ONE WORLD TO SHARE

The 'One People' Oration
Westminster Abbey, London
5 July 1988

It is humbling to deliver this year's 'One People' Oration. It is awesome to do so in this great abbey church of Westminster, this sacred place which has been the scene of so much which has passed into history. Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of another of London's great churches, St. Paul's Cathedral, and the restorer of this, once said that 'architecture has its political use; public buildings being the ornament of a country; it establishes a nation, draws people and commerce; makes people love their native country ....'.[1] That certainly is true of Westminster Abbey, as it is true of St. Paul's. But Wren knew that architecture has more than a political use, and in many of its finest examples the inspiration and the purpose is, of course, religious.

This building, and what goes on in it, stands for the human, moral values by which people at their best live, and which are unfortunately not always to be found in commerce and politics; and it stands for more than this. It stands for something beyond the obvious and the everyday; for the religious values from which morality normally derives; values which transcend and unify, bringing people together in love and fellowship and understanding. It stands for faith—the faith which built it, the faith which sustains it, and which now must sustain the effort to build the shared and safer future for all, of which our world so badly needs assurance. That faith is, indeed, in the title of the hymn we shall sing later, the 'Hope of the World'.

On one particular occasion each year, the Abbey becomes the focus of that hope in a rather special way: the multifaith Observance on Commonwealth Day. On the second Monday in March each year, religious leaders from the major faiths in the Commonwealth, which are most of the great religions of the world, say prayers in their own languages and there are readings in English from the different sacred texts. The flags of the 48 Commonwealth member countries, from all of the world's continents and oceans, are carried in procession in the presence of Her Majesty the Queen, the Head of the Commonwealth, who

is herself such a powerful focus of unity. It is a moment of solemn reaffirmation in the life of the Commonwealth—one enhanced by being spent in the sanctity of the Abbey; and I acknowledge our gratitude to the Dean and Chapter.

This Abbey is, therefore, to me, a very natural setting for reflection on the reality that we are, from all corners of the world, one people: in the words of today's hymn, from the 'Hills of the North, Isles of the Southern Seas, Lands of the East and Shores of the Utmost West'.[2]

In the past, religion has been a source of difference and division as well as of unity. There are parts of the world, indeed of these Islands, where that is still so today. But that is not the spirit of this place nor, I believe, of the most creative tendencies of our times. At the religious level, the ecumenical response is a timely one to humankind's deepest needs, for communication, for understanding and for sharing. As a non-theologian I must not advance too boldly in this area; but I do not need to hesitate in asserting (in the language of the recent Report of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues) that the holy texts of many religions, as well as legal traditions, philosophies, and customary practices 'abound in moral injunctions that imply an ethic of human solidarity':[3] that 'for centuries, the great religious texts have taught the essential oneness of the human race.'[4] This Abbey bears proud witness to that teaching.

I speak to you in the conviction that we are one people worldwide; that interdependence is no empty concept but a living reality; that sharing suits the whole world's purposes better than selfishness; that, in Mahatma Gandhi's words, 'there is enough in the world for every man's need but not enough for his greed'.[5] Yet, I would be guilty of thoughtless optimism if I did not also lay out before you some of the threats and challenges which must be overcome before we can fully respond to being one people in one world—and some of the special problems which closer interdependence brings.

I mentioned the Commission on Humanitarian Issues. That Commission is one of five international Commissions that have worked throughout the eighties, and on all of which I have been privileged to serve: a tribute, I like to think, to our Commonwealth. The most recent, still just beginning its work, is the South Commission chaired by a Commonwealth elder statesman,

former President Nyerere of Tanzania. The others were the 'Brandt' Commission on International Development Issues, the 'Palme' Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues and the 'Brundtland' Commission on Environment and Development. Each was an effort—through membership across the world—to find a new vision and a new way in an area crucial to human survival. Each has functioned, independently of governments, as a kind of international 'think-tank' not burdened by orthodoxy and short term national interest. Together, both in their existence and in their work, they have authenticated the reality that we are all 'one people'; that all we have is one world; and that there is a great need to care and share it better than we have done.

