

The British State: Racist in the Line of Duty

Part 1

In the struggle against racism, changing public attitudes to racial difference is not the place to start, we have to go to the foundation which is the British State itself. In the United Kingdom people encounter extreme forms of violence not only at the hands of racist street thugs but by State employees. This is how it is. Racism is given birth by the British State and fostered within the wider UK society. The significance of the Report of the MacPherson Inquiry, published in 1999, was its straightforward declaration that one particular State institution, the Metropolitan Police, was racist. People knew this anyway but hearing the authorities concede the point was worthwhile, even as "news".

It is ironic that one elemental piece of "news" regarding the Report only surfaced years later. This was dynamite, or would have been had we learned at the time it happened. We were kept in ignorance but, as usual. The Home Secretary who ordered the Inquiry discovered that evidence relating to the machinations of the Metropolitan Police was concealed from the team who compiled the Report. Who concealed the crucial evidence? The Metropolitan Police. The Home Secretary was Labour MP Jack Straw. It is enough to make a horse laugh. Old Jack - he's younger than me - was greatly irritated to discover the information. After all, he was the Home Secretary: surely he was *the* police authority! Here he was finding out that it wasn't him after all. The real authority lay someplace else. What a surprise! Old Jack there, a proper parliamentarian for all these years, privy to all the goings-on, and here he was astounded to learn that a State

authority already known to kill people in the so-called line of duty should not scruple on withholding evidence against themselves.

Clearly the explosive piece of "news" is not that evidence should have been concealed from the MacPherson Inquiry but that Jack Straw should have been so surprised.

These are the situations wherein elected politicians discover the true nature of authority, of temporary versus permanent; the reality of the place in the scheme of things of the House of Commons, in respect of the State. Apparently Straw was "furious" when he discovered the truth some fifteen years after ordering the Inquiry.¹ It is difficult to imagine a parliamentarian of his experience being found guilty of such naivety, but ye never know. Chomsky made the point decades ago that these people are not telling lies, they are so far gone they believe what they say.

Information of this kind is rarely discussed in public forums. Through it we gain insight into why we must distinguish between the workings of the Whitehall Government which is temporary and the British State which is permanent. If a permanent State institution empowers the act of murder it isn't hard to predict they might withhold evidence from the work of a temporary administration. Any form of external meddling in State affairs is unacceptable and Government meddling is external meddling whether from the so-called right or so-called left, it makes little difference. Stability is what counts, survival is primary.

Each generation or so Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (the Labour Party) wins a General Election and becomes Her Majesty's Party of Government. When this phenomenon takes place another stack of folk learn that the Whitehall Government may govern but the British State rules.

¹ See https://www.holyrood.com/inside-politics/view.interview-with-jack-straw_5722.htm

Some folk go away and join other parties; some start wee parties of their own. A few don clerical robes and chant praise songs. Other folk get up to whatever it is they get up to, helping their families and communities survive, trying to avoid the lapse into cynicism.

But why ever did they regard the Labour Party as left-wing in the first place, given its allegiance to monarchy, hierarchy, hereditary privilege; landed rights to wealth and property, and the inviolable unity of the United Kingdom? The one thing they must acknowledge is the mainstream perception of the Labour Party as "left-wing" is an almighty triumph of Public Relations.

Jack Straw became Home Secretary in 1997, in the Labour Party of Government led by Anthony Blair. This followed eighteen years of Tory rule. In the history of the labour movement Jack Straw, like Anthony Blair, will occupy a place to the right of the right of the right of the centre right of the UK centre-mainstream. After serving his time as a parliamentarian it was thought he might achieve a move 'upwards; a peerage, a seat in the House of Lords. This wasn't to be and his time in politics ended in ignominy.²

Nevertheless he will be remembered for that one positive intervention from his first year in office. He accepted that matters surrounding the death of Stephen Lawrence and the failure of the legal authorities to convict his killers required clarification. Unfortunately, but not inconsistently, he appears to have been spurred into action by the Daily Mail's position which, whatever their motives, seemed to accept the public's right to an

² <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/feb/09/jack-straw-denied-knighthood-peerage-jeremy-corbyn>

answer on why the police and the Crown Prosecution Service failed to prosecute the "five white murderers."³

The Report of the MacPherson Inquiry was published in 1999, two years after the Inquiry began, and there is no question of its importance. But, the way I see it, any critique of the Inquiry should begin from the beginning which is the basic terms of reference. What was the purpose of this Inquiry? Home Secretary Jack Straw set up the

judicial inquiry into the killing and subsequent investigation - to identify lessons for police in dealing with racially motivated crimes.⁴

These are the basic terms of reference. This is how the Home Secretary, acting on behalf of Her Majesty's Party of Government, saw the Inquiry's essential function. Whether proposals derived from the MacPherson Inquiry were to prove positive or negative they began from exclusion and served to illustrate the very racism at the root of UK society.

