to this brand of politics is the shaping and 'massaging' of the facts/^{and} ~~xxxx~~ figures to try and fit the forecasts or the projections or to give legitimacy to a particular end in view. We have seen two examples of this on/^a ~~the~~ world scale over the weekend. In Turkey there is a referendum on a new constitution right now. It proposes a seven-year Presidency for the man now in power who seized that power by force in a coup. The voting is compulsory, there is no opposition and no way opposition views can be expressed. So the man in power will win overwhelmingly and will be able to claim that he is ruling by the freely expressed will of the people and the Western World will accept him as a democratic leader. And in South Africa a series of by-elections for whites only have somehow been turned into what has been described as a referendum on the racist government's plans to share power.^{with non-whites} It is nothing of the sort. The so-called power-sharing plan is a device by which to further frustrate ~~split~~ and emasculate the very fragile unity now being built up between black and brown and Asians in the fight against racism. Compared with what is going on in Turkey and South Africa our ^{selective use of} manipulation of facts ~~is an angel's play~~ and figures is an angel's play. But we need to watch it, all the same. Goodnight

- 1) Anti-Conservative Swing Continues
- 2) Serving Jamaica's Interests
- 3) ~~Recovery & Unemployment~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
November 5, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The results of the mid-term elections in the United States this week is confirmation that the great conservative tide which swept the Western world in 1980 is at an end. Following the trend we saw in Western Europe in recent national elections, the American electorate dealt American conservatism a heavy blow. President Reagan himself has not been repudiated; he is not a 'lame duck' President; but his power has been severely limited, and from now on till the end of his term in office in 1984, he is going to have to compromise a great deal more with the Democrats than he did in his first two years. He is going to have to compromise on creating jobs for the vast and still growing army of America's unemployed. Figures for last month, released this morning, showed that over 630,000 more people joined the ranks of the unemployed in the one month of October; the official unemployment figure is edging up to the twelve million mark. Unofficially, some knowledgeable American observers put the U.S. unemployment figure at nearer twenty million. And it is still rising. It is this fact of unemployment, more than any other, which cost the Republicans the loss of those 26 seats in the House of Representatives, and those half a dozen key Governorships which switched from Republican to Democratic control. These Governorships are especially important as strategic bases from which the Democrats will work to recapture the White House in 1984. The one real victory for the Republicans was that they held their own in the Senate, but even here, the majorities by which they won were sharply reduced,

especially those of the known Conservative Senators; so even here, the swing was away from the conservatives. And the conservative special interest groups and lobbies which poured millions and millions of dollars into supporting conservative candidates and into 'targeting' liberal candidates for defeat, these groups, which did so well in 1980, were all repudiated this time around. All this means that while Mr. Reagan's mandate to lead is still clear, he does not now have the blank cheque he had for his first two years. And we will begin to see the result of this over the next few months. We may indeed see the first signs in a much more muted, much less blustering approach to America's Western European allies and to the problems of Central America, especially El Salvador. So what does this power shift mean for Jamaica? I think the first thing our political planners need to take into account is that Jamaica's best interests are served by our government having the best relations possible with the American Government. Presidents and Prime Ministers change but peoples and governments and their institutions go on. We will still need American help and ~~xxxxxx~~loans and friendship, if Mr. Reagan were to lose the Presidency in 1984, which is now not unlikely. At present our official relationship with the United States is too narrowly based on the special relationship between the President and the Prime Minister, and with the ultra rightwing conservative grouping which embarrassed even our Prime Minister by describing and seeing him as 'our man in the Caribbean'. This sort of relationship has obvious short-term advantages. But what happens to our long-term interests when the Democrats regain power? The Israelis can teach us a lesson here in how not to make a special relationship dependent on one ^{person or} party remain-
 in power. We had better learn that lesson quickly and adjust our policies accordingly. If we don't, this swing in political fortunes could hurt us. Goodnight.

The Mid-Term U.S. Elections

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday¹
November 1, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Tomorrow's Mid-Term U.S. elections are, without doubt, the major political news of this week, with the outcome like^M to affect public affairs in almost every country of the world. economic and political
The turn of our own/furtunes here in Jamaica will, whether we like to admit it or not, ride strongly on how well or how badly President Ronald Reagan's party fares in tomorrow's voting. If the Republicans do well the present Jamaican government, with its very special relationship with the Reagan Administration, will benefit. If, on the other hands, the Democrats make big gains at the expense of the Republicans, the Opposition PNP, with its growing good relations with the Democrats, will be the main beneficiary; PNP influence in the U.S. corridors of power will grow, JLP influence will decline. In economic terms, a Reagan triumph tomorrow will mean the President will have greater authority and greater freedom of action to push and to find money for his pet Caribbean and Central American projects. Conversely, a setback tomorrow is likely to severely limit his authority and his freedom of action and the options open to him. So the outcome, like it or not, is important to us and it makes sense understand
for us to try and/~~follow~~ what is involved. Now, there are three sets of elections involved in tomorrow's voting. First there are elections to the House of Representatives, in which all 435 seats are being contested. At the moment the Democrats control 241 of those seats, the Republicans 192, and 2 are vacant. So the Democrats go into the election for the House holding 49 more seats than the Republicans. In the past Mr. Reagan had to forge an alliance with

the conservatives among the/Democrats in order to push through some of his more controversial policies, like those massive tax cuts. If the Democrats gain another 15 to 20 ~~seats~~ House seats, which is what some of the experts predict, their bigger majority in the House would make it that much more difficult for the President to make 'deals' with conservative Democrats. If, on the other hand, the Democrats were to surprise the experts and gain more than 20 additional seats, if they were to gain, say, 30 or more seats, the Administration would be seen as in serious political trouble and would take on the appearance of 'a lame duck' Presidency, one which must serve out its time no longer certain of the confidence of the people. But if the Republicans hold their own, or even lose only a few House seats the President would remain strongly in command and might even be able to claim some sort of victory of an off-season election. The second election is to the Senate where only 33 of the 100 seats are at stake. The Republicans are in control here with 54 to the Democrats 45 seats. The Democrats need to hold all their own seats and win 6 more to take control of the Senate. If they can do that then the whole U.S. political equation would be changed completely; but it is very doubtful that they could do this. Only 13 of the 33/^{Senate}seats up for grabs are held by Republicans, 20 are held by Democrats. So if the Republicans end up nearer 50-50 in the Senate and no more than 20 losses in the House, Mr. Reagan would be able to carry on, under much more pressure to be sure and having to make more concessions. But, if the Democrats gain more than 20 House seats, and gain/^{six}~~more than~~ Senate seats to regain control there, then Mr. Reagan would indeed become that most pitiful of American political species, 'A lame duck' President. The ^{third}~~other~~ part is for 36 of the nation's 50 Governors. So, will Reagan ride again? It depends on the American people and in what numbers they turn out tomorrow. Goodnight.

- 1) The Spanish Elections
- 2) Social Democratic Revival
- 3) U.S. Mid-term elections

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
October 29, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Our very understandable preoccupation with our own affairs and problems sometimes causes us to gloss over very important external developments which could affect our own future intimately. And during the course of this week we have had the dramatic new developments over the Terra Nova deal; we've had, and still have, the waterfront strike, mini-storms over car imports, the availability or otherwise of bank credit, promises of new plans and new loans and the very important announcement of a new law to be passed next year to control and regulate the activities of land developers and real estate agents. So there has been a great deal to be preoccupied about domestically. But it is important for us to look outward too if we are not to miss some of the very profound changes in the making which are now being signalled. First there are the results of yesterday's elections in Spain. The Socialist Party of Spain gained 201 of the 350 parliamentary seats contested, And so the government of Spain which will be sworn in in December will be a socialist government. The special significance of this one is that 46 years ago the workers and peasants of Spain similarly voted a socialist party into power. The Spanish rightwing groups of the time were not prepared to accept the political implications of that mandate, and challenged it with military might, using the soldiers who then controlled Spain's remaining African colonial power. That civil war lasted from 1936 to 1939 when the government forces were finally crushed with help from Hitler and Mussolini. A dictatorship was established which lasted until the death of the dictator Francisco

Franco. So, after nearly a lifetime of rightwing dictatorship, the Spanish people have again voted overwhelmingly to have a socialist government. The rightwing forces are not dead, they make up the official parliamentary opposition with more than one hundred seats. The centrist former government which had ruled since 1979, fared very badly in the elections, and so did the Spanish communist party which went into the elections with more than twenty seats and came out with something like six or seven. ~~out with/xxxxxxxxxxxx~~. So the socialists with their overwhelming majority need no allies from the far left. It is as though the blood terrible and/suffering of the civil war only delayed what the people wanted. Will there be another civil war? A coup attempt perhaps, but not a civil war because there is now no colonial army. But the geopolitical importance of the Spanish elections/~~xxxx~~ is much wider. In early 1980 and a little before there was talk of a great conservative tide sweeping the world and Ronald Reagan was seen as the standard-bearer of that rightwing tide. Now, less than three years later, we have seen the socialists gaining electoral power in France, then in Greece, then in Sweden, and now in Spain. What is it? A Social Democratic revival? It looks like it on the face of it. And yet it was the Social Democrats of Western Europe who seemed unable to cope with the terrible economic crisis of the 1970s after the Arab oil embargo. So how can people turn to them now? How can they be asked or/expected to solve problems which they could not solve a few short years ago, and for which they were turned out of office? The only answer that makes sense is that a majority of the voters appear to have come to the conclusion that the politicians of the rightwing are no more able to cope with these crises than were the socialists; and, most critical of all, that the rightwing is less able/~~and~~ less willing than the socialists to protect jobs and social security. If Mr. Reagan's party suffers serious setback next Tuesday, it will be final confirmation of a spreading Social Democratic revival.

Goodnight.

- 1) The Economy: Finding the right mix
- ~~2) The Spy Business: Squabbling Friends~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
October 25, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two speeches over this past weekend, underscore once again the critical importance of finding the right mix for coping with Jamaica's grave economic problems. One of these speeches was by the Prime Minister of Jamaica, the other was by the head of Jamaica's organisation of bankers. Mr. Seaga spoke of a 'far-reaching new export incentive programme' ^{expected to be announced Nov. 2nd} to help the manufacturing and other productive sectors to earn more foreign exchange. The banking leader ^{said} Mr. Ron Sasso, that the country needed to be told that it was in serious danger of going bankrupt, and he went on to say, and I quote: "It bears repeating that Jamaica today is too heavily dependent upon foreign support - loans, gifts, grants and lines-of-credit, financed by the working people of other countries." Mr. Sasso said that all this ready assistance has resulted in a lack of appreciation by Jamaicans that it is necessary as an independent nation to do more for ourselves. I personally think he could also have said that our political system based on promising the moon in exchange for votes, and the ~~Messianic~~ ^{also} postures of our political leaders, ~~xxx~~ contributed greatly to the 'freeness' mentality which expects others to give and to solve our problems for us. Anyway, Mr. Sasso said our level of production was not high enough to earn all the foreign exchange we need to buy the goods and services we want from abroad. He said we are therefore in need of maximum production. I think we would all agree. The hard catch is: What of the markets? Remember how much we depended on bauxite/alumina to be the mainstay of the recovery

effort. Production and productivity in the bauxite/alumina industry was good, very efficient, and competitive. We could and did compete very successfully with the rest of the world. But when the market went soft there was little we could do. Production and high productivity are most important and we must stress them by all means; but let there be a cautionary note about the markets as well. If there are no markets or if the markets are soft, high productivity by itself will be of small help. American farmers are more productive today and more efficiently so than at almost any other time since the Second World War. And yet, in this context of high agricultural productivity, buttressed by just about the most lavish protections and incentives you could think of, American farmers are going bankrupt on an unprecedented scale. This is one key reason why Cold Warrior Ronald Reagan has just offered to sell the Soviets millions of tons of American grain after trying to prevent the Europeans doing pipeline business with the Soviets. Mr. Reagan is very worried about how American farmers would vote on November 2nd: he hopes the grain offer will help the Republicans. The point is that productivity must go hand-in-hand with good markets. *And markets are soft almost everywhere.* And one lesson we can learn from the Americans is that whatever else their problems, they can always feed themselves: this is a point of strength they have over the Russians. Those who can feed themselves, especially in times of hardship and difficulty, can always survive better than those who cannot. *This is one of our points of weakness now.* In our economic mix we must borrow (and God help the generations who are going to have to pay for it), we must produce to export, *and find the markets* we must sell our tourist attractions, *all* and we must sell our skills and services; and we must do this at levels which will ultimately make us self-sustaining. I think our chances of succeeding will greatly improved if *the* priorities are balanced *and* with realism, *the* imports carefully managed, *and* sovereignty is not traded away *lowly*.

- 1) Seprod Re-opens. What Next?
- 2) New Secondary Schools Budget Cuts
- 3) Borrowing, Agriculture & the Price of Money

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
October 22, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The best news of the past few days was the setting up of the Seprod Board of Enquiry and the re-opening of the Seprod complex on which we all depend for our soaps, ~~xxx~~ much of our detergents, our edible oils and fats, and our cornmeal. And it is because of this on Seprod products near total dependence /that what happens at Seprod is of crucial importance to every Jamaican; its affairs bear intimately on our daily lives so that whether we are clean or smelly and how our food is prepared depends on what goes on there. And for quite some time now many Jamaicans, and Jamaican housewives in particular, have not been happy about the kind and quality of service this monopoly quasi-public enterprise has been providing. So we must all hope that out of this Board of Inquiry will come answers that go further than just telling us what led to the ~~stoppage~~ latest shutdown and how to avoid such shut-downs in future. This latest stoppage so obviously had a great deal to do with confrontationist attitudes, a flexing of muscles and invitations to trials of strength, that I am not sure any longterm and ,as far as consumers are concerned, that/~~anything other~~ acceptable answers/can be found without also addressing the critical question of the personalities involved and exploring their attitudes to labour relations. All we need to do to appreciate the importance of this point is to think back a few years to a time when Seprod was under another style of management and labour relations and when it enjoyed an enviable reputation for industrial peace. The most disturbing, and depressing, news of the past few days came when/~~a committee of~~ the Principals of New Secondary Schools sent

telegrams to the Minister of Education protesting against what they said were nearly 50% cuts in their operational budgets for the 1982/83 school year, and calling on the Minister to restore the operational budget of the schools. According to reports this far there has been no response from the Ministry of Education on the matter. The question is: How can we be as committed as we say we^{type of} are to education and then go on to make this/~~cut~~ cut? And, you know, when you look at the government's own spending figures as published in the Estimates for 1981/82 and 1982/83 these cuts become even more puzzling and disturbing. The revised Recurrent Estimates for 1981/82 show a figure of \$334.65-million spent on Education. The Recurrent figure for 1982/83 shows a spending of \$358.38-million. This means this this year's Recurrent spending on education is over \$23-million more than last year's. And the Capital side is up too. Leaving aside the multilateral/bilateral programme of the old Ministry of Education, Youth & Sport, Capital spending on Education went up from \$7.2-million in 1981/82 to an Estimated \$14.9-million for 1982/83, which is an increase of over \$6-million. So, with these increased allocations for this year's Education budget, why the 50% cuts in the operational budgets of the New Secondary Schools? Where is the money going? To the politically glamorous new education showpieces? I sincerely hope the Minister of Education will think again. You do not go forward by cutting back on school budgets. So please, think again. And finally and briefly, it is good to hear of big new credits for agriculture. But what farmer, big or small, can in today's Jamaica borrow at 12% or 13% and still make a living for himself and his country? If our new approach is serious it will express itself in easier credit terms. ^{for farmers.} Goodnight.

The Politics of Survival:
The need for alternative strategies

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
October 15, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: It is clear to all of us now that the Jamaican economy is not doing anywhere near as well as most of us had hoped it would by this time. Our bauxite/alumina industry is in deep depression and there are no signs that it would get out of that depression any time this year or next year. And so some of our most highly skilled and highly paid workers are joining the ranks of the unemployed with likely social consequences that we have not even started to think about yet. If the current level of our youth unemployment is seen as a time-bomb how are we to describe the likely consequences of highly skilled men and women in the prime of their lives, with mortgage commitments, household commitments, commitments to educate children, to pay off instalments on cars and furniture - how are we to describe their joining and swelling the ranks of the unemployed? Because of the massive unemployment in the United States and Canada these highly skilled Jamaicans are going to find it infinitely more difficult to get visas to go job hunting up North. In times of trouble everybody remembers that charity begins at home. So what is the society going to do about these people? At the moment we are all so busy with crisis-management, with running here and there ^{+ everywhere} to raise a little foreign loan or find a new buyer for our bauxite/alumina, or to find someone willing to come and invest here, that there is little time left for thinking things out and for serious forward planning. It is no accident that the Heart Programme was conceived and thought through when the party now in power was in opposition. You always have more

time to think a problem through and make plans when you are ^{daily} in opposition. Once in power, with problems rushing at you/ from every quarter, forward planning become^s very difficult and you end up with crisis-management, with trying to plug one hole after another^{and} with little time for anything else. ~~shipxofxstaxxxxxxxspringingxxxxxx~~ And this is made even worse when each Minister of Government also sees himself as his own chief executive officer. Such a Minister has little or no time to sit back and think things through and plan alternative strategies if one line of action should fail. And so, having built our recovery programme around the assumption of an expanding bauxite/alumina market, we are in a mess because that market has contracted rather than expanded. We had ^{no} no fallback position; we ~~had~~ ^{have} done little ~~hard~~ forward planning and practical hard work to/ ~~make~~ ^{turn} our export agriculture into a possible fallback position. ~~So~~ ⁼ while rich metropolitan countries subsidised ^{protected} their agriculture, we cut off supports and opened our markets. Now our agriculture cannot help take up the slack and our foreign exchange earnings are in a worse situation than they could have been; and we have also hurt the production of food for local consumption. It seems to me that we need urgently to learn how dangerous it/ ~~is~~ ^{can be} to put all our eggs in any one basket. ^{no matter how pretty.} To be sure, all the indications of the time were that bauxite and the very obvious goodwill/ ^{and support} of the Reagan Administration and the I.M.F. for the new Jamaican Government would ^{to} help see us on/ recovery road. So no-one thought of fallback plans. Indeed, in our cockiness we even unnecessarily upset potential customers. ^{& friends} We must learn from all this. We must learn that we need all the friends we can make in our effort at economic survival; we need to sell what we produce wherever we can without committing ^{it} our sovereignty. Especially in economic terms, we have no enemies, only interests. Above all, we must think and plan on the key assumption that in the last resort ^{Jamaicans +} only Jamaicans can bring recovery for Jamaica. Nobody else. Friends can help; we must do it. Goodnight.

Political Morality, Ideology & Power:

- 1) The Abolition of Solidarity
- 2) Solidarity with S.A. Political Prisoners

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
October 11, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Polish trade union, Solidarity, was voted out of existence by an Act of the Polish Parliament last Friday. The voting infavour of the abolition of Solidarity was reportedly overwhelming, with only two members of the Polish Parliament speaking against the action, and only nine out of some 400-odd abstaining in the voting. So, by strictly legal means, that particular independent trade union organisation was abolished. The Western world reacted with predictable heat and anger and outrage. On Saturday American President Ronald Reagan cancelled the 'most favoured nation' trading status Poland enjoyed with the United States and promised further sanctions against it. And at the British Conservative Party Conference over the weekend British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher blasted the Polish tyranny in a powerful speech. Today, Monday October 11th, commemorates solidarity of another kind. It is the Day of Solidarity with South African Political Prisoners. And unlike the abolition of the Polish Solidarity this day of solidarity with South African Political Prisoners is not likely to evoke any action against the Government of South Africa by President Reagan or any bitter denunciation by Mrs. Thatcher. And yet, Nelson Mandela, and Walter Sisulu have been held as the political prisoners of the South African regime for more than twenty years, and they are only the two most widely known of an army of political prisoners in South Africa. And you know, the difference between the South African political prisoners and the leaders of the now-banned Solidarity, is that the South Africans were not even

trying to change the political system under which they lived. They just wanted to participate fully in that system which was supposed to be a multi-party parliamentary democracy such as those operated in Britain and the United States and here in Jamaica. They are political prisoners because they demanded the same rights for all South Africans as are enjoyed by all Americans, all Britons, all Jamaicans. The leaders of Solidarity in Poland, on the other hand, quickly reached the point of challenging the Polish Communist Party for state power. Before this time last year it had become clear that Poland's Solidarity union had gone beyond being just concerned with workers rights and was bent on changing the political system; they in fact wanted to end communist rule. And the Communists/had shown of Eastern Europe in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia that they were not prepared to be voted out of power. In this particular respect there is no difference between them and between the rulers of South Africa. In other respects there are great differences; and most of them to the credit of the East Europeans and to the discredit of South Africa's rulers. So why the great democratic silence on South Africa's political prisoners and the thunder against Poland? The short answer is, I think, the great global power struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States to decide whose system should dominate and influence the world; ~~in this struggle~~ ~~the~~ political morality or ideology are used as tools. So the U.S. supports rightwing dictators ^{hips} with foul human rights records while blasting human rights violations among the communists and while trying to undermine places like Cuba and Grenada and Nicaragua. The communists will not tolerate change in their world; the capitalists, American-style, will not tolerate change in their world. They use the same means to prevent change. So where is the moral difference? Where the moral superiority? Who is really for the freedom of choice of the people? ~~Goodnight~~ The enemies look more like each other every day.

Goodnight.

Unemployment & Economic Recovery

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
October 8, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The American Stock Market yesterday had its biggest selling and buying spree with more than 140-million stocks and shares reportedly changing hands. Question: Is this stock market boom a sign of economic recovery? The American government's own ^{official} statisticians this morning made public the latest/unemployment figures for the United States. These figures show that 10.1% of the American workforce is now unemployed. If you translate that statistic into living men and women it means that, officially, more than 11-million Americans are out of work today. Question: Does this unemployment tell us the same story that yesterday's stock market buying spree tell? A buying spree on any stock market is usually a sign of ^{fiscal} confidence. Massive/~~af~~ ^{and} growing unemployment is ^{economic} usually a sign of/trouble. So how do we reconcile these two very important, and now very contradictory, indicators? And this question does not apply to the American economic situation only. We here in Jamaica are faced with basically the same contradictory indicators. The only difference^s are of size and scale, and the difference between a small and heavily dependent economy and a large and relatively independent ~~one~~ and globally dominant one. But the contradictory ^{Jamaican} indicators are the same. On the one hand we are told the/economy has turned around and we are presented with figures showing or projecting growth, and with forecasts that are upbeat and optimistic. On the other hand we have the reality of the large-scale bauxite lay-offs, the JOS lay-offs, and the coming lay-offs in the sugar industry. And almost every month, some workers, somewhere are being

laid off or made redundant or retrenched in the fives and tens and twenties and thirties. The big dramatic ones, the lay-offs in the hundreds, tend to make the headlines; the small ones tend to be ignored. But if you add up all the small ones and put them together they, too, run into the hundreds. So we come back to the question of reconciling this growing unemployment with the claims and the statistics of economic recovery. There is, I think, one way in which this can be done. If economic recovery is an end in itself, if getting the 'bottom-line' numbers to come out right, no matter what happens to ^{the majority of the} people, then you can indeed achieve growth and recovery at the same time as you have increasing unemployment and less and less money to spend on schools and hospitals and teachers' and nurses' pay. But this is not what the fiscal conservatives say. They say they do care about people and that once their policies are working and economic recovery is in full stride, new jobs will be generated and unemployment will go down and the new **boyyant** economy will generate the necessary ^{taxes} ~~money~~ to pay for the needed social services such as health~~e~~, education, ~~and~~ water and sanitation and public transport. So all you have to do is trust the market forces, have confidence in your leaders and work hard. Mr. Reagan, you will remember, in pursuit of this prescription, cut taxes in such a way as benefit the rich most (on the assumption that they would plough these benefits back into production), and also cut social service^s. This, the Americans were told, would turn their economy around. Before he became Vice President Mr. George Bush had described this as 'voodoo economics'. Today, that voodoo economics has led to the highest unemployment figures America has ever recorded, ^{In terms of} ~~with many~~ unemployment ^{in Jamaica} we appear to be drifting in a similar direction. The big difference is the American unemployed have some social cushioning; our unemployed have none. So what price recovery if the ~~the~~ numbers ^{get} get out of hand? Goodnight.

The People's Right to Know

~~1) Blinding Ourselves with Ideology~~
~~2) International Notes~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

Dor broadcast on Monday
October 4, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: One of the great and good and healthy things about political democracy in Jamaica is the tendency to turn almost any event into a raging political controversy: the words of a song, nudity on the beach, an audit of a monopoly concern, the kind of advertisement we get, the circumstances of the sale of an energy enterprise or hotel - all these can, and often do become instant hot political potatoes. Jamaicans are used to speaking their minds on [✓]anything, whether they know the facts or not. And that is the hallmark of a free and open society with a robust tradition of free speech. The dark side of this is the abuse and the manipulation and the clever use of that tradition of free speech in the service of ^{only} special interests and special power groupings, which are not always necessarily the same as, or in keeping with, the national interest. And the only way to deal with this dark side which is the abuse of our tradition of robust free speech is to [✓]keep the society as well informed as possible on everything of public concern going on in the society. Let it all hang out; make it easy for all the people to get at all the facts. Tell the truth, all the truth, and let the people make their judgements on the basis of fact rather than hearsay, sou-sou or manipulative use of the media by any group or quarter. This is the only way to serve the best interests of democracy and freedom of speech. Far too many of our politicians are hot champions of press freedom and freedom of speech when they are in opposition but ^{once in power they} suddenly become remote or tight-lipped or highly selective about what information the people should get and

in what form. This highly selective release^{and withholding} of information is what is known as 'managed news' and when carried to extremes becomes our brand destructive of freedom of expression and of democracy itself. So let the information all hang out. Publish, or table in Parliament, the terms of the Esso purchase and all the documents related to it; the full terms of release/the most recent as well as the earlier Seprod audits. Make the details public all/of that extraordinary deal in which a state-owned entity acquires a valuable piece of real estate at a reported profit of two million dollars to the vendors over a twenty-four hour time span. All these are in the public domain and the Jamaican people have a right to all, not just some of the facts. And in a different, and perhaps more complex sense, political parties seeking state power are also part of the public domain, for if they/succeed in gaining power they will make far-reaching decisions on our behalf which could lock us into processes for generations to come. So I think we need to know a deal more than we now do of what goes on inside our political parties, once those parties offer themselves for election. I give you one small example/ which raises the first loyalty. If a Jamaican is also a citizen of say, Britain or Canada or the United States should such a Jamaican become a member of Jamaica's Parliament and perhaps, one day, become a Prime Minister or a key Cabinet Minister?/ Remember some who held office then left when things got rough? What a person is or does as a private citizen is one thing; the level of their commitment, what they are or do/as representatives of a nation is something else again. So how do the parties deal with these matters, if at all, when they select candidates/ for high office? And how really democratic are the internal workings of the parties? Can parties which do not/practice internal democracy operate national democracies? We know more about every quarrel in the PNP than we do about the other parties. Why? Are there no quarrels in the JLP or WPJ? Or are they/hidden behind closed doors? And how much should we know? I think we should know everything, the people. Goodnight warts and all. That is the way of true democracy. Goodnight.

The Bauxite Lay-offs:
The economics of losing a job.

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
October 1, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: For the 420 bauxite workers of Reynolds Jamaica Mines whose jobs left them earlier today, Friday October 1st, 1982, is 'black Friday' indeed. And next Monday, Monday October 4, 1982, will be another 'black' day for another batch of bauxite workers, some 169 of them, whose jobs at Kaiser Bauxite will also leave them. So, between today and this time Monday 589 bauxite workers will have lost their jobs. And this, in any man's language is a bitter blow. And yet, when you call out these numbers, especially and mix them with other numbers, if you call them out quickly, as politicians tend to do with unpleasant and unwelcome statistics, it is possible to make them seem less terrible than they really are. So, in respect for the men whose jobs left them today, and those whose jobs will leave them on Monday, let us try and put these numbers and the very human tale they tell in their true perspective. Our bauxite workers are among the most skilled and best paid of our workers, and they have, over the years grown accustomed to a certain quality of life for themselves and their families and their dependants. So a fair assumption would be that the average bauxite workers with his high pay would live in a two or three bedroom house, depending on the size of his family. He would run a car, and at the most conservative estimate, have say two school age children. There would be at least one domestic helper and the wife is likely to stay home, especially if there is an older dependent, either one or two of his or the wife's parents. But even if this older dependent lives away he would still give some sort of financial help. So now you begin to add up a new set

of numbers. When the breadwinner-heads of 589 households lose their jobs the jobs of 589 domestic helpers are also endangered; the physical needs of 589 old age dependents are also endangered; the schooling of 1,178 ^{children} ~~are~~ is in jeopardy. So you have roughly ~~2,945~~ 2,356 direct dependents whose lives and livelihood are bound to be affected by the loss of jobs of the 589 bauxite workers. Your 589 now spawns a conservative estimate of some 2,945 Jamaicans who will be directly affected to one degree or another by these job losses. But it does not end there. Your bauxite worker ^{with} his high income lived reasonably well so the shops and groceries and pubs in his area benefitted from his and his family's spending and the circulation in his community of his relatively plentiful bauxite dollars. And the government did very well out of him, thank you, by way of his tax and other deductions. In this way, the negative effects of this loss of jobs by what at first seems a small number, spreads and grows. Shopkeepers and supper shops in bauxite areas are likely to lay off helpers or close down completely. And your 589 which grows to 2,945 can spread and grow. This applies, of course, not only to this particular batch of bauxite workers. It applies to one degree or another every time ^{any} a group of workers are separated from their jobs. So what are we doing about this? The severance and redundancy money they get will hold things for a time, but not for long. Then what? History shows that it is always the better-off groups, those with the highest skills and the best returns in their societies, who are least prepared to lose everything, or what they regard as everything, without a fight. The unskilled unemployed; and those who have forgotten what it is to have a job will grumble and endure. The highly skilled with memories of better ^{times,} ~~days~~ and with high expectations, will not endure passively. Wisdom and prudence would suggest that we think this one through carefully, and then ~~act~~ ^{act}. Goodnight.

games with it.

not play in sand time Power

Gathering Storm in Southern Africa:
The Cubans in Angola

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
September 27, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: An almost casual news item over this past weekend, which was datelined Lisbon Portugal, and which was carried on the news wire services and over a few of the world's more politically shortwave alert/radio stations, could be an indicator of ^{new} danger in one of the world's hottest ^{old} trouble spots. And coming so soon after the stark horror of the Beirut massacre, I suggest we all take very serious note, because there are deeply disturbing similarities between this new development and the events which culminated in the Beirut massacre. The item to which I refer is a report that a senior U.S. government official arrived in Angola on Saturday night for talks with the Angolan Government on "the future of Namibia and the thorny issue of U.S. recognition of the Angolan Government". This, on the face of it, is a straightforward diplomatic mission, that is, if you do not know the background. There are two key factors to the racist background. First, South Africa invaded and very nearly over-ran the fledgling Republic of Angola in the early, tricky days of its independence and only the arrival of Cuban troops prevented a South African occupation of Angola and the installation of a puppet regime headed by Jonas Savimbi; and second, the racist South Africans have made the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola a pre-condition for arriving at a settlement over Namibian independence. The United States, for its part, has made the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola a condition for recognising Angola. And to complete the parallel with Lebanon, both the South Africans and the Americans have covertly helped and armed the forces of Jonas Savimbi in their

efforts to overthrow the government of Angola. So you have there the attempts to make the kind of civil war which ~~the~~ divided the Lebanon to the point of weakness where the Israelis could invade and occupy and demand the expulsion of the PLO. The civil war idea has not quite worked so the Cubans are still in place and the South Africans dare not invade. Two weeks back, at the height of the Israeli action in Lebanon before the massacre, the South African Government declared publicly that the main obstacle to a settlement in Namibia is the presence of the Cubans in Angola. A question we might usefully ask is: what would happen if the Angolan Government were to ask the Cubans to withdraw? What assurance is there that the South Africans would not then invade Angola and let loose the Savimbi forces to massacre in the same way as the Israelis let loose the Phalangists in Beirut? Are the South African racists supposed to be any more humane? Are they any more likely to honour any evacuation agreement than did the Israelis after the PLO had left? And is the United States likely to act any more decisively against the South African racists than she did against Israel? And yet, just as she did over the PLO in the Lebanon, the United States is now using all her power and her influence, as well as the promise of recognition and aid, as levers to persuade Angola to tell the Cubans to leave. The Organisation of African Unity and the Frontline States have rejected all U.S. efforts to get them to condemn the Cuban presence in Angola: they know ^{that presence} ~~it~~ is the only shield against a South African over-run. So now the heavy pressure is on Angola itself because both the OAU and the Cubans will honour whatever Angola decides. The catch is that not only Angola's fate, not only Namibia's fate are at stake; the fate of all Southern Africa hinges on how Angola handles this pressure. The tragedy is that once again America is on the side of racism and repression. Goodnight.