The Brandt Report, *North-South: A Programme for Survival*,[6] issued in 1980, had urged the world to cease to see itself and organise itself in adversarial ways as so many opposing forces competing for primacy; but, more and more, as a community of states mutually dependent, with jointly shared rights and obligations and a common commitment to co-operation for the good of all. It was a message better received by the world's people than the world's governments; but it is a message that remains alive. Indeed, now, in the late 1980s, though governments might not admit it, a new functional acknowledgement of the need for closer international co-operation in many areas of global economic affairs reflects something of the spirit and the ideas of Brandt.

But the Brandt Report was about more than international co-operation between some parts of the world some of the time. It was also about the goal, the ambition, of meeting the needs of all the world's people through new ways of sharing the bounty of our planet. And here it is necessary to acknowledge and regret how little has been achieved. Just over a week ago Professor Hans Singer of the Institute of Development Studies at Sussex University pointed out in a timely way the contrast between the Toronto Communiqué of the major industrialised countries, which characterised the 1980s as 'the longest period of economic growth in post-war history',[7] and the recent report of the UN World Food Council, which highlighted declining food production in all developing regions in 1987, a rise in the number of hungry people, more children suffering from malnutrition than a decade ago—with over 14 million under the age of five dying

needlessly from malnutrition and disease every year.[8] So great remains the gap between perception and reality. The unmet challenge of mass poverty and starvation in our one world, among our one people, should surely be a matter for universal reproach. It cannot be a time for complacency; still less for smug satisfaction.

But global realities must in the end change our narrow national perceptions. Already it is becoming clear that the world's major problems must be confronted in holistic rather than in narrow national terms. Few of those problems on our agenda of anxiety fit neatly within national frontiers. They arise within and between both developed and developing countries.

In industrial countries, for example, hazards like pollution from chemical and industrial plants used to be perceived essentially in local terms: smog in London and Detroit and Hamburg. Today, we know that acid rain, rain that sometimes has the acidic content of lemon juice, falls thousands of miles away from the smoking chimneys that contribute to it. North American pollution destroys the forests of northern Europe.

But forests are being destroyed in other ways as well, and with other consequences. In my part of the world, Belize used to be a great producer of mahogany; but there are few mahogany trees left. Belizean mahogany, some of the finest in the world, is all over the world in furniture and panelling, produced by some of the finest craftsmen of Europe. But those who exploited the forests did not plant new trees. They moved on to other forests. We thought of it as a terrible plunder of Belize—but only as a local tragedy. Today, we know better. We know that, as the world loses its forest cover with the cutting down, for example, of the great forests of Indonesia and of Brazil, we are tampering with the limits of our ecological balance.

Within fifty years all this, added to fossil fuel burning, could produce an increase in the planet's average temperatures; the 'greenhouse' warming of the planet.[9] This could lead in turn to a rise in the sea-level large enough to inundate many low-lying coastal cities and river deltas all over the world, and to upset dramatically national and international agricultural production and trade systems. And this is to say nothing of what deforestation will cause in terms of the loss of plant resources which we require for future agricultural and medical progress. It is no

longer a problem for Brazil or Indonesia alone. It is a problem for all the world.[10]

Similarly all countries, not just the super powers, have a vital stake in ending the risk posed by nuclear weapons to the whole world. Growing up in the West Indies fifty years ago, it was tempting to surmise that if Europeans chose to blow themselves up in 'tribal' wars, it was essentially their affair—sad, tragic, but their affair. That was, even then, a superficial reaction; but, to some degree, it was harmless. Today, we dare not indulge in superficialities of that kind. We know that war in Europe would probably involve a nuclear exchange, and we know that nuclear war will involve us all. The 'nuclear winter'[11] it brings on will not stop at the Equator, it will be a winter that envelops the world, one that shuts out even the Caribbean sun.