At that early stage Jack Straw might have been asked by fellow MPs Diane Abbot and Bernie Grant in what way the MacPherson Inquiry would help black police officers deal with "racially-motivated crimes" against themselves? Not only those crimes committed by racist members of the public but those committed by their racist colleagues within the police-force? The factor here is the Home Secretary's presumption that black people are not doing the policing, they are the ones being policed. Maybe Jack Straw was just being honest. These forms of exclusion are at the core of institutional racism and other forms of prejudicial strategies and policies.

According to these terms of reference the MacPherson Inquiry might have succeeded yet failed to make any impact whatsoever on the

³ Jack Straw makes this point himself. He had known the Daily Mail's editor for several years.

⁴ See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/special/politics97/news/07/0731/lawrence.shtml>

institutional prejudice at the heart of the British State. For the various Departments of State, for authorities such as the police, immigration, education, health, welfare and social security, it was a case of as you were. Those sections of the establishment that seek to extol how the MacPherson Inquiry "changed the face of Britain" are engaged in the usual humbug that masquerades as unbiased reportage..

Yet there is no denying that within the United Kingdom the Report of the Inquiry, despite its flawed terms of reference, was a step in the struggle for racial justice. How significant the step is a question for racial, ethnic and other minorities. As far as I can see the struggle remains. All sections of the public, in solidarity with the minority groups under attack, must carry this struggle for justice. They have no option but to get to the root of it, and admit reality, which is basic: the British State is rotten at the core. How could it not be? How else could it sustain the extraordinary inequalities that prevail in this society?

But it is beyond foolishness to expect that the British State will 'change' to rectify this. There is as much chance of that as there was of the Metropolitan Police submitting to the supposed authority of the Home Secretary.

The Report produced by the MacPherson Inquiry went further than most would have anticipated. Following its submission in 1999, Jack Straw advised the 'House of "the main findings of the first part of the inquiry:

The conclusions to be drawn from all the evidence in connection with the investigation of Stephen Lawrence's racist murder are clear. There is no doubt that there were fundamental errors. The investigation was marred by a combination of professional incompetence, institutional racism and a failure of leadership by senior officers. A flawed Metropolitan Police review failed to

expose these inadequacies. The second investigation could not salvage the faults of the first investigation."

Those who persist with the argument that the MacPherson Inquiry as "changed the face of our nation" should explain why it took another fifteen years to convict anyone of the murder of Stephen Lawrence, and even then only two of the "five white murderers."

But here we can return to the terms of reference of the Inquiry "into the killing and subsequent investigation - to identify lessons for police in dealing with racially motivated crimes." The police authorities were to use the "Stephen Lawrence case " that they might learn how best to deal with this most sensitive area in the fight for law and order. The murder of this 18 year old young fellow was to become a casework example in regard to future policing in racially-motivated crimes.

Imagine telling that to the boy's parents.

Almost twenty years after Stephen was murdered two of the "five white murderers" were finally brought to trial and found guilty. Twenty five years after the murder his mother, Doreen Lawrence, asked the authorities to "be honest", and admit that the remaining three of the "five white murderers" had got off scot free, they have escaped justice altogether.⁵

This is what the Lawrence family were still having to deal with all these years later. This was stated clearly in the Report of the MacPherson Inquiry, published back in 1999.

We refer to (the gang) as (five white) murderers because that is exactly what they were; young men bent on violence of this sort rarely act on their own. They are cowards and need the support of at least a small group in order to bolster their actions. There is

⁵ See <https://www.stephenlawrence.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Stephen-Lawrence-Timeline.pdf>

little doubt that all (five) would have been held to be responsible for the murder had they been in court together with viable evidence against them.⁶

But what did that matter, an Inquiry initiated by a Home Secretary? The British State still had not convicted those who had murdered Stephen Lawrence, and there was nothing further to say. And everybody had known who they were only three months after he had been killed.