- 1) The Government & the Nurses
- 2) ~~Israel & the Beirut Massacre~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
September 24, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The good news is that our registered nurses are back on the job, as from this morning. They have gone back on the advice of the Minister of Labour that he had now received the long awaited advice from the Attorney General's Department on how the Industrial Disputes Tribunal should proceed in ~~that~~ dealing with the anomaly which is the cause of the present impasse. I understand registered the/nurses expect some positive action from the IDT within the next seven days. I hope they get that action within that time frame; I think there has been an awful lot of stalling on this matter; and I think there has been something unwholesome and socially unhealthy in the way this issue has been dragged out, and for those who did the dragging out to then preach social responsibility to Jamaica's nurses. With all the respect in the world, I do not think that any politician of any party in Jamaica today is in a position to preach social responsibility to Jamaica's nurses. On the contrary, I think ^{politicians} they can learn much of the true meaning of social responsibility from our nurses. Anyway, let us remind ourselves of just what this dispute is all about. The registered nurses are the trained and qualified nurses whose professional skills are recognised the world over, as are the professional skills of doctors, ^{accountants,} teachers, dentists/and the like. The enrolled nurses have not gone through the same training and so ^{do} not have the same professional qualifications and the same professional standing in the world. This is a simple fact of a professional difference. The moment an enrolled or assistant nurse can gain the same professional qualification that nurse would also become a

Registered Nurse. Indeed, being an enrolled or assistant nurse was seen, in the first instance, as a new opening for people who did not have the necessary school passes and the like to ^{get on-the-job} ~~train~~ to become qualified for the nursing profession. And so, in the beginning, the pay difference between the Registered Nurse who is the trained professional and the trainee or enrolled nurse, who was in the position of the articulated clerk or the apprentice, that pay difference was 50%. The trainee nurse received half of what the qualified nurse got. But in the anti-elitest days of the 1970s this differential in pay between the Registered Nurse and the Enrolled Nurse began to be whittled away. If the skills of the enrolled nurses had been upgraded at the same pace at which their pay was, I don't think there could have been much argument. This was not how it was: the skills differential remained; the pay differential was massively reduced until there was a difference of only 12½% between what the registered nurse received and what the enrolled nurse received. You may remember the registered nurse's protests of 1975 over this same matter. The then government finally agreed that the differential should go back to 35%. But the same erosion of the difference continued till we were back at a difference of 12½% which is what the registered nurses are now protesting against once more. And they have been doing so since 1979 and they have been getting the run-around since then. The issue is really quite simple: you either pay people in accordance with their recognised ^{training &} professional qualification and say to anyone else 'if you want that same pay then get that same qualification', or else you abandon those standards and make idiots of the truly qualified. And you do something even worse: you tell others that they do not really need to make the effort to become qualified; ^{for the job & its rewards.} all they need is the ^{known} 'muscle' ^{or the political connection.} This is not in the interest of either the nation or the nation's health services. Goodnight.

- 1) Massacre in West Beirut
- 2) Beyond Anger & Protest - What?
- 3) The PNP & the Communists

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
September 20, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The world continues to be in a state of shock and horror and anger over that bloody massacre in West Beirut, Lebanon, which began late last Thursday night and lasted for roughly twenty-four hours. Nobody is as yet certain of the exact number of Palestinian refugees - men, women and children - who were slaughtered over that dreadful twenty-four hour period. What is known is that the slaughter of human beings was massive and savage and that attempts to cover up some of the killings were made by using bulldozers to shove the bodies into the rubble and debris of bombed buildings and bomb craters. Early estimates of the death toll range from a low of 300 to a high of 1,500. The final figure could well be higher than the highest estimates: modern machine guns can fire thousands of rounds of bullets into thousands of rounded-up bodies in any twenty-four hour period. High-speed machine guns are part of the high technology some among us now worship as the latterday icons of progress and civilisation. The catch is that high-technology without vision, humanity, without ~~humanity~~, without morality, can lead not to a higher civilisation but to technological barbarism. And we were as close to that in Beirut this ^{past} weekend as we were during the Sharpville/^{massacre} ~~killings~~ of 1960 and during the earlier slaughter of Jews in the Hitler years. The highest technology in the world is not of itself a virtue; its measurement must be the uses to which it is put: whether it serves or destroys, liberates or enslaves. Anyway, it would have taken much longer and probably been much more difficult to conduct that kind of slaughter without high-tech. The Government of Israel has angrily

denied any responsibility, direct or indirect, for the Beirut massacre. And yet there is information that last Thursday night the Israeli Cabinet was informed of the plan to allow the rightwing Christian Phalangist force to go into the two refuge camps 'to seek out terrorists and arms'. The Israeli Cabinet reportedly approved the plan even though one Cabinet Minister warned that it would result in a massacre. The Israeli~~s~~ government knows better than most other governments the bitter hatred of the Christian Phalangists for the Palestinian refugees. They could have^{had} no doubt of what would happen if the Phalangists were let loose among unprotected Palestinians. And it happened while the soldiers of Israel ringed the camps and looked on, and held back. I think Israel may find this one haunting her as Sharpville haunts South Africa and the Holocaust haunts Germany. Beyond talk the world did precious little about the Holocaust, and nothing about Sharpville. Will it do any more about the slaughter in West Beirut? Will America, the only one with the power to do it, show practical and concrete disapproval of Israeli policy in the Lebanon? For, make no mistake about it. Israel is now the occupying power in Lebanon, and for as long as it is that, it must be held responsible for what happens there. And finally and ^{all too} briefly, the important local ^{new} news was the PNP conference which had some interesting features this year, and which declared anew that it is not a communist party. I don't think anybody interested in Jamaica politics seriously thought the PNP was or was going communist. The PNP is and has always been^{committed to a West European type socialism and is} the most open and democratic mass party in the country, which is^{one reason} why they cannot keep secrets. Communism has always been a bogey used against the PNP by its political enemies on the right. The ^{only} new factor, since the 1970^s is that there now is a real communist party in Jamaica which, as all communist parties do, tried to infiltrate and gain a mass base by riding the PNP coattails. Can the PNP handle this without swinging to the anti-communist right? ^{in the world} ^{socialist} ^{lookish}

The Facts Behind the Lebanese Crisis

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
September 17, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The latest Israeli aggression in West Beirut has ~~aid~~ to rest, very quickly and very dramatically, that piece of political fiction so cleverly fostered by both Israel and the United States, that the real problem in Lebanon was the presence of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, the PLO. Remember the argument that once the PLO was out, once the so-called 'state within a state' was put to an end, peace and stability would return to Lebanon and the Israelis and the Syrians would go home and leave the Lebanese to solve their own problems? Remember? Well, Israel's aggression this week has blown all that sky-high. Israel has used Tuesday's assass-
Christian
ination of the rightwing/Falangist leader, Bashir Gemayel, as excuse for a massive new military onslaught on West Beirut. Israel says she wants to ensure peace and stability, and so she is now in military occupation of the capital city of another country. Reports are that Israel was putting pressure of Gemayel to make the signing of a peace treaty with Israel one of his first acts after being installed as President of Lebanon next week. Israel's frustration at the disintegration of this plan with the death of their man, may be the reason for the new violence against a now completely undefended people. But this very violence now ensures that there will be no peace treaty, certainly not in the short run. And Israeli bombs and tanks and planes cannot solve the Lebanese problem, anymore than the driving out of the PLO could. Indeed, the only way Israel might be able to contribute to a solution of the Lebanese problem would be by agreeing to the West Bank and Gaza becoming the homeland to which

the very many Palestinian refugees, upwards of a million of whom are in the Lebanon, could return. That would not in itself solve the Lebanese problem; but it would help ease it somewhat. The real solution for Lebanon lies, I think, in the complete overhauling of the religious-tribal political structure imposed on it by the French with indepedence in 1943./ ~~xxxxxxthe French~~ ^{The French found} the most effective form of colonial rule in Lebanon to be along religious and cultural lines. They got on best with the educated urban Chritian Lebanese, had most trouble with the muslim sects. So they institutionalised the political structure with their favourite 'natives', the Christian ^{Arabs} ~~Moslems~~ on top. The population of the time, by French estimation, was 60% Christian and 40% Muslim: so power was divided accordingly. The President would be a Maronite Christian, the Prime Minister a Sunni Muslim, the Speaker a Shi ite muslim, the Vice Prewident an Orothodox Christian. Parliament would have 60% Christians and 40% non-Christian. Government jobs were shared out along the same 60-40 ratio. And so it has been since 1943, even though all the indications are that the Arab muslims now greatly outnumber the Arab Christians. And the history of foreign invasions to protect the interests of what is now a Christian minority when those interests coincided with those of a particular power, has made the Lebanese Arab Christians as unwilling to give up any of their historically entrenched power as are, say, the Protestants of Northern Ireland. So you have political tribalism of the worst kind reinforced by religious zealotry and intolerance. If you add to this the emergence of private armies, loyal to individual warlords, (Bashir Gemayel was one such), you will begin to get an idea of the dimensions of the Lebanese problem. It is a hard problem/ ^{both nationally and in Pan-Arab terms.} Isreal makes it harder by trying to manipulate that problem in its favour through using the Christians. The death of Bashir Gemayel should make that plain to Israel and the world.

Goodnight

The Economics of Survival:
Productivity, Unemployment & Social Stability

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
September 13, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Economists and bankers tend to look at the world's current economic crisis in terms of how a country handles its balance-of-payments, its levels of production and exports and imports, and its management of ^{its} ~~the~~ finances. And the general assumption has been that if a country handles these matters well then economic growth would be almost automatic and all the citizens of that country would enjoy the benefits of such growth, not necessarily at the same time or to the same extent, but certainly everybody would see and feel the benefit sooner or later. But recent developments in the world economy have raised doubts and questions about this optimistic assumption. For one thing, it now seems that before some economies can achieve that turn about and growth we all say we want there has to be some really massive so-called 'adjustments': all the slackness and weakness, it seems, has to be squeezed out of an economy before it can be set on that growth path. And this so-called 'squeezing out' has led to large-scale collapses and shut-downs of businesses. We know of businesses closing down here in Jamaica. But what is happening in the United States and Western Europe make our little closings look small. There have been more than 15,000 business bankruptcies in the United States so far this year. In one single week last month nearly 600 companies collapsed. And as it is in the United States so it is in Britain and Western Europe. And of course, when companies fold, their workers lose their jobs. And even the companies that survive have to tighten up and squeeze the waste out of their operations, especially when their markets become weak and

people stop buying what they produce. And unemployed workers in North America and West Europe just cannot buy new cars or new houses or go on holidays to far-off sunny Caribbean islands as they did when they were in jobs and had saved money. So the demand for Jamaican bauxite and alumina slumps and Jamaican bauxite workers are laid off and the companies try to tighten-up and squeeze out the fat. And so the effort to stimulate economic recovery and growth has led to large-scale unemployment, not only among poor Third World countries but in the rich Western capitalist countries as well. In the United States unemployment officially hovers around eleven million. Unofficially it is somewhere between 13-million and 15-million. In Western Europe it is officially somewhere in the region of 15-million ; it could be at least a million more. So, in the world's richest and most developed countries you have, today, anywhere between 26-million and 30-million people who are without jobs as their countries squeeze and tighten their economies in the struggle for that greater productivity and efficiency which they hope will end the most terrible recession to hit the world since the Great Depression of the 1930s. One great difference is that in the 1930s the United States was not the same dominant and dominating world economy that she is today so the rest of the world was less directly and dramatically affected than it is today. The world did not catch pneumonia; it only caught a ~~slight~~ cold. Today things are different. And today's people are different too. What would happen if more white middleclass Americans were to be squeezed into unemployment, say to between 15-20 million? Will they accept it as relatively passively as their forebears did in the 1930s? I think not. And I am certain the West Europeans would react violently if their unemployment were to rise to between 30-40 million. And then there are the millions in the 3rd World. Economic recovery may result in chaos if it cannot accommodate these people and do so quickly. Goodnight.

- 1) The I.M.F. After Toronto
- 2) America & Western Europe
- 3) A Worst-Case Scenario

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
September 10, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Reports out of Toronto at the end of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund annual meeting suggest that the two lending institutions will have their quotas increased so that they will in future be able to lend a little more money to the poorer countries of the world; but these increases will not be as high as the Third World countries had pressed for. The Third World had wanted a doubling of the lending money available to the I.M.F and World Bank, and at least two West European countries had backed the Third World stand. Others, like Great Britain and West Germany wanted the increase to be in the region of 50%; but the United States, the biggest contributor, was against even this size of increase. But in the end the United States did relax its opposition somewhat and my guess is that by next April when the matter comes up for final decision there will be agreement to increase the quotas - and so the available lending money - by between 25% and 30%. But I also think the Americans are going to insist on continued tighter IMF conditionality than most Third World countries want. Mexico is the current victim of the American determination to adhere to strict IMF conditionality with its overwhelming bias against all forms of state control or regulation of the economy, and in favour of a dominant role for the private sector. And so there are signs of Mexico facing the likelihood of being 'punished' for nationalising its banks. A standby loan of over \$1,000-million has suddenly been suspended until Mexico arrives at an 'understanding' with the I.M.F

for a \$4,000-million-plus agreement. The new and interesting twist to this one is that Mexico these days is not one of the run-of-the-mill poor Third World countries with little or no resources. She is oil rich and her problem is essentially short-term and one of massive miscalculation and massive over-spending. So how far will the IMF push Mexico? Latin America, all of Latin America, is going to watch this one very closely, and on its outcome may very well depend whether U.S.-Latin American relations begin to improve or deteriorate even further. For, make no mistake about it, any undue pressure on Mexico by the IMF will be seen as an American economic squeeze. And just as American relations with Western Europe are at a new low because of the American embargo on Europe sales of ^{American-made} ~~equipment~~ or licenced or controlled equipment to the Soviets for their gas pipeline, so any squeeze on Mexico is likely to provoke bitter reaction. The Western Europeans are particularly angry at the assumption, voiced publicly by Vice President George Bush, that as the leader of the so-called 'free world' America must lead and everybody else must follow. The West Europeans do not see it in such simplistic cowboy terms; neither will the Latin Americans. So there could be tricky days ahead. And this brings us here in Jamaica to the question of a worst-case scenario. . Of course we will go on raising the loans we need, our leaders are skilful enough for that. So that worst-case scenario may never arise; I certainly hope it does not. But what if it did? What if one day next year or the year after there is suddenly no loan money to be had? What will we do? How will we cope? Have we any fall-back plan for survival. I know the small country farmers will feed themselves and survive. But what about the rest of Jamaica? Do we have a survival plan if the day should ever come when we cannot borrow our troubles away? When we cannot import food?. Goodnight.

World Bank-I.M.F. Toronto Meetings:
What Future for the Third World?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
September 6, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The single most important economic event in the world today's ~~today~~ is undoubtedly/ ~~the~~ opening in Toronto, Canada of the four-day annual meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund which is attended by the Finance Ministers and economic leaders of some one hundred and forty rich and poor countries. The decisions which will be taken at this meeting will have a profound bearing on the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people all over the world, but especially on the daily lives of the poorest people living in the most depressed areas of the world. On the face of it, those decisions will be arrived at democratically, with ^{spokesmen from} rich and poor countries alike making their contributions and casting their votes. But as with the United Nations Security Council the decisions of one or two superpowers can block or over-rule whatever the majority may want. In the case of the World Bank and I.M.F. it is not a veto power that can block or overrule decisions; it is the number or percentage of voting rights member countries have, and the United States ^{has the} ~~largest~~ largest single number of votes in both the World Bank and the I.M.F. And this gives the U.S. and ^{an} effective veto on decisions and actions taken by the World Bank and the I.M.F. And of course, the United States and its West European allies, when they are in agreement, determine what does or does not happen in the world economy. And even communist economies can be, and are, affected by such Western capitalist determination. We have seen this in the cases of Hungary and Poland, which have borrowed ^{ed} heavily from Western banks and are now deep ^{ly} in debt to the Western capitalist

banking system. Communist Cuba has called for the rescheduling of its relatively small debt of some \$3,000-plus million to Western Banks, and is inviting capitalist investment on a controlled, partnership basis. So having a different ideology and a different political system does not of itself insulate any country from the influences and at times, the control of the capitalist system through its World Bank and International Monetary Fund. The only possible insulation is for a country to be either rich enough to pay its way in the world or else to choose deliberately to do without those imports which it cannot pay for. So the Soviet Union can import thousands of millions of dollars worth of grain without becoming a client of the World Bank or the I.M.F; and Japan, with hardly any resources or raw materials of its own can, through the use and organisation of its people and economic structures, ^{become} a feared competitor and powerful honorary Western capitalist state instead of a client. The ^{poorest} countries of the Third World are in no such position; their options seem limited to being either dependant clients of the dominant Western capitalist system or joining the economically weaker communist economic system and help build up its strength, or electing to go the much more economically painful and difficult route of non-alignment with its risks and disadvantages. The genuinely non-aligned are usually under varying degrees of economic pressure from both the capitalist and communist economic systems. Each system wants its client states to become submissive parts of that system. And so if the vote in Toronto is to lend the client states ^{of capitalism} a little more money, the terms will be a little tighter and the client states will become a little less sovereign in their decision-making, and the dream of economic independence will recede a little further. That is the hard reality for the Third World this week. Goodnight.

- 1) The Esso Acquisition: the 1979 Gas Price Strike
- 2) Reagan's New Move in the Middle East

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
September 3, 1982, 6.10p.m

latest news
Good evening: The/~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ is that the government of Jamaica and Esso West Indies have reached basic agreement for the government to buy out and take over the Esso refinery located on Kingston's Marcus Garvey Drive. There are, we are told, some details still to be worked out, but the deal has been struck. The refinery will pass into Jamaican hands. And this, in face of this government's known attitude to public ownership of business enterprises, is an ~~uncharacteristic~~ ^{un}characteristic step. But the alternative the government faced was to agree to Esso's demand for an increase in its margin of profit on the refinery operation. And thereby hangs a tale of political consideration of no mean importance. Most of us still remember the ^{January} gas price strike of/1979 when the economic life of Jamaica was brought to an abrupt and jarring halt with road-blocks, slashed JOS bus tyres, and the more enterprising among the striking hustlers exacting tribute from motorists to permit them to go their way. I still remember the great distances some people travelled, the great detours they made, to avoid the roadblocks and get to and from work. And as it was in Kingston so it was in many other areas of Jamaica. That gas price strike was masterminded by a JLP affiliate many of whose members now hold important positions in the ⁶present government of Jamaica. So in a purely political sense, a gas price increase, especially at this time, could have unpredictable and explosive consequences. The precedent for massive economic and social disruption had been set in January 1979. In this sense that gas price strike of January, 1979, can be either cursed or blessed - depending on your point of view - for the government's present move to take over the

refinery. We must hope that the refinery, under ^{public} Jamaican/ownership, will continue to operate as a viable profitable enterprise to the benefit of the Jamaican people, and that the price of its products can now be held at reasonable levels. There are examples to prove that this can be done, given good sense and good management. There are examples of the other thing too, of public ownership leading to the 'feeding tree' mentality and to the running down of an enterprise, as we have seen with the JOS. It is all up to the workers and the manager ^{to} rather than just/the system of ownership. Remember that gas price strike? Our actions can lead to unexpected results, can't they?

The other big news, on the international scene this time, was ^{on Wednesday} Mr. Reagan's new proposals/for tackling the Palestinian problem. The key point in that plan is that the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip areas should become the Palestinian homeland, and that this area should be associated with Jordan. Israel should not establish any more Jewish settlements on the West Bank and Gaza. And ^{the} process to full Palestinian self-government in association with ^{over} Jordan should be carried out/~~xx~~ a phased five-year period. In return for giving up its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, the association of Jordan and Palestine would accept unconditionally Israel's existence and right to secure borders, as would all the other Arab states. Such is the heart of the Reagan proposal. This, the President and his people have made clear, is how the American government sees the way to peace and stability in the Middle East, with both Israeli interests ^{and} Palestinian interests, assured. It is, I think, the most sensible basis for negotiations so far put forward for satisfying both Jewish and Palestinian fears and interests. It is unfortunate that Israel's first reaction was a flat rejection of the plan; perhaps its second reaction will be less colonialist. If not there there is nothing but grief ahead for the Middle East and for Israel.

Goodnight.

Reagan Vetoes CBI:
Where do we go from here?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday,
August 30, 1982, 6.10.p.m.

Good evening: American President Ronald Reagan struck Jamaica a terrible economic blow last Saturday when he vetoed a Congressional money bill which empowered the American Government to spend \$14.1-thousand million dollars to keep the U.S. government's machinery going for the balance of this financial year which ends in October. This money was supposed to go into paying the military, some of the civil service, and some of the social programmes. But in its passage through the two Houses of Congress various Congressional Committees had tacked on to the Bill additional spending on matters which they considered important. For instance Mr. Reagan has done some heavy budget cutting on social spending which would benefit the poor, the old, students and minority groups. So some Congressional people tried to restore some of ^{these} ~~this~~ ^{cuts} ~~cut~~ ^{them} spending/by adding ~~it~~ on to the new Appropriation Bill. All-in-all these additions amounted to some \$910-million. In addition the Congressional leaders also changed cut, and rearranged some of the amounts the Reagan Administration had asked for. They, for instance, cut \$2,000,-million from the proposed Defence Department budget; ^{they tacked the CBI on,} and they changed up the numbers ^{out} of the Caribbean Basin plan, cutting/the proposed military assistance to El Salvador and reducing its overall allocation. The thinking of the Congressional leaders was simple and clear. If Mr. Reagan was as committed to his Caribbean Basin Initiative as he made out, then he would accept/ their changes and additions in order to get the CBI through the Congress. This, after all, was ^{4 15} the old traditional way

doing business in political Washington: the Congress gives the President what he wants, and the President gives the Congress what it wants - especially in an election year. They sometimes call it 'a little honest horsetrading'. But last Saturday Mr Reagan made it clear he did not want to trade. After all, he got his way last year without giving anything. Or so it seemed, until he had to sign that massive new tax measure a couple of weeks ago. In this case, too, sooner or later, Mr. Reagan is going to have to trade. The risk is that the CBI may either get lost or become even more severely mangled in any later horse-trading. This is the American way and it is being played out with American interests being paramount: not Jamaican or Caribbean or Central American. To be sure, the President and many other Americans do care what happens to us; but only after they have taken care of their own business first; and I, for one, see nothing wrong with that. What I do see as wrong is the apparent shocked and traumatised reaction of some of our leaders and some of their spokespeople at this turn of events. It is as though we have absolutely no options of our own; as though policy for Jamaica is made in Washington as though things will fall apart if Washington does not hold us up. And that, whatever else it is, is not a healthy state of affairs and not a healthy state of mind. Of course we need that \$50-million of CBI aid desperately, and of course it will be a blow if it is delayed as now seems very likely; but it is wrong for it to be or to appear to be a matter of life and death for this nation. Jamaica has survived worse blows than this in the past. Jamaica is capable of surviving worse blows than this. What is wrong is that our political system and a new generation of political and business ~~xxxxxxeducatedxxxxxx~~ leaders have led us into a dangerous new state of almost total dependence on external forces and external interests to such an extent that Jamaica today cannot even feed itself from its own earth. And that as we are seeing ^{how} and will go on seeing, is no way either to deliverance ^h or the better we want. Goodni

Third World Economic Problems:
The Search for New Perspectives

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
August 27, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Conferences on economic matters, especially Third World economic matters, represent one of the highpoints of this weeks news⁶ here in Jamaica: there was the conference of Central Bank Governors of Latin America and Spain at which Dr. Owen Jefferson painted a stark picture of the present state of the world economy and its impact on the poorer nations of the earth; and there was the opening meeting of the Latin American Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank at which Prime Minister Seaga spoke of the importance of ^{economic} structural adjustments and defining it in these words: "...We agree that there is need for adjustment if fundamental imbalances in our economies are to be corrected...And here we should perhaps remind ourselves that the term structural adjustment embodies a range of policies designed to bring about the more efficient performance of an economy by removing structural defects, by changing the direction of the economy, or by transforming the basis of its operation. It might be any one or any combination of these. The ultimate objective is the maximisation of production, and increased foreign exchange earnings." Mr. Seaga has, earlier in the life of his government, said that it would take three years for the nation to begin to ^{see the results of} ~~enjoy the fruits of~~ these policies. We are only approaching the end of ~~the end of~~ the second year of the new direction so ^{based on declared policy} any serious assessment/is still fourteen months away. And yet, with nearly two-thirds of the three-year period up there are disturbing and nagging worries, especially about maximisation of production and increased foreign exchange earnings. And another very important conference of this week, that of the Jamaica Teachers Association

has added to these nagging worries with the flat declaration out of that conference that when negotiation time comes around early next year they will not be prepared to hold strain, as they were ~~the~~ at the last round of negotiations. If this is the posture of the J.T.A. will that of the Civil Service Association be any different? And will that of the other government and quasi-government workers be any different? And in any new round of wage increases, where would the government get the money from? From new taxation? And how will the government justify any demand for new taxes from the populace? By pointing to the service it provides? What services? A sick public transport system/~~whose total failure~~ whose total failure to perform has only been saved by chaotic small man's free enterprise a/free-for-all/minibus system which is itself now threatened by rather heavy-handed efforts at government regulation which, in part at least, appears/~~designed~~ designed to use the/~~earnings of~~ earnings of the unsubsidised minibuses to support the sick JOS? One result, I understand, is that some of the better minibus operators are dropping out of this/~~new~~ new rat-race whose unpleasant undertones are getting worse. You do not ask for increased taxes for/~~providing~~ providing this kind of service; or for the kind of water services we are now getting. In open elective parliamentary democracies people measure the taxes they pay against the services they receive. Jamaicans from every walk of life, but especially the poor, pay very - direct or indirect - high taxes/for very low services. Any structural adjustment programme which ~~cannot~~ ignore, or gloss over, these internal problems, ~~are~~ is doomed to failure, no matter how great the inflow of foreign borrowing. The 'trickle-down' theory of economic development may have been feasible in a bouyant world economic context. In an economically depressed world where there is little or nothing to trickle down structural adjustment requires new social and economic perspectives. In hard times most of all, people measure viability by the standard and quality of their own daily lives; not theory not abstractions.

Goodnight,

Who Can Win A Nuclear War?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
August 23, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening; Last week the U.S. Pentagon - America's military headquarters - sent new shock-waves reverberating through the world. The word was that America can win a nuclear war against the Soviet Union. And logic says that if one side feels that it can win a war over its enemies, self-interest dictates that it should get ready to do just that. And it is this logic that is frightening the daylight out of America's Western European allies who know that their countries are likely to be the battle area for at least the first devastating blows in any such nuclear show-down. For instance, a study by the American Congressional Office of Technology Assessment suggests the following: if a small nuclear bomb of just one megaton, equal to ~~or~~ one million tons of TNT, were to be exploded at 6,000 feet over, say, London or Paris, or Berlin or Bonn or Washington or New York or Tokyo or anyone of the world's major industrial cities, buildings factories, skyscrapers, cars, trucks buses, and everything within $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles of the explosion will be instantly vapourised by the great and searing heat. People will just disappear, melted by the fireball. For nearly twenty square miles further out, that city would be levelled to the ground and most of the people would be killed either instantly or so badly that they will die later. And then there will be a secondary area of destruction some 33 square miles away from the point of explosion, in which the place and the people and the property will be severely burned and damaged and almost every person will need some kind of medical help. And all this will happen within the

first one minute of the dropping of the bomb. And when you have this sort of happening there is bound to be chaos among the survivor - those trying to get medical help and those trying to get out of the devastated area. Roads and hospitals will be overcrowded, much of the town will be on fire, light and power and water will be disrupted, and the familiar mushroom cloud will hang over the ^{city} ~~town~~ of death and destruction. Civil order is almost certain to collapse with people looting for food and medicine wherever they can get these. Depending on the size of the city the death toll from that one single "small" bomb could be anywhere from half a million to over a million. Think of wiping out one half of Jamaica's population in less than an hour and you will get some idea of the scale of death and destruction. And both the Americans and the Russians have bigger nuclear bombs that ^{each do} ~~can~~ up to fifty times that amount of damage in one go. So who will win a nuclear war? He who strikes first? The fact is that no matter who fires the first bomb, the other side already has its plans in hand to make sure that its responding bombs will be on their way to hit the enemy even as its own cities are consumed by the awful flash of fire which destroys everything. I frankly do not see any side, except death destruction and chaos winning this kind of war. And I do not see how this kind of war can, as Mr. Alexander Haig suggested, be limited to say the ~~the~~ European theatre of war. Once started, this kind of war is bound to be total, with bigger and bigger nuclear bombs reducing the great cities and economies of ^{East and West} Europe and America to burnt-out rubble and ashes and dust. This is where the notion of the winnable nuclear war leads, logically and inevitably. But let us say just the Americans are using the notion as a propaganda pressure point, hoping by it to intimidate the Russians into being 'more reasonable' in the negotiations. If that is so, they are gambling ^{dangerously} with the future of mankind. For mankind there is no winnable nuclear war. Goodnight.

- a) Some Ironic Twists in World Politics:
1) The Reagan Tax Bill; 2) Mexico's Money Worries;
3) Israel's Military Victory & Political Setback.
~~b) Who Will Win a Nuclear War?~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

ForrBroadcast on Friday
August 20, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The American Congress yesterday gave its approval to President Reagan's new tax bill which would, over the next three years, require American taxpayers to pay something of the order of an additional one-hundred-thousand-million dollars. This is, possibly, the single largest tax bill ever levied on the American people in any one year, certainly in any one year in peacetime. And the irony of it is that it follows the single largest tax cut ever given to the American people just about a year ago. So Mr. Reagan has the unique, though questionable distinction, of first giving the American taxpayers the biggest cuts ^{they} have ever had, and then licking them with the heaviest new tax burdens they have ever had. He gave with one hand and was hailed for it; now he is taking away with the other hand and again he is being hailed for it. And America's economic woes continue unchanged. The one big political change following ^{on} Mr. Reagan's powerful lobbying for the new taxes is the disenchantment of the American conservative groups who had so much to do with Mr. Reagan's winning of the White House. The upcoming November elections should give us some idea of how ^{deep} this disenchantment ^{goes}. If the Republican candidates, especially the staunch Reagan backers, do badly, then Mr. Reagan might well become that most lonely of all American political figures, a lame-duck President serving out his term with minimal influence on American affairs and on world affairs; which would not make matters any easier either for the United States or the world. If, on the other

midterm Congressional

hand the Republicans do well in the November ^{midterm} elections, Mr. Reagan's power to influence events would be even greater than it now is. The irony is that ~~if~~ all the time and thought and money that went into campaigning, for ~~for~~ the 'greatest tax cut ever', then for the 'greatest tax increase ever' were really wasted since the one largely balances out the other. It is not only in Jamaica that these costly wasteful games are played. But can even rich American afford them? Another kind of ironic twist is the spectacle of oil-rich Mexico in acute financial trouble to the point where it has to turn to the IMF. The problem here was ^{caused by} the sudden riches that went to the head and caused Mexico's leaders to go on an almost reckless developmental spending spree, much as the Nigerians did a little earlier. Nigeria is now containing its problems by prudent cutbacks and planning. It may be a little more difficult for Mexico, what with America and its lifestyles and its political interests and its ambitious business tycoons just across the border. We must hope that Mexican leadership is strong enough and Mexican nationalism is clear-eyed enough to be able to resist the most attractive takeover bids. Mexico is not, as some wishfully suggest, bankrupt: her ~~assets~~ ^{economic} and resources far exceed her liabilities. But this crisis will test her will to freedom and independence to the utmost. The other ironic twist of the week is supplied by Israel's military defeat of the PLO in West Beirut, which is now drawing to its close. To win a war without achieving your main objective and then to lose the rewards of the peace is a particular irony. The PLO is defeated but not destroyed; Israel has ~~never~~ been as low in world esteem as she now is because of the indiscriminate savagery of her attacks on West Beirut; the defeated PLO has never enjoyed more respect; the stature of Yasser Arafat is greater now than ever. This was not the kind of victory the Israelis ^{or the Americans} wanted. This is the ^{victory} ~~one~~ they now have to live with. Goodnight.

The World Economic Outlook &
The Foundation for National Survival

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
August 16, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: News summaries out of Washington of the latest World Bank report on the state of the world economy paint a very gloomy picture indeed. The world economy, it says, is in no better state than it was last year and the outlook for the future is, if anything, gloomier than it was last year. So the hoped-for turn-about in the world economy is not likely to come about this year, and the prospects do not look any better for the foreseeable future. And since the economies of most Third World countries are intimately linked with the world's Western economies, Third World economies, which are basically poor dependent economies, are bound to feel the strains and pressures most. The old saying about us catching pneumonia every time our giant northern neighbour sneezes is no joke in economic terms. For some countries, like most of those in Africa south of the Sahara, pneumonia could lead to a form of economic slow death unless they have developed ways and means of staying alive and holding on until this disastrous period passes. For the most part the Western economically advanced countries will tend to husband ^{resources} such/as they have; they will tend to put up barriers of protection; they will tend to import only what is essential and at the lowest possible prices; the competition among them will take on a fierce edge, especially if unemployment grows. And already unemployment is somewhere in the region of eleven million in the United States, over three million in Great Britain, and similarly high and rising in most of Western Europe. And when countries face problems like these there is less of a

willingness to help others in trouble. Charity, after all, begins
 at home, and as the strains and pressures increase on the developed
 countries they will become more concerned with their own angry poor
 and hungry and less concerned about the Third World's poor and hungry.
 So there will, inevitably, be less and less aid and much more
 important, less and less credit on much stiffer terms. The hope is
 that this state of affairs will not last too long and that when the
 world economy picks up again, the world can restart the process
 of development and co-operation and assistance on which the Third
 World has come to depend so much. In the meantime, though, things
 could get very rough indeed. Our ~~hopes for~~ investment hopes are not
 being fulfilled and look less and less likely to be. And we have not
 succeeded in borrowing our troubles away; on the contrary our
 troubles are being compounded by the debt-trap, and everywhere we
 turn we grasp makka. We are not singular. This is the state of our
 world in which we must hold on and survive until this crisis passes.
 And those of us in the Third World who will survive best of all are
 those who are able to feed themselves from their own resources: for
 that is and that has always been the start of economic survival in
 times of trouble. If a people can feed itself from its own resources
 then that people can weather all kinds of storms and strains and
 pressures. There was a time when Jamaicans and most other Third
 World countries understood this and were much more economically
 and self-sufficient
 self-supporting than they now are. It is not a matter of 'either- or'
 There is no real incompatibility between feeding yourself as a
 people and developing industries and export manufacturing. What is
 and what has been wrong was the wholesale Third World abandoning of
 self-sufficiency in food production for the ^{glittering} dross of
 cheap foreign imports. It suited the metropolitan exporters and ~~some~~
 importers but ^{in these times of trouble} the people are going to pay a heavy price for it.