What all this means is that we should have learned, through our propensity for destruction and exploitation and waste and general wantonness, that there are no places 'far away' in which these irresponsibilities can be indulged without hurting ourselves; that there are some irresponsibilities that we cannot indulge even at home without hurting others; to say nothing, of course, of obscenities like nuclear testing or the dumping of nuclear waste in other people's regions precisely because they are perceived to be far enough away from home.[12]

But have we learned those lessons? For the first time twenty years ago, our human species saw our planet in outer space from outside itself. Earth-rise was a sobering experience. It confirmed not just that the world is round, but that it is whole; that there is no North or South, no East or West; one earth, small and indivisible. It is a glimpse of human reality we badly needed, and need now to hold in focus. As man stood on the moon and looked at earth, what he saw was oneness; one planet earth, not the separate worlds we strive so hard to sustain. How petty from that vantage point are the divisions of race and tribe, of creed and country, which remain central features of the 'civilisation' we boast of in our vanity.

It is through these new eyes, with these new perceptions, that we must see the world. It might help us to do so to reflect on how others might fairly see us. Just think if, one day, we did receive on this planet visitors from outer space, who studied us as we have in mind studying them in our travels in outer space. How would they report on us? Might they say, for example:

Earth is a strange planet of great natural beauty and wondrous human accomplishment, but amazingly inefficient and insensitive in managing its global affairs; and full of strange contradictions.

The humans who live on it have divided themselves into little groups they call 'states' and each one struggles for its own prosperity even at the expense of others. Today, all are theoretically free and equal, but that is not so in practice. The inequalities are startling.

A few humans, less than a quarter, enjoy great material prosperity which they measure in terms of money—between $6,000 and $16,000 a year for each person. The remaining three-quarters exist in varying degrees of wretchedness with about $600 a year per person, but some with as little as $150.[13]

In some groups, out of every hundred children born, only one or two will die before the age of one; but for others the figure will be as high as fifteen.[14]

In the poorest groups most people can afford only one meal a day, their life expectancy is below fifty years, and only one in three is literate. In the richer ones, most families have a car, many luxuries and three meals a day; life expectancy is over seventy-five years and literacy almost 100 per cent.

The population of this planet is growing at such an explosive rate that it will double within thirty years.[15] Most of the increase will occur within the poorest groups who, in the absence of social security of any kind, see children as their only protection against the insecurity of old age; but the planet as a whole does not seem to understand this link between poverty and population or its implications for the future of all groups.

Most contradictory of all, is the fact that only some $40 billion is spent each year on what they call 'aid' to narrow these great differences in the condition of life on the planet.[16] Yet, some $1,000 billion is spent annually, mainly by the groups regarded as most advanced, on arms designed to be used against each other.[17] They have weapons of such high destructive power aimed at each other that if firing ever starts it will eliminate all life

> on the planet.
>
> Earth is a dangerous enigma. It is advanced in some ways; yet primitive in others. It espouses compassion as a virtue; yet is dominated by greed. It is beginning to understand its oneness; yet has not overcome its habits of separateness. This combination of genius and perversity may yet cause it to self-destruct?

Could we, in all conscience, question the fairness of such a report?

But we can't just stop there; we surely must ask what such dispassionate judgements mean for the way we have developed as a community of nations. We have to ask these questions ourselves, about ourselves; and we have to begin to understand our human reality and the need for change responsive to it. We must come to accept, in our hearts no less than our minds, our condition as a human family; our oneness; our inseparable humanity. We must begin to acknowledge what our unspoken judgements tell us, namely, that the national sovereignty which we prize so much may now be producing diminishing returns; that the adversary system of relations between states which we superimposed on it, or which it imposed on us, is becoming not just outdated but far, far too dangerous.

