



THE *Statler Hilton* NEW YORK
COMPLETELY AIR CONDITIONED

21. Y. 61.

Dear Peter,

A word of thanks for all your hospitality and kindness last Tuesday. I could not have asked for a better introduction to Jamaica and thoroughly enjoyed meeting you and Daphne. I only wish I had arranged a longer stay at itna as this would have given me the opportunity of seeing you again. As it turned out, my two day stay was barely adequate to achieve the ends in view at New. Yours (for want of a fuller vocabulary) fabulous home has left me green with envy and I am more than pleased at the opportunity of attending a session of the W.I. News Service. That was an experience in itself. I only hope your inspiration does not turn into ulcers.

New York has been exhausting, expensive, indifferent but worthwhile and I

thoroughly look forward to a rest in London
though I doubt much I shall get it.

Again, a thousand thanks to you
and Daphne for a most interesting and
enjoyable evening. I hope I shall see you
again sometime soon.

With best wishes,

Michael Armstrong

D. Henderson & Co., Ltd.

Distributors of Building Materials - Lumber

Electrical Appliances & General Hardware

Telephone: 5642 (10 lines)

CABLES & TELEGRAMS:-
"HENDOVA" KINGSTON

P.O. BOX 68
1 KING STREET,
KINGSTON,
JAMAICA, W.I.

2nd February, 1962.

Mr. Peter Abrahams,
c/o West Indian Economist,
164 Harbour Street,
Kingston.

Dear Sir,

re Building Account - Diamond Hill,
Red Hills

Will you please advise us if any progress has been made towards settling the above account which goes back to December, 1956.

I must advise you that it is the directors' definite desire that this account be settled not later than March 31st which is the end of our financial year. We now therefore have to inform you that every effort must be made to bring this account to a close as we are unable to hold it open any longer, failing which we shall have to ask you to give us a mortgage on the premises.

Please advise what is the position and when we may expect settlement.

Yours faithfully,
D. HENDERSON & CO. LTD.

F. N. Vaz
F.N. VAZ.

Manager, Financed Building Operations.

FNV/yms

Flat 5,
15 Lyndhurst Gardens,
London, N. W. 3.

2. 11. 60

My dear Peter,

How are you? I get far too little news from Jamaica; it all grows far too remote at times, or rather it's my friends there remain as I last saw them & I fail to move ahead with them.

I remember your saying to me once: "All those feelings I keep them for your work."

Well, I did, & I learned today that Victor Gollancz is interested in publishing the book I wrote this past winter. It is on his suggestion that I am writing to ask you a favour.

The book is autobiographical - dozens of autobiographies are published every month & Gollancz tells me they sell very badly indeed unless written by well-known people - therefore he

wants me to get a prominent English literary figure (he suggested Abraham Greene or Priestly but any such would do) to write a preface to my book. As I know none myself, & we agreed that you undoubtedly do, he suggested I ask you to read the MS. & if you feel you can & will, ask you to recommend it to a prominent writer over here to write the preface.

I myself suggested asking you to write the preface, if you felt you could after reading the book, & I should be most happy if you offered to do so. Colman was enthusiastic about this but thought an English writer's name would help sales even more if I can find one willing to help, (he does not want to be the asker himself since he would be publishing.)

The script is now on its way to Edna Hanley whom I have asked to pass it at once on to you - It should reach Jamaica in about a fortnight, & meanwhile, if you can spare a moment,

do please drop me a line about all the
above - You may have some valuable
suggestions.

My very best wishes to you, & to
your family - Are you still living on
your alarming & lovely hilltop? What
are you writing?

Sincerely yours,

Cicely

Cicely Waite-Smith.

28th September, 1962.

Mr. S. B. Walker,
Highgate P.O.

Dear Mr. Walker,

I do hope you will forgive me for only now writing to thank you for sending me the first day cover of our independence stamps. I should be most unhappy if you thought that my long silence was due to lack of appreciation. It is just that the pressure has been so very great. The stamps you sent are among my nearest and most valued mementos of Jamaica's independence and I am deep-grateful to ^{you} for thinking of me on that great day.

Thank you again.

Highgate P.O.

7th August, 1962

Dear Mr. Abrahams,

I do not know if you are interested in stamp collecting, but I would ask that you accept this first day cover as a token of my appreciation of the many lucid comments you have made on radio, of course, I have not been able to agree with many of your comments, but have found them interesting nonetheless. I can assure you that I look forward to many more and trust that your stay amongst us will be as pleasant as I believe it has been in the past.

