

Global View 2001: An Emerging Agenda (GS 1413)
 Report by the International and Development Affairs
 Committee of the Board for Social Responsibility, and
*Development Matters: Essays on Christian Perspectives on
 Globalization (GS Misc 634)*

The Chairman: Members will see from the order paper that under SO 95A there is to be a presentation by Christian Aid. It is being given by Dr Daleep Mukarji and the Bishop of Matana, Burundi, Bishop Bernard Ntahoturi. I welcome them very warmly on behalf of Synod. Dr Mukarji is known to many of us. Bishop Bernard is slightly less well known here but he is playing an important part in the Arusha peace process, works indefatigably with Christian Aid in South Africa, and was recently with Nelson Mandela.

Bishop and Dr Mukarji, we welcome you very warmly and invite you to give your presentation. (*Applause*)

Dr Daleep Mukarji: Mr Chairman and members of the Synod, it is a great privilege for me to be here to share with you some of our concerns and some of the ways in which I believe we can move together as a Church. To participate in this international development discussion is important for us, for we in Christian Aid take very seriously our role as a special agency for you, the Church. We are your relief and development agency. It is your prayers and good wishes that make our work possible, and I want to thank all of you for your parishes, your churches and your members who, in different ways, encourage us and support us to make the work that we do important to the people overseas. We take seriously being a Christian agency. 'Christian' is not just in the name; it is part of our being and part of our understanding of who we are, and it must influence and inform all that we do. So in our understanding of our work we are inspired by a gospel that is good news to the poor and a gospel which we believe must make a difference and help to make fullness of life a reality for all people.

Christian Aid has essentially three purposes on your behalf: first, to expose the scandals of poverty; second, to contribute to its eradication; and, third, to challenge structures and systems that keep people poor, excluded and marginalized. Our development, humanitarian and advocacy work is built on our understanding that we are the Churches' agency. Not only are we sponsored and supported by the Churches; we take seriously working with you, to encourage you and your members to put your faith into action. We in Christian Aid believe that we are an integral part of the life and mission of the Churches.

However, sadly, we live in a time when the world is divided, unjust and unhealthy. One-fourth of the world's people are poor, living in abject poverty. That is 125 million children who will never go to school. People are still denied their basic right to adequate food, shelter, clean water, education and health care. This is just unfair in a world where there is growing wealth and where the gap between the rich and the poor

seems to be getting worse. There are now twelve million children in Africa orphaned because of HIV/AIDS: that is equivalent to the total number of children in this country. Today 36 million people are living with HIV/AIDS, with about 25 million of them in sub-Saharan Africa. The world faces a deepening humanitarian and economic crisis because of the AIDS pandemic. Let us understand, however, that AIDS is not just a health issue; AIDS is fuelled by poverty and a lot of other factors.

It is in this context that our Government have pledged to reduce by one-half the proportion of people throughout the world living in poverty by 2015. That means taking one billion people out of poverty by 2015. These highly ambitious development targets, agreed by the international community, include universal primary education, decreasing infant and childhood mortality, gender equality and improving access to health services and sustainable development. As Churches we must play our part in making these targets a reality. We need to be inspired again by our jubilee vision of debt relief, of taking care of the land, of freeing the oppressed and enslaved and of building a new society, where people can live in peace, justice and equality in the perspective of the reign of God.

Therefore we believe in Christian Aid that, working with other people, we must contribute to a better world for all, irrespective of creed, caste, colour, gender or ethnicity. This requires a fairer distribution of resources throughout the world; it requires radical change and active campaigning to influence our leaders and the leaders of the world. Christian Aid believes that each one of us with God's help can make a difference. We have done this recently in our Jubilee 2000 campaign where people of faith came together and challenged the international structures and decision-making processes, and with others we were able to put on the agenda of the World Bank, the IMF and the UN issues of debt relief, health care, HIV/AIDS and a host of others with which we are concerned.

However, it is not going to be easy to eliminate world poverty because poverty is manifested in different ways in different countries, and we need to understand that there is no one solution that will work throughout the world. If we are to close the widening gap between the poor and the rich we need to understand that there are some problems ahead. I want now to share some of these problems and challenges.

The first is globalization. The growing interdependence and interconnectedness of the world today has created the concept of a global village or a global economy where we believe that global governance may control and manage the situation. Yet globalization has not benefited all; there are winners and losers in this. Recent events in Seattle, Prague, Washington and London have shown that there is serious opposition to both the values and the results of globalization, and people are beginning to think that money, markets and multinational corporations control the world.

It was the UN Secretary General who said, "The central challenge we face today is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all the world's people instead of

leaving billions of them behind in squalor. Inclusive globalization must be built on the great enabling force of the market, but market forces alone will not achieve it. It requires a broader effort to create a shared future based upon our common humanity in all its diversity.'

Our own Government in their White Paper last December came out with a statement *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*, but we cannot just assume that globalization is working for the poor. From our partners we hear the experience of many instances where it does not benefit the poor, and we are worried by an overemphasis on a one-size-fits-all trade liberalization model that is being promoted throughout the world.

A second issue is international trade. What fuels this extraordinary drive to globalization is trade. International trade is now worth about \$10 million every minute, and it is growing. It could work for the benefit of the poor but unfortunately this is not entirely true. Poor countries get only 0.4 per cent of the world's trade. In the world today international trade is controlled by a developing set of rules. We have analysed them and seen that some of these rules are unfair because the decision-making processes are biased against the poor; many of the rules hurt rather than help poor people; and sometimes there are rules that should not be there or there are no rules where there should be some. The UN estimates that if we could change the rules \$700 billion worth of trade would benefit the poor countries.

Therefore we in Christian Aid, working with others, are calling for a new set of rules which, among other things, will explicitly promote reduction of poverty, will be monitored to check their impact on poverty, will be decided by democratic and transparent processes, will be enforced to make the rich as well as the poor abide by them, and will cover the large multinational companies as well as governments.

International development is not easy today. Development problems, including the problems of conflict and of the destruction of the environment, are interrelated and interdependent, rather like our understanding of globalization. We need to approach this with leadership, courage and coherence in our strategies.

Can we make a difference? I believe, from our experience in Christian Aid, that we can. We are doing this at the local level through our partners, where we are helping people to help themselves; we have seen results and we shared them with you in Christian Aid week when our theme was 'You are Making a Difference'. On behalf of Christian Aid I have the privilege of travelling overseas, and only last Sunday returned from a visit to Cambodia, China and Burma. Just last Saturday I was with Bishop Daniel Hoi Kyin of the Anglican Church in Burma in his Hpa-an Diocese, spending three days with him. I saw his leadership, courage and conviction as he tried to work for peace and development in a very difficult situation. I bring you greetings from him because I told him that I would be speaking the following week at this Synod.

From our partners in the UK and Ireland I am hearing from people how it is making a difference in *their* lives and *their* churches as people feel enabled and encouraged to change the world, to influence our governments, to influence the World Bank, to influence the IMF. As Christians we feel empowered to use our democratic right to keep our governments and politicians accountable. We are empowered to use our commercial power to hold our supermarkets accountable, to see that supplies on the shelves and in the shops are fairly traded and have not come from people who are exploited in the process.

We need to work with people of faith and of no faith, people in the private sector and people throughout the world, to build a more just society, where every human being is valued and is seen as a child of God, made in God's image. It is for us to be agents of change, agents for the kingdom, agents for witnessing to a world where every human being can have that fullness that we take so seriously in our own calling.

What then of the future? With many, I believe that it is important for us to challenge the Government and the international community on a certain number of priorities. Perhaps I may end by suggesting four for our consideration this afternoon: more aid for poverty reduction, debt relief, fairer rules on international trade, and urgent action on HIV/AIDS.

Christian Aid, with others, is calling on our Government and other governments to set aside at least 0.7 per cent of GNP in aid, a promise that was originally made in 1970. The UK Government at present is committing only 0.31 per cent and, while this is increasing, it is not enough. Sadly, the richer countries of the international community are putting in only 0.22 per cent of their GNP. This is a scandal at a time when incomes and wealth are growing in the countries of the north. We believe that we can hold our Government accountable to their own target and ask not just for promises but for results, and those soon.

Second, Christian Aid will continue to campaign for debt relief. We believe that what has been promised has not yet reached the countries and people who need to benefit, or not enough. We demand and expect that the multilateral debt owed to the World Bank/IMF will be cancelled on agreed terms and that some countries not yet covered will be included. However, debt relief alone will not solve the problems of poverty; we need to look at international trade and good governance and development models that benefit the poor.

So my third concern is about international trade. We will work with others on our campaign 'Trade for Life' and ask the World Trade Organisation to change the rules that influence international trade. We will ask the British Government to work within the EU and with others to see that future trade talks benefit the developing countries.

Finally, on HIV/AIDS, we call upon the nations of the world to take this seriously. Tackling the problems of HIV/AIDS must be intimately linked to tackling the problems

of poverty, of lack of health care and of lack of drugs. Yet we have seen that, even with little or no money, changes can take place in Senegal, Uganda and Thailand, where governments and people are committed. As Christians, we must contribute a more holistic approach to the issues round HIV/AIDS and encourage faith communities to be at the forefront because we cannot solve the problems of HIV/AIDS in any country without taking the grass-roots faith communities on board.

Thank you for this chance to speak to you. I want to be a little more personal towards the end. In 1978 I was a young doctor just qualified, working in a mission centre in a health and development programme in rural India funded by Christian Aid. Today that programme continues and gets little or no money from overseas, and we have shown that in that community of 150,000 we can make a difference. In 1978 also the world community made a promise. There was an international conference in Alma Ata in the Soviet Union which proposed 'Health for All by 2000 AD'. We made promises and we set targets and we had expectations. The year 2000 has come and gone and now the World Health Organisation is talking of 'Health for All in the Twenty-First Century'. We have a hundred more years in which to do something about it!

People throughout the world are tired of promises, targets, conferences and commitments; they are asking for results, they are asking to be involved and they are asking the world to wake up. We can make a difference.

I would like to end with the words of somebody you may have heard about, Nkosi Johnson, a twelve-year-old boy who spoke last year at the International AIDS conference in Durban. I believe that he spoke on behalf of all the poor countries and all the people who are excluded. He said, 'Care for us and accept us. We are all human beings and we are normal. We have hands, we have feet, we can walk, we can talk, we have needs just like everyone else. Don't be afraid of us. We are all the same.' Sadly, Nkosi died on 1 June this year. We in Christian Aid believe in life before death. With God's help and your prayers, I believe that we can and must work for this, work to make that fullness of life a reality for many of God's people. *(Applause)*

The Chairman: Thank you very much, Dr Mukarji. Our applause indicates the huge respect and affection that we have for all you do and for who you are.

Bishop Bernard, may I invite you to continue the presentation?

The Bishop of Matana (Rt Revd Bernard Ntahoturi): Bishop and members of the Synod, this is a historic moment for me and I am glad to be part of it. I bring you greetings from my diocese of Matana, from the people of Burundi who are suffering, from the Church in Burundi and also from the people in Africa who remember you and appreciate your prayers. Let me thank the leadership of the Church of England who have accepted my participation in this Synod and especially Christian Aid who invited me to contribute to this debate.