*

There is much to read online and in bookform about the Stephen Lawrence case, but very little on the campaign itself which some might find surprising.⁷ Here I concentrate on that earlier period in its development, from the time of Stephen's death in the spring of 1993 through the summer of 1995. The wider significance of Stephen's murder had yet to force itself to the attention of the public. It did not happen by a fluke. Nor did it begin through an act of magnanimity by the authorities. There was none of that. The State authorities had denied justice to the Lawrence family, as a matter of course; or so it seemed, that if they had had their way they would have put an end to the campaign, and sent the family home. Except this is where they were, home. Ironically, after the murder of their son and in the wake of their campaign for justice, Doreen and Neville Lawrence received such a high level of hate-mail and racist abuse that they "considering emigrating to the Caribbean."⁸

⁶ See 1.5 of the MacPherson Inquiry as ref above

⁷ The full Report of the MacPherson Inquiry at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/277111/4262.pdf

⁸ See <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/student-murder-charges-are-dropped-teenagers-freed-as-cps-finds-insufficient-evidence-to-provide-a-1487933.html>

In April 1993 their 18 year old son had been murdered while standing at a bus-stop. Five white youths were arrested. Three short months later the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) halted the prosecution, dropped the case and released them " through lack of evidence. "9 "Scotland Yard refused to comment . . . but said 'the murder hunt will continue.'"10

And the family were left to get on with it - with life, whatever that might mean for parents whose son had just been stabbed to death by a gang of "five white murderers" who didn't bother to conceal their contempt for the legal process and were later seen laughing together. Their contempt for the system was justified. The inherent racism of the British State had been expressed not only by an act of barbarism on a London street but in the response of the police and legal authorities who had failed to prosecute the murderers although everyone knew who they were.

Why had "crucial details . . . been lost due to the police failure to gather forensic evidence from the scene of the crime"? Was such a failure the rule or the exception to the rule? Such a question must be confronted. Unfortunately, whether it was the rule or exception is of no consolation to a grieving family. Questions of this nature only serve to transform the uniquely personal end of this human tragedy into something other than that. No one is asked to forget the tragedy, that a young man was stabbed to death. A tragedy, yes, but time to move on. This is what the authorities are requesting of the bereaved family, and given no right of reply.

Forget justice.

The dead child is now a casework example. The authorities will make use of his death for future reference: *Dear Parents, We regret if Her*

⁹ See Making Anti-Racial Discrimination Law: A Comparative History of Social Action and Anti-Racial Discrimination Law, by Iyiola Solanke. I discussed matters on evidence-gathering relevant to this in my essay, Attack on These People not Racist, says British State.

¹⁰ See <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/student-murder-charges-are-dropped-teenagers-freed-as-cps-finds-insufficient-evidence-to-provide-a-1487933.html>

Majesty's Judicial System did not work for you on this occasion. Please rest assured that the death of your son is not in vain and if it happens again a different outcome may well occur. Through his death we shall have learned more thoroughly how to deal with future cases of this nature in respect of evidence-gathering and inquisitorial strategies.

That was in July 1993. Case closed.

By early autumn the Lawrence family campaign had begun, and developed. Their friends and support group were versed in gathering evidence and relevant information in cases of racially-motivated crime, then passing it on to the police and legal authorities.

The public associate these skills with the dogged determination of highly-motivated detectives for whom justice for all is the sole motivation. Such is the stuff of television drama. Heroic officers with idiosyncratic behavioural patterns work eighteen hours a day in pursuit of the truth. They solve crimes by meticulous deductive reasoning coupled with brilliant flashes of insight. Having brought the villains to book they drag themselves wearily home to solitary musings beneath a night-sky, sipping a fine malt whisky, with interesting background music. In real life the primary work of the police is policing the public.

Stephen's father, Neville, spoke clearly and unequivocally that there could be no rest until "the killers and the hidden perpetrators of all racial attacks and murders are brought to justice, and for the whole truth to be known." When Neville Lawrence spoke in these terms he was making public what the establishment has failed so dismally and consistently to acknowledge, let alone confront, that the British State advanced the cause of racism directly through its institutional policies and strategies, and by the failure of its employees, the police, to carry out adequate investigation.

In those years evidence suggested that victims and survivors of the vilest forms of racist harassment were liable to receive negative, even hostile receptions from the police. The burden of proof was on them. What do you mean you are being harassed? Explain what you mean. Prove to us that you are being harassed. Prove to us that you are targeted. Prove to us that these violations are happening. Prove to us that what you regard as harassment are not just a few incidents between two sets of feuding neighbours. Prove to us that these things you say are happening are crimes against you and your family and that you have been targeted through racially-motivated hatred.