What holds us back from these acknowledgements? In part at least it is that the curse of separateness or 'otherness' still afflicts our humankind despite all the forces drawing us together. By 'otherness' I mean the distortion of vision which makes one person see another as crucially different, ignoring the fundamental similarities, emphasising the differences to the point where the other is perceived as alien, unequal, even in the last resort less than human, to be excluded from what William Wilberforce so well described over a century and a half ago as 'that equitable consideration and that fellow-feeling which are due from man to man'.[18]

The consequences can be disastrously far-reaching. One of the worst was institutionalised slavery. All forms of enslavement of one human being by another begin in the mind, in the perverted judgement that those enslaved are not fellow members of the human race. For slavery to be formulated by law and institutionalised into a system, a measure of dehumanisation was

essential—often gross, sometimes subtle. Slavery rested on an assumption of superiority by the enslaver, and it is 'the other', perceived consciously as different and inherently inferior, who is enslaved. To the Romans, all those outside the Empire were barbarians. That, consciously or unconsciously, was the conviction of the now-ended Age of Empires, which set out with unwarranted arrogance to bring the virtues of 'civilisation' to 'the lesser breeds without the Law'.[19]

Sometimes, the basis of 'otherness' has been religion. European Christians were for centuries enslaved as 'infidels' by the Islamic Turks and Moors; captured Muslims were made the galley-slaves of the Christian West. Religious differences and sectarianism promote doctrines of otherness even in our own time. What is it but 'otherness' that compels the fellow Islamic nations of Iran and Iraq to remain locked in their unyielding war of attrition, leaving on both sides countless 'martyrs' who are in fact victims?

And is it not also the persistence of doctrines of 'otherness' which prevents the people of Ireland from ending a political conflict dramatised by religious differences but deriving from centuries of 'colonisation'? Ironically, in Ireland, the last two decades, in which a real effort has been made to respond to ancient grievances, have seen a counter upsurge of sickening, barbaric violence—yet one met increasingly by the most amazing compassion, as in the case of the courage, faith and forgiveness of the father of the nurse killed in the Eniskellen bombing last year. And just last week, the Protestant and Catholic schoolfriends of a girl badly wounded in the bombing of a school bus said that the attack brought them closer together; and they urged a change of heart from their elders. Surely all this shows that the time for 'otherness' in Ireland has passed; that it is time for forgiveness to prevail over the dogma of difference; for impulses of understanding to reach across the borders of the mind.[20]

'Otherness' has many accomplices. Extreme nationalism is one: the division of the world into 'we' and 'they'; 'our side' and 'the others'; a ritualistic patriotism which displaces dispassionate judgement and deepens division. In the end, of course, it drives out internationalism, and we enter the danger zone which threatens to turn our global village into a global jungle. For over a year now internationalists have been warning of the need to

secure freedom of passage in the Gulf for the ships of all nations through a naval presence which flies the flag of the United Nations. But instincts of nationalism have prevailed instead, and we are today in that danger zone. Yet some responses to the terrible loss of life on Sunday[21] are still being conditioned by who the victims are and who it is that made them victims. How deeply worrying that our human solidarity should prove to be so fragile and the instinct to respond even to massive human tragedy on the basis of 'otherness' so persistent a malaise.

But otherness can deepen divisions even within nations. Feudal society had its serfs and bondsmen. The West Indian and American plantations were worked in their earliest decades by indentured poor whites or white criminals. The ruling groups within some African tribes actually sold their own serfs into the plantation slave trade, together with captives from 'other' tribes, the spoils of war.

And what is it but that same bane of 'otherness' that makes terrorism in all its horrible forms possible? Whether as practiced by the state, as in South Africa, or by misguided zealots in many a troubled region of our world, terrorism has its roots in alienation. Both its ends and its means repudiate our oneness and therefore our humanity. And how can I speak in this Abbey without calling for the freedom of all those held hostage—innocent persons of many nationalities? If I think rather specially of Terry Waite it is naturally because of his special role on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as a friend of all humanity who, interceding on behalf of men held captive, was to become a captive himself. His release, and that of others held hostage, can only open the doors of human reconciliation, a process in which all people, all nations, all sects, all groups, have an ultimate interest. And the scourge of terrorism reaches beyond people to entire nations, like the Lebanon itself torn apart by relentless conflict. It is a scourge we must remove from our human society; but perhaps we only will when we succeed—all of us—in changing the way we see ourselves and each other.

The history of our own century affords the most complete example of 'otherness' as a reason for enslavement. Nazi Germany used pseudo-scientific theories based on perverted Darwinism to justify the persecution and enslavement of the Jews. That brings us dangerously close to the present; close

enough to put us on notice for our own time.