I come from Burundi, part of the Great Lakes region of Africa, often remembered when there is human or natural disaster. Life there is also full of positive and colourful things. This complexity of life makes our future look most of the time as unpredictable as the weather. (I did not say 'the English weather'!) Many millions hardly know what that future holds for them, whether there is a better tomorrow when the household will have something on the plate, water to drink, security and peace, or whether it will be as uncertain and insecure as it is today. Yet the Church of Africa continues to grow and to preach the gospel, the good news of hope and abundant life in Jesus Christ because we believe in God, the God who is able to change things and whose time and plans for us are good and not limited like those of men.

To illustrate this complex situation, let me take one example among many of a young couple from my diocese: John and Mary. They got married in 1992. John was a Hutu and Mary was from the Tutsi ethnic group. John was a primary school teacher and the breadwinner for the family. Mary could not aspire to a formal job with a salary because she did not have a formal education, but she was a wonderful wife, and they loved each other. In October 1993 the crisis broke in Burundi and John had to take refuge in Tanzania. He left his wife in Burundi because she was of a different ethnic group and the camp where John went could not receive Mary because it was anti-Tutsi. Mary was obliged to stay inside Burundi in an internally displaced camp. Because she had no means of existence she started selling beer and in a short time young men started befriending her. She gave birth to Andrew, her first and only son by John. Unfortunately during the exercise of her profession she was infected with HIV/AIDS. Two years later she died because she could not get medicine or a good diet. She left Andrew an orphan and without news of his father. We have heard recently that John has been accepted as a migrant to Canada but that he has not been allowed to take Andrew his son because this boy was never in exile and so was not considered a refugee.

As Andrew grows into a small man, what does he see round him? Hopelessness, fear, poverty, oppression, hunger and disease, family dislocation and separation, a continent whose population is on the run, to name but a few. Like any other growing young man in Burundi, Andrew will inevitably face, among many other problems, the problems that I am going to speak of now.

The first is poverty. Never before have our people experienced such a deepening of poverty as in these days. Poverty is right inside the Church as well because it is composed of people who are poor. Poverty is in the villages where communities have over-stretched their survival mechanisms. The irony of it is that this poverty is in the midst of a continent so rich in resources, a continent so endowed with a growing population and hard-working people. Yet the poverty is real, and it is biting hard.

The second problem will be food security. Africa is a continent that has one-third of its population malnourished. A population without food is vulnerable to disease and poor productivity. Christian Aid has been helping us with its programmes to introduce

agricultural programmes and policies so that we develop food sufficiency and avoid dependency.

The third problem that Andrew will face will be conflicts (ethnic, regional and even sometimes religious), peace through reconciliation, rehabilitation and the means of reconstruction. Africa is the continent that has the highest number of displaced people. In Burundi, my country, one person in six is on the run. We live daily in fear and despair within our own country.

The fourth problem will be human health. The threat posed by HIV/AIDS is bringing Africa to the brink of collapse. If nothing is done urgently, some villages will be covered with darkness, as life has nearly come to a halt. HIV/AIDS is an issue, unfortunately, on which the Church in Africa has not yet given a clear voice, let alone a common message. Besides HIV/AIDS, many other diseases, such as malaria, are killing people and have contributed to the collapse of social services and given rise to other social problems.

Another issue is education and capacity building. The capacity of our population, the Churches included, is very low and unable to cope with the demands of the times. The population and institutions have to be empowered, especially now that participatory development and good governance are the mode of operation. Capacity building has to be for the clergy in areas of theology and social issues so as to influence and contribute to policy formulation and discussions. Education, formal or informal, is the best way to empower our people and deal with the issue of inequality, and actually to help our population to be functional in all other dimensions.

The final issue, surprisingly, will be spiritual renewal. Africa is known as the home of culture and spirituality. It is the continent where Christianity is growing very fast. I cannot think of Africa without Christianity. Yet Africa today faces a variety of internal and external threats to life, to justice, to peace, to the environment and even to the unity of the Church, to the family and to the spirit of tolerance. The spiritual renewal that I am talking about is not the counting of statistics or the number of communicants, though these are also very important; I am talking about the spiritual attitude that promotes respect for kingdom values, that leads to a glorious life, the glorious life which begins with respect for life and the healing of the wounds of the past with a hope for the future.

In its prophetic mission the Church in Africa should humble herself before the Lord so that she may become the channel of a new moral culture of responsibility, accountability and transparency in the community. Our vision is to work for the coming of God's kingdom, so that his will reaches us in Africa with the same intensity as in heaven.

What will be the way forward? I have two proposals. I propose that we work through a holistic approach to Church life and development. In our work of evangelism and

development we endeavour to strengthen the capacity of the poor and the disadvantaged people to bring about positive and sustainable changes in their lives, because they are vulnerable to emergencies and to any form of denial of their basic rights. This is what we have tried to achieve with the programmes that we do with Christian Aid, either in the field of humanitarian assistance, peace and reconciliation, inside Burundi, in Arusha, in Johannesburg, agricultural rehabilitation and reconstruction of the infrastructure. At a local level, incentives like credits for small-scale projects, training and access to information can make a difference to a suffering community.

An example is a project in Burundi in my diocese called 'Pigs, Potatoes and Peace' (in that order). A group of displaced widows received funds from Christian Aid to rehabilitate their agriculture and livestock. They chose to grow potatoes and keep pigs. This has brought them together and even to talk about peace, their security, issues of gender and development and reconciliation. A couple from that group have decided to care for and look after Andrew and provide a family for him. Yes, there is hope in Burundi.

A second proposal is that we should be guided by a God-driven, people-centred perspective. Looking at the experience of our people, we see a real danger that our world is becoming ever more divided into two zones. One is a zone of relative peace and prosperity, a giant community centred on economic growth, democracy and liberalism; the other is a zone of turmoil, with states becoming ever weaker, where there is a lack of social security protection, deepening exclusion and a chronic debt problem.

The challenge facing us, and especially you from the developed world, is to agree to work towards a set of human values which will serve as a unifying force in the development of a genuine global community. Only then will we be able to look to a future where human beings are valued for what they are rather than for what they produce. This needs solidarity to seek, and work together for, a sustainable future for humanity. It is possible. Come and help us.

Thank you. (*Applause*)

The Chairman: Bishop Bernard, thank you very much indeed for that astonishing mixture of truth and hope which you have brought to us this afternoon. We are deeply indebted to you and of course assure you of our prayers. Thank you very much indeed for being with us and speaking to us with such honesty, precision and compassion.

We now move out of presentation mode into debate mode but the intention is that the presentation should inform and help us in what we say.

As background reading to the debate, members might want to have with them this book, *Development Matters: Essays on Christian Perspectives on Globalization*. For

those of us bishops who were privileged to be present at the Lambeth Conference some years ago, one of the most moving moments was a Eucharist on the Feast of the Transfiguration, in which the Eucharist was celebrated by the Anglican Church in Japan. The preacher on that occasion was Canon Susan Cole-King and those of us who heard her preach there will remember that our hearts were deeply moved by all she had to say. This book is dedicated to her and in her memory and I simply bring that to members' attention for those who knew Susan and who owe her so much.

Just in case you are interested in this sort of statistic, in the *Church Times* top ten religious books *Development Matters* has beaten the *Scottish Episcopal Church Directory* by one place.

The Bishop of Selby (Rt Revd Humphrey Taylor): I beg to move:

'That this Synod

- (a) commend *Development Matters* to the dioceses and to the wider Church for further study;
- (b) call for global political and economic action, as set out in *Global View 2001*, with a view to strengthening the position of the world's poor;
- (c) encourage the Church to advocate and practise justice in the distribution of its resources; and
- (d) recognize that current trading relations and lending practices have exacerbated the acute economic and social problems facing developing countries and therefore urge Her Majesty's Government to give priority in trade negotiations to the needs of the poorest communities.'

On behalf of the Board for Social Responsibility I am pleased to move this motion against the background of the Christian Aid presentation that we have just heard. The Board is immensely grateful, as I am sure the whole Synod will be, for Christian Aid's help in mounting this debate, together with its associated fringe events, which is a splendid demonstration of Christian Aid's role as the Church of England's development arm, a function which of course it fulfils for other Churches in Britain and Ireland as well.

Our debate today is in response to the challenge made in 1998 to the last General Synod by the Secretary of State for International Development, Clare Short, to 'develop a broad coalition to combat global poverty'. The debate is timely in view of the winding-up of the Jubilee 2000 coalition last December and the launch of Christian Aid's 'Trade for Life' campaign earlier this year. We have this afternoon an

opportunity to show that the Church of England remains committed to international development, with a fresh emphasis, I suggest, on trade.

GS Misc 634 entitled *Development Matters: Christian Perspectives on Globalization*, the book to which you have just referred, Mr Chairman, has been produced as background for this debate and to help the Church more widely to study these issues as clause (a) of the motion recommends. The Board is very grateful to those who have contributed to the publication, and I should like to express particular appreciation of the work of our secretary for international and development affairs, Dr Charles Reed, in editing it. You have already remarked, Mr Chairman, that it has been dedicated to the memory of Susan Cole-King, a former member of the Synod and of the Board with an outstanding combination of knowledge and experience in these matters, whose sudden death in February this year shocked and distressed us all.

Clause (b) of the motion refers to GS 1413, a report by the Board which sets out policy commitments prepared for the recent general election by Global View 2001, an alliance of 24 human rights and development organizations, including the Board and Christian Aid. The Board is not here asking the Synod to agree a score of recommendations but rather to show the range of policies that are needed in the campaign against global poverty. Each of the actions set out in GS 1413 could form the basis for a whole debate, and providing a composite document like this might risk making debate superficial; but if the Church is serious in meeting Clare Short's challenge we have to recognize that poverty is multi-faceted, as we have just been hearing, and that our responses to it therefore should be numerous and interrelated, as its causes are.

For example, the provision of cheaper medicine will do little to combat HIV/AIDS unless there is improvement in access to basic health care and in the status of women. Jubilee 2000 has shown how many poor countries spend more servicing their debts than they are able to allocate to health or education services. There is little point in trying to resolve or prevent conflict without examining the supply of arms and the use of export credit guarantees. The Christian Aid presentation has demonstrated how the link between debt, poverty and trade makes it necessary to reform the IMF, the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation. The bishops meeting in Liverpool last month heard that all these actions could be worthless unless governments tackle climate change.

The impact of globalization will be determined by the political and economic choices made by governments, international institutions and big business. It is not for the Church to try to make their policies for them but rather for it to set out principles and advocate their implementation. The most fundamental of these principles surely is our gospel concern for the poor, sometimes called the preferential option, and that comes at the end of clause (b) of the resolution. So, as an important component of what we have learnt to call civil society, the Church has a responsibility to encourage policy choices that would make globalization work to the benefit rather than to the detriment of the world's poor.