If the benefit of the doubt can be given to the police officers, it may lie in their failure to grasp the concept "harassment". In general people find the concept difficult, and tend to confuse it with bullying. It pays to be aware that in law harassment is a crime, bullying isn't. The victims of racist harassment who complain of bullying may be passed on to Community Police for advice and counselling.

There is no one act of harassment. Harassment is an indefinite set of actions and activities. These could include overlooking someone for promotion who warrants promotion; spitting at them in the office toilet, glaring at them; shoving excrement into their bags and coat pockets; name-calling in the street, elbowing someone in a shop queue; stamping on the home ceiling, kicking the walls to frighten people; blaring audio volume so children cannot sleep; breaking windows, pushing lighted newspapers through letter boxes; slapping babies in prams; urinating on the doorstep; knocking over elderly women on the pavement, beating up elderly men; smashing up stores, gang-shoplifting; driving towards groups of young people and forcing them to jump to safety.

Those are some of the violations that minorities must prove criminal, not just detrimental to the health and well-being of their families and communities. Not all of these actions and activities are crimes; they may be morally and socially monstrous yet individually some will not be classified as crimes if reported to the police.

But they do indicate a pattern. Occurrences of that nature require to be noted, monitored, reported. No civilized society should stand for it. In the United Kingdom the authorities did stand for it. At one time more than 80% of racially-motivated crime went unreported. How many perpetrators of these depraved forms of behaviour that appear in the set "harassment" have ever been charged with a racially-motivated crime?

Towards the end of the summer of 1993 the bereaved family of Stephen Lawrence were being supported in their campaign by the Monitoring Group of Southall. For so many people under attack this group had been the last line of defence in the struggle for justice against racial discrimination and racially-motivated crime.

But it is important to recognize that sections of the British State perceived the Monitoring Group of Southall as a threat, they were already reacting hostilely to this support group, and had done for years prior to the death of Stephen Lawrence. Its very existence was seen as a criticism. And so it was. The existence of the Monitoring Group highlighted the ineffectuality of the State authorities on law and order; the failure of the police and legal system to support the victims of racial harassment, barbaric violation, to the point of death, and beyond, to the extent that bereaved families were themselves being victimized and stigmatized. This was shown in the case of the Lawrence family who were subject to extraordinary levels of abuse and hatred following their decision to stand

up and assert their right to justice, and show their determination to struggle for as long as that might take.

Families and others who assisted by the Monitoring Group of Southall had been left bereft by the effects of these vile, race-hate crimes, and more often than not had nowhere else to turn. Some of the racist criminals responsible would have been brought to justice had the State forces of law and order followed through properly on their investigative work. There can be no question of that.

In Scotland support for the Lawrence Family Campaign had begun in October 1993.¹¹ This was in the aftermath of the State authorities' decision to drop the case and release the "five white murderers." A benefit night was held in McChuil's Bar, Glasgow in support of the family campaign. But it was a joint benefit. It was also on behalf their support group, the Monitoring Group of Southall.

We felt it was crucial to name the Monitoring Group and express our recognition of their work publicly. This is why we made it a joint benefit. We were aware of the hostility towards the Lawrence family now shown because of their association with the Monitoring Group. It was essential to show solidarity and to acknowledge the merit of their work of which we had known for several years.

In another essay I spoke of the death of Kuldip Singh Sekhon in a racist atrocity that took place in 1988.¹² Kuldip Singh, father of seven daughters, was murdered in a most savage and brutal attack. The post mortem showed that he had been stabbed 58 times. The inhuman brutality of this shocked people. Many were further shocked by the reaction of the authorities. The family of the dead man had been given full support by the Monitoring

¹¹ The Artists in Solidarity [AIS] network organised this.

¹² For further information see my essay *Attack on These People Not Racist, say the British State*.

Group. During their campaign for justice a full day of protest took place in Southall's town centre in January 1989. Every shop in the long main street - including betting offices - closed as a mark of respect. An Edinburgh busload of supporters in support of the family campaign made the trip to Southall¹³ and took part in this march and major demonstration of solidarity.