Despite all our human progress, unless we lift this curse of 'otherness' from our civilisation we can never fulfil our human potential as 'one people' and may well destroy ourselves. It is so vile a curse on our humanity that mere whispered disapproval of its excesses comes close to acquiescence. Recently, when Archbishop Trevor Huddleston was asked on his 75th birthday, after a life-time of standing tall against apartheid, about attitudes to South Africa, he said that what troubled him most was the absence of anger: given the enormity of the crime that apartheid is, mere sadness could not suffice as a human response.[22] That really is the heart of the matter: that our humankind, in a kind of complicity with 'otherness', finds it possible to be tolerant of even massive wrongs committed in the name of 'otherness', when the victim is perceived as someone else—the other. Yet the lessons of history are so clear that each and every one of us is in time a victim of such wrongs. Remember, as Lord Elwyn Jones urged in his Oration three years ago, the anguish of Pastor Niemoeller, eventually himself a victim of the Nazis: he had failed to speak out when they came for the Jews, when they came for the communists, when they came then for the trade unionists—because he was not one of them; but then they came for him—and there was no one left to speak out for him.[23]

Over a century and a half ago when Wilberforce and the Anti-Slavery Movement crusaded against that most abhorrent of inhumanities, they did not lack for anger. The 'Evangelical Saints' of the Clapham Sect did not whisper their revulsion or conceal their passion. They attacked the 'otherness' of slavery root and branch: Wilberforce himself, Thomas Buxton who succeeded him, Zachary Macauley, James Stephen, Thomas Clarkson and the many others in whose name Wilberforce spoke in Parliament. 'Am I not a man and a brother' became their cry on behalf of those held in bondage in the name of 'otherness'.[24]

Their passion and their anger against slavery kept a candle burning for humanity. By their refusal to acquiesce and their eventual victory, they helped to soften the judgement of history on the generation that permitted slavery. Reviled as he was by the establishment for most of his life, Wilberforce, at the end, on a motion by both Houses of Parliament was buried here in Westminster Abbey. Why then do we have to argue—as it were

all over again—the need for passion and anger against human bondage? Why is apartheid for all too many people a matter for whispered disapproval and for accommodation of innumerable kinds in almost all fields of endeavour: economic, social, military, and even political? Is not the black South African 'a man and a brother' too, a woman and a mother, a child like any other child? What will soften the judgement of history against us for allowing apartheid to stain the pages of 20th century civilisation?

When President Reagan spoke at the Mansion House recently of 'a new era in history', he concluded with the call: 'let us seek to stand for freedom, to speak for humanity'.[25] That surely is a call all governments must heed; and since freedom is nowhere more in chains or humanity nowhere more degraded on our planet than in South Africa, ending apartheid must surely be the primary challenge and the first test of our resolve.

But to stand for freedom in South Africa and to speak for humanity against apartheid requires more than that whispered disapproval of which I spoke. It requires passion and steadfastness in disallowing apartheid as a blot on our humanity. It requires sacrifice and courage in compelling Pretoria—by sanctions as well as other means of pressure—to end apartheid. It requires a stand with all those in South Africa who truly stand for freedom and speak for humanity like the South African Council of Churches and church leaders like Archbishop Tutu, whose personal freedom is now in jeopardy. We cannot stand for freedom or speak for humanity anywhere with conviction and credibility, unless we do so in relation to South Africa itself.

Let me end, by returning to those International Commissions with which I began. What their collective experience confirmed for me—their collective search for human responses to many problems—is the interconnectedness of the issues with which they were concerned. Development, security, environment, humanitarian issues—cannot be isolated from each other; poverty, population, refugees, debt, street children, nuclear war, famine, vanishing forests, encroaching deserts, climate change—are not so many separate crises as elements of one human crisis. Our human response must have a unifying dimension. It is that dimension with which I end, but which in a sense I place in the forefront of these reflections on our world of 'one people': the dimension of ethics.