+ a law
 at some local
 importers but

might
 wish

- 1) The Minibuses: Their Role & Future
- ~~2) Israel & the Destruction of West Beirut~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
August 13, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The chaos and confusion on the streets of Kingston and St. Andrew during the first three days of this week have dramatised, as nothing else could have, how greatly the travelling public of the Corporate Area has come to depend on the minibuses, be they legal or otherwise. Without the minibuses there was a transport void with which the gutted skeleton of the J.O.S. just could not cope. Like it or not, the people in the Corporate Area who depend on public transport, and they are the overwhelming majority, just cannot get about nowadays without the minibuses. The minibuses have effectively taken over the bulk of the city's public transport. It is the J.O.S. which is now the sort of standby service. And yet, the J.O.S. is the official government-owned public transport system which has the franchise rights. And I am told that each minibus which has been given some part of that J.O.S. franchise is required to pay the J.O.S. \$500 every six months for the privilege of doing the job which the J.O.S. itself is so signally failing to do. So the minibuses not only do the work the J.O.S. is supposed to do, they also have to pay ^{a kind of rent} /for providing that service to the travelling public: this is on top of the licensing and insurance premiums the minibus operators have to pay. If this is in fact how it is, then I, for one, do not think the minibus operators are getting a fair deal in this whole business of streamlining/^{the} public transport service which is now under way. Please don't get me wrong. There has to be streamlining and there has to be ^{+ discipline} regulation/so that is not a point of objection or complaint. But is it being really

2

done in a fair and equitable manner? Many minibus operators think not. For instance, if some big outside foreign investor, or for the matter some big local investor, were to be invited and were to accept the invitation, to run the city's public transport, such an investor would expect and in all probability would be given all kinds of concessions: there would be tax concessions; there would be help with the finding of foreign exchange and lines of credit; bottlenecks would be cleared so that new vehicles and parts are brought in quickly and smoothly. This is the traditional way of attracting ^{and keeping} big investment, especially big foreign investment. My information is that our local minibus operators have not had any assistance of this kind at all. Why? Because they are small or petty capitalists? Do we cater to the needs of only big capitalists, even on as vital a matter as public transport? I think the government knows that if it had to rebuild the J.O.S. or to put in place another system based on minibuses only, it would have to find millions and millions of dollars to do so. The minibus operators are doing this for us without a penny of investment from the public purse. I would have thought that rather than making them pay for providing this service/^{we} would instead offer them incentives at the same time that we insist on regulating and streamlining their operations. After all they are in this, like any good capitalist, big or petty, to make a ^{decent} living and a profit. Unlike the J.O.S. and other state-owned enterprises they have no Big Daddy/^{government} to turn to when their vehicles need repairing or replacement: so turning a reasonable profit is a matter of survival for them. I think the minibus operators have shown us a way in which our public transport problems can be solved: that is to divest public transport into the hands of our ^{own} small or petty capitalists and, while we regulate them, help them with the tools to do the job. If we fail we may never have another such chance.

Land the investment This one Again Goodnight.

at a local and privately owned

If we fail at this we may never
again have a chance ^{at a viable} to have a public urban

transport system which is privately
owned by our own smaller operators

be help with the finding of foreign exchange and lines of credit;
bottlenecks would be cleared so that new vehicles and parts are
brought in quickly and smoothly. This is the traditional way of
attracting big investment, especially big foreign investment. My
information is that our local minibus operators have not had any
assistance of this kind at all. Why? Because they are small or
petty capitalists? Do we cater to the needs of only big capitalists
even on as vital a matter as public transport? I think the government
knows that if it had to rebuild the U.O.S. or to put in place another
system based on minibuses only, it would have to find millions and
millions of dollars to do so. The minibus operators are doing this
for us without a penny of investment from the public purse. I would
have thought that rather than making them pay for providing this
service ^{we} would instead offer them incentives at the same time that
we insist on regulating and streamlining their operations. After
all they are in this, like any good capitalist, big or petty, to
make a living and a profit. Unlike the U.O.S. and other state-owned
enterprises they have no Big Daddy ^{government} to turn to when their vehicles
need repairing or replacement: so turning a reasonable profit is
a matter of survival for them. I think the minibus operators have
shown us a way in which our public transport problems can be solved
that is to divest public transport into the hands of our small or
petty capitalists and, while we regulate them, help them with the
tools to do the job. If we fail we may never have another such chance.
Goodnight.

End of the Jamintel Strike:
A Critical Review

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
August 9, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The ^{settling} ~~end~~ of the Jamintel strike was undoubtedly the most welcome as well as the most important weekend news for us here in Jamaica. But ^{to} if we are/have any hope of the kind of industrial peace and stability without which increased productivity is an impossible dream, then we need ask why this strike took place in the first instance. And why did it have to go on for 30 days? And why could Mr. Hugh Shearer step in and settle it in a matter of three hours? There was one figure given which suggested that the strike cost the country somewhere in the region of \$1-million a day. Even if that figure were cut in half, the cost of the strike would still be heavy. So why did it drag on until the Shearer intervention? Surely, something which could ^{be} ~~have been~~ settled so quickly 30 days later could have been settled just as quickly in the first or second week of the strike, or even before there was a strike. So why the strike? The facts ^{as I understand them,} ~~are these~~ are these: The starting point of the workers and their union in the negotiating process was ^a demand of a wage increase of 20% in the first year and 20% in the second year. The starting point of the company was an offer of 15% in the first year and 15% in the second year. We know that traditionally, in the negotiating process, the tug-of-war is for the employer side to try and ease down the demands of the worker side, and for the worker's side to try and ease up the offer of the employers. And usually, all things being equal, they end up somewhere in the middle with each side making some concession. In the Jamintel context Government

policy specifically allows wage negotiations to be settled on the basis of ability to pay. Jamintel, after all, is not a government department which is supported ^{out of} ~~by~~ the Budget and it is making a decent profit, so there was no question about its ability to pay. If the negotiations between the company and the workers' union were allowed to run their course it is fair to assume that there would have been a settlement somewhere midway between the company's offer and the union's demand. But at this point the Minister stepped in and changed the company's offer of 15% and 15% to 15% and 13% on the grounds of ability to pay. And of course the whole thing broke down. It seems to me that the very first lesson to be learnt is the danger of Ministers stepping in midway through a negotiation ~~to~~ alter the bargaining terms of even ^{the government's} ~~its~~ own servants. You either lay down your conditions before the start of any negotiation till there is a breakdown in advance or else you hold your peace ^{to} ~~to~~ revise the offer of your own servants in midstream is to undermine their ~~own~~ authority as well as to court the kind of trouble we saw in the Jamintel case with its charges of 'bad faith' and hostility to labour. Good faith and consistency is not a one-way street and is not conditional on how much power or 'muscle' either side may have. I think those who see only the faults and shortcomings on the workers ^{any} side of ~~the~~ equation had better face this one too, otherwise the industrial peace and co-operation they say they want will keep on eluding us. Calls for ^{and sacrifice} patriotism/by the workers ring hollow when they ~~come~~ from those who only seek to benefit from such one-sided sacrifice, and who have themselves been branded as 'greedy and grasping' rip-off artists of the Jamaican economy and the Jamaican effort at recovery. Our burdens, as Mr. Shearer said, must be shared ^{equally} by all, not only by the working classes. And forging industrial peace and co-operation, ^{is a critical} ~~given~~ good element in that sharing. You won't get that by knocking the workers and their unions. Goodnight.

- 1) Seeing Our Problems in Context
- 2) Developments on the African Scene
- 3) The U.S. & the Middle East

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
August 6, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Our first week into Jamaica's twenty-first ~~xxxx~~ year of political independence has not been a time of joy for very many and very important segments of the Jamaican society. Our business community is not happy. Our farming community is not happy. There is an air of embattlement about our trade union movement. The general citizenry is fed-up and ~~distressed~~ disgruntled over high prices and low quality service in almost every area of life. Water and public transport are endless worries for most Jamaicans. Only Reggae Sunsplash, over in Montego Bay, offers a few days of joy, as well as the earning of much needed foreign exchange. But let us not repeat the destructive negativism of the 1970s by making it seem that we are ~~sigglar~~, that it is only in Jamaica that things are not going as we want, only in Jamaica that there is no joy. We are part of a whole world in worries, and most of the other worries are much worse than our own. While we celebrated our twentieth anniversary of independence the people of Kenya were caught up in a violent coup attempt to overthrow the Kenyan Government. Before that attempt was contained over one hundred people reportedly died and there was much damage and looting, especially of property of the minority Asian community. Some 3,000 people, including almost the entire Kenyan airforce, ~~personnel~~ a number of university students, have been arrested and the university has been closed down. If Kenya's President Moi and his Cabinet really regard this attempt as no more than "a serious form of hooliganism by misguided youth" then this could be only the first of many attempts, one of which, sooner or later, will succeed. When discontent runs deep enough

and when all forms of expressing it are ^{suppressed then,} ~~put down by force~~
 sooner or later, attempts will be made to achieve change by violence.
 So I hope Kenya's leaders will look beyond 'hooliganism' and ^{deal} ~~xxxxxx~~
 with some of the very acute political and social and economic problems
 which beset that beautiful country. There is poverty and unemployment
 There is suppression of free speech (their finest poet, ^{+ play right} Joseph
 Kariuki, has been harassed and imprisoned for writing and speaking
 the truth) and there is an extraordinary elitism which more than
 matches the earlier racism of the white settler days. These are some
 of the causes behind that attempted coup which happened on the eve
 of our Independence Day. And Kenya, lest we forget, is America's
 closest ally in that part of the world and ^{is} the biggest receiver of
 U.S. assistance there. So U.S. ^{friendship and} aid ^{itself} does not guarantee stability.
 Tanzania, much poorer and starved for aid, is also more stable. We
 can look on these things and count our blessings. And we can also be
 relieved that with all our troubles we are not in the desperate
 political situation now faced by the government of Zimbabwe where the
 economy and the tourist trade are being undermined by enemies both
 within and without in an attempt to force the government either to
 change direction or to lose power. There was a time, in our political
 innocence, when we thought this sort of thing did not happen in real
 life. We have learned better since and we know ^{we have} the ease of being out
 of the direct heat of ^{that kind} ~~battle~~ ^{however briefly} of battle. And the right to choose and
 to change and to change again, still resides in the hands of the
 Jamaican people - which is what makes us so much more fortunate than
 most, despite all our worries. Our big problem, into our twenty-first
 year, is the impulse among so many of us still ^{to} believe that some
 big somebody from overseas will solve our problems for us. Well, it
 don't go so. Look at Lebanon, look at El Salvador, look at Kenya,
 look anywhere and only those who ^{think clearly &} help themselves, survive and are
 helped by God. Goodnight.

Independence, 1982:
a Look Back at 1962

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
July 30, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This evening marks the start of the long Independence weekend in celebration of the 20th anniversary of the attainment of Jamaican political independence from Great Britain: and twenty years is a neat and tidy time package against which to measure movement and change; it provides a longer and, perhaps, truer perspective against which to measure such movement and change than ~~than~~ ^{is possible with} the year-by-year observations of Independence. So what was it like twenty years ago? How does it compare with today? You can, if you like shocks and surprises, start with such simple statistics as that ~~weekly~~ ^{male workers} wages for unskilled ~~workers~~ varied between a little over £2 a week to a little over £3 a week. In today's money that would be between \$6 a week and \$9 a week. For women it was even less: 30/- to 40/- which was between \$4 and \$6 a week by today's money. But, and it is a very important but, you could buy a great deal more with your money then than you can today. The cheaper meat cuts, for instance, could be had for 9d to 1/6d a pound, which would be between 10c and 15c in today's money, and the better cuts would sell for the equivalent of between 25c and 50c a pound. So the clerk or typist earning between £7 and £9 a week, or the other artisans earning between £3 and £7 a week could buy more for their money than can the workers today earning between \$50 and \$100 and \$200 a week. But this is not only a Jamaican phenomenon: this debasement of the value of money with its consequent inflation of prices which reduces the level and quality of living, especially for the lower paid workers, is worldwide, hitting the workers of the developed countries ^{almost} as badly.

as those of the Third World. The great difference is that most developed countries have social security cushions to ease the blow a little for the hardest hit of their poor; we of the Third World have as yet developed no such cushioning. So our poor are indeed the Wretched of the Earth of whom Franz Fanon wrote. For them the past twenty years have brought little economic improvement. But it is not all gloom. Twenty years ago you did not hear the poor complaining and protesting and asserting themselves as today. There was no black pride no self-assertion of the young, no black faces in front offices and banks, let alone in Boardrooms; *and certainly no women on Boards of Directors;* there were no call-in radio programmes where people could speak and, at times, over-speak their minds and so abuse this wonderful new access to their fellow men by way of a more open media. And twenty years ago the trade unions spent as much time undercutting each other as they did gaining benefits for their members. So one of the great and glorious changes in Jamaica between 1962 and 1982 is the new cooperation and spirit of unity within the trade union movement. But for that, the enemies of trade unionism would have gained a deal more ground than they have by now, for the union movement is embattled today and only its unity can prevent its emasculation and /dismemberment. The political movement has not fared as well these past twenty years. In 1962 Alexander Bustamante and Norman Manley still dominated the political scene and imposed on the political parties their own *five* sense of the limits beyond which the democratic process should not be pushed without risk to its survival. So the rivalry and the tribalism were kept within bounds and there was no use of the political gun or the incendiary torch as an adjunct of partisan activity. They are gone now and the *several* hundreds who died in the bloodies and ugliest election campaign Jamaica has ever known, *is* a gross violation of all they stood for, and is an ugly blot on the record of these past twenty years. We must never forget that. ~~More on Monday.~~
Goodnight

- 1) Lebanon: New PLO Initiative
- 2) ~~Zimbabwe: Terrorism & Destabilisation~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
July 26, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Yesterday, Mr. Yasser Arafat, the Chairman of the embattled Palestine Liberation Organisation met in West Beirut with a group of American Congressmen and set off a political time-bomb whose shocks and consequences are still to be heard and felt. Mr. Arafat's shocker was a simple signed statement saying that he accepted all the United Nations resolutions relevant to the Palestine question. Now, the United Nations, at the level of the Security Council as well as ~~at~~ in the General Assembly, has passed a number of resolutions on the Palestine question over the years. These resolutions have, at various times, affirmed and reaffirmed the right of Israel to exist within secure and recognised borders, as well as the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination within a state of their own. Because resolution 242 and 338 dealt specifically with the question of Israel's right to exist succeeding United States governments have said that they would not recognise Mr. Arafat's PLO or have any direct dealings with it, until it accepted these resolutions. The Israelis, for their part, have pointed to the stated PLO objective of the destruction of the Jewish state, and the PLO refusal to recognise the existence of that state, as justification for all their various actions, provoked or unprovoked, against the PLO over the years. And now, yesterday's simple statement by Arafat of PLO acceptance of all U.N. resolutions has thrown both U.S. and Israeli policies into a kind of confused disarray. Predictably, the Israelis have hotly denounced Arafat's statement as shameless propaganda. The White House, for its part, has advised

'extreme caution' in assessing the meaning of this development, and said that it could not confirm that Mr. Arafat had signed the document despite the fact that a number of U.S. Congressmen witnessed it. I rather suspect that without those American Congressional witnesses much graver doubt would have been cast on the authenticity of the Arafat statement. As it is, statements by lesser PLO spokesmen in other parts of the world are being used to question and^{to} raise doubts as to what Arafat meant. Clearly, ^{neither} ~~neither~~ the United States nor the Israelis were prepared for or expected anything like this shocker.

And make no mistake about it, it is a political shocker. It changes the whole complexion of Middle Eastern politics by at once wiping out the moral and political justification on which both Israeli and American policies to the Palestinians were based. Twist and turn any way you like: to recognise and accept all the U.N. resolutions is to accept Israel's right to live within secure and recognised border. But it also implies U.S. and Israeli acceptance of all those self-same resolutions and this, in turn, means acceptance by the U.S. and by Israel of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and a state of their own; and that is where the rub is. Self-determination means people deciding for themselves the form of government they want and the people and parties they want to lead them. It is not self-determination when some outside power decides what parties or persons can or cannot run for office and what form of government is acceptable. The Israelis are afraid of a Palestinian state under a PLO government. ^{But what if that is what the Palestinians want?} The talk about terrorism they now use against the PLO is the self-same talk that was used against them when they struggled for their state. And the U.S. is trapped in its own ^{spelled-out} terms for dealing with the PLO. How Israel and how the U.S. respond to Arafat's dramatic new initiative, after the screaming and shouting, will be a pointer to the longterm future in the Middle East and to the question of war or peace, security or continued conflict between Jew and Arab. Goodnight

- 1) Line-of-Credit Interest Rates
- 2) Divestment Policy Problems
- 3) Politics, Production, Progress

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday

July 23, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Mr. Aaron Matalon of the ICD Group of Companies has a most revealing letter on page two of today's Daily News setting out the details of what it costs a Jamaican company to take up one of the many Lines-of-Credit now said to be available to Jamaican manufacturers. From the specific case mentioned by Mr. Matalon it comes out that the average Jamaican businessman will end up paying between 40% and 59% interest per annum on his Line-of-Credit. And if any local manufacturer has to pay between 40% and 59% interest on the cost of the raw materials he imports, what hope in hell has he of being able to compete with low-cost foreign producers from metropolitan countries? I think we need to try to understand this one if we are to make any sort of sense of some of the angry bawling from our local manufacturers and merchants. They do seem to be operating under handicaps which effectively demand that they compete with one arm tied behind their backs. In the jungle of the free market system this is a sure prescription for disaster, and it explains, in part at least, the phenomenon of the 33 or is it 38 'non-operating' factories over which there is presently a running argument between the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the President of the Jamaica Manufacturers Association. What is for sure is that these staggering interest rates of Lines-of-Credit are massive roadblocks in the path of the local private sector, which this government has designated the principal engine of progress. If the government does not tackle these roadblocks, then no amount of lecturing will get

production going, or stop the illicit importing of finished goods, or stop the heavy and flourishing trading in black market U.S. dollars³. Survival and profitability are the names of the game under the free market system, and it is cheaper and more profitable to buy black market U.S. dollars even at the rate of three-for-one than it is to pay between 40% and 59% per annum in interest on a Line-of-Credit. This is a hard one that is not going to be just talked away with invocations to decency and patriotism and commitment, all virtues which were scoffed at and made dubious in another day and another time. So how do we deal with this? And how do we deal with last Sunday's statement by the Leader of the Opposition at the PNP Women's conference that, and now I quote: "They can divest all they want. When the PNP comes to power, we will take it back."? On page ten of today's Daily News there is a signed report that the ~~xxx~~ much discussed Southern Processors plant in Bull Savannah is to be re-opened within two weeks, but under private ownership. If this report is correct then the government must have completed its divestment. But is the government really selling a public venture worth some \$7-million for a paltry \$1.5-million? And, as the signed report asks: who is the lucky person to get such a gift? And what happens to that lucky person when the PNP returns to power? What happens with all the other ^{divested} properties and ventures? It is obviously not in Jamaica's ^{best} long-term interest for one party to put important segments of the economy under public ownership, and for the other party to undo this when they gain power. It is economically debilitating and destructive and is bound to end up mashing up parliamentary democracy itself unless the parties can agree on some sort of national compact on what is to be publicly-owned and how. In this way partisan politics could be made less of an obstacle to steady, long-term progress and productivity than is now the case. Goodnight.

- 1) Lebanon: Will Kissinger Ride Again?
- 2) Western Fall Out over Soviet Gas Pipeline
- 3) "CBI Day" in Washington

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
July 19, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Three topics^d dominate the news right now, and may indeed do so for the rest of this week: first, there are the latest twists and turns coming out of the continuing Lebanese crisis and the Israeli seige of West Beirut; then there is today's meeting in Brussels of the Foreign Ministers of the European Community to discuss^s and, perhaps, decide on retaliatory action against the United States for its ban on the sale of all American and American-financed and controlled equipment~~ment~~ to the Soviet Union for its projected 3,500-mile gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe; and then, on Wednesday, there is the planned all-day lobby in Washington by Jamaican and other West Indian delegations for the passage by the American Congress of Mr. Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative. This lobbying effort will be coordinated and managed by the United States Business Committee on Jamaica in conjunction with Caribbean/Central American Action. And the aim is to persuade members of the U.S. Congress to give approval to the Reagan Initiative with as few changes as possible. Latest^t reports indicate that the Initiative will gain Congressional approval; but there may be some sticking points over issues seen by different American interest^e groups as affecting either their own trading interests or the jobs of American workers. And it is on these that the lobby hopes^{to} assure the American Congressmen- and women. As a kind of backup to this the leaders of our major trade unions will have their own lobbying delegation in Washington on Friday to try and win over the American labour leaders of the AFL-CIO whose

U.S.

members are under very great pressure right now:/unemployment is higher than it has been since the Great Depression; social security benefits have been severely restricted and American labour is in no mood to accommodate the Reagan Administration on anything. Our union leaders are likely to hear much stronger language against the Reagan Administration/than the words of Mr. Belafonte, which touched so many raw exposed nerves here. How they handle this could be important; but things are not going to be easy. And/the latest ziggs and zaggs on the Middle East is evidence that things are not any easier there. The mere talk - current over this weekend - of bring Dr. Henry Kissinger back to take over the negotiations in Lebanon is evidence of some desperation. The Reagan people, and their powerful rightwing power base, have little time for Kissinger and having to turn to him is an act of desperation. So, whether Kissinger rides again or not, the Middle East equation continues to undergo change. The Israelis would, I think, like to see Kissinger back because they know where they are with him and they are reasonably sure of what ends he would serve. But if Kissinger returns then the newly installed Foreign Secretary George Schulz/^{might} ~~xxxxx~~ end up emasculated even before he has properly started the job. So even this could contribute further to a foreign policy already in disarray. And nowhere is that disarray more starkly evident than in the fact that America's European allies are thinking and talking of economic relatiation. The Soviet gas pipeline would, when comple~~ted~~ in 1984, supply Western Europe with less than 10% of its total energy needs so the American fear of Europe becoming dependent on the Soviets is a bit unreal; it will ease dependence on Arab oil, though; and the contracts entered into will create thousands of jobs and spur new production in Western Europe. All this the Reagan ban would obstruct. And the Europeans note bitterly that Reagan's American/ does more trade with the Soviets than anyone else thought/ its grain purchases. *Full of faults* Goodnight.

Crisis Management & the
Politics of Consensus

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday

July 16, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The question is: Can the Jamaica Public Service Company maintain its present level of electricity supply to the Jamaican community, unsatisfactory as it may be, without its present management team? Or can we replace that management team quickly and without severe/^{further}dislocation to the service? If the answer is: Yes, we can, then we can safely ignore the distress of the Jamaica Public Service Company Managers Association over what they describe as sweeping statements by the Minister of Public Utilities "which have had the effect of causing great disquietude and a lowering of morale among managers in J.P.S.". If, on the other hand, we do need the services of these people, and if we cannot replace them quickly and quietly and without dislocation to the service ^{causing} and ~~and~~/further distress and discomfort to the consuming public, then the sooner we stop casting stones at them the better. You do not, in this day and age, get the best performance out of people with dark warnings of shake-ups and dismissals. Similarly, empty calls for divestment of the Public Service Company ^{or J.P.S. for that matter,} are more likely to undermine rather than build up worker morale, ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ And since there are no takers in sight, what is the point of such calls? Where are the group or groups with the kind of money and expertise needed to take over such a major undertaking? In the first six months of this year no less than twenty-one American banks reportedly collapsed. There is no easy risk money to be had for such difficult undertakings unless high returns - at least higher than present risk-free interest rates - can be gssured and gaaranteed and underwritten. And what guarantee

does the Jamaican consumer have that a divested JPS would provide a better service at an almost certain higher cost? If the intention is to frighten JPS workers into better performance then I suggest, respectfully, that fear, uncertainty and low morale are just about the worst possible incentives to improved performance. The days when people were driven by fear are long gone, and may they never come back. We need, I think, to foster other attitudes and offer other incentives to achieve better productivity and better performance at the workplace, and I hope the government Task Force on Work Attitudes will take a cold and searching look at some of the now almost built-in disincentives to ~~work~~ truly healthy work attitudes. One of these, perhaps one of the worst, is political interference where the getting or not getting of a job is related to party affiliation and services already rendered, ^{to the party} so that the receiver of the job sees the job ^{itself} as payment for something already done, and so there is no need to perform more than minimally. To be sure this is only so for committed party activists who are an admitted minority; but the rest of the work force can see this and seeing it they do not see why they should do any better. Then there is the elected politician who fancies himself as his own chief executive officer and who mistakes his up-setting of things and people for strong and forceful leadership. Shaking up things can be very negative and counter-productive, as we have seen again and again. The crippled JBC is one enduring monument to the political cult of the shake-up. The truth is that politicians not recognising the limits of their power, and ^{not} operating within those limits, is one of the greatest obstacles to our coming truly to grips with our present crisis. They cannot do the job alone; and they cannot curse and bully and threaten and frighten the workforce and the rest of the society into co-operating. You do not command co-operation; you earn it; and that requires thoughtful and sensitive leadership. That is our most pressing challenge right now. Goodnight.

The Seige of Beirut: Is there a
U.S.-Israeli Fall Out?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
July 12, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: ^{and parents and} or some of us, while we have been preoccupied with the stormy ~~and~~ ~~boiling~~ ^{el} scalding-cat reaction to that speech by Mr. Harry Belafonte, and others having been working themselves up over the stripping and examining of containers in search of illegal imports, an interesting and potentially important geopolitical twist appears to have developed over the seige of Beirut ^{in the Lebanon}. According to this morning's American National Public Radio programme 'Morning Edition', there is speculation that President Reagan has sent a warning to Israeli Prime Minister Begin for Israel to stop obstructing or frustrating U.S. policy ^{efforts} in the Middle East; if he, Begin, does not heed the warning the U.S. may enter into direct negotiations with the Palestine Liberation Organisation, which would in effect amount to U.S. recognition of the PLO, ^{and} which would in turn change the whole political climate in the Middle East. Predictably, when journalists with the American President on his trip from his California home back to Washington, tried to confirm these reports, they got nowhere. Neither the President ~~nor~~ any of his spokesmen were prepared to comment. But there is one interesting pointer and it can be put as a question: Why is West Beirut still beseiged? Why have the Israelis not over-run West Beirut and so complete their self-appointed job of liquidating the PLO? Considering the speed of their blitz-like invasion and over-running of Southern Lebanon, ^{death and} the devastation they left in their wake, why have they stopped short on the edge of West Beirut with total victory within their grasp? It is when we look for

answers to this question that this morning's report out of Washington, however speculative, takes on grave importance. The record shows that the Israeli Government under Mr. Begin has not yielded to public opinion or public pressure; it has ignored U.N. condemnation of its action, and it has even ignored U.N. Security Council calls. So it is reasonable to assume that it was not the appeal by the Pope or the strong worldwide criticism which stayed the final assault on the PLO stronghold in West Beirut. To be sure, there ~~was~~^{is} the risk of taking very heavy Israeli casualties in any street-by-street hand-to-hand fighting; but that could be largely neutralised by heavy precision bombing from the air to 'soften up' the target first. So that was no real obstacle. The only real obstacle had to be a threat that was so clear and so compelling and so deeply disturbing in its likely consequences, that they had no alternative but to stop and ^{likely} examine it and its consequences very seriously. Well, for over a week the Israelis have not pulverised or over-run West Beirut; the Israeli Cabinet has met and met again and each time it has extended the deadline for the evacuation of the PLO. Was Mr. Haig's resignation a factor? It is now generally assumed that his nod was the go-head for Israeli invasion and this may have been a key factor in his going. If this is correct and the Reagan people are now not prepared to continue to underwrite Israeli action with a political blank cheque, then what happens next? The Americans clearly have to try and recover some ground among the so-called moderate Arab leaders in the region; if they don't ^{continue to} Soviet influence will grow and with it Arab radicalism. A settlement with the Palestinians therefore becomes as important to American interests as is the friendship with Israel. And for the first time in its short history Israel may be faced with the grim prospect of either listening to its one true friend and protector in the world or of going it alone in a hostile world. Goodnight.

- 1) The Belafonte 'Storm-in-a-Teacup'. Why?
- 2) Unemployment and Numbers *T Good Work*
- ~~3) International Update~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday

July 9, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The extraordinary and rather waspish uproar provoked by Mr. Harry Belafonte's speech at this year's Norman Manley Foundation Awards ceremony, and the announcement of the government's \$30-million budget for this year's rural road improvement programme, deserve a little closer examination than they seem to have been given up to now. In the case of the reaction to the Belafonte speech I think the comment: "The screams are the same, only the faces are different," sums it up best. This is not the first time that a govt. of Jamaica has been described as the 'pawn' of this or that power or government or grouping. The government before this one was denounced variously as the 'pawn' of Cuba, of the Soviet Union, of international communism; indeed, some of the people who now form the government of Jamaica were party to some of these charges and accusations, which were not always made with the ^{comparative} good ~~xxxx~~ manners displayed by Mr. Belafonte this week. So why all the fuss? He said nothing that had not been said before. And he certainly was not the first to make that kind of suggestion. I remember the first time I heard the ^{report} ~~xxxx~~ ^{newly-elected} ~~xxxx~~ out of Washington when our Prime Minister was described as "Our man in the Caribbean". It started a slow quiet burn/but no public uproar. ^{And} People were relieved when Jamaica's Prime Minister declared flatly that he was nobody's man. But that was a suggestion, from the very corridors of American power, of the pawn. Is it all right ^{when} ~~if~~ highly-placed Americans in Washington make the suggestion in an approving manner, but all wrong when Mr. Belafonte makes it in a

disapproving manner? So precisely why are some of us so very angry with Mr. Belafonte, even to the point of being nasty and waspish about his personal character and his career? I don't think there is anything wrong with attacking a man's ideas when you disapprove of them: that is the common intellectual currency in democracies. Being personal and vituperative is not. And I was glad that Prime Minister Seaga refused to be drawn into this rather ugly storm in a teacup which showed up ~~some~~ more ugly things about some of us and some of our attitudes than about Mr. Belafonte. True freedom of expression, true freedom of speech is not, and is not to be, reserved only for what you and I approve of and with us reserving the right to say when and where it may be exercised and how. That is ~~the beginning of~~ ^{the start of} intolerance and suppression. Now, the more economically important matter of some 70,000 folk mainly in rural Jamaica, being able to get jobs during what remains of this year under the government's rural road improvement programme. If the programme goes as outlined then it should be more than the usual make-work political hand-out business. The intention is to permanently upgrade the quality of our rural and especially agricultural roadways if that is fulfilled all Jamaica should see lasting benefit. If it is not, then the same work will have to be done again next year and the year after and the year after, as it has been in the past, and which is a massive waste of the limited resources of this nation. One of the worrying things is that \$30-million to pay some 70,000 workers works out at an average of \$428.57 per worker per year, or \$8.24 per week. You can, of course, juggle the numbers and the work around, so that a worker gets a larger lump sum for a short concentrated work period; but that will not change the general average, which is very small indeed. If that sum is for the remaining six months of this year only it improves things a little: but the problem of good work for poor pay still remains.