May I say thanks for the confidence you had in the people of Kingston as exemplified by your decision to visit many areas on Sunday night, as a native of Kingston, I am proud of their behaviour and am satisfied to have been able to be in the city on the evening of that day.

I must apologise for having used the stiffener as note paper
and also for the absence of the 1/6 stamp, but must say that
stamps of that value have not yet reached the local post office.

Yours faithfully,

B. S. Walker
B.S. Walker.

I travelled to Port Maria to get the
1/6 stamps.

INDEPENDENCE
FOR
Jamaica
6TH AUGUST 1962



Mr. Peter Abrahams

c/o Jamaica Broadcasting Corporation

P.O.Box 100

KINGSTON 10.



92
KINGSTON 41365.

7 BENSON COURT,
14 BENSON AVENUE,
KINGSTON, 8.
27. 2. 72.

Dear Mr. Abrahams.

The topic I should like to introduce is so huge that it is likely to be shelved, but of such universal importance that it may not be. I refer to the right-to-authority of the Christian Church.

In these days, when people ^{are} becoming increasingly aware of their human rights, Christianity's very existence is a denial of these: the function being to dominate (having colonised) the entire world into Christian orientation.

Christian doctrine and discipline encourages the saintly dismission and meek acceptance of suffering that not only allow unjustified hurt to continue but condemn anyone daring to protest as "proud" (i.e. not "humbled"): the very ultimate in lost-ness being he/she who attempts self-justification in the name of self-respect. And yet the *raison d'être* of Christian ministry is to encourage the growth of the disciple to full maturity - and self-confidence!

This is but one example of why the thoughtful dissenter has conscientiously to reject Christianity: that Jesus did not behave, at his own trial, in a way synonymous with ^{that of a} a totally emancipated person, by speaking up to those who violated him, or to his so-called "Friends" who did nothing. Had he done so, and called upon the full machinery of the Jewish church and that purporting to uphold justice under the occupying power, he might well have established a precedent that could be used by the world for all time; constant, radical reform is possible by peaceful means through traditional channels, should these channels be kept open, perfect according to the law, and used to the full.

Now this would be just one more interesting, intellectual meditation were it to remain a philosophy in which one were allowed the right to make a choice; but this is not so. In ways of infinite variety, personal and collective, there is pressure brought to bear on the non-Christian. (Just two examples: can it be imagined that any Government ^{head} ~~representative~~ would be chosen who would

3.

not profess Christian allegiance? [whatever that
may mean] And by whose divine ^{rite} ~~right~~ may the
same church, that is discriminatory in politics
and denouncing of economic control other than
that of government, have such power [moral,
economic, educational, social, international - etc.
etc.] that it itself has rights over government?

were the church speaking as with one voice of
the people (so that church and state were ^{or-} ONE)
then there might be some authority; but since
there is just as much confusion in what it is
to "be Christian" as in to "be Jamaican", those
not able to respect Christianity from reasons
of personal integrity could be forgiven for
losing confidence in any government that is
 beholden to "the Christian Church."

were there some semblance of the original
essence (that true religion was a life-long
attempt to understand one's neighbour by
knowing him, that one might make good that
which he needed by discovering what the need
was), non-Christians might be encouraged to
have faith in the ultimate potential of both

Church and State; but since the very leaders (claiming personal perfection as God's elect) declare, by their very policies and behaviour that are selective in "loving", that they do not ^{believe in} ~~love~~ all persons as though they were God. They deny the very faith in Christ incarnate that is their only right to lead.

Had those deploring slavery but who joined it seen a dark-skinned, crucified Jew in every slave they could never have allowed it to start; if those good Christians in British government had been Christian, they could never have allowed it to continue; if the slaves, being freed but denied proper emancipation, had questioned the Christian colonisers (through theological and ecclesiastical channels of the Church) on the theme "inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, unto one of the least of these, my brethren They could have explained that a Christian's duty to lead others to full maturity meant making it possible for them to get there: personally & politically. But nobody went all the way. Perhaps they were too scared (either of death or what the neighbours would say): a denial that their professed right to colonise the world to goodness held good.

Yet these imperfect Christians, though enslaved by Christianity, would all sincerely wish to follow the way of a man called Jesus - imperfect as he would seem to be to me. We were brought up - in church, in school, at home, in England - to see the suffering servant specially in all who are poor, or captive, or oppressed. We have a special affection for the person from Africa. We find his difference, in looks and culture, tremendously attractive and enriching. We beg him (her!) not to be like us - not to change one bit; and to be angry, and speak out, and for heaven's sake educate us - for we were only taught British history! Please don't just be emotional; we need you to know that our inadequacy comes from immaturity rather than lack of caring - and immaturity is from an un-grown mind, that needs educating to maturity: in facts and attitudes.