That dimension was present in the work of all the Commissions: when Brandt said, for example, "we are looking for a world based less on power and status, more on justice and contract, less discretionary, more governed by fair and open rules";[26] it was there. When Palme said, "international security must rest on a commitment to joint survival rather than on a threat of mutual destruction";[27] it was there. When Brundtland looked to a common future through "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs";[28] it was there, too. Beside the economic strategies for overcoming poverty; beside the complex programmes for disarmament; beside the technical prescriptions for preserving a sustainable environment; beside, if you like, the science of survival, there must be the ethics of human solidarity.

What does it profit the human race if, unconstrained by the ethics of survival, its genius leads it to self-destruction? How content can we be to live by the politics of power if at its apogee it condemns us all to death? How proud can we be of our science if at the pinnacle of its achievement it threatens not to save but to sacrifice us? W.H. Auden gave the answer to such questions when he wrote, as if on behalf of an entire generation yearning for survival: 'We must love one another or die'.[29]

It is that same understanding—more intuitive, it is true, than spiritual—that has led millions of ordinary people the world over to call for the ascendency of 'peace and love'; to demand, in the words of John Lennon's song, that we "give peace a chance".[30] In our threatened world there is in the human spirit an irresistible urge to elevate the moral imperative to a place of primacy in global affairs. And that urge is manifest everywhere in people; especially, young people. When the Report of the Commission on Environment and Development was launched in London in 1987 one of the young people invited to receive it from Mrs. Brundtland, Jenny Damayanti of Indonesia, made this moving plea:

> Please, Presidents, Prime Ministers, and Generals, listen to the poor, to the voice of the hungry people who are forced to destroy the environment. Listen to the silent death of dying forests, lakes, rivers, and the seas, the

> dying soil of the earth, poisoned and trampled by human greed, poverty and inequality. We, the young, hear them loud and clear! [31]

Other young people are helping us to fill out that vision of one people in one world. The Council of Europe's current 'Public Campaign on North-South Interdependence and Solidarity' has as its theme: 'One World is enough for all of us'—from the song by Sting and Ziggy Marley. Another generation is understanding better than we did that the world is more than a totality of sovereign states and separate people; that there is a human society; one global people.

Nor is the ethical choice a soft option. There is no morality without some passion; there are no ethics without some emotion; there is no credo that does not call for consistent action. What is involved is much more than a new philosophy, a new intellectual fashion. How can I put it better than Dylan Thomas did, writing of individual death? How much more pertinent his insistence when we ponder our common future?

> Do not go gentle into that good night,
> Old age should burn and rave at close of day;
> Rage, rage against the dying of the light.[32]

Where the peace of the world by any of its many names is threatened, the righteous, virtuous rage of the people of the world is the most authentic testimony of a people everywhere keeping a vigil for peace in all its meanings; a vigil against poverty and the abuse of power; a vigil for an end to terrible evils like apartheid; a vigil in support of 'Live Aid' and 'Sport Aid' to end the horrors of famine; a vigil for an end to the arms race and its threat of human extinction; a vigil to preserve our one earth for its one people. Each is the testimony of people demanding to be heard while there is still time for someone to listen and to act; people ready to show by example that they care about their neighbour and understand that their neighbour now is everyone on earth. An ethic of human solidarity is stirring in the world. We need to help it to develop and grow strong. Where better to say so than here in this reverential place?

Notes and References

1. Sir Christopher Wren, in *Perspectives: An Anthology of 1001 Architectural Quotations,* Charles Knevitt (ed.) (Lund Humphries, London, 1986), p. 17.

2. Order of Service for 'The One People Oration', (Westminster Abbey, London, 5 July 1988); "Hills of the North, rejoice" No. 470 Hymns A & M New Standard; words by the editors of 'English Praise', based on C.E. Oakley (1832-65).

3. *Winning the Human Race? The Report of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues* (Zed Books, London, 1988), p.9.

4. Ibid, p. 10.

5. Mahatma Gandhi, quoted in a compilation by D.C. Manners, (1983: 25 April) *Indian and Foreign Review* Vol. 20 No. 13 (Government of India, New Delhi), p. 10.

6. *North-South: A Programme for Survival: The Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues* (Pan Books, London, 1980).