- 1) Showdown Week for Beirut
- 2) Mid-East Geopolitical Moves
- 3) One-Party Democracy - Mexican Style

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
July 5, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Israeli seige of the Lebanese capital, Beirut, and the sealing off of the Palestine Liberation Organisation stronghold in West Beirut, represents the kind of charged situation which is either quickly defused or else explodes in uncontrollable violence: so the Palestinian forces will either move out of Beirut and Lebanon this week or there will be a terrible new bloodletting that will be worse than all the death and destruction caused by the Israeli invasion of the Lebanon this far. And so far, lest we forget, it is estimated that some 10,000 civilians have already been killed. Not unexpectedly, the Israelis dispute this figure, but their own claim that only 362 civilians have been killed takes us back to the 'numbers game' of the 'body count' of the Vietnam era when everybody lied shamelessly with numbers to serve propaganda ends. In this instance I think we must put more reliance on reports from sources such as the Red Cross, the British Guardian, Times, ^{and} Statesman newspapers than on official Israeli statements. Cluster bombs dropped in densely populated areas kill and destroy massively and indiscriminately: they make no difference ^{between} military and civilian targets; to pretend otherwise is dishonest. And to raise the matter of the Israelis having no other option but to invade is the kind of special pleading which ends up on the dark side of morality: Hitler had no option but to attempt to exterminate the Jews; Stalin had no option but to liquidate the kulaks; Ian Smith had no option but to cross the borders into

black neighbouring states; the South African racists have no option but to try to destroy the ANC and impose their brutal degrading Apartheid. The truth of the matter is there are always options: Israel's own David Ben Gurion offered an option which would have made possible the harmonious living together in peace of Palestinian and Jew - but it was ~~an~~ a ~~apparently~~ more difficult and risky option, in the short run at least, than the use of force. The 'no option' argument is a thing of political and moral bankruptcy. One small ray of hope in the general darkness of this situation is that scores of thousands of Israelis inside Israel over this weekend demonstrated against their own country's invasion of the Lebanon. Some Palestinians will note this, could comfort that it is, and through it, see perhaps a hint of the common humanity behind the horror and the savagery. In the meantime, from Moscow to Washington to Bonn to Ryad to Cairo this week will see furious diplomatic activity to try and avoid bitter and bloody fighting between Jews and Arabs in the streets of Beirut - always, of course, provided it suits the geopolitical interests of the party concerned; each party is out to further its own political interests. It is no accident, for instance, that the Arab states which talk so loudly have not come to the military aid of the PLO. Many of them are as afraid of a strong PLO as is Israel and as hostile as the U.S. to it. And the Russians are not about to pull chestnuts out of the fire for rightwing conservative Arab regimes; but they are interested in increasing their influence in the region and they can do so without too much cost or effort as long as American foreign policy is in its present state of confusion in which they even have to protest loudly, in the face of Arab scepticism, / that they did not give the Israelis the go-head to invade Lebanon.

And finally and briefly, Mexico yesterday returned the same political party to power for the fifty-fourth year when it again chose as President the candidate of the Institutional Revolutionary Party. Talk about a working and cohesive one-party democracy! Goodnight.

The beautiful trick is the one-term President.

- 1) The Need for Morality & Consistency
- 2) Protection Against Unemployment

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
July 2, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: We must all hope that the government's efforts to put a stop to, or, at the very least, greatly reduce the flow of illicit imports will be successful and quickly so. For if that flow of illegal imports is not stemmed quickly all hopes of turning the economy about may come to nothing. The trouble is that some terrible damage has already been done, and so we again find ourselves in the unhappy position of reacting and responding to a crisis situation after the damage has been done, rather than having made forward plans to avoid it. Indeed, I am not sure that the government itself is not mainly to blame for this situation. All the talk about deregulating the economy and opening up markets and the free flow of competition was accepted in good faith by very many people. They saw it as a clear signal of the freeing up of the economy and for them to go ahead and 'do their thing'. You will remember that the banking system was advised not to enquire too closely if and when large sums of foreign exchange were brought in. Here again, many people got the impression that we were into a very much more relaxed and permissive climate where foreign exchange was concerned, and while it was technically illegal to do certain things, no one would look too closely or ask too many questions. This perception that we were into a new time of permissiveness which had the tacit approval of the government of the day was, I think, one important reason for the large-scale illicit importing, the almost open ~~xxxxxxx~~ black market dealing in U.S. currency, /the shameless escalation in rentals, and the general fiddling with

raw material allocations. To say all this is not to try to either justify, condone or explain away, this dangerous development. It is simply to say that if we do not understand and learn from ^{what} ~~xxx~~ caused this situation, we will repeat the same mistake over and over again in a slightly different form each time. In politics as in all facets of life order and stability require a certain level of consistency: you cannot be against something when you are out of power and then be for it when you gain power. You cannot be for political strikes when out of power, and against them when in power. You cannot be for fiscal and import permissiveness at one time and then for tight controls at another. For if you are you create confusion and crisis and instability and that undermines your own best efforts. So consistency is more important than politicians seem to realise, especially in the heat of partisan battles. And I think it is a very dubious morality which gives people the impression that it is alright to behave in a certain way, and then, when things go wrong, turn on them. Better by far to first make your position clear beyond any doubt and then deal with those who violate the rules. That is the way of the rule of law. And I think we need to be consistent too, about Jamaica's single most crucial social problem: unemployment. Article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights says: "Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment." This week Bishop DeSouza talked about the terrible insecurity caused by unemployment. When in Opposition Mr. Shearer talked about a limited ^{form} of unemployment pay ^{out of N.I.S. funds}. When the new Government first came to power Mr. J.A.G. Smith talked about ^{some} forms of job sharing. Was this only talk? If it was, then the strife and internal conflict of which Bishop DeSouza warned becomes only a matter of time. We need morality and consistency here too. Goodnight.

- 1) Israel & the Palestinians
- 2) Haig's Resignation & U.S. Foreign Policy
- 3) ~~Argentina Accepts Ceasefire~~
A. Good Samaritanism Corner

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
June 28, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: There is no doubt about it: Israel's formidable military machines, now one of the most powerful and certainly the most ruthless in the world today, has delivered a crushing military defeat on Yasser/^{Arafat's}~~Arafat's~~ Palestine Liberation Organisation. It has battered the PLO forces to a point of collapse, and the final question is quite simply whether the 5,000,6,000 odd PLO fighters trapped in Beirut make a last desperate stand in which they will most certainly be utterly destroyed or whether they give up and leave the Lebanon as Israel demands. Either way, the PLO, as a fighting force has been crushed. That is the hard, brutal military fact, like it or not. In the process the Israelis have killed many, many civilians and done fearful/^{physical} damage to what remained of the ^{economically} once/~~prosperous~~ propserous and culturally cosmopolitan/~~state~~ ^{and} highly civilised state of Lebanon, which is now on the verge of collapse. The Israelis say the PLO is to blame for all this/^{death and} damage because it used the Lebanon as the staging ground for attacks against Israel, and so the Israeli invasion of Lebanon is no more than an act of self-defence. This, is basically the same argument used by the white South Africans to justify their across-the-border attacks on both Angolan and Mozambican territory in search of either SWAPO or ANC freedom fighters or terrorists, depending on which side you support. And this, before Zimbabwe's independence, was Ian Smith's justification for so-call^{ed} search-and-destroy missions into neighbouring black

countries. By use of the Orwellian Newthink and Doublespeak invasion becomes an act of self-defence: and the Israelis have carried it to its furthestest point. Anyway, however you view the issue, the fact is that the PLO is smashed for now. But does that also mean that the struggle of the Palestinian people for a homeland of their own is over? I think not. I think there will be a pause and then the Palestinian cause will rise again and try again, and again, and again for there is no way that any number of guns can liquidate an idea. And the Israelis themselves, should know, from bitter experience, that wiping out an entire people who are driven by an idea, is a near impossibility. It was tried on them, and it failed. So however the Lebanese tragedy plays itself out, it will not mean the end of the Palestinian people's struggle for a homeland. And after this defeat that struggle may turn really extremist. Next there was the resignation of Mr. Haig as U.S. Secretary of State which has turned which was in an American foreign policy/in shambles into a state of utter chaos. The Middle East situation today is a manifestation of that chaos. Until either Mr. Reagan himself, or his new appointee, pulls things together, the sense of confusion and flounder of American foreign policy will continue to feed international instability. Haig symbolised continuity of American foreign policy along the Kissinger lines which served American and West European interests well and succeeded in playing a balancing act in the Mid-East, and forging detente with the Soviets and better relations with China. To be sure Haig did not have the Machiavellian manipulative skills of Kissinger but he understood the complexities and delicacies of the issues involved, which is more than the ^{California} cowboys of the Reagan team do. And that ^{is} the problem and the worry. And finally, congratulations to Terry Smith for his extraordinary series on the Citybank affair. That is the kind of journalism Jamaica needs more of, and deserves.

Goodnight.

A Problem of National Leadership

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
June 25, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Listening to, and watching segments of the current annual sectoral part of the/national Budget debate has been a bit of a depressing experience. The performances, generally speaking, have, with rare exceptions, been well below the level of the earlier main presentations of Mr. Seaga, Mr. Manley, Mr. Shearer and Mr. Mullings. ~~xxxxxxx~~ The exceptions, in my judgement, were Mr. Broderick, Mr. Charles and Mr. Anthony Spaulding. These three, it seemed to me, were part of the important national debate started by the four main spokesmen. What made the others so depressing was the overriding sense that partisan politics took precedence over national politics, even in the manner in which they addressed genuinely national issues. Every now and then one got the sense that the 1980 general election was being fought all over again in the Jamaican parliament of 1982; more heat and passion went into the rehashing of who did what to whom in 1980 than went into the clear articulation of the hard and brute problems we face now, in 1982. The cold fact is that scoring political points, blaming the last eight years for every ill in the society and every present-day failure, using the last eight years as a kind of universal alibi for present-day bad performance and lack of forward planning, are all becoming counter-productive and utterly boring. Even the party faithful tend to show a sort of sickly smile when everything is blamed on the past regime. The Jamaican voters replaced the past regime precisely because they were not satisfied with its ^{overall} performance. ~~It is expect-~~

To make it appear that the electorate saw nothing good being done by the past regime was acceptable party politics during the campaign period. To now still carry on with this fiction is to insult the intelligence of the people; they know the performance of the past regime, as indeed of every government, was a mixture of the good and the bad. What they are concerned with now is the performance of this government, which they have now given a chance to show that it can do better, and manage better, and deliver. One of the problems created by this excessive near-electioneering partisan politics is that it tends to turn off so many who might otherwise take part in the national recovery effort. The supporters of one party alone, no matter how faithful and dedicated and committed they may be, are not enough to move this country forward. The party in power needs that hardcore, to be sure, but it also needs a broad consensus which includes the largely non-partisan and interest groups, apolitical/~~xxxx~~, the independents, and at the very least the tacit acquiescence of the political opposition; without these, no present-day Jamaican political party, no matter how well-organised, can run the country successfully/ especially in an economic crisis. Any time your propaganda ends up alienating the opposition and its sympathisers and gives the uncommitted the impression that you/are intolerant, you are digging a hole for yourself as a party and as a government. Confidence is a two-edged sword and so is credibility. And this brings us to the question of the media which ^{also} featured prominently in the sectoral debate this week. Any time press freedom ^{which} is dependent on a government, no matter under what political label, it is in danger; anytime any government or any government-appointed entity takes on responsibility for policing the media, the media is in danger. By their very nature all governments want to 'use' the media. We know this. So I for one am not impressed with government appointed ^{regulatory} media commissions, no matter how they are constituted. Supervising elections is legitimately the government's business. Supervising opinion is not. Anything ultimately, under

- 1) Are we Giving Up on Unemployment?
- 2) U.S. Foreign Policy in A Shambles?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
June 21, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two issues - one local, the other with international overtones - loom like ominous shadows on the political horizon. The one is unemployment in Jamaica and our responses to it; the other is the state of utter shambles of American foreign policy under the Reagan Administration. To begin with our own ^{issue} ~~is~~ first. On an almost weekly basis we hear and read about lay-offs and cut-backs and shut-downs, usually of small enterprises employing from say half a dozen workers to anywhere up to fifty or sixty. So it is usually only a handful of workers who are laid off or made redundant at any one time; and so the tendency is for us not to take too much note of it. It is important news when a few hundred workers are laid ^{off} ~~off~~; it is not worth much more than passing mention when six or twelve or a score of workers are laid-off. And yet, every four or five or six or sixteen add to the steadily growing pool of the unemployed. When a shoe ~~manufacturer~~ announces, as one did this past week, that it is closing down next month, it means a growing of that pool of the unemployed. According to official statistics unemployment stood at 25.6% in October of last ~~year~~; this means that in October of 1981 just over one-quarter of the Jamaican work force of a little over a million Jamaicans was out of work. More than twenty-five out of every 100 Jamaican workers had no jobs in October of 1981, according to the official statistics. Since then nearly nine months have passed, and it has been nine months of lay-off.

and cutbacks and redundancies. There were, of course, some very encouraging and optimistic projections of new job-creation, but there were actually very few new jobs created. So, in terms of flesh and blood people rather than of projections and numbers, more workers are without jobs today than last October. And the really worrying thing is that we, as a society, seem to have given up on the unemployed, at least in the short-run. It looks like an intractable problem, and so, as people often do with such hard problems, and as successive governments of Jamaica have done, we seem to be putting it aside to deal with other things, hoping against hope that time will either make the problem easier or make it go away. The trouble is that this particular problem is people and mainly young and reasonably educated people with higher expectations than had the unemployed of the 1950s and the 1960s and the 1970s even. This lot may not be as patient for as long as were those of earlier years. So I think it is in the interest of stability and good order in the society that the government and the trade unions make more of an effort than they have done up to now to tackle this problem: there are many things that can be done to ease it considerably; what is needed is the will. If we cannot summon the will reasonable quickly, all Jamaica will suffer. And so to the other, international shadow of American foreign policy in a shambles. Goodwill toward America has for very long been at a low level in ^{Black} Africa because of her tacit support under the Reagan administration of racist South Africa. She lost Latin American goodwill more recently over the Falklands business and her support of Britain. Now she is in process of losing the tattered remnants of the little support she has left in the Middle East over her perceived support of the Israeli aggression in the Lebanon. And in geopolitics when one superpower loses that much ^{would support} ~~credibility~~ it could tempt the other ^{one} into risky adventures. That's the danger. Goodnight

- 1) Falklands Update
- 2) A Soviet Anti-Nuclear Coup
- 3) Confidence as a Political Tool

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
June 18, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: There seems to have been some confusion over this week's developments in the Falkland Islands. The Argentine soldiers there did lay down their arms, and the Argentine military commander on the spot did surrender. The Government of Argentina has not, up to this morning, either ^{formally} endorsed that surrender, or even acknowledged it publicly. So hostilities are not over and cannot be over until the Government of Argentina declares an end to the hostilities. Until this is done there is no real ceasefire ^{in existence} in the South Atlantic and Argentine planes with their deadly missiles can drop out of the sky at any time and do further terrible damage to the British task force as well to the British troops now in possession of the Falklands. That is the grim reality of the present situation, and we must hope that the fall of Galtieri and today's installation of a new interim President, as well as the agreement to allow British ships to take the captured prisoners-of-war back to Argentine ports, are first signs that an end to hostilities may be declared over the next twenty-four to forty-eight hours. Both Britain and Argentina desperately need a formal end to the hostilities which have cost both dearly in men and material, especially to Argentina, because she is the poorer of the two; and the poorer you are, the heavier the burdens of war. I think, too, that the political face of Argentina is going to be transformed more rapidly as a result of this defeat than it would have been if she had been able to hold on to the islands; it is very likely that the military junta will fairly quickly give way to civilian

a larger measure
 rule and the restoration of democracy and/human rights which have
 been grossly violated by the military rulers over the past six years.
 I think the British are much too politically sophisticated to misread
 the nature of the support they have received from the Third World
 over this issue. It was support for their defence of the principle
 that territorial disputes should not be settled by force; not for any
 grand show of imperial power restored, whatever Mrs. Thatcher's
 private fantasies. So let us hope for that declaration of an end to
 hostilities and then, in due time, for negotiations over the territori
 al issue. Next, the Soviet Union brought off a brilliant political
 propaganda coup coup at the United Nations this week when it declared
 unilaterally and unequivocally that it would not be the first to use
 nuclear weapons in any fighting. With this simple, clearcut pledge
 the Soviets put themselves closer to the anti-nuclear movement than
 the United States is seen to be, especially/~~when~~ ^{after} the United States
 refused, however indirectly, to make a similar pledge. For the anti-
 nuclear movement in the United States, in Western Europe and through-
 out the world, America is now generally accepted as being the greater
 nuclear threat to the world than is Russia; and that is a psychologi-
 cal defeat of the first magnitude for the West. And finally, and here
 at home, a psychological setback of a different kind. Confidence is
 a state of mind and politicians often generate it and then use it
 as a tool ^{to} ~~the~~ ^{to} further the ^{political} policies and objectives. Churchill
 and Roosevelt's use of confidence during the dark days of world war
 two are classic examples. You project ^{and instil} confidence and ^{then} use it to mobilis
 e a nation to great action. The trick is to know how to use it, how
 much of it, and when. Over-use or mis-use ^{or abuse of it,} can come out looking like
 deception and dishonesty and can blow up in your face. We are into ^{at} the
 dangerous situation now in many areas of Jamaican public life. I hope
 the government takes note and thinks carefully. Goodnight.

- 1) The British Push to Port Stanley
- 2) The Israeli Invasion of Lebanon
- 3) Anti-Nuclear Protests in U.S.A.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
June 14, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: It was a weekend of war, of political violence, of massive bloodletting, and of bitter protest against the known and unknown horrors of war. Down in the bitterly cold and bleak South Atlantic the British have started their deliberate and measured push to finally retake Port Stanley. All the indications are that the battle for Port Stanley is not going to be the relatively low casualty affair which the British were aiming for. The whole point of their slowness and their pauses was to give the Argentines an opportunity to pull out, if they wanted to. But this has not paid off. The Argentines want a fight to the finish, and they clearly want to inflict as much damage as possible on the British, no matter what the price. ^{to themselves, or, rather, to their own soldiers.} The more ships they sink, especially battleships, and the more British soldiers they kill, the greater will be the justification for their own losses, no matter how great these may be.

The Argentine ^{junta}/leader has talked about 'fighting to the last' Argentine in surrounded Port Stanley. One suspects that the junta leaders would consider the deaths of a few thousand ^{young} Argentine soldiers well worth it if ^{in the process} their deadly airborne missiles could ^{be used to} sink one of the British Aircraft Carriers. In dictatorships showy and dramatic 'victories' are usually worth a great deal more than any number of human lives. And this morning's news is that ^{French-made} missiles of the kind that sank the Sheffield may now be on their way to Argentina from another Latin-American country which also bought these from France. So the EEC trade and arms ban is not going to prevent Argentina ~~the~~

getting the highly sophisticated weapons it needs to do as much damage as possible to the British naval force. Indeed, as the British Opposition leader, Mr. Michael Foot, said over the weekend, British planes sold to Argentina are likely to carry those deadly weapons to try to sink British ships. And if it is not British planes, it will be the planes of Britain's allies: the weapons of the Western alliance are being used against one of its own. This, I think, may increasingly become one of the long-term prices the West is going to pay for being the world's principal arms dealer. Iran, lest we forget, is using supplied American/weapons as the 'muscle' of its anti-American drive in the Middle East: and South Africa, aided and supplied by both the West and Israel, is one of Argentina's suppliers. The West's own weapons will, increasingly, be turned on the West. So the final battle for Port Stanley looks like being a terrible and bloody affair. Though it will not, I suspect, be half as terrible and bloody as has been the bloodletting in the Lebanon over these past few days. There, civilians and civilian locations appear to have been deliberate Israeli targets in their drive against the Palestinians. Indications are that in the few days of the fighting in the Lebanon, more people have been killed than the total number killed in the Falklands since the outbreak of the trouble there. And most of the thousands killed in the Lebanon were civilians as against only two reported/civilian killings in the Falklands so far. Terrorism is terrorism, no matter who carries it out; and governments, too, we have seen again and again, can be terrorist. The really sad part is that this kind of terrorism makes reconciliation later almost impossible. And in New York, ^{over the weekend} ~~yesterday~~ one million Americans came together to demonstrate their protest against the ultimate terror of nuclear war. They want an end to the nuclear arms race, as I think most people do. If the Americans, and the Russians, and the Europeans and all the other peoples of the world could force their leaders to disarm: but what a really big 'if' that is.... Goodnight.

The Polio Outbreak:
Prevention versus Cure,
Management versus Campaigns & Crusades

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
June 11, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The indications are that the campaign to contain the Polio outbreak in Jamaica is ^{if not all} ~~succeeding~~ and that most Jamaicans, especially the young who are most vulnerable to it, should ^{soon} ~~xxx~~ be immunised against the dread disease. And that is just about the best news we could have at this time. I think there is an understandable tendency in our medical establishment to see the handling of this outbreak as a great success, which it is. A great deal of hard work under considerable pressure was put into containing this outbreak; and without wanting in any way to detract from this massive effort we must, nonetheless, examine some of the root causes of the outbreak and try to learn from them. If we do not we may continue down the slippery and dangerous and costly path of neglecting our problems until they explode in our faces and force us to respond with massive and costly campaigns and crusades. And perhaps the single most negative things about these campaigns and crusades is that they almost always divert attention and resources from the kind of hard carefully planned day-to-day slogging which is the true answer to all our most basic problems. I don't know, and I am not sure anyone else can calculate the total money value of this latest massive campaign to immunise the total Jamaican population. What I am reasonably certain of is that if our school children in particular and our youngsters in general had been routinely immunised at their schools, and if ^{periodic} ~~there~~ had been a routine and systematic ^{programmes} ~~campaign~~ of immunisation at out clinics and health centres, the cost would

catchall

have been far less than the cost of this/islandwide campaign.

Those who run our health services know that prevention is not only better than cure, it is also much cheaper, and it does not divert human energy and vital resources away from the ongoing development effort; indeed, it supports and sustains that effort. Campaigns and ~~crusades~~, on the other hand, nearly always tend to undermine that effort. The queues/lining up to be immunised during working hours is a most obvious example. Prevention is part and parcel of proper management, whether it is the prevention of a polio/outbreak or of a breakdown in factory or plant machinery, or of a breakdown in light or water or transport. And the money saved through prevention/~~can~~ then be put to work grappling with urgent social problems. Instead there is a tendency/~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ toward fiscal meanness and penny-pinching where there is no obvious political benefit to gain by spending on prevention. So prevention is either under-financed or else completely ignored until disaster strikes. And then we go in for these vast and costly campaigns with their inevitable political spin-offs. Where you have good management it would ensure that your city is always clean as a whistle; where you have good management your utilities would always service your community at a level where that community could be most productive and most creative. Given careful forward planning, \$14-million would have been wonderful seed-money, say two years ago, for the starting of a model old people's complex in some cool and quiet place which would by now have been sufficiently far advanced not to need any massive spending on a temporary place. The trouble is that this kind of/forward planning and/preventive performance are unspectacular and undramatic and our political tradition - created by both parties - demand drama and spectacle, even if it means the short-changing of the long term national interest. ~~This is an aspect of the Jamaican dilemma.~~ Goodnight

This is the real Jamaican obstacle to change without chaos.

Israel Invades South Lebanon:
The Morality of Collective Punishment

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
June 7, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: The focal point of large-scale military violence has, for the moment at least, shifted from the Falklands to the Middle East with yesterday's Israeli invasion of Southern Lebanon. For those of us who were around during the period of the rise of Adolf Hitler and Nazism in Europe, and who watched how the Nazis treated the Jews of Europe, there was something particularly depressing about the events which preceded and which led up to yesterday's invasion of the Lebanon by Israeli forces. Last Thursday night the Israeli Ambassador to the United Kingdom was attacked and critically wounded as he left one of London's most famous hotels. The attackers it later turned out were two Jordanians and one Iraqi, all three of who were held by the British police. The Palestine Liberation Organisation, the PLO, denied any responsibility for the attack and the British police reportedly found a 'hit list' which suggested that PLO representatives would themselves be attacked. Most ~~are~~ informed observers in Britain seemed to agree that the attack was not ordered by the PLO but was the work of some anti-Israeli fringe group. Israel, on the other hand, blamed the PLO for the attack, and on Friday it sent its fighter-bombers into Lebanon to attack the capital, Beirut, as well as PLO strongholds and Palestinian refugee settlements in Southern Lebanon. First reports were that 30 people were killed and 120 wounded in the two-hour air raids over Beirut. And then, yesterday, the Israelis launched their full-scale invasion.

Israeli reaction to those who criticised the bombings and the invasion, and the UN Security Council did so, was that over 100 terrorist attacks have been launched against Israelis in various parts of the world, including the killing of an Israeli diplomat in Paris a little over two months ago. And so, for the near-fatal attack on Thursday in London on one Israeli diplomat, 30 people, mostly Lebanese ~~Q~~ suspect, were killed on Friday, and over 100 wounded and much property damaged. As I heard and read of these things, my mind went back to the times before and ~~during~~ the second world war when we had reports of one or two or three Jewish young men killing some high-ranking Nazi officer and this being followed, a day or two later, by the execution of all the ^{Jewish} ~~men~~ of a particular village, ^{or ghetto area,} or all the people, or by the razing to the ground of an entire community, as punishment for the killing. This was called 'collective punishment'. One or two people did something against the Nazis, killed someone or blew up a train or building and an entire community was punished. Friday's bombing of Beirut made me remember what the Nazis had done, and ^{making} ~~xxxx~~ the connection was deeply depressing. If collective punishment is morally wrong, then it is and must be wrong, no matter what the circumstances, no matter who inflicts it. And I think it is this sense of moral outrage ~~about~~ at what many people all over the world see as the Israeli use of collective punishment as an instrument of policy, which may yet hurt Israel most in the long run. The state of Israel did not come into being simply and solely because of Jewish military might. The vast outpouring of moral and material support from all the most decent and freedom-loving peoples of the world was a potent, though not always visible part of the Jewish struggle; It would be tragic indeed if, flushed with their new military muscle, the Israelis were to completely lose the moral authority and strength which once sustained their struggle.

Goodnight.

A Disastrous Week:

- a) The Polio outbreak
- b) The Power bkackout
- c) The Bauxite & JAMAL layoffs

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
June 4, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: This has been a disastrous week for Jamaica. Tuesday morning's main Gleaner headline announced: "All-Island Blackout: City water supply hit.". The main Daily News headline was: "Island in Darkness: as Hunts Bay explosion sparks off 91% black-out." The third Gleaner headline for the same Tuesday issue was the question: "St. James Polio outbreak?" On Wednesday morning both papers carried frontpage reports of the islandwide immunisation programme that the Ministry of Health was undertaking. By this time the radio station had already told the nation of the Polio outbreak in St. James.

Tuesday,
Between/Wednesday and Thursday the likely numbers for the 'few hundred' lay-offs' in the bauxite/alumina industry began to come out: Alcan confirmed that it was making 150 workers redundant. Other reports said that Alpart would most likely lay-off some 600 workers. However, a report this morning says that no decision has yet been taken on the lay-offs. Please note that 'no decision' does not mean either that there will be no lay-offs or that the number of 600 is necessarily wrong; it simply means that the company itself has not yet made the announcement. What does seem to be indicated by the numbers so far, even in their ^{present}/speculative state, is that the numbers may be more than the 'few hundred' the Prime Minister spoke of at his Party's conference. Alcan's 150 lay-offs is said to be an 'initial' number; if the Alpart number ends up being between 500 and 600, the minimum number for the two sets of lay-offs combined cannot be less than 650. Then there are Alcoa, Kaiser and Reynolds still to come. I frankly do not see

less than
 their combined total of lay-offs being/at least another 650, which
 would give us more than one thousand lay-offs in bauxite. If this
 turned out to be the case, and we will soon know, it would be a ~~X~~
 disaster for the bauxite workers in particular and a serious blow
 to the workforce in general. And the week's report that 400 Jamal
 workers are to be laid-off, and other almost unnoticed periodic
 reports of a dozen workers being laid-off here, two-dozen there,
 forty or fifty elsewhere, all add up to a very dark picture on
 the labour front. If you couple this with the present state of the
 utilities, especially water/^{transport} and electricity at this time, and such
 minor irritations as to who is to be immunised first against polio
 and where, the government's upbeat pronouncements tend to have a
 souring effect/ ^{many} on/people. So you hear charges of the government
 not levelling with the people. You have even the timing of the
 announcement of the polio outbreak in St. James questioned. And
 this is not a healthy state of ~~affairs~~ at the best of times. There
 is an especial need for understanding and for tolerance between those
 who govern and those who are governed when things are difficult or
 when things go wrong. And the foundations for that tolerance and
 that understanding are usually laid at the time when things are
 going smoothly and well. It is at such times that wise leadership
 builds up the stock of trust and confidence on which it will have
 to call later on if and when things go wrong. If it abuses and
 dissipates that stock of trust and goodwill in the good season, it
 will have little or nothing to call on in the bad. When this govern-
 ment was in opposition/^{the words} 'credibility' and 'confidence' were part of
 its stock-in-trade. Now, in our time of trouble it is itself being
 measured against ^{these words and} its own pronouncements. Good management shows up
 best in times of trouble. We are in trouble now. We need the good
 management team we were promised. Goodnight.

Productivity, Progress, Social
Stability & Unemployment

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday

May 31, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Unemployment and productivity were two of the main themes of the ^{local} weekend news. Yesterday, Prime Minister Edward Seaga told the public session of the JLP conference that there would be more cutbacks in the bauxite/alumina industry and that a few hundred men were going to be laid off until the industry gets back on its feet. On Friday night ~~night~~ Mr. Carlton Alexander told a CAST awards function that unemployment was the root cause of several other problems in the society, including the undisciplined behaviour in the society. And Mr. Alexander called for a meaningful and co-ordinated effort to reduce the level of unemployment 'to manageable proportions of about two or three percent of the work force'. And at yesterday's JLP conference Deputy Prime Minister Hugh Shearer, after warning that the government would not allow the hard-won gains of the workers and their trade unions to be eroded, called for increased production and increased productivity without which, he said, the government could not achieve its goals. So, in face of the coming lay-off of 'several hundred men' in our mining and quarrying sector, which is the country's major foreign exchange earner, we have these calls for increased production and productivity, and for a reduction of unemployment from its present official figure of some 26% to between 2% and 3% of the work force. These look like very tall orders indeed. The hard question is: how feasible are they? Given today's realities, can we reduce unemployment to anywhere near the

target level proposed by Mr. Alexander? One thing is for sure and that is that we cannot even begin to scratch ~~at~~ it without the kind of co-ordinated efforts Mr. Alexander calls for. The hard question is: Has the government ^{got} the will; do the unions have the will; does the private sector have the will ^{to make that} ~~for that~~ kind co-ordinated assault? Are all these power groupings prepared to make the sacrifices and ^{needed} put in the hard effort to bring unemployment down to say 10% of the work force? The market system whose virtues we extol is not normally known to make this kind of effort unless it satisfies the bottom-line philosophy of profitability. The socialist system, which we say cannot work, is much more likely to make that kind of effort to deal with unemployment. Each political system exacts its price. But, productivity at a sufficiently high level could earn enough money for us to spend more on social programmes and job-creating developments, which is what makes Mr. Shearer's call for increased production so important. One trouble is that, according to the Economic and Social Survey for 1981, our export agriculture, the hard currency earning part, was down compared with the year before. We were producing less, not more. And you know, it is all very well to talk about educating our young people into the correct ^{work and social} attitudes and about proper ^{schooling} ~~training~~ for all. How are you going to do it when the number of graduates from our Teachers' Colleges were 10% fewer than the year before? And how can any worker perform at his or her best when they have to spend hours of exhausting struggle to get to and from work by a near hopeless public transport system. When they reach work sweaty and tired there is very little will left for increased productivity. The workers, too, need the proper conditions in which to work best. Good transport, good water, good light, must be part of any drive for increased production and increased productivity. So give them the tools and they'll do the job. Goodnight.

26751
 1572
 26751
 1572

Police Federation Annual Conference:
4 Areas of Concern

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
May 28, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Chairman of the Jamaica Police Federation on Wednesday of this week told the annual conference of the Federation of four areas that are of deep concern to the force. These, he said, were: 1) The forthcoming early retirement of the present Commissioner of Police Mr. Bill Bowes; 2) the retaining of retired officers after they have reached the age of 60; 3) the manner in which Deputy Commissioner of Police Mr. Larry Trought was asked to leave the force; and 4) the prospect of reverting to the practice before Jamaica became independent/^{whereby}~~affixing~~ the officer corps of the police force was made up by those who entered directly at the Gazette level, either from the army or otherwise.~~through the ranks~~. And Mr. Simpson said that these four concerns had put ^{members of the} the police force "under great stress, anxiety, apprehension, and fear." There was much else that was of importance in Sergeant Charles Simpson's speech,/^{most}~~some~~ of it challenging to the Government, some of it challenging to the news media, ~~and~~ some of it challenging to the community at large, and all of it of importance to good order and stability in the society. If there was any element lacking in the speech it was, I think, a note of self-criticism. Dismissing all public criticism as a 'chorus of irrational soundings' is not the best way to win friends and influence people. Anyway, the really important long-term issue, as far as I am concerned, was number four in the list of concerns, the matter of the officer corps being recruited from outside the force. Mr. Simpson said this was one of

the stories being pushed within and outside the force. And, of course, if this were to happen then career policemen would normally have no chance of rising above the rank of police Inspector, no matter how long or distinguished their service. Those few who would rise above the rank of Inspector would not be likely to do so as part of the normal process of earning promotion through merit. There would be other considerations involved, considerations of personal and political commitments, for instance. In fairness let us note that the Minister of National Security, Mr. Winston Spaulding dismissed this particular concern as coming out of the destructive rumour machine. If it is just a rumour then it could very easily be put to rest by a clear and unequivocal statement from the Minister saying that it is not ^{the intention of the} government to change the present system of advancement through the ranks, which has made it possible for men like Former Commissioner Robinson, former Commissioner Campbell and now Commissioner Bowes, ^{to work their way through the ranks} to reach the top through hard work and merit alone, without any political connection and without any political influence coming into play. These men were the living visible symbol of the changed Jamaica in which anybody in the force, and by extension anybody in the country, could rise to the top by dint of hard work and merit. Before them, certain offices and certain positions were reserved for people of certain background and certain socio-economic positions only. The banks were one glaring example. Not all of this has changed; but there has been significant changes, and these must not be reversed for any reason. It is not in the best ^{long-term} interest of the nation to have a police force, or indeed any other grouping in the ^{whose top leadership} society, is so far removed from the mass of the ordinary people, and ^{politically controlled} ^{have an} ^{change & progress} so ~~politicised~~ as to become a divisive new ~~class~~. In this sense this particular concern of the Police Federation is one we should all share. It is not enough to dismiss it as rumour. Repudiate it. Goodnight.