Clause (c) of the motion deals with the Church's own life. It encourages advocacy but also the practice of what we preach in the distribution of our own resources. This is a challenge to the scale and character of our giving, or perhaps one should better say our sharing, as Christian people and organizations. Domestically in the Church of England we meet the challenge to some extent in the policy of the Church Commissioners on financial support for poorer dioceses, but in the worldwide Anglican Communion how are we, for example, to reckon the problems of funding our clergy pension scheme in relation to those of other provinces where the clergy pension barely meets basic necessities? I understand from Bishop Bernard that the province of Burundi is one that has no clergy pension scheme. To the eyes of Third World Christians accustomed to sacrificial service, we clergy in the Church of England can seem obsessed by material security. Given the structure of world trade, how can we avoid our prosperity being at the expense of others, including fellow-Anglicans, in different parts of the world? The chapters in *Development Matters* by Kevin Ward and Mark Oxbrow show how mission, evangelism and development are entwined, but is this demonstrated in the work of every mission agency, in every companion-diocese relationship and in all other aspects of Church life? Are we fully committed, in our individual and corporate economic lives, in the things we buy, to fair trade and environmental protection?

Clause (d) of the motion turns towards Her Majesty's Government. Everyday experience in the Anglican Communion bears out what Daleep Mukarji was saying a few minutes ago, that globalization is associated with a reduction in expenditure on things like health and education, with a widening economic gap within and between countries, with social fragmentation and poverty. This reality tends to contradict what we often seem to hear from Government. For instance, the thinking set out in this Government's second White Paper on development, *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*, emphasizes, as we have been hearing, economic liberalization as the appropriate policy in response to globalization. Yet globalization often appears as rampant, secularist materialism which gives the individual priority over the community in a way that is contrary to the gospel.

It is here in particular that the Board wants to challenge Government thinking. This Government, with their strong record on international development, seem not to see, or at any rate not to heed, the manifest connection between economic growth and inequality that worries many observers. Nor do they seem to recognize the hopeful sign, noted by Ian Linden in his chapter in *Development Matters*, of a World Bank report observing that 'more equal societies can actually grow faster'.

'Be radical and save the world' ran the headline in the *Church Times* for 22 June, reporting the publication of GS 1413, with the quality of theological insight customary in headlines. The world will only be saved of course by the grace of God through faith but if, to follow the argument in Ephesians 2, we are to do the good works which God prepared for us, I believe that we cannot neglect any of the actions set out in the report, GS 1413. The leading article in the same edition of the *Church Times* said that *Global View 2001* had 'produced a sound and detailed agenda. What

it needs is popular support.' I hope that by passing this motion the Synod will contribute to that.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr George Carey): May I, together with the Archbishop of York and the Synod, thank Christian Aid very much indeed? Thank you, Daleep, for your moving address and for all you are doing to strengthen the links between your organization and your member Churches. We welcome that very much indeed.

Our gratitude goes also to you, Bishop Bernard. You are well known in the Anglican Communion. We send our greetings to Burundi, and Eileen and I look forward to being with you early next year and to sharing in your life.

We are grateful also to the Bishop of Selby for introducing this important topic. Thank you for reminding us of the need for pensions and indeed salaries in many parts of Africa. There are only two provinces, as far as I know, where they have anything like a salaried clergy and pension rights as we have in this country, so maybe we need to bear that in mind when we go on to talk about pensions.

International development issues did not loom large in the recent general election. I regret that; we all do. It is all the more important now that we should take this opportunity to show that they matter to us profoundly as Christians. They matter for the well-being not only of our poorest brothers and sisters but of the entire human family.

The range of topics opened up to us in the three speeches is so vast that I just want to pick up on one that the first two speakers enlarged on: the HIV/AIDS pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa. Daleep has told us that the number of orphans in that region alone is estimated at twelve million, the equivalent of the child population in the United Kingdom.

I hear it asked again and again: is this really a development issue? People point to issues of sexual morality and personal relationships, and rightly so, for they are important; but so are the grinding poverty and dearth of resources that provide the grim backdrop to the AIDS pandemic. When we are talking about bringing this crisis under control, they are vital. Literally, the future of some African countries is bound up with tackling the AIDS crisis and the factors feeding it. Eileen and I recall vividly going to Durban in South Africa just last year. We went to a home for AIDS orphans, little children under the age of three or four in Durban, all destined to die within a matter of months; with sadness, the nurses told us that there was no money available to give the tiny bodies a decent burial. The police were telephoned; the bodies were taken and incinerated. Immediately we got on to the local bishop, Rubin Phillip, to bring the aid of the Church into that situation. We saw at first hand what life was like.

So what are we doing? What can we do? May I answer those questions from my perspective as president of the Anglican Communion? First, I was delighted at our

meeting of Primates at Kanuga in the spring that the Communion's leaders identified HIV/AIDS as a top priority, demanding an intensive and co-ordinated response. It includes a concerted campaign for affordable treatments, a programme to develop and spread good practice in AIDS prevention and care, and the channelling of human resources into tackling the crisis.

As a result, the Archbishop of Cape Town will be hosting a Communion-wide conference next month. At that meeting experts and practitioners in the fight against AIDS from around the globe will come together to exchange ideas and best practice. What we want to do is to share ways of really making a difference – not a talk-shop but a workshop that will transform attitudes – of deepening our moral commitment and making it real in the lives of individual men and women. I am heartened by that initiative, primarily for the benefits that I hope and pray it will bring. I am also encouraged, however, because it shows that this is one of the leading priorities of our Communion; we are often – maybe that is an exaggeration: sometimes – misrepresented as inward-looking and in danger of becoming distant from the daily cares of the world.

Of course we in the Churches have sometimes been accused of burying our heads in the sand over AIDS. However, in so many communities in Africa the Church is at the forefront of providing support and shelter for those living with AIDS. In many African countries, as Bernard will know, faith-based organizations – primarily Churches – provide up to 50 per cent of the health resources. Long-term commitments are necessary to control this disease; Churches have been present in the communities for centuries and they provide the networks ready to deliver. If HIV/AIDS continues to erode the capacity of communities to care for those affected, faith-based organizations will be even more important.

A second project that I have been pleased to be associated with is in Uganda, in Namirembe. Gideon Byamugisha (I can never pronounce his name), a young Ugandan priest who is HIV-positive himself, has started a centre in his home town and because he was the first priest to declare himself HIV-positive he has encouraged others to come forward and to make a real difference. Gideon's clinic, called the Archbishop Carey Resource Centre – I had nothing to do with the name, but I am delighted to be patron – runs AIDS awareness and education programmes, trains local people in the care of the sick and provides the spiritual support that is so urgently needed in such critical circumstances. It is a wonderful beacon of hope in Uganda and also for Africa.

One important dimension that we cannot ignore in the HIV/AIDS debate is the second-class status of women in many societies. The exclusion of women from educational and other opportunities adds to their vulnerability – and Bernard has already spoken about that – in the face of the African AIDS pandemic and of course to the vulnerability of their children. So I am pleased that the World Faiths Development Dialogue, which the president of the World Bank and I set up three years ago, is highlighting the position of women as it draws on the traditions and experience of no

fewer than nine of the world's religions. In this area we have so much to learn and to share. The WFDD can help to strengthen and deepen the dialogue and the understanding upon which effective action is based.

What of the involvement of Churches here at home? Clearly that exists through diocesan and other links and also, as we have been hearing, through the engagement of Church-based organizations like Christian Aid. However, we can and should be looking for ways to do more and it is with that in mind, and with the collaboration of Christian Aid, that I am pleased to announce today that I shall be inviting other Church leaders to join me for a one-day conference at Lambeth Palace towards the end of this year. I hope that this will provide an opportunity for developing awareness, understanding and co-operation between the United Kingdom Churches in the face of this pandemic. Of course the scourge of AIDS in Africa will be beaten first and foremost by Africans themselves; we must not be paternalistic in this matter. Our job is to help them as best we can, and I hope that this initiative will play a part.

HIV/AIDS in Africa can be beaten and must be beaten, but there is no point in denying the scale of the challenge. Neither should we ignore the signs of hope, which we have heard about. Daleep said a few minutes ago that we are called to be agents for change and agents for the kingdom. I want to say Amen to that and encourage us all to seek to be that.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd Dr Alan Hargrave (Ely): I would like to speak very much in support of this motion and I also strongly support the proposals contained in *Development Matters* and *Global View 2001*, but I would like to say something about the tone of these documents because the emphasis is almost all about what we need to do for *them* – and indeed we need to do an awful lot.

My wife and I spent ten years working in South America. We went out to serve and minister to people who were poor, though actually I sometimes wonder what we achieved; but when I reflect on what we received I have no doubts at all because we were deeply enriched and greatly blessed by our ten years working in South America. So, as the Archbishop has just said, let us not be paternalistic providers, thinking that we know best; let us be partners, because the so-called poor people of the Two-Thirds World have just as much to offer us as we have to offer them, if not more. This is something that we clearly see as we read the Gospels.

Part of the problem is that we in the West are generally far less aware of our own poverty and are therefore often unwilling to receive.

Let me finish with an example of what I mean. Six weeks ago I was in Uganda with my wife and on the Wednesday morning after we arrived we walked up the hill to Namirembe cathedral in Kampala, the Anglican cathedral. There was a service going

on and after a while people started to come out. About 150 people came out of the service. Curiosity got the better of me and I asked one of them, 'What's going on? Is it a wedding or something?' 'Oh, no,' she said, 'we're having a special prayer meeting for farmers in Britain suffering because of the foot and mouth crisis.' 'Shame on us,' I thought, 'shame on us.'

I think about the words of Gustavo Gutiérrez: 'The question is not "Do you work with the poor, do you serve the poor, are you working to alleviate poverty?" The question is "Do you have friends who are poor?" because then we really will be partners.'

Revd Caroline Dick (Durham): The reason that I have asked to speak in the debate this afternoon is because I want to tell Synod a story that has made me reflect very deeply on the issues that lie before us now.

Last year I was worshipping with a group of Christians in South Shields, where I live. It was debt decision day, and we were using Christian Aid's vigil watch service. To say that I arrived at that service with a very heavy heart would be the understatement of the year. I, like many other people in the diocese, had spent the past year encouraging, motivating and enthusing people to get involved in Jubilee 2000 and now, as the people were arriving, they were saying, 'What's the point? The task is too difficult. Here we are, praying for the leaders of the world to show compassion and a change of heart over debt repayments and yet even as we meet the leaders have put themselves physically beyond the reach of those who would try to prick their consciences. And, as if that is not enough, they are feasting together in an obscenely extravagant fashion in what feels like a gesture of defiance. So why bother? Why not just give up? After all you can't change human nature.'

I must say that at that point my 'Once more unto the breach, dear friends' speeches seemed somewhat vacuous.

Earlier on in the same afternoon hundreds of people had gathered round the Angel of the North in Gateshead so that they could conduct an act of witness that culminated in the flying of kites, each of which had the words 'Drop the debt' emblazoned on them. Normally on such occasions the organizers have sleepless nights, wondering if there is going to be enough wind to get the kites up, whereas the only problem on the day was getting the things down, such was the ferocity of the wind. As we sat in the church, one of those battered kites was propped up against the altar, acting as a focus for our vigil watch.