Which is supposed to be the job of the Church! All we have to do is to free it from Christian control.....

Yours sincerely,

(W.S.) Margaret Wallis.

92
KINGSTON 41365.

7 BENSON COURT,

14 BENSON AVENUE,

KINGSTON, 8.

27. 2. 72.

Dear Mr. Abrahams.

The topic I should like to introduce is so huge that it is likely to be "shelved", but of such universal importance that it may not be. I refer to the right-to-authority of the Christian Church.

In these days, when people ^{are} becoming increasingly aware of their human rights, Christianity's very existence is a denial of these: the function being to dominate (having colonised) the entire world into Christian orientation.

Christian doctrine and discipline encourages the saintly discomposure and meek acceptance of suffering that not only allow unjustified hurt to continue but condemn anyone daring to protest as "proud" (i.e. not "humbled"): the very ultimate in lostness being he/she who attempts self-justification in the name of self-respect. And yet the *raison d'être* of Christian ministry is to encourage the growth of the disciple to full maturity - and self-confidence!

This is but one example of why the thoughtful dissenter has conscientiously to reject Christianity: that Jesus did not behave, at his own trial, in a way synonymous with ^{that of a} a totally emancipated person, by speaking up to those who violated him, or to his so-called friends—who did nothing. Had he done so, and called upon the full machinery of the Jewish Church and that purporting to uphold justice under the occupying power, he might well have established a precedent that could be used by the world for all time: constant, radical reform is possible by peaceful means through traditional channels, should these channels be kept open, perfect according to the law, and used to the full.

Now this would be just one more interesting, intellectual meditation were it to remain a philosophy in which one were allowed the right to make a choice; but this is not so. In ways of infinite variety, personal and collective, there is pressure brought to bear on the non-Christian. (Just two examples: can it be imagined that any Government ^{head} ~~general~~ would be chosen who would

3.
not profess Christian allegiance? [whatever that
may mean] And by whose divine ^{rite} ~~right~~ may the
same church, that is discriminatory in politics
and denouncing of economic control other than
that of government, have such power [moral,
economic, educational, social, international - etc.
etc.] that it itself has rights over government?

were the church speaking as with one voice of
the people (so that church and state were ^{at-} ONE)
then there might be some authority; but since
there is just as much confusion in what it is
to "be Christian" as in to "be Jamaican", those
not able to respect Christianity from reasons
of personal integrity could be forgiven for
losing confidence in any government that is
 beholden to "the Christian Church."

were there some semblance of the original
essence (that true religion was a life-long
attempt to understand one's neighbour by
knowing him, that one might make good that
which he needed by discovering what the need
was), non-Christians might be encouraged to
have faith in the ultimate potential of both

Church and State; but since the very leaders (claiming personal perfection as God's elect) declare, by their very policies and behaviour that are selective in loving, that they do not believe in ~~one~~ all persons as though they were God, they deny the very faith in Christ incarnate that is their only right to lead.

Had those deploring slavery but who joined it seen a dark-skinned, crucified Jew in every slave they could never have allowed it to start; if those good Christians in British government had been Christian, they could never have allowed it to continue; if the slaves, being freed but denied proper emancipation, had questioned the Christian colonisers (through theological and ecclesiastical channels of the Church) on the theme inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, unto one of the least of these, my brethren They could have explained that a Christian's duty to lead others to full maturity meant making it possible for them to get there: personally & politically. But nobody went all the way. Perhaps they were too scared (either of death or what the neighbours would say): a denial that their professed right to colonise the world to goodness held good.

Yet these imperfect Christians, though enslaved by Christianity, would all sincerely wish to follow the way of a man called Jesus - imperfect as he would seem to be to me. We were brought up - in church, in school, at home, in England - to see the suffering servant specially in all who are poor, or captive, or oppressed. We have a special affection for the person from Africa. We find his difference, in looks and culture, tremendously attractive and enriching. We beg him (her!) not to be like us - not to change one bit; and to be angry, and speak out, and for heaven's sake educate us - for we were only taught British history! Please don't just be emotional; we need you to know that our inadequacy comes from immaturity rather than lack of caring - and immaturity is from an un-grown mind, that needs educating to maturity: in facts and attitudes.

Which is supposed to be the job of the Church! All we have to do is to free it from Christian control.....

Yours sincerely,

(W.S.)

Margaret Wallis.

The topic I should like to introduce is so huge that it is likely to be shelved, but of such universal importance that it may not be. I refer to the right-to-authority of the Christian Church.