The Falklands Invaded:
The Geopolitics of it all.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
May 24, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The main item of worldwide news this Labour Day of 1982, continues to be the faraway Falkland Islands where Britain last Friday landed troops in force in the face of fierce Argentine air attacks. Latest reports are that the British have successfully landed a force of some 5,000 troops. Argentine news reports dispute this claim and say instead that only a few hundred British troops have landed and have been surrounded. All the indications are that the Argentine leaders and the Argentine propaganda machine are not telling the Argentine people the truth. The trouble with this business of lying to the people, especially on something as serious as fighting and dying, is the matter of how you explain it away later. A BBC ~~xxxxxx~~ military analyst told us this morning that Argentina is estimated to have lost something in the region of 60 planes or one quarter of its airforce since the start of this affair and wondered how long they could go on sustaining this level of aircraft losses. I wonder how long they can keep their people in ignorance of their true losses in men as well as machines. I wonder what effect it will have on Argentine morale when the people finally discover they had been lied to. This kind of lying propaganda is alright for as long as you are winning; it becomes counter-productive when you are not. Then war becomes, not a thing of strutting glory, but of casualties. But that is only one aspect of what has now become a complex geopolitical problem. The United Nations Security Council is currently meeting in open debate with a strong Latin American group, supported by the Soviet Union, pressing hard for a ceasefire. The British are

not going to agree to any ceasefire, certainly not until they are more securely^{re-}established on the Falklands. Six weeks of peaceful negotiations turned out to be nothing but a grand runaround with Argentina, whom the Security Council had itself branded the aggressor, mounting a massive stalling and propaganda campaign which almost succeeded in burying the fact of its aggression. So now the British are bent on retaking the Falklands by force. And contrary to recent reports of declining support from her European partners, the EEC this morning decided to extend its economic sanctions against Argentina indefinitely. Incidentally, if you want to get some idea of which side is getting the upper hand just take note of who is calling hardest and loudest for a ceasefire. Those who support Britain will not call for a ceasefire as long as Britain is doing well in the fighting. If things should look like changing those supporters of Argentina who are now screaming for a ceasefire will suddenly stop doing so. But while Argentina's supporters would love to see a decisive humiliation for a European power, if that is possible, Britain's supporters, and especially the United States, do not want to see Argentina completely defeated and humiliated. So their hope is that the British will quickly take Port Stanley this week and then, in possession once more, agree to negotiate the sovereignty issue at the U.N. level. And one reason, a key reason, why the African countries will support this pro-British scenario at the U.N. is because the Organisation of African States has made it a cardinal point of its Charter that no territorial disputes should be settled by the use of force. That, for the Africans is the point of principle. For us in the Caribbean it is much more practical: Guyana and Belize would be exposed to forcible dismemberment if the Argentines get away with their territorial grab. They may ultimately get it by negotiation. They must not get it by the use of force. Goodnight.

The Reagan Plan Setback:
How Will it Affect Jamaica?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday

May 21, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: American President Ronald Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative yesterday suffered a serious setback which could have an important bearing on our own economic outlook. The American Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by a single vote majority, yesterday rejected Mr. Reagan's request for that additional \$350-million which was supposed to boost the current U.S. aid package to Central America and the Caribbean. You will recall that Jamaica was to get \$50-million out of this additional aid. What the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has now proposed is that that money be put into an international trust fund ^{developed} to which other/countries in the hemisphere, like Canada, Mexico and Venezuela would also be invited to contribute. And the Committee further suggested that the American share should not exceed one-third of whatever the total amount in that international trust fund may be. One Senator on the Committee made it clear that he saw this as a means of blunting the sharp furthering of political objectives/^{through} ~~by~~ the use of aid by the Reagan Administration which, he said, had ^{donor} made other/countries reluctant to participate. He did not say so but it is no secret that neither Mexico nor Canada wanted any part of the use of aid as a political weapon through which to reward friendly regimes and punish 'unfriendly' ones. So yesterday's vote, which follows other earlier suggestions for changes in the Reagan Plan, by committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, makes it pretty clear that however it comes out the Reagan Plan is not likely to be the same Plan that some of us welcomed with such warmth and excitement and others with such

bitter skepticism. It seems that both the supporters and detractors of the Plan either overlooked or/^{else} made little of the fact that while it is the/^{American} President who proposes, it is the American Congress which disposes. There was a time, not many months ago, when it seemed that Mr. Reagan could force anything through the American Congress. That time seems to have passed and the setback to his aid plan for Central America and the Caribbean seems to be the first sign of the changed and changing times. It is of course still possible, though not likely, that the full U.S. Senate and the full House of Representatives will over-rule the changes proposed by their committees. I think it would be unwise for/^{any of us in the region} ~~us~~ to bank on that. Much wiser to expect and prepare for changes. I think El Salvador, which expected most, will lose most. We may still get that extra \$50-million but it may be a longer time coming. The Eastern Caribbean looks like doing better under the proposed changes than under the original Plan. But perhaps the single most important lesson for us to learn is not to hitch our little Jamaican wagon to any single star, no matter how brightly it may shine for the moment as it shoots across the sky. Get all the benefit you can from it by all means, but do not foreclose on other options. Economic survival dictates that we do business wherever we can get it and whenever it suits the national interest. And the national interest does/^{not} last for a four-year period of/^{a particular} ~~an~~ American administration or a five-year period of a particular Jamaican administration. The national interest is ongoing and beyond partisan interests. Above all, we must have alternative strategies and fall-back positions so that if one strategy collapses or does not work ^{as we hoped} we can move to another with the least possible dislocation and grief. That unnecessary alienation of the Soviet bauxite/alumina market is an object lesson in how not to conduct the nation's business. I hope we do better if the Reagan Plan does not deliver all our hopes. Goodn

Trade Unions Week, 1982:
The Unemployed: Whose Responsibility?

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Monday
May 17, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Jamaica's four major trade unions today began a week of activities in observance of their second annual Trade Unions Week. The theme of the week is: "Reaching out to the young workers of tomorrow." and there is a full and varied programme planned. For me, personally, a startling omission from the programme, particularly at this time, is any mention of unemployment. All around us, on an almost weekly basis, there are signs and sounds of lay-offs, of firings and redundancies. And one question that comes to my mind is: How many unionised workers, how many union delegates, have been fired or laid-off or made redundant between Trade Unions Week, 1981 and this Trade Unions Week which begins today? Where are they? What is happening to them? Who is doing anything about them? Or do they cease to be of interest to the trade unions when they are no longer employed and so cease to be able to pay union dues? I think we need to have this kind of ^{human} balance sheet from the viewpoint of the trade unions themselves if we are to have a sharper perspective of the gains and setbacks of the trade union movement over any given twelve month period. Perhaps the Joint Trade Union Research Development Centre will be able to give us such a report by the time this week draws to a close; if not, then perhaps the Centre could start compiling such figures for this time next year. The trade union movement has taken some casualties this year; I think it, and the Jamaican people, should know and should face up to the fact and implications of those casualties. To be able to measure our gains realistically we need

to have clear and realistic understanding of our losses. Unionism has been under attack and, in some instances, under seige, in recent months. And unfolding economic conditions suggest that this is not something which is likely to come to an end in the short run. When things are tight, as they now are, workers' rights and workers jobs are the first to come under threat. One piece of hard news out of Washington this morning gives official unemployment in the United States as now standing at 10,300,000 (ten million three-hundred-thousand). These are figures for unemployed Americans who are known and registered as looking for jobs. There are a couple of other, non-official figures, which make the picture even worse. 6½-million Americans have become discouraged and ^{have} stopped looking for work, so they are not on the ^{official} unemployed list, but they are known to be there; and another one-to-two million have gone in for the ^{kind of} hustling and higgling we know here ^{at} our 'bend-down plazas' and elsewhere ^{because} because they can find nothing else. If all these are added together then a truer picture of actual unemployment in the U.S. today would be somewhere in the region of 17-million. To the extent that the Jamaican economy and the hopes for the turn-around of the Jamaican ~~e~~ ^{are} ~~depend~~ ^{on} the turn-around in the American economy, we are likely to have some rough times, with the workers having to put up with ^{the} roughest of those rough times: we are not likely to bring down ^{here} unemployment/while unemployment is rising in the major economy on which we depend for investment and job-creation. And this, I think, is the sort of problem our trade unions should get involved in ^{more deeply than they now are:} ^{is and} saving jobs/should be their business; ^{is and} job-sharing/should be their business as much as are protecting the rights of those who are now their members. I think that in the hard days ahead our ^{trade} unions are going to have to become very much more activist about the problem of unemployment - or risk being emasculated by it. Goodnight.

- 1) Eventide: Who is accountable
- 2) Balancing Economic & Social Progress

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
May 14, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Public and private and especially official reaction to the latest horror at the Eventide Home tells us a great deal about the psychological state of the Jamaican society at this time. And it is a mixture of deep and heartwarming caring and concern and of political buck-passing, with primitive overtones of wanting to stone the messenger because he carries bad news. That reported call on Father Richard Ho-Lung to withdraw copies of his book on Eventide because it is not in the interest of the Government for it to be sent abroad, and the accusation that Father Ho-Lung had publicised the dreadful business of rats attacking human^s as "a conspiracy to embarrass" the KSAC and the government, are shameful new lows in partisan political responses to a burning social issue. The truth is that the state of Eventide, two years after that fire of May 20, 1980, is no better and, is perhaps worse today than it was be^ofore that fire. Most of those of us who care have known that for a long time; and most of us have been silent, partly not to rock the boat, partly to give the new government and the new council a reasonable chance to get on with the job of making changes without chaos and without tension and with as little friction as possible. This keeping quiet about the horrors of Eventide, and about many other bad things was, I think, a deliberate and conscious act of self-restraint so that there should be no repeating of the ugly abuse and name-calling and finger-pointing which accompanied and gave such a bitter edge to the failures and the setbacks of the past.

So Jamaicans endure, with relative patience, the daily and growing indignities of a bad public transport system at its worse, a water system which was never quite as bad in the darkest days of 'mis-management' and a host of other social ills. Essential things, like water and public transport, are daily needs that must be fulfilled daily; they cannot be left to await the economic turn-around as promised in the government's three year recovery programme. So that recovery programme/ ~~with its strong emphasis~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ on economic recovery, must make short-term provision for these essential daily needs. If it does not then whatever economic progress we achieve will not necessarily be reflected in a matching social progress. The brute fact, as former U.N. Ambassador Don Mills told a university audience last week is that social progress does not necessarily go hand in hand with economic progress. Social progress has to be as carefully ~~xxx~~ planned and then pursued and deliberately decided on/as economic progress. It will not just happen. ~~the Govt's~~ responsibility for And/it cannot just be divested into private hands as can a hotel or a sugar industry: people, and the basic needs of people are not that easily divested. We at this radio station have seen and been humbled by the extraordinary response of ordinary Jamaicans after that fire of two years ago. The people knew what was morally right and what had to be done, and they did it. It is the politicians and the ^{political} parties who failed the old folk at Eventide; not the ordinary people of Jamaica. So there is no 'national disgrace' involved; just the ~~shame~~ and disgrace of a political system grown callous and more concerned with its own interests than with the interests of those it ^{is supposed} ~~was expected~~ to serve. In this sense Father Richard Ho-Lung is more representative of the caring of the majority of Jamaicans than are the clever buck-passing responses we have had from the political establishment which ^{has} ~~has~~ been found derelict in its responsibilities at Eventide & other essential social services. Goodnight.

L. Browne

- 1) Strategic Arms Limitation~~s~~ Talks
- 2) The Politics of the Law of The Sea
- ~~3) Falklands Update~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
May 10, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: American President Ronald Reagan's latest call for talks on nuclear arms reduction, the very odd voting line-up on the Law of the Sea Convention, and the ^{ongoing} ~~latest~~ developments on the Falklands dispute, dominated the international news over the past weekend. And these are matters which are as important to us as the most important purely domestic matter. If a nuclear war were to break out it would most probably result in a final and deadly solution to all the world's problems as we know them today; and there is no way that we, in little Jamaica, would be able to escape or avoid such a global disaster: those who are not killed outright will end up dying more slowly as the victims of radiation sickness, fire, famine, disease and massive civil upheavals in a world where all civil order was destroyed. And right now, without adding another ^{nuclear} single new weapon to their/arsenals both the United States and the Soviet Union each possess enough nuclear firepower to wipe out each other's major population centres as well as most of the rest of mankind. So, for these two superpowers just to sit ~~down~~ and talk about reducing their nuclear weapons is some sort of slender hope for the world's peoples. So Mr. Reagan's call for talks to begin as early as next month, and his proposal that both sides should begin by reducing their nuclear weapons by one-third must be as welcome as was Mr. Brezhnev's announcement ^{a few weeks back} that the Soviets were temporarily suspending their nuclear build-up on the borders of Western Europe. But there are a number of ~~grave~~ ^{grave} difficulties

in the way of any successful talks. To begin with, neither side trusts the other. But this, in the past and under different American both Democratic and Republican, administrations, did not prevent the series of earlier and successful SALT agreements which did prevent the runaway nuclear arms build-up we are now threatend^e with. Rightly or wrongly, there is a perception that the Reagan Administration is not really interested in any nuclear arms limitation talks unless they can give America a clear nuclear advantage: and this view is not only held by the Soviets but by some of America's own Western allies, as well as by vast numbers of ordinary West Europeans and growing numbers of ordinary American people. The communists have of course exploited this perception, but they have not created it; that was done by some of the early blustering and threatening talk of the Reagan people themselves with their irresponsible chat about winnable nuclear wars, and their apparent under-estimation of the intelligence of their opponents. For instance, the Soviet nuclear arsenal is the same as the Warsaw Pact nuclear arsenal; the American nuclear arsenal, on the other hand, is not quite the same as the NATO alliance's nuclear arsenal; some of NATO's West European partners have their own nuclear stockpiles. So the Soviets are not likely to agree to a numbers game which means they end up being numerically weaker than the NATO alliance. This is one of the major obstacles and dangers of this deadly numbers game. And for those of us who tend to see every issue in terms of the ideological contest between capitalism and communism what happened over the Law of the Sea Convention should be an eye opener: the 'have' nations of the world, irrespective of ideology, ganged up against the 'have-not' nations because they want the lion's share of the riches of the seabed for themselves. And so the Seabed Authority on which we have pinned so much hope is in danger of being aborted.

Goodnight.

The 1982/83 Budget Debate:
Some After-thoughts

NEWS COMMENTARY
For broadcast on Friday
May 7, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: With the 1982/83 Budget debate now behind us, it might be useful to try and see what broad conclusions can be drawn and what useful suggestions, if any, can be made. First there is the problem of the long-winded tediousness of the whole exercise. *+ its effects on the electronic media.* We have had between 24 and 25 hours of almost saturation radio and television coverage of speeches by the Prime Minister, speaking twice, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Industry for the government side; and by the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition spokesman on Finance. With the exception of the case of the Minister of Industry, who was not carried in full on one of our two main radio channels, listeners and viewers had no choice other than to watch and listen or else turn the whole thing off. Very few listeners have FM receivers, and even fewer can resort to overseas listening by shortwave radio. *as an alternative* So most Jamaicans were locked into what became for many an exercise of being talked into a bored stupor. I think it is important for these key speeches to be carried live; it is, after all, a once-a-year exercise of national importance. So let them be carried as they now are, on television; but let the two main radio channels do the kind of alternating coverage which they do for cricket. This way, all the main speeches would still be heard by all who want to hear them; the only difference is that they would have to switch from ~~one~~ main channel to the other at either half-hourly or hourly intervals. This would afford radio listeners at least that freedom of choice they are now denied at Budget time; and it would do so without depriving our politicians of the massive

radio and television exposure which seems to give them such a 'high'. Alternatively, they can agree to limit all these speeches to a maximum of, say, two-and-a-half-hours apiece and continue the kind of electronic exposure they now have. Next, there is the matter of the real point of these debates. Surely, when all the clever point-scoring, ^{all} and the smart verbal sword-play, and all the dazzling with numbers are over, the bottom-line question must be whether the citizens of the country have a better and clearer understanding of the state of the country's affairs than they did before the debate. I am not sure that in this specific sense this year's debate was a success. Apart from political point-scoring does it really matter how far ahead of target, or how far behind target, we are, especially when our politicians cannot even agree on what measure ^{is} they are to ^{use} agree?

Paragraph 4 of the Economic Policy Memorandum which accompanied the I.M.F. Agreement said, and I quote: "It will take at least three years to get the economy back on a path ~~to~~ self-sustaining growth. With the plant and equipment now in place, real growth of 3percent can be achieved in FY 1981/82." Well, 2% is not the projected 3%, but it is growth nonetheless: behind target to be sure, but ^{the growth} growth all the same. All the fuss is because the one side wants to exeggarate/while the other side wants to downplay it: good for partisan politics, perhaps but not for clarity and understanding. I think we want neither over-^{not over-pessimistic} optimistic/~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ projections as much as we want the unvarnished truth. And we look to the government ~~now~~. Blaming all setbacks and failings on what happened in the past or else on sabotage is a thing of diminshing returns. It will not help improve our present uneasy industrial relations, ^{for instance}. The electorate has already made its ^{own} judgement on what happened in the past. It did not for long buy oversell then; it will not for long buy oversell now; ^{the electorate} and ~~it~~ does want the truth.

Goodnight.

The Falklands Crisis:
The Geopolitical Line-up

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
May 3, 1982; 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Falklands Islands crisis continues to dominate the international news, with limited air and sea battles in the area, and with the political power groupings in the world lining up behind the one side or the other. And it is this lining up of the world power groupings which could, unless very carefully managed, widen the present limited fighting. So let us examine ^{one aspect of} the lining up and its implications. The Americans have now come out clearly on Britain's side and have offered all kinds of help short of actually taking part in the fighting. The Soviets who began by abstaining in the U.N. Security Council vote of ^{early} April shortly after Argentina's invasion and occupation of the Falklands, now seem to be moving toward outright support of Argentina; and so is the People's Republic of China, which also abstained in that vote. Japan, on the other hand, has followed the EEC countries and the United States in imposing sanctions on Argentina. And Cuba a couple of days ago announced that it was ready to support Argentina with all means necessary and called on the rest of Latin America to do the same. So it begins to look as though the major communist forces in the world may end up supporting the Argentine dictatorship on the very dubious ground, in Cuba's case, at least, of hemispheric/^{Latin American} solidarity against so-called external ^{imperial} aggression. The Cubans appear to have forgotten that most of these same Latin American dictatorships were lined up against them when they faced threats of aggression from the United States. Another factor the Cubans seemed to have either ignored or forgotten is that by supporting the Argentine aggression in the Falklands they help open

the way for others to resort to the use of force in the settling of territorial disputes. If the Argentine adventure succeeds it will open the way for Venezuela to settle its territorial dispute with Guyana by forcibly occupying the disputed territory; it will open the way for Guatemala to forcibly occupy large chunks of Belize. And in a world where might is considered ^{the only} right it will, ultimately, open the way for the United States to settle its political difference with Cuba by the use of naked force. So this is a dangerous direction to go. But what of the question of colonialism which the Argentines have invoked? It seems to me that the only valid point here is the fact of proximity. There are no colonised Argentinians in the Falklands, so while there ~~may be~~ a territorial dispute there is no anti-colonial struggle and it is fraudulent to attempt to invoke the spirit of anti-colonialism in what is in fact an extreme rightwing Latin American ~~bourgeois~~ ^{expansionist} bourgeois/~~expansionist~~ territorial drive to distract attention from acute internal problems. And this territorial matter could and should have been settled without that April 2nd invasion by Argentina. While anti-colonialists can understand the Cuban desire, however misguided they think it, to show Latin-American solidarity, there is no such understanding of the Soviet and Chinese positions. Argentina is neo-fascist, racist and very close to South Africa: by comparison Britain is ^{a paragon} ~~paragon~~ of socialist virtue. To support Argentina just because 'the other side' is opposed to it is to indulge in the kind of political opportunism which has, over the years, brought both Soviet and Chinese communism into doubt and disrepute as social and moral alternatives to Western capitalism among very many ^{Non-Aligned} Third World leaders and their peoples. The Falklands crisis has weakened the American position in Latin America: ^{the Falklands crisis} it has also weakened the Soviet Chinese, and the general communist position in the Third World. Goodnight.

The 1982/83 Budget Debate (2):

a) The Dangers of the Numbers Game

b) Squandering the People's Goodwill

~~c) Danger, Communism & Free Elections~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday

April 30, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The 1982/83 Budget Debate continued in Parliament this week with speeches from Mr. Seymour Mullings, who spoke for^{roughly} five hours as Mr. Seaga had done last week; Mr. Douglas Vaz, who spoke for roughly four hours (or half of an eight-hour working day); and, yesterday, Mr. Michael Manley, who also spoke for^{about} four hours. So, speaking time in this year's Budget debate adds up to eighteen hours so far, and it don't done yet. Was the substance of what was said really worth all that amount of time? I think the politicians & party diehard fanatics / will say yes but I am equally sure that most ordinary people will say no. Anyway, one of the most ^{and most worrying} striking things to come out of the debate thus far, for me at least, is the serious danger of the destruction of public confidence by the way in which the politicians are playing the political numbers game. Last week Mr. Seaga used numbers to show how well the economy had performed in 1981; yesterday Mr. Manley used numbers to challenge that claim and to show that the economy had not performed all that well in 1981. Most people just do not have all the information necessary to sort out the facts from the self-serving political fiction in this confusing and conflicting out pouring of numbers. It is like blinding the people with numbers; and that, in the long run, may turn out to be not such a smart political move after all. Most people want to feel that their leaders are telling them the truth, especially about as important a matter as the true state of their national economy; they do not want to be blinded and confused by the numbers. If they cannot believe in

the truth of what their leaders tell them, there will be a massive loss of confidence followed by ^a general mistrust, which would create just about the worst social and political climate possible for any effort to really move the country forward. In free and open societies progress ^{is} ~~depends~~ ^{dependant} much more on public confidence in national leadership ^P than it is in dictatorships and closed societies. And not telling the people all the truth, all the time, or using numbers to blind and confuse them inevitably leads to loss of public confidence. It does not really matter what the motives are, when people feel they have been misinformed or misled, they lose confidence and refuse to believe anything the next time around, even the truth. This is the danger. And you know something, I think that this government has ^{been,} up to now, and it may still be, in the unique position of being able to tell the Jamaican people the unvarnished truth about the Jamaican economy and still be sure of public support: the people, irrespective of party, want the economy turned around; they want the government's economic policies to succeed, for Jamaica's sake. It reminds me a bit of 1973, after the energy crisis first hit us; all or most Jamaicans were willing to make any sacrifice to deal with the crisis. The government of the day squandered that massive ^{public} goodwill and willingness to sacrifice in political showmanship. That may have been the first, almost imperceptible turning points, in the fortunes of that government. Like all parties in power, ^{the PNP} ~~it~~ seemed to forget that ^{and} the electorate reserves the right to change its mind, ^{small} it behaved as though it were in power forever. There are signs of the same sort of thing developing now. ^{That unruly Govt. back bench nump, for instance, and} ~~It is a form of~~ careless contempt ~~for~~ one government Minister ^{is} ~~to~~ tell us there is no drug shortage and ~~for~~ another ^{is} ~~to~~ tell us the drug shortage will soon end. ~~I thought Mr. Mullings~~ Mr. Manley asked some very important questions and I thought Mr. Seymour Mullings came nearest to levelling with the Jamaican people in this week's segment of the debate. And the Jamaican electorate, lest we forget, knows its own ~~he~~ interests best in both short and long runs, and it is mature enough and pragmatic enough to know how ^{best} to protect those interests. Good

The Falkland Crisis:
Britain Retakes South Georgia -
What are the Implications?

NEW COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
April 26, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: What has up to now been called the Falklands crisis appears to be moving to a climax. Yesterday, ^{British} ~~British~~ forces stormed and re-took the Falklands Dependency of South Georgia, which Argentine forces had occupied shortly after their invasion of the Falklands ^{a little over} /three weeks ago. Reports are that it took the British something over two hours to regain control of South Georgia and raise the British flag once more. In the process they damaged an Argentine submarine so badly that it had to be scuttled, and they took 200 Argentine prisoners. Long after the British said they had and the Argentine soldiers there had surrendered, retaken South Georgia /the Argentine Government continued issuing communiques which reported fierce fighting and heroic resistance. The trouble with this kind of misleading information is that when the people finally find out the truth of what happened they are likely to turn against those who ~~have~~ misinformed them, whether the misinformation was deliberate or not. Anyway, South Georgia is now firmly in British hands and will be used as a British forward base and staging ^{military} ~~ing~~ area for further /operations, if the diplomatic effort of the U.S. continue to bear ~~no~~ fruit. To get some idea of the size of South Georgia, think of a land area only slightly less than Trinidad without Tobago; or, if you prefer, an area a little over eight times the size of Barbados. The big difference ^e is that the weather is fiercely cold with mountains permanently covered in ice and snow and bitter winter storms: winter there is when it is summer ~~there~~ here; and winter there is fast approaching right now, so whatever the British have to do, whether to settle in their troops for

a long blockage of the Flaklands, or to build up their forces for a massive assault, they have to move fairly quickly. This, I suspect is one reason why they did not put off the^{re} taking of South Georgia until today's meeting of the OAS in Washington. ^{And} Now there can be no doubt anywhere in Latin America about Britain's determination to end the Argentine occupation, which the U.N. Security Council has itself ~~condemned~~ as the real act of aggression. For the OAS to try and brand Britain the aggressor at today's meeting would be to go counter to ~~that~~ Security Council resolution as well as to go counter ^{itself} to the United Nations Charter/which says that any country can defend its occupied territory without declaring war and without being branded the aggressor. I expect a majority in the OAS to condemn Britain; I do not expect many, if any, Latin American countries to go to war on behalf of Argentina. But what if some are foolhardy enough to do so? It is clear now that the Reagan administration cannot for much longer sustain its so-called 'evenhanded' attitude over this matter: the American people, as well as its own global geopolitical interests just will not allow it. So America will do everything in its power to ensure little or no military backing for Argentina. Indeed, if the Argentines persist in ignoring the Security Council call to withdraw as a pre-condition for renewed negotiations over the Falklands, probably under U.N. auspices, America will be forced, in any stepped up fighting, to side with the British. This would certainly ^{up} ~~mesh~~ up the current Reagan policy in Latin America generally, and in particular the policy of using the Argentines as part of a concerted drive to destroy the political left in Central America; but it would keep intact, and probably strengthen the NATO alliance. So the U.S. is bound to lose influence, whatever happens; ^{and} ~~and~~ better to lose influence among the small band of ^{dictators} ~~dictators~~ than in ^{Europe} ~~Europe~~ and the rest of the world. The really tricky part is to keep whatever fighting there is localised and non-nuclear. Goodni

1982/83 Budget Debate Opens

NEW COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
April 23, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Prime Minister Seaga's opening speech in the 1982/83 Budget Debate was a most interesting and, at times, impressive combination of hardnosed fiscal and economic realism, attempts at daring new ways of tackling old social problems, some important ^{bureaucratic} social and/~~legislative~~ adjustments, some upbeat projections and forecasts, some partisan politicking, all ending with a kind of moral crusader's fervour. It was long, running to nearly five hours ^{live and} which was carried/in full on both radio stations and on television. I suspect that in the end the very length of the speech tended to detract somewhat from its impact. After about an hour or an hour-and-a-half/^{most}~~the~~ listeners' or viewers' concentration begins to flag; attention is not as sharply focussed; sometimes the mind grows numb and hears the words without taking them in. Teachers and university lecturers know all about ^{the problem of attention span?} ~~this~~: which is why the best teachers are not very long-winded. It is a particular problem with politicians of both parties who tended to behave as though more is better. Now that all the main speakers in our Budget debates are given total and saturation coverage by the electronic media it might be wise for those speakers to arrive at some sort of understanding among themselves to try and avoid verbal overkill. Surely they do not want to talk until people stop listening, or turn them off, or just ^{'break'} ~~'freak'~~ out'. Anyway, I found some of the ~~human~~ ^{welcome.} and social concerns behind the numbers most/~~interesting~~ Raising the monthly amount to all government pensioners to a minimum of \$100 per month is particularly important. I think we need to point out that this does not

apply to N.I.S. pensioners, even though ^{pensions} ~~these~~ are also paid by the government: it applies only to people ^{who} had been government servants and who had retired on pension from the government service. So, please, no need for unnecessary confusion or false hopes here. The new minimum \$100 a month (not a week) is only for retired government servants who are on government pension. Then there is the Human Employment ^{offer} ~~Resource~~ and Resource Training Plan which will ^{relief} ~~use~~ straight tax ~~and~~ incentives to employers who take part in the scheme. The concept is exciting and could be one important answer to the hard problem of those of our young people who finish secondary school and then find that there are no jobs for them. Youth unemployment is critical and I hope this scheme will succeed and help to ease it. I hope, too, that somewhere in the taxation ^{and structural} adjustments that were mentioned, some attention will be paid to what has long struck me as an odd and gross piece of unfairness which amounts almost to an injustice. I am thinking of an aspect of the National Housing Trust which is financed by compulsory payroll deductions. There are people paying National Housing Trust whose incomes are below the minimum ^{levels} ~~income~~ set by the Trust for participation in its allotments: in other words, they pay into the Trust but the level of their income disqualifies them from any benefit. This, I think, is the economic variation of taxation without representation. I think it is wrong, morally wrong, for an office maid or a messenger ^{or any low paid worker} to have to contribute to the building of homes for people in higher income brackets from which they themselves are disqualified. Let the minimum income set by the Trust for participation in its schemes be the level at which N.H.T. deductions are made. Stop the inequity of building houses for the better off with the money of the poor whose low income ^{is} used to ~~disqualify~~ them. That, I suggest, is one direction for any new morality.

Goodnight.

- 1) Upsurge in Gun Killings
- 2) Falklands Crisis: America's Dilemma
- 3) Zimbabwe: 2nd Anniversary

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
April 19, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Seven people, among them a policeman and a woman Crown witness in a murder case, were killed over this past weekend. On Tuesday of last week six people, a mother and her three children and their two friends were killed in the Wareika area. These were reportedly gun killings: a total of 13 gun killings in the space of roughly six days. This is a depressing upsurge in a trend we had hoped was going down. And just as depressing are some of the more important responses from the society to these gun-killings. It is relatively simple when gunmen and gangsters are killed by the police in shoot-outs: we would want to back the police in all such cases; but there are disturbing doubts because we are not always sure that we are being told the whole truth about all these shoot-outs. Perhaps the best way to deal with these disturbing and growing doubts and worries would be for there to be special legal machinery set up, within the Department of the DPP, for quick, automatic inquiring into all such reports of shoot-outs, and, indeed into all cases/~~where~~ where guilty or wanted persons are killed instead of being brought before the courts. At present the time-gap between any such killing and an inquest is far too long. And it is not good for the social/~~and psychological~~ health of the society that/~~this sense~~ of unease about these killings should continue to fester. It undermines public confidence in the rule of law and it feeds the impulse to lawlessness, especially among the ghetto youth. And how can we expect any future witness to murder from, say, Moonlight City to come forward and tell what he or she saw and heard after the killing of that Crown witness? Then there

are the problems created by our social and political culture which invests some lives with more value than others. The killing of a party political activist usually provokes ^{from his or her party} a degree of righteous indignation and demands for justice which are sadly lacking if the killed person is from the opposing party or is of no known political connection. The ^{taking of the} lives of ghetto youth rarely ruffles the upper sections of the society in the way the taking of the life of one middleclass youth from a well-known family would. And it seems to me that as long as we ~~have~~ ignore, or play down, or gloss over these forces which are at work in the society, we will go on having the kind of gun killings of this past weekend, no matter how much we scream terrorist and subversion or how much we spend on security. There are profound socio-political, legal ^{and judicial} and straight human rights aspects to security which we ignore at our collective peril. On the international scene the American dilemma deepens as the showdown between Britain and Argentina draws closer. If Mr. Haig cannot come up with something acceptable America will soon have to choose sides if fighting breaks out, no matter on how limited a scale. If she sides with Britain her entire Latin American policy will collapse in a shambles; if she sides with Argentina she might as well forget all about NATO and the Western alliance; if she tries to stay neutral in any such fighting, she might as well forget about world leadership, for neither Europe nor Latin America will place much store on that leadership and the Soviets would want to step into the vacuum. Which is why the Soviets are now trying to make mischief over the Falklands. That is the American dilemma and why Mr. Haig is trying so desperately for a peaceful settlement. And finally and briefly, Zimbabwe celebrated ^{ve} the 2nd anniversary of its independence yesterday with an impressive 10% per annum growth rate, the promise of still higher minimum wage rates and a freeze on rents and prices; all of which speak louder than the loudest political rhetoric. Goodnight.