As we worked our way through the vigil service, with its three distinct themes of celebration, reflection and re-commitment, I could feel my mood changing quite dramatically, and by the time the service ended my spirits were as high and as strong as the kite had been earlier in the afternoon. Why? It was because what was revealed to me through that service was the deeper and ultimate reality that lies within God's created world, namely that justice is within the very heart of it and it is a justice that

longs for all God's people to be freed in the name of love. That is the ultimate reality revealed through Christ's resurrection and seen in that light every act of witness for debt relief or for any other issue is a theophany, be it a lapel chain worn, a postcard sent or a kite flown way up high in the sky. What each and every one of those acts reveals is the God of justice, of love and of peace at work in our world now.

So on one level this debate is not about how cogent our arguments are on this or any other issue of justice; it is about how clearly we are able to reveal the truth of the presence of God in our world, and whenever we do that we are participating in Christ's resurrection. This debate is not about getting and keeping the kites up in the sky through our own efforts and campaigning work; it is about revealing the far deeper truth that in Christ's resurrection we know that nothing can ultimately bring them down. That is the point. That is why we continue to bother. That is why there is no end to Christian hope or to Christian action.

The Archdeacon of Coventry (Ven. Mark Bryant): I think that we could perhaps do with some kites this afternoon or even perhaps some balloon modellers. There was a poor balloon modeller in Birmingham on the day of the G8 campaign demonstration in July 1998. Poor man: he did not know what had hit him when a whole lot of people started queuing up, trying to get him to make balloon hats with chains. All these people went off, into the demonstration in Birmingham, wearing these balloon hats in the shape of links. Perhaps he learned something from them.

I hope that the debate this afternoon will not become too serious. What we are dealing with are very important, serious and significant matters indeed but I hope that the debate will also reflect the enormous exuberance and enthusiasm that is found in so many parishes by people who, over the years, have campaigned for issues of trade, issues of development and dropping the debt; I hope that there will be something of that exuberance and commitment about this debate.

Yet what I have discovered, talking to people about this debate before I came to York, is that in very many parishes there are very exuberant people campaigning and banging the drum for these issues and yet who feel very lonely because in our churches, which so often seem to be concerned more about their own life than about anything else, issues of development, fair trade and debt seem to come low down the agenda.

I believe that there is the possibility of this debate and these motions being a real encouragement to them in showing them that the Church and its Synod is behind them in what they are doing, even if it often does not feel like that in the parishes.

The reason that I would like later on to propose the very small amendment in my name is just to make one small example of something that is going on which I think deserves our encouragement, our good wishes and our prayers. I hope that Synod will feel able to offer this small piece of encouragement to those who are going to Genoa as a way of showing encouragement to all those who are in the parishes, campaigning for

the things that this debate is all about. So I hope that when the time comes Synod will feel able to support this small amendment.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I welcome the speeches made by Daleep and Bishop Bernard and all that is in GS 1413 *Global View 2001* and GS Misc 640. I also recommend *Development Matters* to those who have not yet had an opportunity to read this excellent collection of papers. Once you have read it, do not put it on the shelf; hand it round your PCCs. It explains far better than I can the plight of the poor in developing countries, suffering from the way in which the developed world has taken advantage of them over the past centuries.

To put it in perspective you only have to read this week's *Church Times*'s front-page feature article about the poor living in the most disaster-prone areas in the world. Our link province of Melanesia contains the Solomon Islands: 41 per cent of the population have suffered from disasters in the past ten years. Just imagine England south of a line from the Wash to the Bristol Channel flooded out, with all the buildings flattened. It would knock our economy a bit sideways; it kills off fragile economies in developing countries. That is the lot of the poor: they live in these disaster-prone areas and they need our help, not just over debt relief but over improved trade rules.

The existing trade rules are a disgrace to anybody with any honesty or common sense. Total debt relief for the 50 most indebted countries to the UK, including all our World Bank and IMF debts, will cost each of us just less than £1 a week; a further £1 would do a lot of what Daleep asks us to do. Just think of that: two quid a week. It is not an awful lot out of many of our pockets, even those on pensions. Over the past ten years we have taken more back in debt repayments from Africa than has actually been invested there, so just think about that.

Our young observers up here take this thing more seriously than we do; they worry more about the suffering of the poor. Once the Church as a whole is seen to be more active, more of them will join and help us do something. When it comes to doing something, six weeks ago I was rung up out of the blue by an old friend who was cycling to Genoa and needed somewhere to kip in Chester, so I commandeered a local community centre, put them up last Sunday night, with the help of Alice and the two Olives fed them dinner, tea and breakfast and sent them on their way. You never know when you have got to do something.

Now we come to the tricky bit. I am the world development adviser for Chester Diocese. I am a member of the core group. I appeal to all you diocesan bishops sitting in the front there, and all your colleagues that you next noble, to give wholehearted and visible support to your world development advisers, who come in various guises from fully funded clergy to those who have a life cure and 'a little of their time will do for this' and the free members like me who do not cost you a *sou*. A bit more support will make the job a lot easier. Make sure that all your congregations know about *Global View 2001*, every last person in the pew, because 70 per cent of the population

are concerned about debt relief. Yes, 70 per cent are already on your side. There, Bishop of Selby, is your popular support.

I urge you all to support the motion.

Dr Helen Leathard (Blackburn): In general, I wish to support the emerging agenda set out in GS 1413, but I am speaking specifically to urge a closer look at section 6(i) of the document. Here I wish to urge that we avoid the potential pitfalls of overemphasizing the biomedical model of health. Instead, I believe that we need to encourage a holistic model that recognizes people as physical, mental, spiritual and social beings and seek to engender an approach to care that integrates the use of medicines within a paradigm of psycho-spiritual support that is appropriate to the local culture.

As a pharmacologist I also wish to raise awareness of the fact that many available medicines are not the magic bullet that was hoped for at the dawn of the pharmaceutical age. The balance between their beneficial and adverse effects can be dependent upon the level of ancillary treatment and other forms of care that are available to support those taking the medicines. We need to be aware that medicines used outside the Western environment for which they have been developed could be adverse: they could prolong the agony or they could introduce side effects which are minimal with nursing care and other help but which, in other environments, would provide real challenges, both to the sufferers themselves and to their carers (and so soon after lunch I will not mention the unpalatable side effects that many drugs have!).

I would like to think about prevention rather than perhaps short-term cures with drugs and urge very strongly support for vaccination. Those might be better routes.

In addition, many poor countries have cultures that will strongly support and favour the susceptibility to a positive response to the sort of healing touch that Jesus used. The recent predilection of our biomedical culture has been to disregard this and perhaps label it as placebo effect. Nevertheless, even in this country, research evidence is emerging that, especially in rural West Cumbria that I know about, in fact healing sessions based on the prayer of the practitioner and used as an adjunct to conventional therapy can produce amelioration of physical signs and symptoms. Perhaps even more important, these healing sessions provide a tremendous positive response in the ability to cope of both sufferers and their carers; and caring for the carers is a very important aspect of care.

So with these facts in mind I wish to contend that section 6(i) might be better drafted as follows: 'improve poor people's access to holistic health care that involves essential drugs by increasing the proportion of aid spent on health and social care to 20 per cent'.

I am not seeking to deny the value of drugs; I just want to urge caution in placing too

much reliance on them at the expense (because of *their* expense) of neglecting many other essential prerequisites of good health. Dr Mukarji and Bishop Bernard have respectively emphasized the importance of holism and spirituality; it seems that we are of one mind and together with the Archbishop of Canterbury. I hope that this has the support of the whole of Synod.

The Bishop of Hereford (Rt Revd John Oliver): I want to give a very warm welcome to this debate and these two reports, particularly to the essays in *Development Matters*. It is a fair bet that most members of Synod, granted the amount of paper that we have to receive, will not have read all the essays. May I commend in particular chapters 10 and 6? I want to speak mainly about chapter 6, on the environment, but first just a word about Claire Melamed's essay in chapter 10, and particularly the section at the end about means and ends, about the relationship between trade liberalization and poverty reduction, that complex and subtle relationship, and about the confusions and unintended consequences of some well-intentioned policies which end up by creating more problems than they solve. It is a wise essay and one that everybody should read carefully.

There are common ends and these are set out on page 94, common ends of poverty reduction, environmental sustainability and human rights protection; and if we are to achieve those ends we must beware of rigid ideology and we must have flexibility in the worldwide trade institutions that we support, so that we can achieve the desired and essential objectives without becoming ensnared by the ideological system which we have created, intending it to be a beneficial one but recognizing that in many cases it is demonic in its effects.

I want to turn now to chapter 6, a very important one, by David Gosling: 'Treading More Lightly on the Earth'. There is a very important relationship between development in its narrow sense – and many people who talk about development use that word in a very limited sense – and development which takes account of the whole of human experience, our responsibility towards the created order and to future generations: development which is truly sustainable. On pages 56 and 57 David Gosling has some very wise things to say about that.

He also talks about empowerment on page 55, making sure that decisions are taken locally but, to counter that perhaps rather optimistic, perhaps unrealistic talk about empowerment, there is an important paragraph on page 39, in the course of John Montagu's excellent chapter on the UK's aid programme, where he talks about the use of the phrase 'civil society'; he says that it is the 'fashionable new term for participatory development' but it is a phrase which:

often disguises the true pattern of unequal, unrepresentative and even corrupt local democracy which is always ready to pick up spare aid money. In areas of conflict or anarchy ... identifying genuinely sustainable development or effective NGO partners has been a challenge for DfID, the EU and aid agencies alike.

That is a realistic note about the awful problems which face anyone trying to enter into participatory arrangements with local leaders.

Incidentally that chapter is a remarkable one written by John Montagu who is himself, as the Earl of Sandwich, a distinguished member of the House of Lords. His loss from that House would be very serious; he is one of the great hereditary peers, one of those who make an enormous contribution, particularly in the sphere of aid, trade and development, a very wise man and someone to whom we owe a debt of gratitude.

May I now turn to a particular point about environment in relation to development? I am deeply indebted to Professor Michael Banner for having pointed out to me the subtle and complex interrelationship of three important and desirable objectives: the conservation of the environment – the protection of creation – as the first; second, dealing with poverty and establishing social justice; and, third, sustainable development.

Conservation of the environment/the protection of creation seems to argue for a moratorium on any development. We have already created an extremely dangerous position with greenhouse gases and climate change; we ought to do nothing more at all; but the desperate poverty of the developing world means that we must do something to meet the poverty and establish social justice, so we must move into a policy of development; but it must be sustainable development. If you think of those three objectives – conservation of the environment, sustainable development, the alleviation of poverty and the creation of justice – each impinges on the other in a complicated, subtle and potentially dangerous and damaging way. We need an open, intelligent, sensible debate about how we relate these three things to each other. This is an ethical, philosophical, theological and practical matter; I hope that there will be no simplistic character in the kind of statements that we make from this Synod but that we shall be wise in taking these complicated issues together.