In these days when people are becoming increasingly aware of their human rights, Christianity's very existence is a denial of these: the function being to dominate (having colonised) the entire world into Christian orientation.

Christian doctrine and discipline encourage the saintly demeanour and meek acceptance of suffering that not only allow unjustified hurt to continue but condemn anyone daring to protest as "proud" (i.e. not "humbled"): the very ultimate in lost-ness being he/she who attempts self-justification in the name of self-respect. And yet the *raison d'être* of Christian ministry is to encourage the growth of the disciple to full maturity and self-confidence!

This is but one example of why the thoughtful dissenter has conscientiously to reject Christianity: that Jesus did not behave, at his own trial, in a way synonymous with that of a totally

emancipated person by speaking up to those who violated him, or to his so-called friends - who did nothing. Had he done so, and called upon the full machinery of the Jewish Church and that purporting to uphold justice under the occupying power, he might well have established a precedent that could be used by the world for all time: constant radical reform is possible by peaceful means through traditional channels. Should these channels be kept open, perfect according to the law, and used to the full.

Now this would be just one more interesting intellectual meditation were it to remain a philosophy in which one were allowed the right to make a choice; but this is not so. In ways of infinite variety, personal and collective, there is pressure brought to bear on the non-Christian. (Just two examples: Can it be imagined that any Government head would be chosen who would not profess Christian allegiance? And by whose divine rite (right) may the same church that is discriminatory in politics and denouncing of economic control other than that of government, have such power - moral, economic, educational, social, international etc - that it itself is not subject to government?)

If the church speaking as with one voice of the people (as the church and state were at one) then there might be some authority; but since there is just as much confusion in what it is to be

"Christian" as in to be "Jamaican", those not able to respect Christianity from reasons of personal integrity could be forgiven for losing confidence in any government that is beholden to "the Christian Church".

Were there some semblance of the original essence (that true ~~in~~ religion was a life-long attempt to understand one's neighbour by knowing him, that one might make good that which he needed by discovering what the need was), non-Christians might be encouraged to have faith in the ultimate potential of both Church and State; but since the very leaders (claiming personal perfection as God's elect) declare by their very policies and behaviour, that are selective in loving, that they do not believe in all persons as though they were God, they deny the very faith in Christ incarnate that is their only right to lead.

Had those deploring slavery but who joined it seen a dark-skinned crucified Jew in every slave, they could never have allowed it to start; if those good Christians in British government had been Christian, they could never have allowed it to continue; if the slaves, being freed but denied proper emancipation, had questioned the Christian colonisers (through theological and ecclesiastical channels of the church) on the theme "Inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, unto one of the least of these my brethern..." they could have explained that a Christian's duty to lead others to full maturity meant making it possible for them to get these personally and politically. But nobody went all the way. Perhaps they were too scared (either of death or what the neighbours would say): a denial that their professed right to colonise the world to goodness held good. Yet these imperfect Christians, though enslaved by Christianity would all sincerely wish to follow the way of a man called Jesus - imperfect as he would seem to be to me. We were brought up - ~~in~~ ^{church} in school, at home in England - to see the suffering servant specially in all who are poor, or captive, or oppressed. We have special affection for the person from Africa. We find his difference in looks and culture tremendously attractive and enriching. We beg him ~~(her)~~ not to be like us - not to change one bit; and to be angry, and speak out, and for heaven's sake educate us - for we were only taught British history. Please don't just be emotional; we need you to know that our inadequacy comes from immaturity rather than lack of caring - and immaturity is from an ungrown mind

that needs educating to maturity: in facts and attitudes.
which is supposed to be the job of the Church! All we have to
do is to free it from Christian control.

UWI Libraries

The topic I should like to introduce is so huge that it is likely to be shelved, but of such universal importance that it may not be. I refer to the right-to-authority of the Christian Church.

In these days when people are becoming increasingly aware of their human rights, Christianity's very existence is a denial of these: the function being to dominate (having colonised) the entire world into Christian orientation.

Christian doctrine and discipline encourage the saintly demeanour and meek acceptance of suffering that not only allow unjustified hurt to continue but condemn anyone daring to protest as "proud" (i.e. not "humbled"): the very ultimate in lost-ness being he/she who attempts self-justification in the name of self-respect. And yet the *raison d'etre* of Christian ministry is to encourage the growth of the disciple to full maturity and self-confidence!

This is but one example of why the thoughtful dissenter has conscientiously to reject Christianity: that Jesus did not behave, at his own trial, in a way synonymous with that of a totally

emancipated person by speaking up to those who violated him, or to his so-called friends - who did nothing. Had he done so, and called upon the full machinery of the Jewish Church and that purporting to uphold justice under the occupying power, he might well have established a precedent that could be used by the world for all time: constant radical reform is possible by peaceful means through traditional channels, should these channels be kept open, perfect according to the law, and used to the full.