- 1) A Question of Sovereignty:
The Bajan Example

~~2) Unemployment - Some forgotten ideas~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
April 16, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Barbados ~~these~~^{past ten days or so} ~~week~~ became, for many of us, a kind of symbol of people determinedly holding on to their national sovereignty. The Barbados Advocate-News was the first to make public what it described as the 'obnoxious behaviour' toward local journalists of the security men who looked after President Reagan during his recent Caribbean visit. In Jamaica there had been some angry and at times bitter talk about the same thing, but in private and it had been confined to Jamaican journalists and the few non-journalists who had witnessed what happened. But until Joy Scott's column in this morning's Daily News, we have behaved^{publicly}/as though nothing bad had happened. There was no news report, no editorial comment to hint at any 'obnoxious behaviour'. Only that picture of RJR's Lester Hinds' tape-recorder being examined by an American security man while other Jamaicans waited their turn to be so examined. And that, by itself, was no big thing, except for the fact that a foreign agent, albeit on a very special occasion, was 'frisking' Jamaican journalists in their own native Jamaica. Now, I frankly do not think that the main burden of the criticism should be directed at the American security men, however much we may deplore their bad manners and the racism reportedly shown by some of them; bad manners and racism are not exclusive to Americans only; we have our own fair share. The point is that this is Jamaica, not America. And regard and respect for Jamaican sensibilities is one important way of showing respect for Jamaican sovereignty. One

of the key responsibilities of those in charge of Jamaican affairs is to ensure that ^{be as well as} all our visitors, no matter how important or how humble, at all times show respect for that sovereignty. For instance were those American security men briefed on the Jamaican media? Were they given any guidelines on how to deal with Jamaican journalists? During the 'friskings' which are necessary for security purposes, did they have standing beside them as the Jamaican symbol of authority, a Jamaican security man or a Jamaican government media official? In these small ways, in our own interest as well as in the interest of the visitors, some of the ugliness, some of the 'obnoxious behaviour' could have been removed from what was in most other respects a highly successful occasion. Those of us who are not ideological fanatics of either the political right-wing or the political leftwing, those of us who are not JLP or PNP zealots, naturally ^{want to avoid} ~~do not want to~~ doing or saying anything that might disturb the present good relations between Jamaica House and the American White House; Jamaica's economic prospects ride on those good relations. ^{How far do we carry this reliance?} Perhaps this is why we left it to the Barbados Advocate-News to bring this unpleasant aspect of the Reagan visit to public attention. We, after all, do have so much more ^{precisely} to lose/because we have so much more to gain. But is that really all of it? I still remember how in the very first flush of the 1980 electoral landslide victory, a press conference for foreign journalists at Jamaica House was only opened to local journalists after bitter protest. We cannot and we must not expect others to ^{which} show more respect and regard for our own Jamaican institutions/~~than~~ are the visible ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ symbols of Jamaican sovereignty, than we do ourselves. This week's Bajan example made me wonder if we ^{are} really ^{worried about} ~~believe in~~ Jamaican national sovereignty, or is it all a matter of dollars & cents? Goodnight.

- 1) Falklands update: An American Dilemma
- 2) Dangers of Political Demonology

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
April 12, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: And I hope you have had a very happy and peaceful Easter weekend. For those of us who live up in the hills it was dry and parched with little or no water most of the time; trees quailed, grass shrivelled and turned brown; young plants withered and died; seedlings did not germinate; hillside land looked bare and bleak; and the ^{dry}/driving wind made this worse. Small peasant farmers endured the brunt of all this with stoicism and kept on nursing and plant^{ing} and hoping and praying that rain would come. It was a particularly hard Easter for the small farmers up in the hills this year. We must hope the rain will soon come. The political world outside seemed no less bleak this Easter. The Falklands crisis continues to dominate the news, with American Secretary of State Haig now back in London from Argentina with so far undisclosed new ideas for solving the crisis. But it has been let out that the Argentines would be prepared to settle for talks if their forces of occupation are replaced by a peace-keeping force of U.S. and Latin American soldiers and their flag was allowed to continue to fly over the Falklands. This is a very tricky Argentine move which, if the British were to accept it, would amount to ^{a kind of} recognition of the validity of the Argentine claim to the Falklands. I cannot myself see the British agreeing to this flag business; and I am sure Mr. Haig could have had no illusion that the British would agree. So there has to be something else, some fall-back position which would allow the Argentines to withdraw without too great a loss of 'face'. Perhaps the flag thing will be dropped - if Britain agrees

to some so-called neutral force being stationed on the Falklands. In that event the flag thing^s would have been a useful headline grabbing stalking-horse, and by dropping it the Argentines could appear to be 'reasonable' and willing to compromise. Hitler, some of you may remember, was the one who developed the techniques of grabbing other people's lands and then making 'reasonable' demands. However[^] this matter is finally worked out, and the Argentines sound less belicose than they did last week, a very important American interest is also at stake, though not much is being said about it. Since the second world war Britain has been the U.S.'s closest, most loyal and most dependable ally. She has backed and defended American policies and positions even when she doubted the wisdom of some U.S. positions. Indeed, the great Charles DeGaulle kept Britain out of the European Common M^arket for a long time precisely because he was convinced that Britain's first loyalty was, and would continue to be to the United States, rather than to Europe. But what if that loyalty is seen not to be reciprocated? Mr. Haig was reported^{ase} as saying the Americans are not taking sides but rather/trying their to settle a dispute between two of/~~xxx~~ friends. Does it matter that one of the 'friends' is/a harsh military dictatorship which has resort^{ed} to the use of force and the other is the oldest and still one of the most liberal democracies in the world?/What does seem to be a reasonable ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ assumption is that the British may not, after this affair, be quite as 'blindly' loyal to their American ally as they have been in the past, and that may turn out to be not in America's best long-term interest. I suspect that one reason for this is the current American^{obsessive} indulgence in a kind of political demonology. The communists are the demon^s who must be driven out, wherever they are. The Argentines will help to drive out the demons in Central America. The price of this brand of demonology ~~costs~~^{usually} comes very high indeed. Goodnight.

The Falkland Islands Crisis

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
April 5, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Britain's Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, resigned from Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's government earlier today because of Argentina's invasion and occupation of the British Falkland Islands last Friday. Britain had sustained a humiliating setback and some political heads had to roll. So Carrington went and, with him, two other lesser figures on the political side of the Foreign Office. But why not also Mrs. Thatcher? After all, she bears overall political responsibility for the management of British affairs, both at home and abroad; so why not her? The main reason, I think, is that her resignation would have precipitated a crisis of a different and larger dimension for Britain. There is no one within the British Conservative Party at present of such stature and authority as to be able to easily and quickly take over the Prime Ministership, as was the case when Winston Churchill took over the wartime Prime Ministership from Neville Chamberlain in 1940. So Mrs. Thatcher has to stay and Carrington, her key non-elected senior Cabinet Minister had to go; but only after the British/Task Force had been assembled and ^{naval} was already on its way to the Falkland Islands ^{some 7,000 miles away}. This way, no matter what happened inside Britain, the political and military signals to the outside world were clear and unambiguous. Britain would repossess the occupied Falkland Islands by force if necessary; and Argentina would have all of a fortnight of steadily mounting psychological ^{all} pressure in which to consider the likely consequences of last Friday's forceful occupation. Under the United Nations ^{or indeed, any country,} Charter Britain can defend its occupied territory without declaring war and without

being branded the aggressor. Indeed, the U.N. Security Council was already behind Britain in having over the weekend called on Argentina to abandon its occupation. The Argentine's military rulers were bitterly disappointed when no-one among the Permanent Members vetoed that Security Council resolution; for some reason best known to themselves they seemed to have assumed that the Soviet Union would cast ^{such} a veto; instead, both the Soviets and China abstained. So now Argentina has called for an urgent meeting of the Organisation of American States, and it would be interesting to see how the OAS responds to what the UN Security Council has, in effect, already condemned as an act of aggression by Argentina. But why has Argentina ^{dangerously} taken this/reckless gamble at this time? The Falklands consists of some 200 islands whose combined land area totals 4,618 square miles, which is a little larger than Jamaica's land area. The present population is between 1,800 and 2,000 people all of British descent whose ancestors went to the islands from the United Kingdom more than 150 years ago. ^{cold, windy, moorland.} There are not, and there never has been, an indigenous native population from Argentina or anywhere else; so the sheep farming and cattle raising descendants of the British are the only Falklanders; and they are determinedly British in allegiance. The French first established a colony there in 1764; the British established their first settlement there in 1766. In 1767 the French sold their settlement to Spain for about 24,000 pounds sterling. The Spanish expelled the British settlers in 1770, and this nearly led to a war between Britain and Spain but the matter was finally settled by negotiation and the Spanish 'repudiated their violent enterprise' and returned the settlement to the British. When Argentina became independent of Spain in 1816 it claimed the Falklands as part of its territory even though the British had been there much earlier than even the Spaniards. ^{But now there is talk of oil being found in the Falklands.} That is the background to today's nuclear age crisis. And ^{that} unless we are careful, ^{from such dubious claim} is how nuclear war may start.

- 1) Caricom & Reagan Plan
- 2) Central American Update
- 3) The Problem of Inflating Expectations

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
April 2, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Foreign Ministers of the members states of the Caribbean Community, Caricom, met in Belize over the past couple of days to talk mainly about American President Ronald Reagan's recently announced proposals of assistance to Central America and the Caribbean. In the event, the Caricom Foreign Ministers welcomed the Reagan proposals, albeit with some serious reservations. They were not happy that the Reagan Plan ~~had~~ no specific proposals for support to such inter-government institutions as the Caribbean Development Bank or, indeed, Caricom itself. And they did not feel that the proposed level of development assistance for both the more developed as well as the less developed Caricom countries was sufficiently large to lay the ^{infra-structural} basis for increased private sector activity. But they did think that, all these shortcomings notwithstanding, the Reagan Plan would make a positive contribution to development in the region. This is not, of course, the same fulsomeness with which Jamaica's Prime Minister welcomed the Reagan Plan when it was first announced. And I think the reason is understandable. If you look at the breakdown of the additional ^{U.S.} aid of \$350-million for the current financial year you will see that while El Salvador was to received \$128-million, Costa Rica (with a population roughly the same size as Jamaica) \$70-million, Jamaica \$50-million, Honduras (population over 3 million) \$35-million, the Eastern Caribbean will share the sum of \$10-million. If you include Trinidad and Tobago and Guyana in a tally of the ^{English-speaking} Eastern Caribbean then you come up with a population of just a little over 3-million people residing in

some eleven territories, having to share \$10-million out of that additional aid. And that averages out at something less than a million dollars apiece. It is an indication of a maturing realism that the Eastern Caribbean members of Caricom have not screamed and shouted at the obvious inequities of the aid package. It is, after all, America's money and aid to give or to withhold, depending on what is important to America and on her perception of her own interests. For instance, the Dominican Republic with some five million people also gets only \$10-million of the additional aid; there are no guerillas in the Dominican Republic and Juan Bosch's socialists have long since been subdued. Which brings us to the question of what happens now in El Salvador - and indeed in all of Central America - after the rightwing victory/^{following} ~~in~~ last Sunday's elections. The Americans are now scrambling desperately to salvage what they can of the Duarte land reform and human rights programmes which they used as justification to the American people for their aid to El Salvador. If the now electorally legitimised rightist leaders can be persuaded to at least pay lip-service to those programmes the aid to El Salvador and the war against the left could be continued. If not, the chaos may spread and the alternative may be an American 'adventure' in Nicaragua. There are already some disturbing reports of the possibility of such an 'adventure'. And looking inward at our own domestic affairs, there is a strangely contradictory mood abroad in the land. On the one hand we are told how well things are going: tourism is booming; investment figures sound good and make big headlines; job prospects are growing; prices are being held and goods are on the shelves. On the other hand there is a mood of depression and frustration. Life is difficult and is getting more difficult for very, very many people. Somehow our leaders must strike a balance between their optimism and the spreading mood of frustration. Goodnight.

El Salvador: What Now?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
March 29, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two things stand out sharply and clearly about yesterday's voting in El Salvador. The first is the unexpectedly large turn-out of voters which seems to have surprised even the most fervent supporters of yesterday's electoral process. The American Ambassador to El Salvador, Mr. Deane Hinton, could hardly contain his excitement at the size of the turnout in early morning interviews with American newsmen and women; he said it would not surprise him if the final tally shows a voter turnout of somewhere in the region of 600,000. But in order to get this business of numbers into some sort of perspective we need to remember that El Salvador has a population of somewhere in the region of five million people, of which only some one million, or one-fifth of the population are reportedly eligible to vote. So really, the turn-out if it is half a million or fifty percent of the eligible voters would be just one half of one-fifth of the people of El Salvador. If you contrast this with our own last general election in which roughly one million people out of a population of 2.2-million people went to the polls you will get a clearer perspective about the numbers involved. Really, whether it was half a million or 600,000, it was a comparatively small minority of El Salvador's total population which took part in yesterday's voting. The turnout was low, but expectations were for an even lower turnout, hence the present excitement. In this sense the Reagan policy with its insistence on these elections has succeeded. Whatever the numbers, the new government, when it is formed, will have the legitimacy of having come to power by way of the ballot rather than the bullet, even though

the ballot was influenced by the bullet. ^{and the ballot forms were numbered.} And most of those who
 risked the violence of the bullet to ^{cast} their votes, voted because
 they were told that they were voting for peace and for an end to
 the violence. The coalition of leftwing groups which boycotted the
 elections must now deal with the fact that the elections have taken
 place. ^{and that their boycott was a tactical blunder.} And this brings us to the second important point, which is
 the strong showing made by ~~the~~ an ultra-rightwing group headed by
 a former National Guard Major, Roberto d'Aubuisson, whom the former
 American Ambassador to El Salvador during the Carter administration
 has
 / described as a 'psychotic killer'. This group have received the
 second largest number of votes after Duarte's Christian Democrats.
 If the final count does not give Duarte's party an absolute majority
 then d'Aubuisson is almost certain to put together a far-right
 neo-fascist coalition to control the Constituent Assembly and the
 later Presidential elections to come. In that event, American policy
 for Central America will be reduced to an utter shambles, for such
 a new rightwing dictatorship would in fact have the electoral
 legitimacy which Washington has so painstakingly labour ^{to} bring
 about on behalf of Duarte's civilian Christian Democratic coalition.
 If Duarte does get an absolute majority ~~then~~ then d'Aubuisson will be
 the powerful rightwing opposition leader who will try to frustrate
 even the lukewarm efforts at social reform, at human rights, and
 at coming to terms with the socialists. The one over-riding point
 about Duarte gaining power is that it would ^{buy} ~~give~~ the Americans the
 time and the breathing space to mount the type of economic programme
 which can ^{and exploitation} ~~to~~ eliminate the poverty / which ^{are} ~~is~~ at the root of Central American
 unrest. For it is poverty and exploitation, not ideological duppies
 which are the real enemies of peace and stability in Central America
 And on that the votes are not yet in. Goodnight.

- 1) The Utilities & Crisis Management
- 2) Central America Update

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
March 26, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The water crisis, this week, as for very many previous weeks, continues to be a main topic of local concern. The drought has made it worse. Larger and larger numbers of people are spending more and more of their time either hunting for water or waiting for water. Some have to be awake in the middle of the night or in the early hours of the morning in order to catch the trickle in their pipes and thus store some water for the rest of the day. Others have to travel distances to where they can find water. Most of those who live in the higher reaches of the hills of St. Andrew have not had a drop of water coming through their pipes for at least all of this week. If they have tanks things are not too bad; if they don't but have cars they can always find some water with comparative ease. The real hardship is on those who have neither tanks nor cars. For them the scramble to find a little water for cooking and cleaning before going to work, and then the scramble for transport to get to work on time, are desperate enough. This desperation is made worse by anxieties about whether their/cherished appliances would still be in working order when they get home from work: one or two power outages, followed by one or two power surges could burn out those appliances, and there is no way they can claim for such damage. And this state of crisis in our utilities, and this mood of being in a crisis situation by those who use these utilities, is not conducive to the greater productivity and the greater efficiency we all say we need if the economy is to be turned around. Far too many people are

much time and energy far too/~~busy~~ scrambling for essential necessities to be as productive as they could or should be. And given this reality, the volatility on the industrial relations scene becomes all too understandable. Now, the government has worked out and made public some of its broad strategies for dealing with the crisis in the utilities. There are longterm plans ~~lightxxxxxpower~~ for light and power and water and we expect to hear about public transport before too long. But while these longterm plans are being put in place the need for short-term crisis management is acute. The public service company is not doing too badly at short-term / crisis management. Generally speaking its power cuts are as rational and equitable as possible and it does keep the people informed most of the time. The same cannot be said as yet for either water or public transport. If there is some pattern or plan to try and distribute the scarce water/~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{now available} so that everybody, including the poor, will get/~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{a reasonably} fair share, that plan has not been made public. And the chaos in public transport has been going on for far too long. The JLP slogan, Change without Chaos, is a challenge to this government to provide the nation with better short-term crisis management in our water and our public transport than we are now seeing. Blame the crisis on Manley if you will. But you are in power now: and managing the crisis is your responsibility. Everything: our hosting of the Seabed Authority, the investment we want to attract, the increased productivity we want, ^{the continued expansion of tourism} /all depend on the provision of sound and adequate utilities, both now and in the future. So short-term crisis management must go hand-in-hand with longterm forward planning. The one will not succeed without the other. And finally, and briefly, elections are being held in El Salvador this weekend in the context of a raging civil war; a military coup has just overthrown the government in Guatemala; Nicaragua told the UN it fears a U.S. invasion; and Mr. Haig says America will not talk to the leftists of Cuba, Nicaragua and EL Salvador. So the explosive Central American pot continues to boil. Goodnight.

The Anatomy of A Social Contract

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
March 22, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Mr. Carlton Alexander, the chairman of Grace Kennedy Ltd., and one of the most enlightened and progressive employers on the entire Jamaican scene, over this past weekend called for 'some form of social contract' to stem the rising tide of industrial action which is currently plaguing the Jamaican economy. Mr. Alexander said that without some such 'social contract' mechanism in the industrial relations arena the country will not be able to offer a good investment climate for either local or foreign investors; and it would never achieve the level of production to satisfy the 'demands for foreign exchange' and 'other revenues to realise economic growth'. Now, to put Mr. Carlton Alexander's call in context we need to remember ~~some~~ figures revealed in a speech made by the Minister of Labour on Friday, March 12th. In that speech Mr. J.A.G. Smith reportedly said that there had been 45 work stoppages ^{if} in the first two months of this year and ~~at~~ that rate was maintained there could be 270 stoppages by the end of ~~this~~ year. And, certainly ~~if~~ that rate of stoppage were maintained then we would be in serious industrial and economic trouble; so it would make sense of us all to pay serious heed to this latest call for 'some form of social contract'. One of our problems is that 'some form of social contract' between Jamaican management and Jamaican labour is already in existence; the whole elaborate pattern of industrial relations machinery which has grown up over the years and which has been formalised in legislation is a form of social contract between management and organised labour. The National Minimum Wage is a form of social

between domestic workers and other casual, low-paid and non-unionised workers and those who employ them. And one of the features of this form of social contract is that as well as management and employers we have the government, through one/^{or another} of its agencies, performing the role of mediator or conciliator. This point was most dramatically illustrated by Mr. Hugh Shearer's highly successful role in the bauxite/alumina recent/wage settlement. But even that came after long delays and unrest. So while this form of social contract can settle disputes ⁱⁿ the first instance, it seems unable to prevent them. So how do we get to Mr. Alexander's point of prevention? What kind of social contract do we need? The Japanese seem to have worked out a form of social contract which has virtually eliminated strikes. But this is part of a wider social structure which turns the industrial plant into a kind of closed-shop family affair with 100% lifetime job/^{and social} security for everybody from top to bottom. Indeed, the Japanese seem to have turned their whole nation's industrial and productive effort into a closed-shop against all other nations. And so they are out-producing and out-selling all other nations while keeping their own Japanese domestic market neatly insulated from outside competition. The totalitarian states too can have the sort of social contract where both management and labour are part of the state structure, regulated at all levels by the state. Or there is the other extreme, where free market forces are so dominant and cheap labour in such great abundance that no strong trade union movement can emerge: there, too, a form of social contract can be imposed on a docile and poorly paid work force. In open societies with strong trade union traditions - Western Europe and North America are examples - ^{it is little known} the forging of social contracts have proved much more difficult ^{involved} primarily because they must be based on ^{the self-interest of} the free consent of all the parties. ^{for us} They cannot be imposed. This is and must be the starting of any search for 'some form of social contract'. Goodnight.

- 1) Cleaning Up City: Serving the People
- ~~2) Central American Update~~
- 2) Central American Update

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
March 19, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The latest campaign to clean up the city of Kingston, especially the downtown area, will almost certainly succeed in the short run. There is a natural impulse in most of us to respond positively to this kind of clean-up call. We would, almost all of us, I think, prefer to live and work and move in a clean city. One trouble is that most of us also tend to look to someone else to do sustained the/cleaning while we only put in a one-shot effort to show our commitment to cleanliness. So how can we go on keeping this, or indeed any Jamaican city clean after the public relations razzle-dazzle is over? First, I suggest, by keeping alive at the grassroots level, for the whole year and longer, the sense of civic pride which is expected to be stimulated by the propaganda campaign. The litter bins and clean streets and cleaned up markets are important of course. But what of the/public sanitary conveniences - or the/public lavatories - the ordinary citizens need to use as they go about their city? There is nothing more destructive of civic pride than for people to see one of their own, a mature woman perhaps, having to relieve herself behind some tree or against some fence in an open lot. I remember many years ago another generation of merchants and civic leaders complaining bitterly about what they called 'public voiding'. They objected to people - and it was usually the poor - relieving themselves in public, but they said little, and did even less about providing enough public lavatories/^{so that} the people/^{did not} have to use the streets or open lots or go behind trees. Consider the uptown situation. There is a public lavatory at ~~the~~ Cross Roads

then nothing till you get to Half Way Tree square, and then nothing until you get to the Constant Spring market. There are great walking distances between these three points; not for people with cars or cycles but for people walking or waiting on buses. There are no public lavatories in any of the uptown Plaza. So let those who want to beautify our city/^{provide for}~~give to~~ the ordinary citizens of the city the amenities to inculcate/^{civic}pride. It will not cost all that much to put up a few more public lavatories - especially in the crowded shopping areas - and/^{to}hire attendants to keep them clean and disinfected. In time, the people will themselves ~~will~~ ensure that such places are kept clean; they will have reason to be proud of their city, which is the surest way of ensuring its cleanliness. On the wider political scene developments in and on Central America continue to dominate the news, with two particularly disturbing developments. On Wednesday night or early Thursday morning, four Dutch journalists were killed in El Salvador. The information suggests that they were on their way to make contact with the guerrillas fighting the military regime when government soldiers who may have been trailing them, killed them. That is the on-the-spot view of an American journalist reporting for National Public Radio. The version of the Salvadoran government is that the four Dutch journalists were caught in the crossfire of a battle. Yet one of the Dutch ~~xxx~~ journalists had been questioned by the military, just a few days before, about their contact with the guerrillas. I am sure that like all true professional journalists ~~who~~ would not have revealed his contacts; which is probably one reason why they died. Next, and perhaps even more ominous was the report out of Nicaragua quoting the Soviet Ambassador to Mexico as saying that if the Americans took military action against Nicaragua the Soviets would come to Nicaragua's assistance. The situation in Central America grows increasingly ugly, dangerous and explosive. Goodnight.

- 1) U.N. Law of the Sea: New US Proposals
- 2) Soviet Military Mission to India
- 3) ~~Developments on Central America~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
March 15, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: A Jamaica Information Service report out of New York says that the United States last Friday presented to the U.N. Law of the Sea Conference the proposed changes it wants to have made to the draft Treaty of the Law of the Sea. And this is a matter that is of great importance to Jamaica which has been chosen as the location of the headquarters of the Seabed Authority. You will recall that before the change of Government in the United States, negotiations for a Law of the Sea treaty were in their final stages and expectations were that the Seabed Authority would become a reality in either 1982 or 1983. In fact, the Carter Administration in the United States had approved the draft of that Law of the Sea Treaty. But then, on assuming office, Mr. Ronald Reagan let it be known that his Administration was not happy with the treaty as it was and so the whole process was stalled until last Friday's new American proposals. The high points of these new U.S. proposals are: firstly, that there would be a more liberal access to the resources of the deep sea-bed by American corporations; secondly, ^{that} when the Convention is up for review in 15 years' time, the results of such a review should be subject to ratification by the Senate of the United States of America; and thirdly, that the composition of the Seabed Council should be altered to provide greater assurances of representation ~~on~~ on it by the United States and other Western Industrialised countries; and, fourthly, that the voting system should be changed that a majority in each category of nations represented on the Council would be able to exercise a blocking vote, or a veto. In other words, if say

three out of five members of the Western group objected to any decision arrived at by all the rest of the members of the Seabed Council, those three would veto that particular decision. This is a variation of the veto powers enjoyed by the Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council. It is not clear yet ~~just~~ precisely what is involvedⁱⁿ the U.S. Senate ratification requirement. If such ratification is binding only on American action within the Seabed Authority, that is of course America's business. If, on the other hand, U.S. Senate ratification is expected to be binding on the Authority itself and on all other member nations, then this whole exercise might as well be called 'The United States Law of the Sea' rather than 'The United Nations Law of the Sea'. So things do not look too good right now. But all this is based on summary of the American proposals; the details just might be a little better; but that is not very likely. Next, and further afield, just about the most powerful/^{Soviet} military delegation possible is now in India. The Indian government is spending a great deal on arms to counter the/^{Pakistani} ~~Amex~~ build-up of American-supplied arms^{now} to the tune of thousands of millions of dollars. India, in true non-aligned fashion, is also ~~seeking~~^{to} diversifying her arms buying so that she is not too dependent on any one single supplier, so she is buying from Britain and France as well. The Russians are still her ^{biggest} ~~greatest~~ ^{arms} supplier because they accept payment in Indian Rupees as well as in kind, while the West nearly always wants hard currency; and the Russians want to keep things that way. The ^{bitter} irony of this situation is that India is the greatest democracy in the world and ^{it} should logically be armed and ^{be} in alliance with the most powerful democracy in the world. Instead ^{that} the most powerful democracy in the world arms ^{and aids what is perhaps} the most repressive dictatorship in the world. What a contradiction! Goodnight

- 1) Capturing, Rentals & National Unity
- 2) J.E.F. Shows the Way
- 3) ~~Who Shapes the Jamaican Future?~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
March 12, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Yesterday's forcible eviction of the illegal occupiers of the 166 two-bedroom units at the Government's Mount Salem housing scheme has brought to the surface once again the ugly cancer which lurks just beneath the surface of Jamaican political life. Anyone from almost anywhere else in the world would have thought that there could be nothing political about any government re-possessing this number of houses if they had been illegally seized and illegally occupied. All such a person would have seen and realised was that the law had been broken, and that in the public interest - which is the greatest good for the greatest number - the law and the rule of law had to be upheld. But then it would never have occurred to such a person that there could be anything political about enforcing the law. If such a person lived anywhere in Western Europe or the United States or Canada he or she would not expect the Parliamentary Opposition in the country to accuse the governing party of carrying out the eviction in order to get rid of supporters of the Opposition party and ^{to} replace them by supporters of the ~~Governing~~ party. But then both governing and opposing parties in those countries would know this because they do not conduct their politics, even at its bitterest, on ^{the} ~~xxx~~ basis of 'benefits' and 'fish-head' and 'the-ins-and-the-outs'. So you do not have the occupiers of government housing not paying rent for years because the party they support is out of power, and then, when there is a change of government, suddenly ^y paying up with great show because their party is now in power. ~~But~~

has been *for a long, long time*
 But this is how it/~~is~~ in Jamaica. And one result has often been
 that people see the occupation or possession of a place to live as
 reward for political loyalty and for being on the winning side.
 How do we break out of this? How do we get to the stage when no
 party in opposition, be it PNP or JLP, will ascribe political motive
 to the eviction of people who have broken the law? Make no mistake
 about it, until we do get to that stage, all our calls and all our
 prayers for national unity will come to nothing. The government of
 Jamaica, once in place, must be and must be seen to be the government
 of all the people of Jamaica. That is how the Americans, the Canadian
 the British, the French, forged and maintain that over-reaching
 national unity in diversity that we say we also want. And I think
 the Jamaica Employers Federation this week gave us all a pointer to
 how this can be done. Referring to what I/~~and~~ many others see as the
 clearcut union-busting tactics of the local operation of Citibank,
 the Employers Federation declared flatly that it cannot and does not
 support any course of/~~conduct~~ ^{action or} by an employer designed to condition or
 influence the worker in the exercise of his right to join or belong
 to the union of his choice. In short, the Jamaica Employers Federat-
 ion repudiated Citibank's union busting tactics. And the JEF, let us
 always remember, is often in bitter conflict with Jamaica's trade
 unions and with the positions taken by those trade unions from time
 to time. What they are not in conflict with is the right of those
 unions to exist under our constitution and the unfettered right of
 workers to join the union of their choice. Here we see an over-
 riding unity of/~~purpose~~ ^{national} *transcending narrow* sectional interests. I am sure
 that if the need arose Jamaica's trade unions would take an equally
 clearcut stand for the right of an employers federation to exist.
 That is unity in diversity. *It seems to me* ~~The~~ political parties and their spokesmen
 are still to *fully* learn that important lesson. Goodnight

- 1) Elections in Central America: Guatemala
- 2) Joshua Nkomo For Trial: Split in What Front

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday

March 8, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Yesterday was election day in Guatemala, one of the Central American countries which are key to the success or failure of U.S. President Ronald Reagan's recently announced Plan for Central America and the Caribbean. At the heart of that Plan, you will recall, is American determination to stop what they see as the spread of Soviet and Cuban influence in the region. The difficulty, and the dilemma for America, is that those who are seen as America's allies in the anti-communist crusade are themselves totalitarians of the political right: except for democratic Jamaica, ^{perhaps Costa Rica} all of America's principal allies in the region are military juntas or dictatorships. So one of the great difficulties is: How do you defend and support democracy where it does not really exist. One short answer is that you have set-hand elections, carefully managed and controlled so that the results of the elections are a foregone conclusion. So, in Guatemala's elections yesterday, the results were a foregone conclusion: the candidate of the military would win. The military was itself supervising the elections and the only other candidates were people on the political right who were approved of by the military. And so the Guatemalan rulers would be able to claim that their new government came to power by electoral means, which is true. What is not true is that this was either a free or fair or a genuinely democratic election. But they did go through the form of the democratic process and so the result can be described as a kind of face-card democracy, a kind of samfie democracy, which can be used to show that they are different from the totalitarians of the

left who do not even bother with the democratic face-card of bogus elections. Many Americans have seen through this kind of manipulative use of the electoral process and are deeply concerned about it. And many of them, not communists or leftists, but ordinary and ~~affected~~ people who genuinely believe in democracy and the democratic process have begun to seriously question their government's role in Central America. Last week more than 100 U.S. Congressmen signed a letter calling on President Reagan to take serious notice of proposals by the Mexican President to act as a mediator between the U.S. and Nicaragua and the U.S. and Cuba to try and defuse the tensions in Central America. At the time President Portillo made the proposal, which was shortly before Mr. Reagan announced his plan, a White House spokesman all but dismissed it out of hand. But now, thanks to domestic American pressure, Mr. Haig is having talks with the Mexican Foreign Minister on Mr. Portillo's ideas. And you will recall that last month both the Canadian Government and the Canadian churches rejected invitations from El Salvador's junta leader to send observers to this month's elections there. They say 'fair and democratic elections cannot be held under present conditions' in El Salvador. There are many, all over the world, who see genuine democracy as the only acceptable alternative to totalitarianism of both the left and the right. And this is the dilemma in which the key component of the Reagan Plan is caught. And finally and briefly, matters are moving to a most interesting point in Zimbabwe. Prime Minister Mugabe has decided that the law must take its course and Mr. Joshua Nkomo must answer to the courts for that stockpile of hidden arms. And seven white Members of Parliament of Mr. Ian Smith's former Rhodesia ^{Front} Party have broken with Smith and declared themselves as independents willing to co-operate with the government. So it would seem that ^{political} tribalism, both white and black, has suffered ^{over} a setback. Goodnight.