On the same evening a benefit night took place.¹⁴ This had an additional significance. It marked the 10th Anniversary of the murder of Blair Peach, a schoolteacher from New Zealand who was working in England. He had come to Southall in solidarity, on a day of protest against racism. During this he was battered to death by an elite unit of the Metropolitan police. A year later an investigation took place into this criminal behaviour.

The investigation into this criminal behaviour of the Metropolitan Police was conducted by the Metropolitan Polices. Finally they "concluded that Peach had had his skull crushed by an 'unauthorised weapon' . . . 'almost certainly' delivered by a member of its elite riot squad, the Special Patrol Group, but the individual's identity could not be determined with certainty because of collusion among SPG members."¹⁵ So the police looked after their own. Who cares about the murder of a schoolteacher from New Zealand. Who cares about that, about justice so-called. Shield the killer. He was in the wrong place at the wrong time, supporting a bunch of pakies and darkies, what was that all about!

But at least the Metropolitan Police had arrived at that conclusion. Yes, and the British State did not release these findings for thirty years.

. . .

¹³ Ibid, the same essay: Attack on These People Not Racist, say the British State.

¹⁴ Tom Leonard and myself took part in the benefit night. It went ahead a couple of months after my novel A Disaffection had reached the short list of the Booker Prize award. Some of this was worked into press releases but made scarce a ripple!

¹⁵ see "New Zealand History" <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/page/blair-peach-killed-london>

Another of those sentences people need to read at least twice, then go for a coffee, then come back and read for a third or fourth time. It took the British State thirty years to release the findings of the Metropolitan Police inquiry into the death of Blair Peach at the hands of an elite group of the Metropolitan Police.

1979 was remembered north of the border for the chicanery of the 40-60% stipulation on the Scottish Referendum but known generally for the advent of a far-right Whitehall Government. Under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher the Conservative Party had moved so far to the right that it won most all of the votes normally reserved for racists, fascists and ultra-nationalists of one description or another. What was happening on the streets of Great Britain and the north of Ireland was an expression of the free-for-all racism and other prejudicial strategies and policies now at liberty within its permanent infrastructure. Even so, and it is important to see that attacks on "racial difference" were not the prerogative of the Tories alone. During Her Majesty's Labour Party of Government back in 1972 tough anti-immigration legislation had been introduced.

Why did Blair Peach die? What was his crime? He had a belief in justice, that the plight of people having to deal with the worst forms of racist violence should be shown support and solidarity by every section of society, and that sometimes the most powerful support of all is solidarity. It is solidarity that cuts through all these spurious divisions of race, ethnicity, religion and the rest. It was solidarity that the British State had taken on in a major fight with large sections of the British population from the mid 1970s through the 1980s. This was a fight to the death literally, on several occasions where people stood their ground in opposition to this hardline approach and were battered by the police, and some died for their beliefs.

At the inquest into Blair Peach's murder "The jury was shown 23 items, including knives, iron bars, and wooden staves, which were found in the lockers of two (Special Patrol Group) units." The SPG Inspector explained to the jury that "traditional truncheon was too flimsy and officers would often take out pick-axe handles. Sledge hammers and jemmies would also be brought from home to execute search warrants, as this type of equipment was not issued."¹⁶ It was also revealed here that "the six police officers who were present when the fatal blow was struck (had been) identified. These findings however were not disclosed to the inquest and remained hidden from Peach's family, and the public for thirty years."¹⁷

The State authorities concealed the murder. The criminal brutality of what had occurred that day in a town in Middlesex had been carried out by their employees. Through his concern for justice and for truth a young man on a visit from New Zealand met a violent and horrible death at the hands of the a group described as "elite" by the police authorities. The British State empowered this elite unit to carry most any weapon they wanted on the understanding that they would be accountable only to their own management, and might expect exemption from prosecution for any action performed in the line of duty.

How do we define any action in the line of duty? We don't. They do. Things change according to necessity: the needs of the British State.

It was later reported that "the Metropolitan Police paid an out-of-court settlement to the family of Peach."¹⁸

Sections of the UK public will be surprised to learn that out-of-court settlements can apply in Criminal Law, even in the case of murder. Some

¹⁶ see <https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2014/may/07/blair-peach-inquest-police-weapons>

¹⁷ See <http://www.tmg-uk.org/who-killed-blair-peach/>

¹⁸ See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Special_Patrol_Group

may see this as a "development" with worrying implications. On reflection, they should be familiar with the idea. The State authorities consistently allow the perpetrators of the worst forms of sexual abuse on children to be punished "in-house" by the religious institutions who employ them. Occasionally cash sums are paid to the victims and their families on condition they keep their mouth shut. Other than that who knows what happens. The State leaves it to the religious institutions to sort it out with the children and families their employees have abused, terrorized and even driven to suicide. The Crown Prosecution Service appears to see nothing illegitimate in this. Commit the crime and pay the dough. The State and the Church learn from one another: self defence is no offence; the power structure defends against the imposition of justice.