Now this would be just one more interesting intellectual meditation were it to remain a philosophy in which one were allowed the right to make a choice; but this is not so. In ways of infinite variety, personal and collective, there is pressure brought to bear on the non-Christian. (Just two examples: Can it be imagined that any Government head would be chosen who would not profess Christian allegiance? And by whose divine rite (right) may the same church that is discriminatory in politics and denouncing of economic control other than that of government, have such power - moral, economic, educational, social, international etc - that it itself has rights over government?)

Were the church speaking as with one voice of the people (so that church and state were at one) then there might be some authority; but since there is just as much confusion in what it is to be

"Christian" as in to be "Jamaican", those not able to respect Christianity from reasons of personal integrity could be forgiven for losing confidence in any government that is beholden to "the Christian Church".

Were there some semblance of the original essence (that true ~~ix~~ religion was a life-long attempt to understand one's neighbour by knowing him, that one might make good that which he needed by discovering what the need was), non-Christians might be encouraged to have faith in the ultimate potential of both Church and State; but since the very leaders (claiming personal perfection as God's elect) declare by their very policies and behaviour, that are selective in loving, that they do not believe in all persons as though they were God, they deny the very faith in Christ incarnate that is their only right to lead.

H₂d. those deploring slavery but who joined it seen a dark-skinned crucified Jew in every slave, they could never have allowed ~~it~~ to start; if those good Christians in British government had been Christian, they could never have allowed it to continue; if the slaves, being freed but denied proper emancipation, had questioned the Christian colonisers (through theological and ecclesiastical channels of the church) on the theme "Inasmuch as ye did it, or did it not, unto one of the least of these my brethern..." they could have explained that a Christian's duty to lead others to full maturity meant making it possible for them to get these personally and politically. But nobody went all the way. Perhaps they were too scared (either of death or what the neighbours would say): a denial that their professed right to colonise the world to goodness held good. Yet these imperfect Christians, though enslaved by Christianity would all sincerely wish to follow the way of a man called Jesus - imperfect as he would seem to be to me. We were brought up - ^{church} in ~~in~~ school, at home in England - to see the suffering servant specially in all who are poor, or captive, or oppressed. We ~~Have~~ special affection for the person from Africa. We find his difference in looks and culture tremendously attractive and enriching. We beg him (her) ~~not~~ to be like us - not to change one ~~bit~~; and to be angry, and speak out, and for heaven's sake educate us - for we were only taught British history. Please don't just be emotional; we need you to know that our inadequacy comes from immaturity rather than lack of caring - and immaturity is from an ungrown mind

that needs educating to maturity: in facts and attitudes,
which is supposed to be the job of the **Church**! All we have to
do is to free it from Christian control.

UWI Libraries

WEST INDIES GENERAL INSURANCE LTD.

TELEPHONES 23611 - 23612

55A DUKE STREET,

TELEGRAMS "WIGILEY
KINGSTON, JA."

DIRECTORS

ERIC W. ABRAHAMS
EDGAR R. H. BOWRING, M.C., M.A.
SYDNEY CHANG
FRANK R. MORRELL, F.C.I.L.
REGINALD J. TREASURE

KINGSTON, JAMAICA, W. I.

AGENTS & ATTORNEYS FOR

English & American Insurance
Company Limited
CRUSAIDER INSURANCE CO., LTD.

LONDON CORRESPONDENTS:-
C. T. BOWRING & CO., INSURANCE LTD.
SETTLING AGENTS FOR
INDIAN TRADE & GENERAL
INSURANCE CO., LTD.
NIEUW ROTTERDAM INSURANCE
CO., LTD.

SECRETARY

ERIC H. BARNETT

YOUR REF.

OUR REF.

22nd June, 1962.

Peter Abrahams, Esq.,
164 Harbour Street,
Kingston.

Dear Sir:

Consequent upon a report made to this office today, of an accident between your wife's car and a motor vehicle owned by Jamaica Telephone Company, which occurred on the 21st instant at the entrance of the Sheriton Hotel, we enclose herewith claim form which we ask that you complete and return to us at your earliest possible convenience.

Yours faithfully,
WEST INDIES GENERAL INSURANCE LTD.

DM Clarke
f. CLAIMS MANAGER.