Mrs Naomi Lumutenga (Canterbury): First of all, my heartfelt thanks to the Board for Social Responsibility for the two splendid reports. I am sure that we have all read them. Both are very informative broadly. In some cases, however, I feel that they tend to be a little bit defensive, especially in development matters. This is quite possibly because outcomes of debt relief and other things like that can be quite difficult to measure. However, this can be said for most things in sub-Saharan Africa; after all, where there is a high rate of illiteracy it is always going to be difficult to quantify things in terms of numbers. In spite of this I urge Synod to adopt the motion and get it on their other synod agendas, and to do so unapologetically.

I believe that most people in this country would like to give more help and perhaps see the debt dropped. However, many worry too much about the money ending up in the wrong hands. Indeed some take the view that African leaders will then buy more guns, fight more wars and all sorts of things like that. This is not helped by selective reporting in the press. I am asking members of Synod to go forward anyway, and I

would like to give some idea of the positive things that can happen if the right help is given.

Members have heard Uganda mentioned in passing. I would like to take the reference further, Uganda being my home country which I visit regularly. Lots of things have happened in Uganda, either directly due to debt relief or indirectly because of the discipline required under the debt relief preconditions. It is not a perfect situation yet but, on balance, a lot of progress has been made.

In GS 1413 there is a reference to debt cancellation. This is required to deliver real benefits to ordinary people. Take, for instance, primary school for all in Uganda. This had never happened before 1997 and I do not believe that it is by accident that it happened then. This is a good thing by any standards, but it has created new problems. The ratio of pupils to teachers, for instance, is 200 to 1. The age group in year one of enrolment ranges from 6 to 15. There is no classroom that can accommodate such numbers, no teaching resources. This is against the background that only part of the debt money has been released; the rest is therefore desperately needed.

Other benefits include the following: infant mortality has dropped from 147 to 103 per 1,000 since 1997. Mortality of mothers while delivering has dropped from 506 to 354 per 100,000. Of course there is a lot more to do. The gender balance is much better. (I have to say that there are more women in Cabinet in Uganda than there are in the United Kingdom.) There are many other projects still under way but they will not be finished nor will the above be sustained unless more aid is given and unless the debt is relieved entirely. We need road networks which mean that farmers can transport the product of their harvest by lorry rather than on their heads, and more lives can be saved in times of tragedy. There has been a completion of the hydro-electric power project which means that more people have access to electricity, fewer trees need therefore be cut, small children from rural areas can study at night and all the things that go with that. Vaccines and medicines, for instance, can be kept refrigerated. The benefits cannot be overemphasized.

Each one of us sitting here has a responsibility to keep these life-saving issues on the agenda of political and non-political institutions; if we do not, we will be letting down those who have no voice.

Mr Stuart Bell MP (Second Church Estates Commissioner, ex officio): I am very grateful to the Bishop of Selby for referring to Clare Short's speech to Synod in November 1998. I spoke to Clare before I came along to Synod today and she remembered very well the various challenges that she had laid down. One was to join battle to ensure that the world makes the greatest advance that it is possible to make to mobilize the worldwide political will necessary to implement development targets; and she wanted me to remind Synod – but of course she had not heard Bishop Bernard or Dr Mukarji – that in the world outside, in the Third World, as we call it, the developing world, where people are impoverished, where they have little regard or understanding of their

governments, where they are in effect disconnected from those governments, where they do not see much of the work of the non-governmental organizations, although they are doing a great deal of work, but where they do have this sense of hopelessness, then, as Bishop Bernard has said and as the Bishop of Selby and others have said, they do then turn towards the Church.

That Church may be Muslim or it may be Christian. Dr Mukarji talked about grass-roots faith communities; the Archbishop talked about faith-based communities; and it is in the Christian communities in these areas that there is the gospel of good news and hope that Bishop Bernard referred to. So Clare Short understood very well that it is to the Church that people turn in these situations and she wanted me to tell Synod that, to remind members of it, and to say how much the Government understand the role of the Church in these extraordinarily difficult situations.

Dr Mukarji pointed out that the development target of the international community is to cut by half the proportion of the world's population living in abject poverty by 2015, and he referred to promises that had been made in the past on these issues. In the World Bank's development report for 2001 the average income in the richest 20 countries is 37 times the average in the poorest 20, and the gap has doubled in the past 20 years. Approximately 1.2 billion people live in extreme poverty, and that was in 1998. We talk often and casually of the fact that these impoverished people live on less than a dollar a day, but the significant fact is that that was the case in 1987; we have gone back 15 years and we are still living with that level of impoverishment.

The Bishop of Selby referred to the Government's own document, *Eliminating Global Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*, and he laid down a challenge to the Government on this document. I will say on behalf of the Government, if I may, that we welcome this challenge and this debate and we welcome the opportunity of putting together the Government's document and this motion on the order paper, and I will make sure that it reaches the Secretary of State for the Environment first thing on Monday morning.

May I quote the Prime Minister on these matters? 'The new millennium offers a real opportunity to eliminate world poverty. This is the greatest moral challenge facing our generation.' We have heard a great deal today about what the Church can do, and the Archbishop has referred to this; the Church does not seek to hide away from a debate on this issue but wishes to confront the issue, again referring to Clare Short and the vital role that the Church plays. So what I would like to see is the Government and the Church coming together before Synod with the document, *Development Matters: Christian Perspectives on Globalization*, spoken to most eloquently by the Bishop of Hereford.

So how can we come together? How can Church and Government come together so that we make this debate a practical starting-point for attacking the many serious problems in the realistic fashion that we have heard mentioned today? I want to

commit the Government to this debate, with the Church, so that in our own small way we can do more than leave a simple footprint on the sand of time; we can change the lives of billions of people living in the kind of poverty that we have heard about today.

The Archdeacon of Coventry (Ven. Mark Bryant): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘At the end of paragraph (b) insert the words “and today send best wishes and the assurance of its prayers to the campaigners travelling to the forthcoming G8 meeting in Genoa”.’

The Bishop of Selby: I am grateful to the Archdeacon for this suggestion because this is another dimension of timeliness to the debate that we are having this afternoon. One cannot help just having a slight twinge of anxiety about sending good wishes to *all* the campaigners who might be travelling to Genoa because recent experience in Seattle and Gothenburg suggests that some of them perhaps do not deserve our support. I leave it to the good sense of the Synod to decide whether to accept this amendment.

Revd Dr Paul Roberts (Bristol): I read the commitments of *Global View 2001* with a mixture of admiration and growing unease: admiration because of the thoroughness with which they seek to take on primary causes of injustice in the present pattern of global economics, but unease because of the complexity of the presentation. We cannot pretend that economic systems which oppress the poorest are simple to understand yet, when it comes to pressure for change, experience of Jubilee 2000 should teach us that you can only motivate wide support if your message is simple and direct. This is particularly so when it comes to harnessing the support and imagination of younger people.

Political action in postmodern times does not seem to obey any of the old rules of single party, single policy or unified theory. Despite the frequent accusations that younger adults are politically passive, direct action and protest in the cause of single issues brings their political potential to realization, and this explains why so many people – the young and the not-so-young – lent their time and energies to the cause of Jubilee 2000.

Multinational corporations have learnt rapidly how to speak the new language of sign, style and signifier. They already know that the battle for public and political support is won and lost in the symbolic rather than the linguistic domain. It follows that the fight for global justice will also need to move to the symbolic domain if Churches and human rights and development organizations are to engage effectively with oppressive structures while also commanding broad-based support. The good news is that significant numbers of young people with a passion for a fairer world are already working in this new setting with the head-start of cultural sophistication that youth can give. A new critique of the global capitalist status quo is emerging, popularized by work such as Naomi Klein’s book *No Logo*.

The problem is that, without responsible voices in leadership, the energy behind single-issue action can be harnessed by groups whose violent strategies play into the hands of those whose interests are served by draconian reactive protection measures (and that has just been mentioned). We have seen since Seattle a gradual clamping-down on the scope for protest because of the violent actions of a minority.

The sort of detailed agenda outlined in the documents before us helps the Church and others to exercise responsible leadership in the cause of global justice, but effective leadership will only come through a process of decomposition as this agenda is broken down into points of inspiration and passion which strike the imagination hard. This is why we should think carefully before going ahead with the amendment.

This is not just about advertising; it is about finding a new language. Only when we find ourselves inhabiting the world of symbol and signifier will the Church find that it shares a common, passionate language for justice with younger people.

As part of this process of decomposition I believe that it is essential for justice and development agencies to talk with their younger fringe to discover those modes of symbolic communication which resonate with the passions and experience of younger people. They need to discover incipient grass-roots networks which are already tackling some of the assumptions of structural global capitalism. For example, during the 1990s a movement for open-source computer software grew up which is now challenging the technical hegemony of the Microsoft Corporation (and there might be a lesson there for big discussions with regard to TRIPS). Many who supported this open technology were young computer scientists whose dreams for a fairer world led them to question the secretive ownership of programme source code and overzealous protection of intellectual property which held back development by smaller nations' players. If Microsoft can be challenged by the dreams-turned-into-action of a network of young programmers, then others can be also.

I therefore encourage us as a Church and as a development organization to listen to young adults and to make sure that they help us play a critical part in bringing the cry for justice firmly into the landscape of our contemporary culture.

Dr Anna Thomas-Betts (Oxford): I am so pleased to have this opportunity to speak to the Synod about a matter dear to me, One World Week. It is actually mentioned in chapter 14 of *Development Matters*. It is about 20 years since I was first involved in introducing One World Week worship in our parish. The Mothers' Union then made it part of their annual programme through the world development movement. Slough now has a town-wide, one- or two-week-long celebration of One World Week.

I am keen on One World Week because it is a positive way of raising popular awareness, with a big emphasis on positiveness, all the exuberance that Mark Bryant spoke about. We all know how much negative sensitizing happens, intentionally or

otherwise. In One World Week we are acknowledging and celebrating the oneness of the world and it is good that we should occasionally do so.

One of the bits of education that I have had to perform in the parish for both clergy and people is that this is not about the Third World; it is about the one world, where what we do affects you and what you do affects us. We all affect each other profoundly, in terms of environment, for example, but in so many ways. It is important that we remember this, even for one week in the year. Drip by drip, people may begin to change their way of thinking. Changing minds is important if development is to matter, as the title of the BSR report suggests. The Church of England has long acknowledged this – see Charles Reed on page 21, for example. To be effective in development Government and not just individuals have to be persuaded to act. John Montagu on page 42 of the report says that it will be hard for the Government to act on every front, partly because of the huge demands placed on them and the inadequacy of their resources. In a democracy we persuade governments by demands from the people, and we achieve that by raising public awareness. I am sure that the Church's support for One World Week is and will continue to be a positive way of raising awareness and influencing development.

A small addendum: on page 134 Mark Oxbrow states that One World Week had serious funding difficulties at the end of 2000, but reports of the imminent demise of One World Week may be grossly exaggerated. Note 22 on page 152 is actually new information and it mentions 'significant funding' for OWW from the Department for International Development.