Some will find this extraordinary. Others might wonder what the fuss is about, given that it happens in Civil Law all the time. Captains of Industry regularly escape charges of manslaughter and even murder, settling cash deals that allow them to stay out-of-court. Her Majesty's Crown Prosecution Service finds it acceptable and never brings a criminal charge against them.

There is a greater can of worms to be opened than that. But so what? This can is opened continually. The worms crawl in and out as they please. It leads anywhere and everywhere, in particular the shadowy area described as "secret State activities." Here anything goes. Apparently the authorities spied on the Lawrence family themselves, and did their best to undermine and discredit them, never mind their friends and individual members of their support group. They are empowered to do as they see fit, whatever it takes in the line of duty, as Jack Straw appears to have discovered about the Metropolitan Police authority fifteen years later. He was entitled to ask for

clarification on "line of duty" To what? To whom? Not the Whitehall Government anyway.

The peculiar part is that most of these "secret activities" are known by the public anyway; and known so well they remain unremarked, and not even secret except in a kind of jokey, populist manner. Terrorists are "taken out" or "popped" by State employees regularly in day-time television, and on children's television too where cartoon goodies target and obliterate foreign (alien) baddies with all manner of sophisticated weapons. Killings are romanticized, even glorified. Mass murderers who are paid to murder people, haven't been described as mass murderers for decades. Most everything depends on who does the murder and who is being murdered. They are known as professional hit-men if they are coldly efficient psychopaths; technically gifted, very well paid and will not rest until their target is taken out.

Look at him, he is a serial killing professional hit-man sonofagun, cool as fuck, look at his clothes and the labels he favour! Off he goes and pops the terrorists, then home, has a shag with the girlfriend and takes his holidays in Bermuda.

Serial killers if they are baddies, members of secret-State agencies if they are halfway goodies, eg. Mossad, Boss, Smersh, CIA, MI5 or MI6. Queen and Country, m'boy, here's your gun, a beautiful 3.4477 silver-mounted Magnum-Baretta furnished by weaponry manufacturers of superior provenance. See its handle, consisting of the finest 18 carat gold with a rolex trigger-device powered and tipped by two tiny rubies for reliability. Retain this pistol within the secret compartment of your prototype boys-own convertible speed launch-helicoptereal submarine which "M" is about to reveal to you as a reward for wiping out "justice-terrorists" of every description, in particular an entire company of no good

hook-nosed anarchist hardline muslims in partnership with cold war-inspired communist fundamentalists during your last sorté. And do straighten your tie, there's a good chap; the wives of certain higher-ups have complained. Very good sir.

Of course the British State sanctions murder. The death of Blair Peach and its surrounding circumstances reinforced a truth which people continue to find difficult to accept, that the British State kills people at home or abroad, and will carry out whatever else is required. This is enmeshed in institutional practice and institutional authorities are empowered to decide necessary courses of action.

Members of the public will recognize necessity on occasion and might wish to add the rider, Only in appropriate circumstances.

Who defines "appropriate"? Who arrives at such decisions? Are there criteria? Are there codes, policies and guidelines for the State killing of innocent people? Must we define innocent? Should we accept the concept "collateral damage" in regard to the death of innocent members of the public?

Nowadays we do, in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic. Elderly folk and persons with underlying health issues are advised to look after themselves. Society has prepared to lose a few. Resources are limited. Some must suffer for the greater good of the greater rich. This is how things are. The good old poor are always with us, working fingers to the bone on behalf of the good old ruling elite. Three cheers for the cooks, governesses, pantry-butlers, silver-service waiters, bin-emptying, corpse-carrying laborers who convey the black polybags to the bin-lorry. Let them unite shoulder to shoulder within pandemic guidelines respecting the rule of law and minimum-maximum wage entitlements. Three cheers for those who give their lives that we might live in the manner to which we are

accustomed in this Land of Hope and Glory. Please die at home to protect the National Health Servants. Hope for the best, here's yer gong, empires ahoy.

[end Part One]