WDH:DMC

Encl:

Claim No. Policy No. Type of Policy Excess

English & American Insurance Company Limited

REPRESENTED BY

WEST INDIES GENERAL INSURANCE LIMITED

55A DUKE ST. KINGSTON, JA. WEST INDIES

PHONE 3611

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT REPORT FORM

PARTICULARS OF INSURED

Name Occupation Age

Address Phone No.

Is there any other policy indemnifying you or the Driver in respect of this Accident? Date of payment of last premium

PARTICULARS OF MOTOR VEHICLE CONCERNED IN THE ACCIDENT

Make of Vehicle	Type of Body	Year of make	Horse Power	Reg. Letters and No.	For what purpose was Vehicle being used at time of Accident	Was a Trailer attached

If a Motor Cycle—(1) Was a Sidecar attached? (2) Was a Pillion Rider being carried?

Was the Vehicle out with the knowledge and consent of the Insured at time of Accident?

Were fare paying passengers being carried?

PARTICULARS OF PERSON DRIVING

Name Occupation Age

Address Is he in your employment? If so, how long employed?

Number and Date of Expiry of Driving Licence—No. / 19 How long has he been licensed?

Has he been involved in any mishap previously? Has he been convicted of any motoring offence?

Give full particulars of each conviction, if any

Has his Driving Licence been endorsed or suspended? If so, when and for what reasons?

Has he any physical disability or infirmity, or defective vision or hearing?

Has he ever been refused any motor vehicle insurance or continuance thereof by any Insurance Company or Underwriter?

If friend or relative of the Insured was driving state (a) Whether he owns a Motor Vehicle of his own

(b) Whether he is insured (c) If so, the name of the Company

PARTICULARS OF THE ACCIDENT

Date of Accident Time Place

Date when occurrence was reported to Insured Estimated speed of your Vehicle

Was horn sounded? If accident occurred after lighting-up time, state which of your lamps were alight

Was your vehicle on near side of road? If so, how far from kerb?

Give full description of how the Accident, Loss or Damage occurred, in the space provided on the back of this form.

WITNESSES

Names and Addresses of Passengers in Vehicle

Names and Addresses of Independent Witnesses

Did a Police Constable witness the Accident or take particulars of the occurrence? If so, give name or number & station

Was any statement, as to fault, made by Witnesses or Drivers at time?

DETAILS OF DAMAGE TO INSURED VEHICLE

Body Work, including Wings (state front, back, near or off sides) :—

Engine :— Steering :—

Radiator :— Axles :—

Tyres :— Lamps :—

Address where Damaged Vehicle may be examined

Estimated cost of Repairs :— £ In the event of Damage to Tyres, state :—

Make Size Type When purchased Mileage done

Have you given any instructions for repairs to be commenced?

The issue of this for does not imply an admission of liability

Please give name of Company insuring other vehicle(s) or property, if known.....

Was he or she detained? Has any claim for such injuries been made upon you?

Was he or she detained? Has any claim for such injuries been made upon you?

Dated _____ 19____ Signature of Insured _____

1211 35th Street, N.W.,
Washington 7 D.C.,
Monday, 31st Oct., 1960.

Dear Peter,

I am taking the liberty of writing to you with the hope that this short note will reach you through the address given to me by Bill Walker of the West Indies Student Advisory Committee here in Washington, D.C.

You may recall that when you visited Washington last year at the symposium for "Holiday" held at the Georgetown University, we met after your paper was read and you informed ^{me} (in Afrikaans) that you are now living in Kingston. Well, this brings me to the point; I intend visiting Kingston from about the 23rd of December this year and I would very much like to contact you there. I shall probably be there for about ten days and if we can arrange matters, a friend will be accompanying me.

Such matters as accommodation, etc., would be highly appreciated if you were to advise me on, bearing in mind that we are both bachelors and, as usual, the cheaper the better!

But more later. Let us first hope you receive this letter.

Kindest regards,

Desmond Willson.

Desmond Willson,
Cultural Attaché,
S.A. Embassy.

*You were not listed in
the Kingston tel. directory.*

1211 35th Street N.W.,
Washington 7 D.C.
U. S. A.



PLEASE FORWARD.

Mr. Peter Abrahams,
~~C/o The Secretary,~~
~~The Institute of Jamaica,~~
~~14 East Street,~~
Kingston,
Jamaica.

West Indian General
Insurance Co. Ltd.
W. D. E. C. C. C. C.
164 Hachem St
Kingston.

AIR LETTER • AÉROGRAMME • PAR AVION

SECOND FOLD

April 3, 1956

Dear Peter,

The atmosphere here still holds much of the sharpness of the past winter's winds, and I memories of your books and visit. I have been a long time writing you because I wanted the communication to have something of fullness about it when I came to the act of the writing. I do hope it will be better than the answers we tried to give you on the night we met at Langston's.