In his concluding paragraph Mark Oxbrow suggests that the diocesan world development officers' role should now be redefined. I am just a little baffled as I think that the two definitions 'development enthusiast' and 'evangelist of a transformational gospel' are merely two sides of the same coin. Can a Christian development officer help but be driven by the transformational gospel? To be relevant should not the transformational gospel be informed by pragmatic development issues?

Mr David Webster (Rochester): On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and lost.

Revd Simon Stokes (Norwich): – plus of course my companion, the Member for the Isle of Dogs! I am probably the only one that can tell this joke in Synod. The blind parachutist was asked, 'How do you know when you're near the ground?' 'Oh, it's simple. The lead goes slack.' Good news for the parachutist; not so good for the dog.

I would raise that question today. What is the good news and who is the good news for, as we look at this debate? One of the things about our gospel is the overwhelming generosity of God, the generosity that does not hold back. A couple of years ago I had the opportunity to go to Nepal with Interserve for a short time to look at what the Christian agencies were doing over there. One of the things that struck me was how, in Nepal's headlong passage to be like the West, they were taking on board materialism. Those members who read the *Daily Telegraph* will realize that it is official now: materialism does not bring happiness.

So I wonder, as we consider this debate, whether it will be just something to vote on this afternoon or whether we will take it to our hearts and into our lives. Yesterday, there was reference to J. John and his evangelism and his preaching on the Ten Commandments. We were reminded of how he talked about God First. I wonder if I could change the meaning of the letters of FIRST for us to think about the fact that we should Freely give. Also we should consider our Integrity. We also need to think about Reconciliation, the damage we have done to the developing world. You know, we have not got it right yet but so often we tell them that we have. The S is for Sharing; we have already heard this afternoon how the developing world has as much to give us as we have to give them. Finally, what about Tears? Do we shed tears with them? Do we cry with them over their pain, as they cry over ours?

I ask Synod to consider this afternoon whether this motion will be one just for the shelves or whether, as we go from here, we will truly have a concern, truly want to give outrageously in all ways to our brothers and sisters round the world.

Mr Mike Tyrrell (Coventry): Another even smaller amendment from Coventry, to add the words 'and investment' to the words 'distribution of resources'. One reason is the simple one: when we have resources we either distribute them and use them or we invest them for the development of further resources or to be used later. I am sure that it was not intended that we have one rule for one and not for the other. So it is meant to be an inclusive amendment.

It is also meant to be an encouragement to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group and to our investing Church authorities to bring this issue on to their agenda in a way that sometimes they seem not to have done or have perhaps pigeonholed in the 'too difficult to handle' category. There is complexity in this whole area; it is very important and very complex; but that is no excuse for complacency.

I want to look specifically at two areas where I think we can help and where our role as a Church can bring a link between how we invest our resources and how we deal with the very important issues in front of us. The first is our unique capacity through our mission agencies actually to be in dialogue with parts of the world that most of the rest of this country never ever think about. That is highly important. I was asked to talk at one of the internal meetings of a mission agency about ethical investment. I pointed out to them that if they had investments in a company which had interests in

an area of the world that they were serving, if they went to the chairman and managing director of that company they would have enormous credibility in being able to say that they were not only shareholders but they worked in the country and knew how it operated. I am sure that any self-respecting chairman or managing director would give them time and listen carefully.

Yet the difficulty in which that mission agency found itself was that the whole area of investment and business was foreign to them, was a completely different culture, even though they were both based in Britain; and I suspect that the problem for the investment managers is the same: that the mission agencies have a different culture. It is vital that we bridge the gap. If Hugh Wilcox says to me that I am asking for more researchers, I am not. I am asking for two things. One, that you put it on the agenda and tell us what you have done about it and, two, that you connect the sort of work that is being done by the BSR with the work that is being done by the ethical investment group in a constructive way.

The second area is shareholders' resolutions. There have been a number of shareholders' resolutions in the past few years on these issues, particularly with BP this last year, and it was through local people in Sudan, who pointed out what was happening with oil exploration in the area, pointed out that BP was a minority shareholder in that oil exploration, that some ideas behind the shareholders' resolutions began to be generated. Those resolutions usually do not get passed, but when you lose the battle you usually win the war because the company is on its guard then and is concerned to communicate and discuss and consider the wider applications. If we put the words 'and investment' in, the Church can truly say that it can link what it has in its resources in business with what we have on the agenda today.

Mr David Pearson (Norwich): I come from Great Yarmouth, a place recently and often featured in the national press, particularly with regard to the asylum seekers and their accommodation; but seldom, if anywhere, is there reported anything about the injustice and the consequence of the voucher system. Asylum seekers are not allowed to have cash or cash benefit.

Great Yarmouth, outside metropolitan areas, possibly has the highest concentration of asylum seekers in proportion to the indigenous population than any other community. There are more asylum seekers in Great Yarmouth than the rest of Norfolk put together, even though at the present time those offending hotels which were featured in the national press have been closed down and boarded up. Thinking of hotels, we are used to the luxury of hotels. Even here in this university, when it is used as a conference centre, we have a conference welcome pack of toiletries – little goodies, and we possibly have not even opened them and looked at what there is inside. Shoe shine, bath gel, shampoo, soap – things we take for granted. If you are an asylum seeker with no cash, however, soap becomes a valuable, expensive and almost impossible commodity to acquire in present-day Great Britain, and indeed in Great Yarmouth.

If there are public order offences between asylum seekers, it is usually over pieces of soap or over the way in which their vouchers are used up, because they are limited and cannot be exchanged for cash in shops. It makes for squabbles and difficulties for them. What can we do about it? We can support the motion and paragraph 24 for a global view. It is there to make people aware of the difficulties and inequalities of the voucher system.

In Great Yarmouth itself we try, through an ecumenical group, to alleviate the poverty caused to people living in this country with no cash. In our parish church of St Nicholas – which claims to be one of the largest or *the* largest parish church in the country – we have plenty of space and on Wednesday mornings we have a free clothes market for asylum seekers to obtain clothing. We sell some items of clothing, at very low cost, to the unemployed. That provides small amounts of cash which can be used to buy toiletries and soap, which can be distributed to asylum seekers.

For women asylum seekers it is even more important, because their ability to acquire the appropriate sanitary items is almost impossible. They are humiliated. The voucher system does not enable them to acquire the modern requisites that they need. There is a form that they can fill up: a form that takes three working days to get anywhere. If there is a bank holiday in between, therefore, you might as well forget the form. This makes for further indignity and humiliation to women. It underlines once again the second-class status of women, particularly if they are asylum seekers.

Out of all this in Great Yarmouth, however, we have found that the Spirit works and moves in wonderful ways. One of the asylum seekers has been so moved that they have changed their faith, which was particularly strong to them. They have turned to Christ through baptism and confirmation. For obvious reasons, their identity needs to be protected, but as a parish and as a community we are greatly moved by that action, following what they saw that we were able to do within our own limited resources.

I would urge members to vote for this motion and to do all that they can to persuade this Government to abolish the voucher system, which is unjust and causes stigmatization and discrimination. It is something to which we need to give our deepest consideration.

Revd George Kovoov (Birmingham): I welcome and support the motion. I think that an investment of theology would be helpful. Any document from the Church must have a clearly expounded theological basis for development. Is development only about economics? What are the kinds of model of development that we might look at? I welcome and strongly recommend development matters in missionary training institutions, because I believe that in the curriculum of many of our mission training centres we do not deal with development strongly enough.

Even in this book, however, I am not completely satisfied with a theology of development. I believe that as Christians we have something to offer here. There must

be a much greater investment in terms of our theological thinking and reflection, both from the text and from our experience on the ground, namely our experience as a mission agency working in many parts of the world, and particularly from the experience of the suffering Churches of the Sudan – the God of the poor.

It is remarkable that more often than not, when we go to the refugee camps, they are not expecting aid in material terms; they want to be encouraged and strengthened in the faith. They have surprised us by asking for educational resources to teach their children. When we look at their worship and listen to their songs, the theology that emerges out of the songs of the suffering Church is something that we need to listen to and acknowledge within any coherent strategy for development.

Having lived and worked in India for the greater part of my parochial ministry, working amongst the poorest of the poor, I recognize that any attempt to take God away from the equation leaves people that much poorer. It was the poor who helped me recognize that I could bring in all kinds of investments – be they money, human resources, materials – but if I did not bring the God of the Christian scriptures and the gospel of Jesus Christ into the equation, they suffered a lack of hope.

The real challenge for those of us involved in mission and in development, therefore, is the question of sustainability and viability. A few years ago, just before the Lambeth Conference, the Church of England invited a number of bishops from the various parts of the Communion to meet. The greatest challenge they shared with the mission agencies was, ‘What do we do with these white elephants? How can we sustain mission and how can we ensure that the nature and the future of mission is viable?’ That is equally a challenge to the development world.

Having worked for many years in India for the development world, I can take you to villages the length and breadth of India where someone has had a fantastic idea; has thought that a marvellous building was needed, and has put that building in the middle of the most inhospitable terrain. Large amounts of Deutschmarks were used, and the villages and local community did not have a clue why those buildings were there or what they were meant to be used for and, today, they are ghost buildings.

When we talk about development and investments, I believe that there is a prophetic call to the Church to ask what is the nature of the investment we bring into the equation. How do we make sure that the participation of those whom we are seeking to develop actually encourage and develop us in the process? Any conversation on investment must be around a core partnership where all parties are involved in the understanding of the investment concerned.

Mr Mike Tyrrell (Coventry): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (c) after the word “distribution” *insert* the words “and investment”.’

The Bishop of Selby: I think that this improves the motion. I accept the amendment.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and carried.

Canon Dr Brian Chalmers (Canterbury): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘In paragraph (d) after the word “therefore” *insert* “(i)” and at the end *insert* the words “and (ii) encourage discussion with business about the wider social contract and corporate responsibility of companies in pursuit of the common good”.’

Again, I hesitate to stand up and speak. I hesitate to speak on behalf of big business. In the folklore of our current debate big business, I suppose, is a bit like the troll from the Bible study this morning. Big business is seen as the troll which guards the bridge and the main purpose is to stop people crossing to the promised land. I want to suggest that big business, like the troll, is really God in disguise. It is a troll which needs to be wrestled with. I therefore add my amendment, so that we deal not just with Government but also with business.

About 20 years ago, as a research scientist, I went as a visitor to that great conference of the World Council of Churches, *Towards a Just, Participatory and Sustainable Society*. It was a wonderful conference, and I carry that glimpse of heaven around with me. At the time, I was the chaplain in one of the earliest business schools founded in this country, at Cranfield. It was run by a very good Christian man called Peter Forrester. His reason for running it, he said quite simply, was, ‘I have seen so much bad management, I want to improve it.’ By ‘bad’ he meant inept, not immoral. In those days the MBA students were very ambitious and hard-nosed. They did not know what the word ‘ethics’ meant and they did not study it. Their own personal ethical programme, I suppose, was somewhere between Darwinian survival of the fittest and straight psychopathy!