- 1) The Water Crisis: Watershed Protection
- ~~2) Central America: A Gathering Storm.~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
March 5, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: As I listened to Prime Minister Seaga's statement in Parliament on our acute water crisis and the steps to be taken to cope with it, and his somber warning that this water crisis was likely to be with us for a long time to come, I remembered the late Harold Cahusac and how he had forewarned us of precisely the kind of crisis we are in today. Year after year, during his lifetime, Harold Cahusac had warned us that unless we protected and restored our watershed areas a day would come when there would not be enough water to satisfy all the needs of all the Jamaicans people. He warned us in the 1950s and in the 1960s and until his death. There was a time, from about the mid-1950s on when it seemed that Harold Cahusac's warning was beginning to be taken seriously. A Statutory body, the Watershed Protection Commission, was established with Mr. Cahusac himself as chairman, and with such dedicated agricultural stalwarts as Mr. Willy Henry and Sir Arthur Thelwell, as well as such well-known public figures as Mr. S.A.G. Taylor and Mr. O.M. Henzell, as members. But Mr. Cahusac was the driving force of the Commission and he crusaded passionately for us to restore and protect our forests, especially in the catchment areas, and to put an end to the destructive practice of clearing hillside land by burning. He warned that if we did not do this, more and more of the rainfall would rush ~~xxxxxxhillsidexxxx~~ faster and faster down the hillsides without properly soaking into the earth; and more and more of the good earth itself, would be washed down to the sea; and in the end not enough water would be retained on the land to satisfy our needs, and the land would be afflicted by periods of droughts followed by floods.

The trouble was, and is, that watershed protection was something of an abstraction for most of us; the water was there, so why fuss about it? And stopping small farmers from clearing the hillsides by burning would be politically unpopular and counter-productive; and it was, after all, a much easier and quicker way to clear the land. So some of us paid lip-service to Cahusac's ideas but did nothing. *Watershed Protection is not even a listed item in the Budget.* Now the crisis is on us and we are working out more efficient and more rational ways of extracting and redistributing the available water. And I myself have no doubt that the plans outlined by Mr. Seaga yesterday will, in the medium run, ease our water crisis considerably. But unless those plans are backed and supported by a serious and systematic watershed protection and restoration programme, another generation of Jamaicans will, in twenty or thirty or forty years' time, face an even more acute and devastating water crisis. Mr. Allan Isaacs, who is now the Chairman of the Watershed Protection Commission knows all this and knows what should be done better than anyone else in Jamaica today. The hard question is whether he will fare any better than Harold Cahusac did in trying to get the tools to do the job. There is no political mileage in watershed protection; it does not bring votes; its results are not short-term or obvious like imported food on supermarket shelves or new roads abuilding or new factory sites; but without it the water available to us becomes less and less, and without water life becomes ugly and brutish. The late Harold Cahusac warned us: are we ready, ~~to~~ ^{restore and} late in the day, to heed that warning and start to seriously/protect our watershed areas? If ~~w-e~~ don't, then all the millions we may spend on the more efficient extraction and distribution of the water/~~there~~ ^{now available} ~~is~~ will only buy a little time, before another, more devastating ^a water crisis hits Jamaica again. Goodnight

- 1) Reaganomics Under Pressure
- 2) Soviet ~~Alternative~~ Looks Sick

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
March 1, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: News out of Washington this morning suggest that American President Ronald Reagan is likely to be under very strong Congressional pressure to change some of the numbers in his 1983 Budget proposals. What has alarmed American Congressional leaders most it seems, is the massive Budget deficit the Reagan proposals project for 1983: if all goes as planned, if nothing goes wrong, then, in 1983 the American budget will be in the red to the tune of \$91 $\frac{1}{2}$ -thousand million dollars - and this, even by superpower measurements, is a massive deficit indeed. And to make this horrifying figure even worse the revised/^{Reagan}figures for the 1982 Budget - that is this year's budget - are now put at \$98.6-thousand million dollars; up from the \$90-thousand million first projected; and some American experts think that this figure may be up to \$100-thousand-million before September 30th when the 1982 financial year ends. One of the great fears is that what happened with the 1982 projections may happen again in 1983, with a vengeance. So many of those who were prepared to accept the Reagan projections last year, and who were prepared to go along with Mr. Reagan's large tax cuts, and spending cuts on the social service^s, as well as his big increase in military spending, are having serious second thoughts this time around. No less a person than Republic Senator Robert Dole, the Chairman of the American Senate Finance Committee, an^t a known conservative Reagan supporter, this morning made public the fact that Congressional leaders of both parties are working for a ^{bipartisan} consensus to redraft the 1983 Budget proposals in order to reduce the

huge projected deficit and save some of the social programmes.
 One result has been that the White House this morning invited
 members of the Senate Finance Committee to meet with Mr. Reagan.
 But the President has shown himself to be a determined and stubborn
 man and he may not be prepared to go as far as the Congress may want
 to in dismantling his budget. So, unless some ^{acceptable} compromise is achieved
 Mr. Reagan may be in for a long and perhaps bitter fight with the
 American Congress; and many Congressmen and women, remember, are
 up for re-election later this year, so doing what will win votes
 will be a major consideration. That is on the domestic American
 scene. ^{though it could affect the Caribbean Basin Plan as well.} Mr. Reagan also has problems with his western allies. While
 we were understandably preoccupied last week with the Reagan aid
 plan for Central America and the Caribbean, the leaders of the two
 major West European powers, Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany and
 President Mitterrand of France met and worked out a strategy to cope
 with the high American interest rates which ^{are} ~~is~~ wreaking such havoc
 on European economies. Just what they have decided is not yet known;
 but they have decided something and any European counter-measures
 could easily dislocate a fragile economic situation. ^{And people like us will feel it most.} But it is not
 only capitalist economies that are in ^{deep} trouble. Indeed, Soviet commun-
 ism and the entire Soviet system must be under question now as an
 alternative economic path leading anywhere. Everyone of the Comecon
 partners is in debt to the capitalists and the ^{banking} system:
 Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, all owe the
 West ^{thousands of millions} ~~billions~~ of dollars in long-term debts; and they seem not even
 able to feed themselves from their own resources. This is no way
 for a viable alternative economic system to function. The Soviet
 system should ^{be very} at least be able to support its dependent economies
 to the same extent that capitalism supports its dependent economies.
 Till it can do that it is ^{in economic trouble} a sick and questionable alternative. Goodnight.

The Caribbean Basin Plan:
What Prospects and Possibilities?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
February 26, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Reaction to American President Ronald Reagan's Caribbean Basin Plan has been predictably mixed. On the ideological front it has ^{generally speaking,} been welcomed by the political right and denounced by the political left. On the economic front reactions are a little less sharply clearcut. Some of those who welcome it, especially in Western Europe, wonder whether it is not "too little, too late". Will an additional injection of something under \$400-million-U.S. of American aid go any real distance toward breaking the ^{acute} economic problems of the region? Questions like this worry even the supporters of Mr. Reagan's Plan. And it is, of course, Mr. Reagan's Plan, not the hoped-for American-Canadian-Mexican-Venezuelan regional aid initiative with no military or political strings. But socialist French President Francois Mitterrand yesterday welcomed Mr. Reagan's Plan as "going in the right direction." Communist China, on the other hand, has found itself in the odd position of almost echoing Cuban and Soviet condemnation of the Plan. But perhaps the most intriguing reaction has been the so-far generally non-committal ~~may~~ reaction of many Latin Americans, some of whom are bound to be profoundly affected by the success or failure of Mr. Reagan's Plan. But then, most of these people operate in political ^{and climates} systems/where choosing the 'wrong' or losing side can mean death or exile, not, as in our case, ^{just} becoming members of the loyal opposition. This, I suspect, may turn out to be one of the handicaps of the early phases of the Reagan Plan in Central ~~and Latin~~ America. Only those with nothing to lose and everything to gain will come out boldly ^{either} for or

against the Reagan Plan, depending on their political position. If the Plan succeeds, or looks like succeeding, then, I think, those of the ~~XXXXXX~~ political centre, the centre-left as well as the centre-right will change from being non-committal to being supporters. And this makes it important, from the American viewpoint, for the Plan to show ^{some} quick and early successes ^{in Central America} in socio-economic terms, rather than in terms of showing political and military 'muscle'. I suspect that President Mitterrand had something like this in mind when he spoke of the Americans going in the right direction: Mr. Reagan did see socio-economic problems as at the heart of the political instability of the region. But then he went on ^{to} ~~the~~ wave the anti-communist big stick, which the French President would of course not have done, knowing that a well-fed, ^{gainfully employed,} socially secure and politically free people are just about the hardest to lead into any kind of revolutionary action. *Poverty + inequality are the seedbeds of revolution.* Then, too, there is the delicate matter of Latin American sensibilities, no matter who pays the piper and calls the tune. Some of this may be at the root of the Latin ambivalence. I think Jamaica will fare ^{much} better than the other islands under the Reagan Plan. It is, after all, Mr. Seaga's brain-child. *But there is the danger of division.* The question is whether our private sector, which is now 'the engine of progress and change' will rise to the challenge. Will it produce, and enough, of the exports to send into that new market which has been opened to us? Can it break out of the old 'crewdriver', 'rip-off' mentality of the protected past? Can it face reasonable and managed outside competition and competitive pricing? And above all, can it do so and still give the Jamaican workers a fair deal. The so-called engine of progress and change can, and will, go nowhere by itself. The workers, unionised as they are, are difficult as some say they are, essential. *And the Jamaican people as a whole are supposed to be the main purpose of this enterprise.* *Let it be so.* Goodnight.

- 1) Caribbean Basin Plan: Aid as Politics
- 2) Post Cancun Meeting: ~~Soviet~~^{and} South Co-operation
- 3) Political Leadership & ~~Miscalculation~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
February 22, 1982, 6.1p.m.

Good evening: American President Ronald Reagan is expected this week to make public his long-awaited Caribbean Basin Plan. Reports out of Washington ^{are} ~~is~~ that for over a week now an 'unofficial prospectus' outlining the main features of the Plan has been circulated among private sector groups. And there are indications that other interests, in other countries, have also seen some version of this 'unofficial prospectus'. For instance, former Venezuelan President Carlos Andres Perez, recently spoke knowingly about the danger of the Caribbean Basin Plan opening the region to a kind of economic colonialism by American multinational corporations. It is reasonable to assume that those remarks by Mr. Perez were based on what he had seen or heard or read. Former Presidents, especially former elected Presidents, do not just shoot off their mouths. So one of the very first things to look out for when the Plan is unveiled is whether it is still based on that agreement of last summer when the four donor countries, the United States, Canada, Mexico and Venezuela, met in the Bahamas and agreed ^{an} on/ aid plan for the Caribbean and Central America with no military or political strings attached. Reports about the present 'unofficial prospectus' make it sound like a purely American plan, rather than a four-nation plan. There is, for instance, talk of a one-way free trade arrangement under which all non-petroleum and non-textile imports from the Caribbean (and presumably Central America) may enter the U.S. market duty-free. Why only the U.S. market? Why

not also duty-free entry to the Canadian, Mexican and Venezuelan markets if it is in fact a four-nation plan of aid? And why only talk of protection for American investors if it is in fact the Plan of the four countries? Surely, Canadian, Mexican and Venezuelan investors and business people would want to enjoy similar market access and protection. Or is the United States now 'going it alone' on the Caribbean Basin Plan? Anyway, these, and a host of other questions, should be answered when Mr. Reagan unfolds his Plan. Economic aid has always had some measure of political strings attached, no matter what the source of the aid, or the ideology of the donor. But there has also been a tendency, in the past, not to be too blatant about it: so Nyerere received a minimum amount because they did not like his policies, and Kenyatta and his successors received much because their policies met approval; but ~~not~~ ^{not} Nyerere's people were/condemned to starve to make a political point. Will Mr. Reagan's Caribbean Basin Plan inaugurate a new era in which and nationalists like SWAPO in Southern Africa leftists like the Salvadorans and Nicaraguans/are starved into submission? It is questions like these that make that post Cancun meeting now ~~taking~~ ^{Delhi} place in Delhi of such long-term importance to the Third World. Those who are economically dependent cannot be really politically independent. When the Third World finally absorbs that lesson it may start the hard process of forging a South-South interdependence as the beginning of real economic independence. And that is going to be a long and hard and difficult one. And finally, and briefly, it begins to look as though Mr. Joshua Nkomo is just the latest of a very long line of politicians who miscalculated the nature of the historical role they play. Two senior and two junior ministers from his party have stayed with Mugabe; and it looks as though the people of Zimbabwe want to be ^{a united} nation, not a group of ^{manipulated} warring tribes. Goodnight.

The JBC Settlement: What Lessons
for the News Media's Future?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
February 19, 1982, 6.10p.m.

Good evening: Jamaica's news media has itself been much in the news this week. On Monday the Supreme Court, through Mr. Justice Downer, handed down a consent judgement in the case of eleven of the thirteen JBC newroom workers who had been dismissed from their jobs just a little over a year ago. On Tuesday the Gleaner newspapers did not appear and have been off the streets since. And the Daily News, we were told this week, is still up for divestment but it has first to be made into an attractive marketable commodity - which is a little like going back to the beginning when the original founders of the paper, or some of them, at least, thought and talked of it in terms of using the same formula by which they had successfully sold bread and ale. Lest we forget, that formula led, ultimately, to the bringing of ITT to Jamaica as a participant in the paper's ownership. And scandal rags with overdeveloped 'girlie' nudess and muckraking journalism ^{without too much sweat,} can/be very marketable indeed. It is all a question of "attractive for whom" and what you want. I think it would ^{be} good ~~if~~ ^{for} the government, or its Divestment Committee, to make public some idea of the terms and conditions under which it would sell the Daily News and the kind of buyer it is looking for. Is it to be Jamaican ownership? If so, ^{sd} what kind? On that will depend very greatly the true nature of the variety and diversity of information available to the Jamaican people to which we pay such great lip-service. And after this week's outcome of the case of the dismissed JBC workers, and remembering the events that led up to it, few thoughtful Jamaicans of either political party, can have confider^t

that any government of Jamaica, JLP or PNP, will leave any government-owned medium genuinely free. When you own and control something the natural impulse is to use it to further your own interest and your own perception of what is best for the public interest; and the public interest invariably coincides with interests of the party in power, be it PNP or JLP. And so, in ^{claimed} the public interest, the highly questionable dismissal of two JBC newsroom workers in 1964, led to a protracted and bitter ninety-seven-day-long strike which ended up costing the country's taxpayers an estimated \$100,000 television and drove some very fine/news media workers out of the profession, and cast a shadow of doubt that persists to this day, on the professional integrity of the organisation founded by the great Norman Manley to serve the educational, cultural, entertainment and informational needs of all the Jamaican people. And this week, history repeated itself as tragic farce: 11 workers, none of whom would ordinarily have earned as much as \$20,000 for a year's work, were each awarded between \$40,000 and \$65,000 for having been falsely dismissed a year earlier. And over and above that \$1¹/₂-million-plus taxpayers are also going to have to pay lawyers fees and costs. The question is: which did the firing If that Board/had itself to somehow find the money to pay these awards and costs, would it have acted in this way? I doubt it. And this tragic farce seems bound to repeat itself ^{again + again} in more grotesque ^{each time} ways/~~wherever~~ there is a change of government. And this, as far as ^{of Jamaica} I am concerned, is the ^{single} strongest argument for the government/not to have total ownership and control over any one of our major news and information outlets. There is of course the problem of taxpayers money. The 25% ^{Govt} share in RJR is to safeguard taxpayers money used in the acquisition. It could divest itself of both the JBC and Daily News on a similar basis ^{democratic} of broad-based ownership. Which can, as RJR proves, be successful. What has failed to the point of being a threat to freedom of expression, is total government ownership, no matter which party is in power. Goodnight.

- 1) The Bauxite Settlement
- 2) Change Without Chaos
- 3) Crisis in Zimbabwe

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
February 15, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The single most important piece of weekend news in Jamaica - and it was very good news, indeed - was the settlement of the bauxite/alumina wage ^{negotiations} ~~agreement~~ in the very early hours of Saturday morning. And the single most important implication of that settlement for Jamaica is that for the next three years the ~~existing~~ alumina/bauxite industry, which is so critical to Jamaica's foreign exchange earnings, should be free of ^{any} major industrial disputes and dislocations. Of course, things could go wrong: there is always the possibility of human error or human miscalculation from either management or worker side; there is always the possibility of the mishandling of some minor misunderstanding resulting in a confrontationist atmosphere. ~~But~~ That is part of the human condition, part of the hazard of doing anything at all, be it in labour-management relations, party ~~political~~ relations or plain personal relations. ~~The~~ risk is always there. But that apart, the next three years should, from here on, see stability and peace in our bauxite/alumina industry on which so much of the recovery programme is predicated. I think myself that Mr. Hugh Shearer in particular deserves the gratitude of us all for having brought these delicate and tricky negotiations to a successful conclusion. It is clear that both sides of the bargaining table ended up feeling they had a deal each could live with. Both sides had to make concessions; both gave something in order to get something. Neither side feels that the other has walked all over it. And that is the best kind of compromise to end up with. So let production proceed

as smoothly and quickly as possible from here on. Far too much time has already been spent on this ~~xxx~~ dispute and far too much confusion spread. There were no saboteurs, no unpatriotic villains, no square-jawed heroes; only conflicting self-interests which were finally reconciled by a skilled negotiator and goodwill and good sense from all sides. That is the true prescription for change without chaos; it should be brought into play at all other levels of Jamaica's economic recovery effort. And it should be brought into play much earlier than in this case; waiting until there is a breakdown and strike action, or a war of words in the news media, is to leave ^{things} too late and thus to hamper the recovery effort. I remember there was talk once of a kind of facilitating ^{or} ~~unit~~ trouble-shooting unit to watch and make sure that attention is drawn to brewing problems before they get out of hand. If such a trouble-shooting unit had existed and had functioned properly, much of our recent troubles in light and power and water and public transport, as well as in industrial relations, might, at the very least, have been attended to long before they reached crisis point. Next, there was the continuing news out of Zimbabwe of government forces continuing to find huge stockpiles of arms hidden on farms owned and controlled by Mr. Joshua Nkomo's Patriotic Front which is the junior partner in the government of Mr. Robert Mugabe. Mr. Mugabe has reportedly denounced the Patriotic Front bitterly, saying it was a snake in the alliance and its leader must have known about the secret arms stockpiles, and he has called for the cutting off of the head of the snake. There have also been calls to try Nkomo for treason. It is a tricky situation. Nkomo leads the largest minority tribe which is 18% of the population. Nkomo is also personally ambitious and Ian Smith and his ^{as well as most foreign investors} settler group would prefer Nkomo rather than Mugabe to be Prime Minister. Mugabe on the other hand does not want to lead a government based on solely tribal divisions. Goodnight.

The JOS: Will a Workers' Co-operative Save it?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
February 12, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Bustamante Industrial Trade Union and the National Workers Union who jointly represent the overwhelming majority of the roughly twelve-hundred-strong JOS work force have recently called on the Government to meet with them to discuss the rights and interests of the JOS workers. The unions are concerned about reports, which have neither been denied nor confirmed by the government, that the JOS is to be closed down and that private sector transport operators are to be invited to run the Corporate Area's public transport. The BITU has reminded ^{the} ~~that~~ government that JOS workers have received no pay increase or improved fringe benefits for nearly four years now. For its part, the NWU has said that it will hold a series of meetings with JOS workers to discuss the possibility of setting up a Workers Co-operative to take over and run the JOS. And this is the first practical idea to come from the workers side to try and save their jobs and secure the future of the JOS as we now know it. The hard question is: Is the co-operative idea feasible, and if it is, in whose interest will it work? I think myself that it is feasible. I think that Jamaican workers can, if they set their minds to it, run businesses on their own. They have done it before now, here in Jamaica, and even more successfully elsewhere in the world where pressures were greater. Often, absentee owners and semi-educated imported managers, have been face-cards behind which the workers really ran the business. ^{One} ~~The~~ trouble was, and to an extent still is, that the face-cards had, over time, become important psychological crutches on which the

workers had come to depend and without which they doubted their ability to do what they really could and were in fact doing. Another, and perhaps more serious immediate trouble, especially in the case of the present group of JOS workers, is motivation. The plain fact is that these workers have given the Corporate Area bus users just about the poorest and shoddiest service they could get away with. The Company was there, primarily, for their convenience so that they could make a decent living under the best possible conditions. The interests of the bus users was something far down their list of priorities. Under private ownership the main concern was to make a profit, and they had to shape up to some extent in order to earn that profit or lose their jobs. Under public ownership they became 'public servants' who enjoyed job security whether the enterprise was profitable or not. So it ceased to be profitable. So even today, in virtual bankruptcy, their unions talk of their entitlement to wage increases and better fringes. Will becoming a Workers' Co-operative change this? I do not think so, certainly not in the short run, and not with this generation of JOS workers. If they are cut off from the public purse string they will, as the new owners, simply expect the bus users to support them by higher and higher and higher fares for poorer and poorer ^{service} ~~fares~~. That, on the basis of past and present performance is what I fear. They have not earned the right, by performance, to ask the bus using public to trust them not to exploit ^{that} the public's ^{need} ~~interest~~. And exploitation is exploitation, whether done by rapacious capitalists or rapacious workers. One day, I hope, workers in public transport ^(for instance as mature + responsible as the TFS workers) will be socially mature enough and socially responsible enough to be trusted to own and operate the service and to do it in the public interest. Till that day, I think it is the responsibility of good government to totally control the service and to impose on it good management and viability in the public interest. Goodnight.

- 1) The New Power Cuts
- 2) Rural Water problems in St. Andrew
- 3) Cuban Troops in Angola

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
February 8, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: When Prime Minister Seaga On January 26th promised the restoration of normal electricity supplies and an end to the scheduled power cuts by the first of February he hedged it with the qualification: "if no further problems occur.." Mr. E.K. Powell, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Public Utilities, made no such qualification last Wednesday when he told small hotelier here in Kingston that, and now I quote: "The power cuts which were experienced over the past few months are over. Indeed, as the Prime Minister promised in his recent speech in Parliament, the outages ended on February 1st." End of quote. Well, the outages are with us again, a scant four days after Mr. Powell said so flatly that they were at an end. I hope all our government spokespeople, and indeed, all defenders of the prevailing faith, will learn the lesson of caution which prompts the qualifier: "if no further problems occur.." and by those There is a natural tendency by those who exercise power,/~~or~~ who think that they influence the exercise of power, to overstate or over-claim or over-promise or oversell. And then when they fail to deliver or when they deliver short/~~or~~ things look so much worse than they would have done if the claims or the promises had been less extravagant. And then they face the problems of confidence and of credibility. So the power cuts are with us again. And many of us have also been without any water/~~or~~ the weekend: the KSAC water worker⁵ for instance, /appear to be on some sort of protest demonstration, resulting in no water in our neck of West Rural St. Andrew. And over the weekend no

one in authority seemed to know about this protest and what it was about. So our three key utilities - light and power, water, and public transport - are still headaches that must be resolved, not by words, however sweet, but by deeds. And I think ~~the~~ task is bound to be hard and long and uphill. And honest and quiet levelling with people could be of great help. On the world scene the most ~~int~~⁹eresting new development was the announcement out of Angola that the Cuban and Angolan governments were in important discussions about the withdrawal of Cuban troops from that country. The most likely reason for that announcement at this time, and for the strong American reaction to it, is the likelihood that some new movement is taking place on Namibian independence. The nature of the so-called Western Contact Group of the United States, West Germany, Britain, France and Canada has been ~~greatly~~^{dramatically} changed by the coming to power of the French socialists who are frankly and openly more anti-Apartheid ~~and~~ than France was under former President Giscard D'Estang. This has tilted the balance within the Group against accommodating South Africa at any cost and in favour of a stronger push for Namibian independence. My reading is that France and Canada would now lead this push, with Britain and West Germany in the middle of the road and leaning toward the French-Canadian position and only the United States ~~resisting~~⁶. In this context, and provided the Group will guarantee Angolan sovereignty, it would be in keeping with long-term OAU objectives to agree to a timetable for Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from South Africa. It would clearly not suit either Angolan or Namibian ^{as, indeed, general African interests} interests to have the Cubans withdraw before the whole thing is settled. The South Africans, and their American friends, on the other hand, would like to see the Cubans withdraw before things are settled. It is ^{all} high stakes political poker. Goodnight

The Future of Public Transport:
After JOS What?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
February 5, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Is the Jamaica Omnibus Service - the JOS - "up for grabs" as yesterday's Daily News headline announced? Today's Daily Gleaner says that the new Minister of Public Utilities and Transport, Mr. Parnell Charles, refused to comment on that screaming headline, and said that a statement will be made shortly on the future of the JOS. So, whether the JOS is "up for grabs" ^{or} ~~are~~ not, there does seem to be movement which suggests that the slow and costly death by attrition which we have been watching over the past twelve months or so may be coming to an end. The "up for grabs" news story also suggests that ^{there} ~~they~~ may be pressures at work to try and influence the way in which the JOS matter is settled. So now, I suggest, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ is the time for the Corporate Area citizens who depend on public transport to make their views felt so that those views may form part of the influences ^{is finally settled} ~~on~~ how this matter ~~show~~ ~~is~~ settled. If not, the people may end up with a public transport service which is designed for them by people who do not themselves use public transport. The Corporate Area of Kingston and St. Andrew now has a population of somewhere between 600,000 and three-quarters of a million people. And the overwhelming majority of them move between work and home and shops and schools and play by public transport. For all their high visibility private cars are used by a minority of the citizens of Kingston and St. Andrew. Even in its present depressed state the JOS in the first five months of last year ^{1981,} made more than 29-million passenger journeys. This was significantly less than it had done the year before, but it is still a massive number

of journeys, moving people by the order of something of a 100-million or more a year. Unless you want chaos you do not just cut off this kind of public transport without first putting something else in place. And what you put in place must preferably be better, or at least not worse, than what you cut off. So it is important not to get rid of bad and end up with worse. I think it is very possible to have a fragmented and reasonably viable public transport service run by private operators. I think it is bound to entail heavy investment to bring in more up-to-date units. Do local private operators have that kind of money? For them to buy the old and often obsolete JOS stock of buses would be to begin with a rattling makeshift which could carry them down in a year or two. handicap/ So capitalisation for new units would be the first major problem. And if they can raise the money at today's interest rates worldwide (and these rates are going up/ not down) will they be able to service their debts without grossly inflated fares, running at anywhere from three or four times the present fares? And who, among the mass of the people using public transport would be able to afford these? I am not sure myself that "up for grabs" is the right way to describe any divesting of the JOS. But there is also the very serious social question of who should be responsible for a nation's - any nation's - key utilities. If our hospitals and other public health services become grossly inefficient and money losers who do not compensate by quality of service, do we divest them into private hands? Do we do so with water? And if we do, who is/then accountable to the people for their key utilities? And what is the point of having a government and paying taxes? The Jamaica Telephone Company, Jamintel, the Port Authority, all publicly owned, all made profits during the first six months of last year. So It is not public ownership that is at fault. It is the operation and the management. Perhaps the best longterm answer is to rebuild the publicly-owned JOS from the ground up. It is a hard challenge. Goodnight.

The Roosevelt Legacy:
The Purposes of Good Government

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
February 1, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Two events, both foreign, but both of great relevance to Jamaica, dominated the weekend news. The one underscored once again the world's general ambivalence about Human Rights: the other stirred and revived again the endless debate on the role and responsibility of governments, especially in times of difficulty. The observation of Solidarity Day with the people of Poland, which took place on Saturday, ^{tv} shown yesterday and the/film/expressing condemnation of events in Poland, should have been worldwide in character. Human rights and the promotion of human rights and the defence of human rights, are, after all, of concern to all human beings everywhere. So why did world solidarity day with the Polish people turn out to be an essentially American and West European exercise? And why could so very few of / ~~xxxxxx~~ the hundreds of thousands of ordinary West Europeans who demonstrated so passionately against nuclear arms a few months back be mobilised for this one? And, above all, why were the overwhelming numbers of the governments and peoples of the Third World - the Asians, the Africans, the Arabs, the Latin Americans, not involved in this day of Solidarity with the Polish people? I think the short answer is that they saw it all as just another move in the political power game between East and West, between capitalism and communism. As far as basic human rights are concerned there is no moral or qualitative difference between what is happening in communist Poland now and what has been going on in ^{capitalist} South Africa and Namibia for the last quarter century and more. A score of people were murdered by government troops in El Salvador, and a number of young women raped on that

same day the world was called on to demonstrate on behalf of Polish human rights. What makes Polish human rights more special than Salvadoran or Haitian or Chilean or African or ^{Palestinian} ~~Arab~~ human rights? Human rights and sensitivity to and concern for human rights worldwide may yet founder because of the cynical double and standard that is now at work. Also on Saturday, on a very much more subdued note, large numbers of Americans and smaller thoughtful groups throughout the world observed the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose 'New Deal' of the 1930s ended the 'Great Depression' which began in 1929 and was finally over by 1940. At the worst point of the 'great depression' a reported fifty per cent of the American work force was unemployed and the nation was in a state of such panic that they were prepared to grab at even the most unheard of measures to try and get out of the mess into which the so-called free market forces had led the country. Roosevelt called a special session of the American Congress which lasted 99 days. In that period some of the most startling and far-reaching measures were passed into law. There was a Work Relief Bill to the tune of nearly \$5,000-million for the unemployed. There was social ^{security} housing and educational help for the poorest and weakest in the society. The turning around of the society began with lifting up these lowest down ^{economic ladder} on the ~~society~~. And the purpose of government as far as Roosevelt was concerned was to serve and promote and protect the interests of the American majority. In his own words: "The New Deal has not been borrowed from an alien source; it derives its inspiration from two earlier dogmas: the Square Deal of Theodore Roosevelt and the New Freedom of Woodrow Wilson. Like these two it seeks to eliminate special privilege in the control of the old economy and social structure by a numerically very small but powerful group of individuals and to swing the pendulum back in the direction of wider distribution of the wealth and property of the American citizen"
 No they embraced him with love on Saturday Goodnight

1) The Alcan Shutdown

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday.
January 29, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The shutdown at the Alcan Kirkvine works in Manchester has made the country's gloomy bauxite-alumina situation even gloomier. The country now faces the very distinct possibility of a total shutdown in the industry. Indeed, reports are that both sides - management and workers - have used the threat of 'doing a Jamalco', shutting down the industry until a new labour contract has been signed. And if this were to happen, then even the reduced foreign exchange earnings that we expect from bauxite-alumina will be endangered. 'Doing a Jamalco' can and will hurt Jamaica grievously, so we must hope that both sides can be persuaded by Mr. Shearer to back away from a total shutdown of the industry. And I am not sure that the tendency among some of our hot-headed political partisans to find villains and to scream sabotage will help ease matters. I think it would be better by far for all of us to try and keep the atmosphere politically as/uncharged as possible and give Mr. Shearer all the room for manoeuvre/~~possibilities~~ that he can get. He will certainly need it. And while we wait and hope it might be useful for us to keep in mind the central issues involved. First, that the last labour contract between the National Workers Union and the five Bauxite-alumina Companies expired on the 31st of January, 1981, just about a year ago. In November of 1980, three months before the expiry of that/contract, the NWU presented its claims for a new contract to the five companies. And the companies and the union have been talking and talking and talking for the best part of fifteen months now. And fifteen months is a

long time to talk without arriving at any agreement. I think it is fair to say that if the world metals market were flourishing today, and if the parent companies of the local companies were not rich in stickpiles of bauxite-alumina, ^{would have been reached} an agreement/and a contract signed by now. The trouble is that the metals market is very depressed, the companies have huge stockpiles, and so for the moment maintaining or increasing production is not all that important to them. So the companies are under no pressure to settle for a new labour contract and get on with production. This is the second central issue. The result has been all sorts of delays, with each side seeking to further its own interests. We've had all sorts of side issues/^{like} the date when the/^{new} contract comes into force (in the past it was related to the date of expiry of the old contract) or the payment of union delegates attending meetings (which was never an issue in the past), to the point where some of us seem almost to have forgotten that the real issue was the hammering out of a new labour contract between management and its workers. It has, in fact, become something of ^{an industrial} a war of attrition. In effect the companies are saying things are bad and ^{they} we cannot/^{agree to} ~~be~~ as generous terms as when conditions were good. The workers are not accepting this. They say things are bad for them as well; ^{that} the companies, worldwide, are still make profits though these are reduced, and they do not see why they, ~~the workers~~ ^{what appears to be} should be the only ones to sacrifice. And so you come down to/a straight collision of two sets of economic interests: the interests of the workers and the interests of the companies. If these two apparently conflicting sets of interests cannot be reconciled then we may indeed have a total shutdown in Jamaica's bauxite-alumina industry; and Jamaica will suffer, whoever else has might and whoever else has right. Goodnight.