I had hoped that you would ^{someday} be able to get to America (the U.S.) when I was reading Tell Freedom. I suppose I wanted this so that you could measure with your discerning eyes the quality of life in the country whose central commitment is your recurring theme as I understand it. You are no doubt quite aware nowadays that on our tainted air also broods fear. You even pointed out to us that in the relationship between man and man, between white man and black man, there is no confidence. This is indeed true, and it is true on every level.

Irvin Howe, one of our young critics who recently did a book on Faulkner, credited the novelist with this:

No other American novelist has watched the Negroes so carefully and patiently; none other has listened with such fidelity to the nuances of their speech and recorded them with such skill; none other has exposed his imagination so freely to discover, at whatever discomfort to himself, their meaning for American life.

It is good to be watched, and recorded in terms of speech nuances, and even imagined creatively. But it is better to be heard and known through the understanding heart. The fact is that the commentary which really reaches us generally has an application over and beyond the issue. The poet Archibald McLeish put it recently in "Why Do We Teach Poetry?" which was first presented as an address before the National Council of English Teachers in NYC's Hotel Commodore:

In few civilizations have the senses been less alive than they are with us.... And in no civilization, at least in recorded time, have human beings been farther from the facts if we mean by that word, facets of reality. Our indifference to ends is the result of our obsession with abstractions rather than facts: with the ideas of things rather than with things. For there can be no concern for ends without a hunger for reality. And there can be no hunger for reality without a sense of the

real. And there can be no sense of the real in the world which abstraction creates, for abstraction is incapable of the real: it can neither lay hold of the real itself nor show us where to find it. It cannot, that is to say, create the relation between reality and ourselves which makes knowledge of reality possible, for neither reality nor ourselves exist in abstraction. Every- in the world of abstraction is object. And, as George Buttrick pointedly says, we are not objects: we are subjects.

I think in this Mr. McLeish has put his poet's eye on the trouble in the U.S. Certainly it is the trouble with Mr. Faulkner, for the enduring Negro which is the reality of his novels is in very truth a creation of Faulkner's limitation as he attempts to assess character. To me, both Lucas Beauchamp and Joe Christmas are abstractions, and what must be most disturbing to Faulkner is that they are even this day being proved abstractions. Let us consider Martin Luther King, Jr.

On Sunday, March 25, I went early to Brooklyn in order to hear the young Dr. King address a protest rally. It was historic. I believe it was so because the Georgia-born Baptist clergymen has unified Negro America and those ^{here} who identify themselves with the idea of freedom more than has anyone else since the great Frederick Douglass set the course a hundred years ago. He is fully in the spirit of the man whose name he carries. For him, as for you, freedom is a compulsion, and forgiveness and understanding a condition of its existence. In the face of power he turned on a light. Most of the American press, certainly the President, and many prominent people have guided open debate on the issue of segregation into a babel. By this forfeiture King is inheriting the moral and spiritual leadership of a nation. And he is informed. You will not meet him in Faulkner's novels, and surely the American critic Robert Penn Warren would like to believe that he is non-existent. But I suspect, Peter, that I make too much over King because I have long felt the need ^{for} someone like him so keenly.

You must have been struck during your visit with the waste of time and resources among us. Indeed, before King revived my spirits I thought that far

too many of us had become involved in the big cities' numbers rackets, that this sin alone had replaced the well-tempered iron of our forebears as a way of life.

The Rev. Dr. King concluded his one-hour, seventeen-minute address at Concord with Langston's "Son, life for me ain't been no crystal stair..." To my shame I must confess that I had heard and read it without memorizing it. I don't even have it here in the house with me. But I shall get it soon. But this introduces another important thing about the clergyman leader. His sudden emergence builds a fire under middle-class Negro leadership in the U.S. It has also stoked the church furnaces. The Negro social worker had been leading the ministry towards the attainment of the good life. Now the latter may perhaps ride back into prominence on the strength of King's challenge.

I was favored to be able to introduce you when you were here, even though the audience, in quantity, fell below my expectations. You see, I can't understand why everybody who reads has not read something you have written. For more of you and those who would be like you I neither smoke nor drink (except at a party I get to once or twice a year). I had hoped to get to London and Paris this year, but my wife is preparing to present us with another child. You know how easy this can be. Now I may never get there, in spite of the fact that the NYC school system looks smilingly on travelers to far countries. It educates us, travel does.