In the 20 to 25 years since then, things have changed. Business has been extraordinarily successful within certain criteria. GNP has gone up in many parts of the world. Standards of living, mortality rates, longevity – all these kinds of measures have improved. We can complain about winners and losers but they would say, ‘Without us, there wouldn’t be any winners – so stop whingeing about winners and losers.’

I agree that, if you measure it against the just, participatory and sustainable society, it is more difficult – particularly sustainability. You and I know that the bottom line is that

we cannot carry on for very much longer, enjoying this standard of living just amongst ourselves. We certainly cannot have this standard of living for all the world, delivered the way it is being delivered at the moment. If we were to wrestle with God with the earnestness in which we were encouraged this morning, and we persuaded him overnight to give everyone our standard of living, in about twelve months' time we would really be in trouble. There is a lot to be done.

I have just spent three months working back at the business school and writing a report, encouraging them to put business ethics and corporate responsibility as a core part of their MBA programme. Things have changed quite a lot in the business school. The present director left a very successful career with British American Tobacco because his Roman Catholic faith thought that it was rather a waste of his gifts. The present director of the MBA programme is not only female but comes from the public sector. Business schools are not what they used to be.

One of the first centres for ethics studies was set up at the London Business School, which has a reputation for being very hard-nosed. Warwick, one of the leading business schools of Europe, has a centre for development studies as part of its business school. All companies now have ethical statements, and are having to develop internal ethical auditing. In the United States you cannot now run a business programme of any kind, that is accredited by the Government, unless it has built-in ethical and corporate responsibility.

I am not suggesting that everything has been done. Corporate responsibility is not just about giving small change to local communities. It is not just about using staff you do not know what to do with on secondment to help out, as it were, voluntary organizations. It is more than that. Please do not ignore them, however; please work with them; please help them to sort out a social contract, a corporate responsibility programme, which will deliver what we all want. Do not assume that the troll has troll-like features.

The Chairman: Can I be a troll at this moment and intervene to say that you have come almost to the end of the bridge? You have one more second.

Revd Brian Chalmers: The most fearsome thing I have seen lately was George W and his oil-backers, congratulating one another on his appointment. He reassured them that CO₂ increased evolution was safe in his hands. We need to fight on both fronts.

The Bishop of Selby: This amendment very usefully extends the scope of the motion. In his speech, Dr Chalmers has suggested interesting and new ways in which the kind of communication that the amendment suggests might be conducted. I am happy to accept it.

Mr Gavin Oldham (Oxford): Larry Summers was secretary of the Treasury in the USA and he is just about to be president of Harvard University. On 19 June he delivered a

lecture to the Stock Exchange in London about business and globalization.

I will summarize the things that he said, because I believe that they bring a lot to this debate. The first thing is that business brings tremendous hope for global improvement. Technology carries development throughout the Third World, and therefore carries with it the ability to improve the standard of living. He pointed out that globalization breaks down monopolies; it introduces competition; it reduces costs and increases choice. He showed how the awesome power of the markets introduces decentralization, less emphasis on control and co-ordination, and more emphasis on incentives. He did say, however, that business does need certain imperatives in the global environment really to work.

First, it needs fiscal discipline. It means that governments must direct their spending efficiently. Secondly, he said that it requires good capital markets. In that context, I am not sure that clause 18 on page 11 of GS 1413 is very helpful in that regard. Thirdly, he said that it requires investment in education and in basic science. Fourthly, he said it required a network of laws and procedures for property rights, to permit contract enforcement and a basis for exchange.

What it all leads to is that trade and business development can improve the standard of living. I will just read one or two of his sentences, where he was talking about the recent process at Seattle and Gothenburg. I think that it shows the importance of trade and business here.

Some part of these protests reflects utterly misguided moral energy. It is not the right moral thing to do *vis-à-vis* Africa or India to say to people who choose to take jobs exporting to Europe or to the United States, in conditions that many of us would find unacceptable, that that opportunity should be taken away from them by us because we think that it is in their interests to remove that opportunity from them.

The talk illustrates what business can do. I have half a dozen copies, which I will leave downstairs with the desk and anyone who is interested is welcome to take one.

Mr David Webster (Rochester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

The amendment was put and carried.

The Bishop of Rochester (Rt Revd Michael Nazir-Ali): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘At the end of paragraph (c) *leave out* the word “and” and after paragraph (d) *insert*:

- “(e) urge that Export Credit Guarantees are only provided for sustainable projects which do not add further unpayable debt to already indebted countries;
- (f) recommend that considerations of good government, accountability and fiscal reform should be part of every bilateral or multilateral development agreement; and
- (g) ask that education and health for the poorest should be priorities in any development agenda”.

From my time at CMS and his at USPG, the Bishop of Selby and I have been members of a mutual admiration society. The passage of time has not damaged the good relations that exist between us. Not only for that reason, however, do I welcome the motion before us. Not only the motion but the careful preparation behind it and particularly the accompanying literature, as has already been pointed out by the Bishop of Hereford and others. Some of the material in the literature is also to be found in my amendment. I believe that it should not be found only in the literature but also in the motion itself.

Coming to my amendment and first of all to (e), it is well known that British companies can strike deals with overseas governments and sometimes the private sector, or both, and the UK Government agree to underwrite these deals. Considerable leverage would be exercised if such underwriting were limited to socially and economically beneficial projects. If companies wish to undertake other projects, they should of course be able to do so but it would be at their own risk and they would not expect compensation from the taxpayer.

As far as (f) is concerned, while much aid has been misdirected and linked with British trade and economic interest – we must not forget that – much has also been wasted in shoring up corrupt regimes, on prestigious but inappropriate projects, and George Kavouras has mentioned some. Most of all, it has led to dependency, and we heard something about that this afternoon – dependency and a reluctance to finance public services through an efficient taxation system. Countries like Uganda and Pakistan, which are overhauling their fiscal systems, are reporting much-improved debt repayment schedules, for example, and better provision for public services.

Coming finally to (g), my experience of even the most well-managed development projects has been that they often do not touch the very poor; that they often do not deal with bonded labour, the landless, nomadic communities and so on. Sometimes deliberately they seek to improve further the lot of the comparatively well-off, in the hope of a trickle down effect which may be described in terms of job creation, better infrastructure, training opportunities, and so on. It is vital for us to support those governments and non-governmental organizations which are working directly with the poorest – and I underline ‘directly’ – particularly in the fields of appropriate education and health.

Prebendary Horace Harper (Lichfield): On a point of order, Chairman, I believe that it is within your discretion to break this single amendment into three. I suggest that the credibility of the Synod would be better served if we voted on each paragraph independently.

The Chairman: I will ask the Bishop of Rochester to respond to that before I seek the mind of Synod.

The Bishop of Rochester: My amendment is a single amendment for good reason, because the three hang together; but of course I cannot fetter your discretion.

The Chairman: I have now joined a mutual admiration society! Are you going to press your point of order?

Prebendary Horace Harper: Yes, Chairman, if I may.

The Chairman: Does the Synod wish this amendment to be taken in parts? Can we have a show of hands? That is lost.

The Bishop of Selby: The admiration is very warm from this end, Chairman! The Bishop of Rochester, as always, argues very cogently for his points. It does create a bit of a problem, however, for the structure of this motion in relation to GS 1413 in which, albeit not so powerfully argued, the Bishop of Rochester's points do appear. His (e) appears in paragraph 17 of *Global View 2001*; his (f) in paragraph 9, and his (g) in paragraph 5(ii).

I am therefore concerned about the shape of the motion and about picking out from GS 1413 these three very important elements from what is already a carefully constructed framework as background to this motion. I leave it to the wisdom of the Synod to decide.

The Bishop of Worcester (Rt Revd Peter Selby): I hope that somebody will found another mutual admiration society that I may be allowed to join, because I might not be admitted to the presently existing one.

I regret the decision of the Synod not to encourage our Chairman to allow three separate votes, because I am seriously concerned about paragraph (f), not merely in itself but in the effect it will appear to have on the character of the resolution as a whole.

I have just come from an international ecumenical conference on globalization convened at Ushaw College, where we tackled, with difficulty but with honesty, the positive and negative aspects of globalization as it affects the poorer nations of the world. One of the aspects which was referred to on a number of occasions was the increasingly competitive nature of taxation. National governments become increasingly

less free to establish their own policies because of the pressure of what was described by one delegate as 'the new gospel of tax-cutting', which prevents poorer nations making the progress which might be appropriate in their situation. What worries me about the reference in (f) to fiscal reform is that it will generally be heard as a reference to fiscal reform in directions of which developed, wealthier countries approve. It will therefore be heard as an attempt to put upon the poorer nations of the world policies which are becoming increasingly questioned in our own country. It is my reading of the situation that more and more people are questioning the orthodoxy that low public borrowing and low taxation are what we most need at this particular point.

It concerns me, therefore, that there should be included in this resolution a paragraph which appears to put upon poor countries remedies which are at least questionable in our own, and certainly questionable for many of them, lest it should give the appearance that the resolution as a whole is concerned to act in a paternalistic way, promoting the assumption that we know best. It will be likely to colour the way people read even apparently harmless expressions like 'good government', because it will be assumed that what is meant is the kind of government to which we are accustomed.

Had it been broken into three, I would have voted for the first and last paragraphs of the Bishop of Rochester's amendment and opposed the middle one. As it is, I have no alternative but to ask the Synod to oppose the amendment as a whole and rely on what is in the report, which makes most of the important points in this amendment.

Revd Peter Townley (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): I am delighted that the amendments by Mike Tyrrell and Brian Chalmers have been carried and I very much welcome the Bishop of Rochester's amendment. One of the greatest influences on my life at theological college was Canon Benaiah Poggo, a priest from the southern Sudan. His son Anthony is at Oxford at the moment, and he had the great courage to speak recently at BP's annual general meeting.

The Sudan has been mentioned several times in this debate. At present the Christians in the southern Sudan are having a terrible time. Easter was more or less cancelled in the Sudan this year. I hope that I am not out of order, but I cannot find any other hook upon which to hang this particular procedural coat. I wonder if it would be possible for this Synod to send a message of prayerful support to our brothers and sisters in the Sudan?

The Chairman: I am grateful for the comment, but you were out of order.

Canon Stephen Taylor (Durham): I am opposing the three additional amendments, not so much for the detail which they contain, which having heard the Bishop of Rochester I support, but for the sake of the simplicity and accessibility of the whole resolution, particularly for the parishes to which we are encouraged to take these issues back.

If we continue to add more words, it may reverse the effect we wish to have, namely that we try to make these issues as accessible as possible to ordinary people in our parishes, on our PCCs, in our churches and in the local communities at large.

We have heard a number of people speaking, particularly on the last amendment, about the desirability to involve businesses. Much of the discussion has been on the bigger businesses that affect the global markets. The reality for our country, however, is that most people are employed in small businesses. Small businesses have a greater likelihood of being influenced by our parishes, by our industrial chaplaincies, by our local parish priests visiting them and taking an interest in them. They should not be disenfranchised from this argument, for many of the local businesses on our doorstep would value opportunities to be involved in some issues. The local parish church can often give them an entry, through the projects they support and the mission partners with which they are linked. We often know about how to access the very poor through the conversations, partnerships and friendships we have within Third World countries.