7. Economic Declaration, Economic Summit of the seven major Western industrialised countries at their Meeting in Toronto, 21 June 1988, Fourteenth Annual Economic Summit (UN Doc. A/43/435), para. 3.

8. Report of the World Food Council on the work of its 14th Session, *General Assembly Official Records: 43rd Session,* Supplement No. 14 (OA/43/19) (United Nations, New York, 1988), p. 2.

9. *The Times,* London, 28 June 1988. Environmental scientists from 40 countries attending the Toronto Conference (World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security, Toronto, 27-30 June 1988), warn that atmospheric pollution is causing global warming.

10. *Our Common Future, Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1988), pp. 168-177 and *passim.*

11. Ibid., p. 295.

12. See, for example, the broadcast by British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, 27 September 1938: 'How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing!', quoted in *The Penguin Dictionary of Modern Quotations* J.M. and M.J. Cohen (ed.) (Penguin Books, London, 2nd edition 1986), p. 67.

13. *The Commonwealth Factbook* (Commonwealth Secretariat, London, 1987), p. 44 and inside back cover; from World Bank and other figures.

14. Ibid., p. 46.

15. *U.N. World Population Perspectives* (1984). See, also, Ivan Head, "What Kind of World do we Live In?", Address to the National Defence College, Kingston, Canada, 5 September 1986) (typescript), p. 14.

16. Net disbursements of official development assistance from member countries of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) totalled $41.2 billion in 1987; figures quoted by Special United Nations Service (SUNS) (IFDA, Nyon, Switzerland, 24 June 1988).

17. R.L. Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditure* (World Priorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1986) and *World Armaments and Disarmament, SIPRI Yearbook 1985* (Taylor and Francis, London, 1985).

18. William Wilberforce, *An Appeal to the Religion, Justice and Humanity of the Inhabitants of the British Empire on behalf*

of the Negro Slaves in the West Indies (Hatchards, London, 1823), p. 43.

19. Rudyard Kipling, 'Recessional', in *The Definitive Edition of the Verse of Rudyard Kipling* (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1941), p. 328.

20. Shridath S. Ramphal, Reaching Across the Gap, '50th Jubilee Address' to the Irish Association, Belfast, 9 June 1988, (typescript), (available from the Commonwealth Secretariat).

21. The destruction of an Iranian aircraft, Iran Airbus A-300B by surface-to-air missiles launched from the 'USS *Vincennes*' in the Persian Gulf on 3 July 1988.

22. Archbishop Trevor Huddleston at the Anti-Apartheid Movement Commemorative Meeting, London University, 13 June 1988.

23. Cited by Lord Elwyn Jones in 'The Place of Law in Society', Westminster Abbey 'One People' Oration (1985), typescript, p. 6.

24. This slogan was widely used in the anti-slavery campaign, both before and after abolition, including by the Anti-Slavery Society founded in 1839. See Shridath S. Ramphal, *Some in Light and Some in Darkness: The Long Shadow of Slavery* (Third World Foundation Monograph 12, London, 1983), title page, where it appears surrounding an image of a kneeling slave, taken from a medallion produced by the prominent abolitionist Josiah Wedgewood I.

25. President Reagan's speech at Guildhall, London, 3 June 1988.

26. *North-South: A Programme for Survival,* op. cit., p. 65.

27. *Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament, Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues* under the Chairmanship of Olof Palme (Pan Books, London, 1982), p. ix.

28. *Our Common Future,* op. cit., p. 8.

29. W.H. Auden, 'September 1, 1939', *Selected Poems* , Edward Mendelson (ed.) (Faber and Faber, London, 1984), p. 88.

30. John Lennon and Paul McCartney, 'Give Peace a Chance' (Northern Songs Ltd., London, 1969).

31. Jenny Damayanti, in 'English Translations of Replies by Young People', in information material at launch of *Our Common Future,* (op. cit.), London, 27 April 1987.

32. Dylan Thomas, 'Do not go gentle into that good night', in *Collected Poems 1934-1952* (Dent, London, 1956) p. 116.