I still teach the low IQ's here in the school system, and I do indeed have a teacher's sympathy for their needs. I wish I were able to ^{do} all that is expected of me for the job, but more than a year ago the effect of the daily tension registered on me in the form of a nervous rash, which has got worse with the peculiar circumstances. I shall soon have to stop teaching altogether or get a better assignment in terms of my nerves. I shall go into what teaching in NYC is like in my next letter to you.

I have yet to read Wright's The Color Curtain and I do so hope he is not as angry and indignant as usual. But I have read about it in several places and therefore know what is thought about it among those who speak with whatever authority they have. I don't like reading about books particularly. What one man drinks, another imbibes.

To date, the most understanding account of NAACP activity in the U.S. with regard to the segregation ^{issue} has been published in The New Yorker Magazine. This good-tempered publication had the honesty to assign a reporter to Thurgood Marshall when this esteemed lawyer went to Atlanta recently. The results were most excellent as reportage (The New Yorker, March 17, 1956), and most significant in that the publication is read by people who figure in what gives, as a current saying goes. The New York Times has published a special report on the issue, but except for the survey of one Gladwin Hill it presents nothing new or even penetrating. The Times can be more comprehensive than clear, and there has been no dearth of explanations of "the Southern way of life" in its pages. You may not know that the managing editor of this esteemed journal is himself the product of Mississippi in more ways than one. He is on record in two articles (written in 1943 for the Magazine Section of the Times) which read like a slightly watered-down version of Mein Kampf. Indeed, the foremost interpositionist in the U.S. is one Arthur Krock, one of America's leading journalists. Krock sees red at every possibility of "the amalgamation of the races." This is the trouble with many an American. As Ralph Ellison put it, they have their warfares mixed.

On Sunday past I was at the Community Church on 35th Street. They recorded the address you made there, and I heard it about two months ago over a radio station. I remember distinctly that you had something quite pertinent to say about men coming between a man, a woman and their God. My regards to your family,

As ever,

Henry F. Winslow

Monrovia -- August 8, 1956

Dear Peter,

I hope you did not think me rude for leaving London without making a final phone call, but I got terribly jammed up just before flight time. Incidentally I learned from the Commonwealth Relations Office on my last day that no visas are required of Americans to enter the High Commission territories.

In Algiers, thru labyrinthian channels that weaved back to the UN lobbyist for the National Liberation Front, I was able to contact several FLN members, including one "rebel" from the hills. Four of them spoke varying degrees of English, so interviews were fruitful. For a television show that Will Rogers Jr. has on CBS I got a tape recording, with silent film, of the "rebel" reading from the American Declaration of Independence as part of a "words that influenced me most" series. Am just shipping the stuff out to New York from here, because I dared not entrust it to Air France.

My next stops will be Accra and then Nigeria, and after that the Congo. I shall drop a note to the South African consulate in Leopoldville giving them the time of my arrival there and will ask them to hold whatever word on my visa they receive from Pretoria. On the off-chance that the word is favorable, I would very much appreciate your dropping the line you mentioned to your contact in the South African broadcasting system, asking him to give me whatever help he can. Perhaps you would be kind enough to send a carbon copy to me at the American Consulate-General, Leopoldville. The envelope should be marked "Personal -- Please Hold."

Many thanks for the time you gave to helping me. I shall let you know promptly as soon as I know the response from Pretoria, whether favorable or unfavorable.

Regards to your family. You know my address in the States if ever I can return the favor in any way. (During this coming academic year while I'm at Harvard, the best address will be that of my mother: 87 Howland Street, Boston 21, Massachusetts.) And for the rest of this trip, CBS News in London (Langham 1166) will know my whereabouts.

Sincerely,

Bill Worthy

Tel.: ABBey 1266

Extension.....

Your Reference.....

My Reference INF.121/32/01



COLONIAL OFFICE

SANCTUARY BUILDINGS

GREAT SMITH STREET

S.W.1

5 December, 1956

My dear Peter

This is just to say that I hope you had a pleasant holiday and an enjoyable trip to Jamaica, and that you arrived safely and are now well installed. Also - since there must be a sting in the tail - to enquire ever so tactfully how soon we may expect the definitive text of the magnum opus.

When the Governor was in London a couple of months ago he said he hoped to discuss the text with you when you and he met in Jamaica. I don't know whether anything like that has occurred? I think you would be quite justified in taking the initiative, as soon as you are ready.

I do envy you in the sunshine just now, when winter is closing in on us. I hope you will enjoy your first Christmas in Jamaica. Poinsettia is so much gayer than holly!

All best wishes

Yours ever

R. H. Young

(R. H. Young)

Information Department.

Peter Abrahams, Esq.