The Utilities: The Problems of Attitudes,
Performance & Ownership; JPS as indicator.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Wednesday
January 27, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Prime Minister Seaga's statement to Parliament and the nation yesterday with its promise of deliverance from the darkness of the past few weeks is most welcome on several counts. There is the promise of the short-term easing of the power-cuts by next week - which, I am sure, all Jamaicans of all views, opinions and interests will welcome. Everybody ~~will~~ want to see an end to the darkness and loss of these past weeks. But by far the more important aspect of the statement was its careful and detailed spelling out of the plan of action worked out to ensure that we will in future have a much more reliable electricity supply. In the JLP's Election Manifesto/^{this} ~~the~~ notion of reliability was coupled with 'reasonable prices', which may be a rather tall order at this time. The key thing now is the stability and reliability of the service; and we now have a clear time-table against which to measure performance and achievement. And for me one of the most interesting aspects of the statement, part explicit, part explicit, was the overview of the utilities generally: the problems of the JPS were part of a wider pattern of problems afflicting our public transport, our water, our telephone and other services. And a reasonable conclusion must be that these other utilities and their problems will be tackled in the same methodical, non-ideological, non-doctrinaire fashion, with viability as the first concern. And yet there was no mention of divesting the JPS. The JPS will be made to perform efficiently and reliability under its present form of

ownership. So the issue here, it seems, is not ownership but performance and the implication is that this publicly owned utility can be made to perform satisfactorily without selling it off to private or foreign investor. And clearly, if this can be done with one publicly owned utility, it can be done with other publicly owned utilities. Would it not be ironic if this allegedly conservative government of Jamaica were to succeed in making our publicly owned utilities into economically viable entities! Public ownership has been largely discredited in Jamaica because of the miserably poor performance of nearly everyone of the entities that became publicly owned. Memories are short so people do not remember the very restricted area and numbers served by the JPS, the JOS and the Telephone Company when they were all in private hands. The JOS plied only highly profitable routes; the JPS made only high-return profitable installations; and so did the Telephone Company. The vast expansions with their social benefits to communities at little profit to the operators of the utilities/^{mainly}~~only~~ came about after public ownership. Special low fares for school children and old people are part of the costly social benefits of public ownership. We need to bear all this in mind when we criticise public ownership. Housing developers do not want to build houses for the poorest people, because it is unprofitable and uneconomic: so either the government does it or the poor have no housing. This is the type of social charge the public utilities at times carried. But public ownership also bred a sense of self-serving arrogance in some workers; ^{as ~~found in~~ with some civil servants;} they couldn't be fired so anything was good enough for the public; and managements saw or pretended to see profitability as a dirty word; and ~~an~~ infantile brand of leftism fed it all. Now, there is a ~~distinct~~^{clear} possibility of a JLP government making public ownership viable and thus respectable because it really is in the public interest. What a blow ^{to Jamaica} for our socialists, that would be Goodnight.

- 1) The Public Interest: what is it? Who serves it?
- 2) The Italian-Soviet Fallout: end of the monolith?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
January 25, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: According to yesterday's Sunday Sun, the President of the Private Sector Organisation of Jamaica on Saturday told the annual convention of the Jamaica Gasolene Retailer's Association that the private sector had to rid itself of the 'get-rich-quick syndrome' and expose the fast-buck operators who had no qualms about fleecing the public. Mrs. Henriques reportedly challenged the private sector to put its house in order and to so act that it cannot be held responsible for any failings in the country's systems. And at this same Convention the JGRA is reported to have issued an ultimatum to the oil marketing companies about the shortage of petrol deliveries. You will recall that the JGRA had previously complained that deliveries to some of its members were at times short of the ~~of the~~ volume ordered or paid for. And at the same convention the Minister of State for Mining and Energy said there would be no further warnings for gas station operators who sell petrol on unauthorised days and hours. This sort of operation is clearly counter to the government's energy conservation policy; but then so must be the fact of the increased numbers of spanking, big, new private cars on our roads. So, at that one convention of one service group in the society, a number of our most pressing problems came to the surface. There is what one editorial describes as 'national thievery in high places'; there is the blatant violation by some of its members of the laws and regulations governing the operations of that particular service group. And, going beyond just that

apparently ^{by} sufficient widespread for the President of the Private Sector Organisation to feel the need to condemn it, there is the 'get-rich-quick syndrome' with its fast-buck operators who have no qualms about fleecing the public. So where, in all this, lies the national interest? How do we identify, in this instance, the national ^{all} interest that we are ^{so} hot about whenever workers and their unions cause stoppages or shutdowns? Where lies the national interest in the context of violent and capriciously varying prices for the same pair of shoes, or the same piece of clothing or the same item of food, depending on where you buy it? Is ~~the~~ 'national thievery in high places' to be denounced any less by leaders of church and state than national thievery in low places? If the answer is no, then why do we hear so little about the one and so much about the other? I suggest that the ^{national consensus} ~~the~~ ~~xxxxx~~ we all say we want, begins here. Do you remember how it was with those early Labour Days when a majority of Jamaicans were inspired ⁱⁿ to put ^{his} labour and a lot of love for Jamaica into Labour Day? We had that national consensus for a brief spell then. To be sure it was blown later; but we had it briefly, and it was good and it was based on the notions of equity: equity of effort, equity of responsibility, each within his or her own sphere. It can be recaptured, perhaps more lastingly, if we sort out the true nature of the national interest. It is not the same thing as the sectional or class or economic or partisan interest: it is a synthesis of all ^{these} ^{The challenge is to find it.} and something more. And finally and briefly, the most politically significant news on the ideological front is the now apparent ^{by} ^{clear} break ^{between} the Soviet Communist Party and the Italian Communist Party, which is the largest communist party in Western Europe. The implications for the future political shape of both the Eastern and Western power blocs is likely to be profound. But more on that another time. Goodnight.

Poland, the Mid-East, South Africa:
The morality of the Power Game.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
January 22, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: On Wednesday of this week, after days of behind-the-scenes jockeying, the United Nations Security Council finally took a vote on the resolution proposed by Jordan calling for voluntary economic and political sanctions against Israel for its annexation of the Golan Heights. Nine members of the Security Council - Jordan (the sponsor), the People's Republic of China, Guyana, Poland, the Soviet Union, Spain, Togo, Uganda and Zaire - voted for the imposition of voluntary sanctions. Five members - Britain, France, Ireland, Japan and Panama - abstained. The United States voted against the imposition of sanctions against Israel for its annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights which it had occupied since the 1967 Arab-Israeli War. You will recall that in a dramatic and surprise move from his hospital bed last December 14, Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin went by wheel chair to the Israeli Parliament to announce the annexation of the Golan Heights. You will also recall that in apparent anger and disapproval the United States publicly suspended a security treaty just worked out between itself and Israel. And you will further recall that on December 17th the U.N. Security Council unanimously passed a resolution denouncing the Israeli annexation and demanding that it be cancelled. That resolution described the Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights as 'an act of aggression'. The Israelis have ignored the Security Council resolution and so Jordan, one of the most moderate of the 'moderate' pro-American and pro-Western Arab states, and a current

non-permanent member of the Security Council, circulated a draft of a resolution calling for sanctions against Israel. Under heavy American pressure Jordan modified its resolution so that the sanctions, if agreed to, would be voluntary rather than mandatory. Those who did not want to impose the sanctions would not be bound by the resolution. Still, as last night's news made clear, the United States voted against the resolution, thus veto-ing it because a negative vote on any issue by any one ~~xxx~~ permanent member of the Security Council automatically cancels it. And today the Arab world, from far left to far right, from religious fanatics to moderate pro-Westerners, are all expressing some of the most bitter anti-American sentiments heard and read in a very long time.

Whether this new wave of bitter anti-Americanism in the Arab world will be temporary or lasting is anybody's guess: it is certainly too early to attempt any intelligent forecast. What is certain is that the next few months are going to see a heightening of confrontationist political tension in the Middle East: a volatile situation will become a little more volatile; and moderate regimes which looked to the West may come under more pressure from the so-called extremists; the whole area, will, in short, become even more of a target of opportunity' for the masters of the geopolitical power game.

And the American ^{hand and} chips, this time, may not be as good as it has been. The dichotomy between America's attitude and action over Afghanistan and Poland, and its attitude ^{and action} over the much grosser and more long-standing violation of human rights in South Africa and now the annexation of the Golan, will again raise profound questions throughout the Third World about the kind of freedoms America defends. And each questioning, and its answers, ^{raises anew} ~~diminishes~~ the question of whether ^{for 3rd World people/ still} there is ^{any real} qualitative difference ^{moral} between capitalism and communism. Goodnight.

Jamaica School of Agriculture Act Repealed:

- a) A break with a Parliamentary Convention
- b) The Danger of Cancelling the Past

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Wednesday
January 20, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The Jamaican Parliament last night repealed the Jamaica School of Agriculture Act. This means that there is now no longer in existence any legal entity known as the Jamaica School of Agriculture. And this, in turn, means that all those legal actions which were pending and which had to do with the actions of the Minister of Education in the closing of the School no longer have any basis ^{in law}/. The courts cannot order the Minister to desist from certain actions, or ^{to} perform certain actions in relation to a non-existent school. There is no longer a JSA, so there is no longer a JSA Board; so any declarations about the JSA are really pointless, and our courts of law do not usually go in for pointless declarations. And I do not think, myself, that there is any profound legal or Constitutional principle involved here on which the courts can take a stand: but this is a layman's view, not that of a Constitutional lawyer. Where I do think legal remedy may still be possible is in the cases where individuals have suffered provable loss: for instance a student who gave up a job, or travelled from another country at great expense, ^{on the promise} /~~inxxxxxxx~~ of being accepted at the JSA: such may be able to recover their losses. But any action about the school itself has been effectively killed by last night's repeal of the JSA Act. So what can we say about the death of the JSA? And about the manner of its dying? First, I think, that the same result could have been achieved without the government laying itself open to the charge of the abuse of power. Once the decision to close the

School
 /had been made the first step should have been to repeal the Jamaica
 School of Agriculture Act; everything else would then have followed
 the government
 without/~~it~~ being charged with using its overwhelming parliamentary
 power to frustrate due process. As it is, this is now a strong charge.
 Then, too, there is the matter of/^{the}parliamentary convention that you
 do not take away from the citizen any right once it has been conferred
 by law. Like all conventions, this/^{one}is not legally binding but respect
 for it has been one of the bases of confidence which make government
 by the freely expressed will of the people possible. If people ever
 come to fear that any government/^{once in power}might take way/^{any}~~their~~ legally conferr
 ed right, confidence in the democratic process will be seriously erode
 But for me personally, perhaps the most serious and the most saddening
 aspect of the complete wiping out of the Jamaica School of Agriculture
 is the fact that we have again cancelled an important piece of the
 Jamaican past. For all its faults and failures, real and alleged, the
 Jamaica School of Agriculture has ~~been~~ over the years, played a
 and influencing
 critical role in producing/~~the~~ men and women who became the movers
 and shapers of modern Jamaica. It predates and influenced Jamaica's
 and agricultural
 modern national political/movements: it was there before the PNP and
 the JLP and ^{all}the trade unions. And now we wipe it out as though it is
 a piece of nothing. And each time Jamaicans cancel any important
 of their past
 facet/~~xxxxxxxxx~~ in this way, they make their future that much more
 difficult. ^{of its importance}The past ~~is~~/~~xxxx~~ our history and our collective experience;
 the wise learn from the past and build on it for the future; ^{it}is
 a measure of both achievement and failure and thus a signpost to the
 future, provided we learn from it and build on it. It is that continu-
 ity without which stability and progress are not possible, because
 without it each and every generation must start all over, from
 scratch. The scrapped JSA is ^{the scrapped 56}more than 70yrs of Jamaica's past.
 L cancelling
 Goodnight^{1/2}

- 1) Sugar Workers Resume
- 2) Production Incentives
- 3) Who Carries the Losses?

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
January 18, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The best local news to come out of this past weekend was the decision of the Innswood sugar workers to end their strike and go back to work so that, in Agriculture Minister Broderick's words, "the normal processes of negotiations to deal with the matters in dispute" can come into play. In his appeal to the workers last Friday, the Minister had again spelled out the sick state in which the sugar industry is at present. And so it is good that the workers and their unions have heeded the appeal; it is also in their own best self-interest. The difficult question is: What happens when the negotiations on their wage claims are resumed? The two unions representing the sugar workers - the BITU and NWU - have put in a joint claim for a 33.3% pay increase for the 1981/82 sugar crop, as well as for improved fringe benefits, plus a 25% crop bonus on gross earnings for 1981/82, a 15% shift premium, \$20 for clothing allowance and triple time for public holidays. Now, in today's context and under today's conditions this kind of claims is not at all outrageous - this, is, if the industry involved is flourishing and making money. But what if the industry involved is deep in debt and losing money? And, more important, what if the industry involved which is deep in debt and losing money is also publicly owned? Do we just say that the taxpayers must pay more in order to ensure that the workers get the better pay and conditions they demand? In short, where is the money to come from to pay for the increases the workers and their unions want?

Logically, and ideally, all pay increases and other rewards, be they to workers or managements or stockholders, should come out of a company's or an industry's Business operations and the profits or surplus generated by those operations. In tight or difficult situations where there are no profits or surpluses a business may draw on its reserves to make such payments; but once the reserves run out the company, its workers, its management and its stockholders either hold strain until things turn around, and they all work like blazes to help hasten that turn around, or else the whole enterprise collapses. And this is how it would be if the sugar industry were in private hands today: indeed this is how it was when the industry was in private hands - and, remember, it always paid its way because everybody knew that the moment it did not pay its way or have reserves to fall back on, it would fold. There seems to be some odd notion that this basic economic principle ^{of survival} can somehow be sidestepped if the enterprise involved is publicly rather than privately owned. And so we had the business with the JOS, which was profitable until it went into public hands, and which is now a mess. And it seems to me that unless the workers in the sugar industry, and their unions, face this one, they too will soon be in the same mess as the JOS: indeed, they are not all that far from it now. We warned the unions representing the JOS workers time and again ^{in those days} Let us hope they have learned from that disaster and will not repeat it in sugar. For the sugar industry to survive and turn around demands for better pay and conditions must either be treated as incentives for clearly defined areas for improved production and performance or, better still, must be related to increased production. The American aut^oworker's union is right now negotiating a cutback in pay and fringes in exchange for job security because it has finally dawned on them that the workers too, must bear their share when any enterprise suffers losses. Let us hope our sugar workers, and others in loss positions, get the point ^{clear}

The Economics of Survival:
Domestic Agriculture as a key survival kit

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
January 15, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evning: It is becoming increasingly evident^{with}/every passing day that 1982 is most unlikely to be the year of Western economic recovery that some American and European economists predicted or hoped for toward the end of 1981. And if the Western economies continue to be in trouble and continue to stagnate, it is most unlikely that dependent economies like that of Jamaica will flourish and grow. Already we are seeing the disastrous effects on the local bauxite/alumina industry of the turndown in the American metals market. And, you know, even if we had the alternative² markets that some theorists are so keen on, it really would not solve the problem: it would ease it very slightly and very fractionally because those alternative markets would take only a tiny fraction of the volume normally taken by our traditional North American markets. It is little use having, or owning, all the bauxite/alumina in the world if you cannot sell it. Please don't get me wrong: I am all for diversification of marketing but I think it is foolish to see that as a kind of panacea for all our bauxite/alumina troubles. Our real trouble is the decline in ~~consumption~~ and the contraction in our traditional markets. So we earn less than we had banked on; and all our plans which were predicated on a certain level of earnings from our bauxite/alumina industry, are in trouble. We may have to revise those plans and look for alternatives to make up the shortfall in our anticipated earnings. One of our hopes must be that tourism will help to make up any shortfall in anticipated

foreign exchange earnings caused by the collapse in the North American metals market. Another hope must be for increased earnings from non-traditional exports. I do not think our traditional export agriculture will be of much help, certainly not for this year, and perhaps not even for next year: sugar production is way down; citrus and bananas are not very much better; and we just do not have enough of our highly valued coffee to earn the kind of foreign exchange it is capable of bringing in. So we are not likely to fare any better than the metropolitan economies, especially the American economy on which we are so dependent. That, like it or not, is the reality and we do not serve Jamaica's best interest by pretending otherwise. Much of our hopes for economic recovery must, of necessity, depend on American and West European economic recovery. The sooner those economies, especially the American economy, turn around, the sooner will our prospects begin to improve. So, in terms of the economics of survival, we are into something of a holding position: we must hold on as best we can till the world economic picture changes for the better. And in the meantime we have to cut our cloth to suit our purse; and we have to find ways of survival that will not undermine or erode the recovery effort. And, in 1982, domestic agriculture ^{the business of feeding ourselves from our own soil} might again become a key to survival as the foreign exchange becomes scarcer and scarcer and we cannot ^{splurgeing} go on/~~buying~~ ^{no matter how cheap.} it on imported food. The trouble is that support for agriculture is something of an unpopular cause at the moment. In France, Britain, Germany, Canada and even the United States, price supports and other forms of protection for agriculture, are seen and accepted as essential to agricultural production and vitality. Only in Jamaica do we have the misguided notion that our farmers must compete with every form of surplus produce that a big producer like the United States may wish to dump. That, for us, is not the road to survival during a hard and difficult world economic crisis. Goodni

The Economics of Survival:
The Bauxite/Alumina Crisis.

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Wednesday
January 13, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The labour-relations crisis in the bauxite/alumina industry, which looked so very threatening last week, has eased considerably this week. Mr. Hugh Shearer has succeeded in leading the two sides back to the bargaining table; the National Workers Union has decided to present revised claims for a ^{new} wage and fringe benefit agreement; and the dispute is back with the parties instead of being handled at the Tribunal level; and, most important, those two seasoned veteran partners-in-negotiations over many years, Hugh Shearer and Michael Manley will be dealing with each other across the bargaining table - all of which makes the prospects for accommodation so much greater than they were last week. But all this is only one ^{side} to the crisis in an industry which accounts for something like two-thirds of Jamaica's foreign exchange earnings. Jamalco is still closed; and for every day that it is closed Jamaica is reportedly losing some \$60,000-U.S. a day. And without that kind of loss Jamaica is already having foreign exchange difficulties. And please, let us try and get away from the pointless nonsense of finding scapegoats and apportioning villainous blame. The alumina business worldwide is in crisis. Markets for alumina have declined dramatically everywhere. The parent companies of our local bauxite/alumina industry have all had to cut back. North American alumina production is down to less than 75% of rated capacity in some cases. ^{American} Workers have been laid off; plants have been closed down. And when any industry is in this sort of state it looks for ways of

tightening up and holding on until things turn around for the better. Indeed, what aggravates the situation is that the parent companies of the local industry have huge stockpiles. They can, frankly and bluntly, do without getting any Jamaica alumina for a very long time without feeling it. It is, in short, more economic to close down high-cost operations like those in Jamaica in the present/^{market} context than it is to keep them going. And please don't forget, they are ^{in the first place} in business/to make a profit for their investors and shareholders. So profitability is the bottom line. This is the context in which we should see the Jamalco close-down. Like it or not, the waythings are today, all the companies could close down for the next six months or so without suffering any great financial hardship. Jamaica on the other hand would suffer a great deal more than even the ^{in such an event.} workers in the bauxite/alumina industry. As it is I suspect that our Bauxite Levy takings are going to be much less than they were in 1980. And so we are back to the problem of the reconciling of apparently diverging self-interests. The companies have a first duty to their stockholders; the unions have a first duty to their members; the government has a first duty to protect the national ^{Jamaican} economic life-line. It is because of this/government first duty ^{because} and/of the American Government's perception of its own global socio-political self-interest that Jamaica has been treated as something of a special case where the alumina/bauxite industry is concerned. The Jamaican Prime Minister has gently persuaded the American power brokers of the importance of the industry to his ^{in turn} recovery plans; and they/have gently persuaded the companies to co-operate. It seems to me that the unions now must see their first duty to their members/^{as} ~~by~~ protecting their jobs by helping to keep the plants going. Nobody, not the companies, not the government, not the ~~government~~ workers will get ^{all} what they want in the present difficult climate in the industry. Goodnight

- 1) NATO Meeting on Poland
- 2) Ambivalence about Trade Unions
- 3) Human Rights Double Standard
- 4) Unemployment & War

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday
January 11, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: The terrible, devastating, sub-zero weather was the highpoint of the weekend news all over/northern regions of our earth. If Jamaica, for instance, or sub-Sahara Africa, or the Indian sub-continent, were hit by the kind of freezing cold the people of east and west Europe, of north America and most parts of northern Asia experienced this past weekend the death-toll would have been counted in the millions. Just think what would happen in Jamaica if we were exposed to twenty-four hours of below-freezing weather. Even those peoples who are used to the bitter cold and who have learnt to survive in face of it have been hard put to go on over this past weekend: this is especially true of the very old and the weak and the poor. But all the money in the world cannot help a family when the power lines are down and the pipes are frozen and the roads are blocked and they are cut off from all outside contact by a raging snow storm. So let us count our blessings and be grateful for being in warm Jamaica, in spite of the power cuts and the water shortages and the poor transport and the high prices. Right now, millions upon millions of people in highly developed and rich countries are physically worse off than the poorest Jamaicans. Of course this will not last for long: but it is a fact right now; and it is worth a passing thought. And still the events in Poland seem to continue to dominate Western, especially American, preoccupation almost to the exclusion of everything else, or at least to the point where almost everything else is on a very low back

burner. So the NATO Foreign Ministers meeting in Brussels today will again discuss the declaration of martial law in Poland and what to do about it. The United States will again try to persuade its European allies to agree on some uniform action to punish both the Soviet Union and Poland for smashing the Solidarity Trade Union. The Europeans are no more likely to go along with sanctions now than they were a week ago. Indeed, the Europeans differ from the Americans in that they^{now} want to use what they describe as 'an inducement package' of massive food and other aid to tempt Poland to end its martial law and^{go} back to negotiating with Solidarity. I think the most that will come out of today's NATO meeting is uniform condemnation but no agreement on uniform action: too many ~~national~~^{national} conflicting/self-interests are at play - even the American President had to assure worried American farmers^{the other day} that their agriculture would not be used as a weapon against the Soviets over Poland. So the rhetoric will be strong; but with little action.

^{grassroots} And as/world opinion over the Polish affair begins to surface two points are noted, especially among the non-aligned. First the ambivalence about trade unions. People who are or who appear to be prepared to crush trade unions in their own countries are suddenly champions of a trade union in communist Poland. Why? And second, Human Rights. /People who are not overly concerned about human rights in other places, in places like South Africa for instance, are suddenly obsessed with human rights in Poland. If the orchestrated propaganda pressure which has been unleashed over Poland, had been unleashed over South Africa's illegal ~~occupation~~ of Namibia, Namibia might well have been an independent country today: no^{communist}/superpower would have stood in the way of Namibian independence. And finally a worrying thought about rising unemployment in the world: in the past the quickest and easiest way out of unemployment was war. Goodnight.

Trouble in the Bauxite/Alumina Industry

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
January 8, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: With Jamalco closed down, and the hourly paid work force at Alpart suspended, Jamaica is faced with very serious industrial and economic trouble in the very first working week of a brand new year. If this trouble in the bauxite/alumina industry is not settled very quickly then the Jamaican economy may be grievously damaged and all our hopes for economic growth in 1982 may be dashed: certainly, our difficult foreign exchange situation would be made infinitely worse. So much of the nation's hopes for economic recovery and stability ride on Mr. Hugh Shearer's efforts to restore relative industrial peace to the bauxite industry. And if there is any one single individual in Jamaica today who commands the kind of respect in both labour and management circles of the bauxite industry that would make success a possibility, that man is Hugh Shearer. If Mr. Shearer cannot lead the parties away from an industrial show-down and back to the bargaining table, then I do not think anyone else can. So we must all hope that Mr. Shearer will succeed. Let us also hope that nobody, be they labour or management in the bauxite industry or be they outside the industry, will do anything to aggravate this difficult and trying situation: the task of trying to restore industrial peace is going to be difficult enough without any mischief-making from any quarters. Labour negotiations are not, and should not be seen or treated as a state of war in which one side or the other must either be totally defeated or stomped into the ground. One of our problems is that some of us do project labour disputes and labour negotiations in this light.

For some ^{of} us, depending on which side we support, the totally sinister villain is either management or labour: our side, the side we support, are the good guys and the agents of progress and enlightenment and development; the other side are the enemies of progress and enlightenment and production. And so we lay the grounds for the confrontationist mentality in which one side must totally defeat the other 'in the national interest'. The tacit assumption here is that one side is for and one side is against the national interest. I think we must get away from this dangerously destructive simplification. I do not think the bauxite companies will come here and invest vast sums of money and risk huge losses for the dubious pleasure of smashing the Jamaican trade union movement. Similarly, I do not think the ^{Jamaican} trade union movement will frivolously risk being smashed, or at the very least being severely crippled, by forcing an unnecessary show-down at a time when all the objective conditions of the market place favour the companies. I choose to self-think instead that the interests of the companies dictate their action in precisely the same way that the self-interests of the workers dictate their action. If we say there is no reasonable and fair and equitable meeting point between these two sets of self-interests then we are saying the companies can survive without the workers and the workers can survive without the companies: and this is just not true; ^{each may} both can survive for a short time, perhaps, depending on many factors. But sooner or later they will need each other in order to prosper and survive. They are interdependent, in a delicate, shifting relationship, especially among free men in free societies. ^{So} Let us hope that both sides in the bauxite/alumina industry understand ~~this~~, and understand that they are going to have to go on dealing with each other ^{present} when the crisis, both domestic and international, is over. And let there be peace ^{Industrial} for the sake of Jamaica. Goodnight

Productivity, Ownership, Labour
& the Quality of Support Services

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Wednesday
January 6, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: If 1982 is to be the year of ^{greater} production that we all hope for, if it is to be the year that the Jamaican economy is to show positive ^{growth} /which benefits most Jamaicans, then we are going to have to deal with certain key services on which that growth depends. Light and power are the most obvious of these key services; and our electricity supply system has not been anything to shout about of late. Over the New-Year-Christmas ^{holiday} period we ~~have~~ had just about the most massive power failure I think Jamaica has ever had. For most of us, especially as it was the holiday period, this was a domestic and social inconvenience. But in a statement on New Year's Eve the Private Sector Organisation of Jamaica put the matter in its national economic context. It said the recent spate of power cuts had cost the country millions of dollars, much of it in scarce foreign exchange; and it warned that investors would be reluctant to ~~to~~ put new investments into a country with an unreliable electricity service. The PSOJ then proposed three solutions to the problem. First, that the power generating plants of the alumina/bauxite companies be joined to the national grid, even on a temporary basis. ^{on the face of it,} This ^{help to better} /is an excellent idea in principle. It would ^{may} /serve the energy needs of other businesses as well as of the Jamaican consumer. But, and this is a very big but, the generating plants of the bauxite/alumina companies are their own private property, built with their own private money, for their own private purposes. Their operations are high energy consuming and any interruptions in their supply would prove most costly. So it ~~would~~ not be in their interest

at all to join their reliable generating plants to an unreliable national grid. Anyway, that was the first suggestion. The second was the contracting out of maintenance work to private operators. I was under the impression that the Company had been doing this to some extent. Indeed, one of the directives in that recent memorandum from the new Board of Directors which reportedly had something to do with the resignation of the Managing Director, wanted greater Board supervision over such contracting of work to private operators. The third proposal^{Government} was that the/~~company~~ consider divesting itself of the Jamaica Public Service Company. The big question here, it seems to me, is: divest to whom? If there is a group or consortium of Jamaican entrepreneurs who are willing to put up their money and buy out the Jamaican Government and try to run the JPS more efficiently, & its profits if any then divestment might indeed be a very good idea; the company/will then remain in Jamaican hands and if those hands manage it more efficiently so much the better for all of us. If, on the otherhand, it is to be divested into foreign ownership then a whole new range of questions come into play, including that of a stepped up outflow of foreign exchange. I am not sure that we can just divest our problems away whenever things go wrong. The real challenge is for Jamaicans to themselves solve their problems instead of always seeing others as solving those problems. And what applies to light and power applies equally to transport and to water. I really do not know how ^{many} some/Jamaican workers perform as well as they do when they have to spend hours in discomfort in order to get to and from work, and then be further inconvenienced by often not having water to wash away the day's sweat and grime or light by which to cook an evening meal. This generally poor quality of social support services adds up to just about the greatest disincentive to that higher productivity we we say we want. So do something about it, please. Goodnight.

- 1) Ghana's Latest Coup
- ~~2) Update on Poland~~
- ~~3) Unemployment & War~~
- ~~4) Casino Gambling in Barbados~~

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Monday,
January 4, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: Last week's ~~latest~~ military coup in Ghana is the ~~latest illustration~~ latest illustration, if any were needed, of what can and usually does happen to a country once it embarks on the politics of the unconstitutional coup d'état, of the/seizing of state power by one man or a small group of men. The justification for this latest seizure of power by Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings a scant 30 months after his first coup, is that the/civilian government he, Rawlings, had help bring about after his first coup, was/grossly corrupt and inefficient. And so, this time around, Flight Lieutenant Rawlings, overthrew and elected civilian government. In that first coup the government he had overthrown had been a military government which had itself come to power by way of a coup. And that military government had overthrown a previous military government which had also come to power by way of a coup. Thus, change of government, by way of coup, seems to have become a firmly established way of political life in Ghana. Since 1966 Ghana has had only/^{two} ~~the~~ brief spells of Civilian Government. The first was led by Dr. Busia/a university professor who had been Leader of the Opposition in the days of Kwame Nkrumah. The second was the just overthrown Limann. And Busia and Limann's periods in office when combined do not add up to a full five year parliamentary session. In other words, after Nkrumah, elected civilian government in Ghana came to a virtual end, except for those two brief periods. And whatever else the military can do, it does not seem able to manage and strengthen national economies of poor Third World countries. We

have seen Idi Amin running the once-very prosperous 'pearl of Africa' Uganda, into an economic shambles from which it does not look like recovering for at least the next twenty years. And the bunch of military pretenders, from Joseph Mobutu, who has turned the once-flourishing Belgian Congo with all its mineral wealth into ^{the} beggarly Zaire depending on IMF bail-outs, and the Emperor Bokassa who had to be run out of a collapsing Central African Republic, to the ^{military} terribly brutal/jokester, Master Sergeant Doe. All these ^{African} military pretenders have, whether they intended it or not, achieved two things in common: they have shattered national economies; and they have subverted the concept of national governments which are in power through the freely expressed will of the people of their countries. *And accountable to their people* A

Rawlings, like some of the Nigerian military leaders, seem not to be of this breed. He did call elections three months after his first coup; but he has now overthrown the result of those elections, two years later. To be sure the ousted President was surrounded by a bunch of corrupt operators, some of whom, like de Graaf Johnson, go back to the days of Nkrumah whom they opposed bitterly. And even then the ugly seed of corruption was abroad. But I still think that that if Nkrumah had been voted out of power rather than being overthrown, and if the tradition of change by elections rather than coups, had been maintained and strengthened, Ghana today would have been in very much better health today, both economically and politically. We now know, from after knowledge, that that first coup which overthrew Nkrumah - and, it now turns out free elective government as well - was not an exclusively internal affair, which the Jerry Rawlings thing seems to be. The trouble is that Ghana is on that road now. And the way back (or forward) to the kind of government based on the freely express will of the people established by Nkrumah is going to be long and hard and bitter and bloody. Goodnight

Hopes & Prospects for 1982

NEWS COMMENTARY

For broadcast on Friday
January 1, 1982, 6.10p.m

Good evening: And warmest wishes for the new year. What are the prospects for Jamaica and Jamaicans in 1982? What are our hopes? What can we look forward to? I think the first thing we need to remember is that ours is and has been a dependent economy for as far back as you care to go, and under all sorts of administrations whatever labels they put on themselves. One of the great efforts of the decade of the 1970s was the attempt at economic independence. And we all know how badly we failed at that one. There are all sorts of explanations and excuses, some very valid, but they do not cancel the hard fact of the massive failure of the effort at economic independence. When our independent, non-aligned policies irritated our traditional trading partners to the point where they withheld or reduced economic support to us we were immediately plunged into a massive balance of payments crisis. And when we tried to turn to the other power grouping for economic assistance there was little or none, certainly not enough to help us: their big support was reserved for those who, whatever the labels, were prepared to 'tilt' in their direction. So, just as capitalists were not prepared to finance the economic transformation of Jamaica into a socialist/^{oriented} society, so the communists were not prepared to finance and prop up what was, for them, a straight bourgeois capitalist/^{Jamaican} society. Must we then be the helpless and dependent victim of either the one or the other system in perpetuity? Or is there some sensible, balanced, non-ideological middle way which genuinely puts Jamaica first? And how do we get there? For instance, how do we deal with unemployment

which is and has for long been the most intractable of all Jamaica's problems? The communist solution is regimentation and direction of labour: the capitalist solution is the jungle of market forces. Is there no middle way for us? Shortly after the JLP assumed office there was encouraging talk about job-sharing, about two-workers sharing one job, and about the elimination of overtime and the introducing of additional shifts to provide jobs ^{some of} for the estimated nearly one-third of the labour force that is now idle. If these ideas had been translated into reality we would have had a dramatic reduction in unemployment. Now, the impression is that, as with all previous administrations, the sheer enormity of the problem has resulted in seeing it as something beyond our management, as something we just have to live with. The trouble is the unemployed are people like all other people, not just numbers; they are Jamaicans like all other Jamaicans and as deserving of the thought and attention of the society as all other Jamaicans. What we need is some creative social engineering to try and break the back of unemployment, and 1982 would be a good year to make that try. Get the unemployed to help produce the food we need to lessen our dependence on imported food. I hope the unions will play an initiating role: just giving their support is not good enough. This is something we can do for ourselves without outside support, and it may help us set the parameters of our economic dependence. And let us hope that & understand sharply ^{very important} in 1982 we will all learn ~~the~~ difference between loyalty to party and political leaders and loyalty to the nation and to the Jamaican people. The two are not necessarily the same. And then there is discipline, the quality without which nothing really worthwhile is possible. The best form of discipline, the truest discipline, is self-discipline and that is a thing of training and example, not beating and bullying. Peace and love. Goodnight