For the sake of simplicity and accessibility, therefore, I would suggest that this motion be kept as short as it can be. I would also encourage all Synod members, when they return to their parishes and dioceses, to put these issues on the agenda and to enable imaginative, creative and practical opportunities for people to engage in support, friendship and partnership with the poor.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

‘That the question be now put.’

This motion was put and carried.

Mr Brian McHenry (Southwark): On a further point of order, Chairman, I wonder whether or not you would reconsider the question of the division of the text under SO 23? It is arguable that the previous point of order was premature, because the Standing Order does begin, ‘Before putting a question to the vote, the Chairman may direct that the vote be taken separately on the text divided.’ It is arguable therefore that this is the right point at which we should consider the division of the text, now that we have heard the arguments for and against the division of the text.

The Chairman: Thank you for that suggestion. It obviously has merit, because we have heard the speeches for and against.

The Bishop of Rochester: I would like to comment about the Bishop of Worcester’s remarks. I think that he misunderstands the intention behind (f). I have not before been accused of paternalism, but of course I am open to new accusations.

Good government applies to both parties. I mentioned in my speech how it might

apply to the British Government as well as to other governments. As regards fiscal reform, I think that he misunderstands my concern, which has to do with the efficient collection of taxation. In a country like Pakistan, which obviously I know and perhaps know better even than the Bishop of Worcester, only 1 million out of a population of 140 million pay income tax. This cannot make for sustainable development.

The Chairman: I suspect nevertheless that the mind of the Synod is that this should be split. I will therefore take chairman's prerogative and do that.

Mr John Freeman (Chester): I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

The first part of the amendment was put and carried.

The second part of the amendment was put and lost, 82 voting for and 116 against.

The third part of the amendment was put and carried.

The Bishop of Selby, in reply: I am immensely grateful for all who have contributed to this debate through a long, hot afternoon, and you would not want me to prolong it by commenting on every one of the contributions. This debate will, I am sure, be a huge source of encouragement to people in dioceses who are engaged with issues of this kind. To pick up speeches that have been made, one thinks particularly of Anna Thomas-Betts and the One World Week; also Mr Freeman and the world development advisers, upon whom we depend immensely and whom the BSR is glad to support.

We will do our very best to pick up the extremely interesting suggestion made by the Bishop of Hereford about holding together conservation, justice and sustainable development and working through the interaction between them. Members of the Synod might like to bear that in mind when it comes to the debate on finance on Monday, and not cut back what the BSR has in order to do such things.

The last comment that I would want to make relates to things that several people have said, for instance about empowering and doing that by making it possible for decisions to be made as close as possible to the point at which they will be implemented. It takes me back to Dr Hargrave's speech at the beginning of the debate. I do not think that any of us had intended that this debate, the motion, or the documents which support it, are about what we do for other people. If it is for anybody, it is what we do, so to speak, for ourselves in terms of trying to be faithful to the gospel and the values of the kingdom. As far as the motion is concerned – I did not have a chance to comb the documents in the light of what Dr Hargrave had said –

there is nothing there that suggests anything other than the kind of partnership which he was advocating.

We certainly ought not to agree, and I think that nothing in this debate has suggested that any of us agree, with the doctrine which is at large in the world: that those who have most know best. That we disavow.

Mr Peter Smith (St Edmundsbury and Ipswich): On a point of order, Chairman, given the importance of this, would you order a count by Houses?

The Chairman: At this stage I think not, unless I am persuaded otherwise. Time is moving on and the Synod is not as large as it sometimes is, and therefore we may have a distorted picture sent.

The motion was put and carried in the following amended form:

‘That this Synod

- (a) commend *Development Matters* to the dioceses and to the wider Church for further study;
- (b) call for global political and economic action, as set out in *Global View 2001*, with a view to strengthening the position of the world’s poor;
- (c) encourage the Church to advocate and practise justice in the distribution and investment of its resources;
- (d) recognize that current trading relations and lending practices have exacerbated the acute economic and social problems facing developing countries and therefore (i) urge Her Majesty’s Government to give priority in trade negotiations to the needs of the poorest communities and (ii) encourage discussion with business about the wider social contract and corporate responsibility of companies in pursuit of the common good;
- (e) urge that Export Credit Guarantees are only provided for sustainable projects which do not add further unpayable debt to already indebted countries; and
- (f) ask that education and health for the poorest should be priorities in any development agenda.’

THE CHAIR *The Dean of Wakefield (Very Revd George Nairn-Briggs)* took the Chair at 5.15 p.m.

Private Member's Motion

Third World Debt

Mr Roger Godin (Southwark): I beg to move:

'That this Synod

- (a) noting with regret that at the end of the year 2000 AD wholly insufficient progress had been made towards the relief of the Third World debt burden; but
- (b) recognizing the complexities of some of the issues and acknowledging the lead already given by Her Majesty's Government,

encourage Her Majesty's Government and politicians of all parties to continue to press for urgent action by the more affluent nations to cut debt, if necessary including unilateral cancellation of debt by the United Kingdom.'

Some 20 years ago I was involved in managing the finances of an exciting Third World irrigation project. It was planned to bring fertility to an arid tropical desert zone. When the contract was signed there was great rejoicing in the streets of the city, and the young people carried banners saying '*Nuestro futuro es seguro*' – 'Our future is secure'. I think that members here can understand something of their excitement, as they foresaw that what was previously desert and useless would now be fertile and giving income. 'Our future is secure', they thought.

So is it not sad that it is more than likely to have left them in a worse position than when they started? They did not know it, but the only people whose future was certainly made better by that project were the lenders and multinational corporates. It is a story repeated across the whole of the underdeveloped world, which for brevity I will call the Third World from now on.

I do not believe that Third World debt by itself is bad: it can often be the only way to improve things. It is rather like those of us with houses, who have had to go into mortgage debt, believing that we can repay from future finances. Many of the 1970s loan projects were for infrastructure development, like dams and roads, for industrialization and technology, that should have been self-funding. However, I gather that as many as 75 per cent of those early projects turned out to be unproductive, leaving debts without income. This was compounded by escalating interest rates in the 1980s oil crisis. Then many prices of commodities, on which the repayment capacity had been based, also fell and, as an example of globalization not working, some

industrialized countries put high taxes on many agricultural products, leaving the Third World farmers outpriced, often by the very countries lending them the money.

Then, for the very people who should have benefited, came the stringency of the euphemistically called 'Structural Adjustment Programmes'. A little while ago I read this doggerel:

They said that our spending would have to be cut
 So the government hospital ended up shut.
 Expenditure targets were brought into line
 And the schools lost their staff, but the army was fine.
 So our kids stay at home and we fear for their health
 While the generals play with our national wealth.
 And we're sick and we're tired and disgusted;
 And we are the structurally adjusted.

Developing countries are still paying billions back to the West, instead of reaping the economic benefits of their projects.

Having read the report of the November 1996 debate, when I was not here, I learned that Canon Susan Cole-King herself said:

It is like a game of Monopoly where the owner of all the rich properties ... has to keep on lending money to the other players in order to keep the game going – only, of course, it is not a game. Millions of human lives, especially those of children, are being sacrificed in this scandalous and lethal game.

Most of those suffering nations spend more on debt than on education or health care, leaving their high levels of illiteracy and mortality in place.

The fact that this motion attracted so many signatures so quickly is, I hope, an indication that in the main I am, as it were, preaching to the converted. We effectively agree that this is sin – some people call it grotesque and obscene – and therefore it must be bad. If so, however, what about effective repentance? We must continue to wrestle with the problem and risk – taking the pitch from the Bible study this morning – being made lame for the kingdom of God.

Fortunately, the BSR paper and the very lengthy contributions earlier this afternoon save us from the need to repeat statistics and the danger of sinking further under them. It suffices to give one example. While this Synod has been sitting, over 24,000 children will have died from starvation, deprivation or avoidable disease. Let us be clear that not all of this is due directly to the result of the debt burden, but we do not need to be macroeconomists, nor international aid specialists to know that billions are coming

back to the richer nations in interest alone which might otherwise have been spent on avoiding just those things.

As I have researched this matter, talked to aid agencies, and surfed the Net – and in fact almost drowned under the amount of material available – I have become even more conscious that this is no easy issue. Just now, I advisedly said the money 'might otherwise have been spent' because there undoubtedly is the problem of waste and corruption. Some funds given for economic aid of this sort have been siphoned off to Swiss banks. In passing, I wonder if perhaps the same reparation pressures could be put on Swiss banks as they have been for the Nazi regime repayments?

Even debt relief can have unwanted effects. So, in one sub-Saharan country with a legacy of corruption from the previous regime, the loan had gone to the leading tribe, but the repayments were exacted from the other tribes. By cancelling this sort of debt it may be said that corruption is seen apparently to be endorsed or unpunished.

Thoughtful reflection can give rise to many other objections also, like 'Cancelling debt must be linked to democratization'; 'There should be a monitoring against corruption and protection rackets'; 'It must be shown that somehow the poor will benefit and not the corrupt'. Yes, of course all these things are important; but I want to suggest to us, as a group of Christian people, that debt relief should not be limited because of waste or corruption in past and present regimes. For us, it should surely be viewed as a clear expression of the unconditional debt relief that we have received through Jesus – a principle he expressed not only in parable but by his life and death and resurrection.

Hence my motion, which I ask the Synod to debate as much with the heart as with the mind. It refers first to the 'wholly insufficient progress' being made by the end of Jubilee year. Any who doubt that need only refer to pages 4 and 5 of the BSR paper, and also many other sources of information.

The motion recognizes the complexities, such as I have described earlier. We must not be accused of being naïve or, as the Bishop of Hereford put it, simplistic. The motion acknowledges the lead already given by governments. The names of Ken Clarke, Clare Short and, more recently, Gordon Brown come to mind. Is it not great that we actually need amendments to this motion, drafted only in November, to make it relate to the progress made since that date? Things are happening, and we can actually be proud of the UK lead.

As I have talked to those intimately involved with debt issues I have been heartened to hear of the continuous efforts of our politicians and negotiators, to the extent that those efforts apparently result in the eyes of the other nations being glazed over, as the UK push this case again. The motion therefore goes on to encourage politicians of all parties to go on going on, pressing other affluent nations to follow the lead.

It happens that our debate is very timely. It is today that the finance ministers of the G8 are meeting, and the Genoa meeting is coming up shortly. Frankly, I doubt in all humility that all those good people are waiting with bated breath for the decision of this Synod before they make theirs. Carrying this motion, however, will give a clear message of encouragement from a new Synod to a newly elected Parliament – with whatever faults it might have – that we hope will encourage them to continue their excellent example.

I fear that, in the time allotted, I have had to be brief, and indeed superficial. What I hope is that subsequent speakers will flesh out the bones, deal with the more complex issues and give information where I have not.

As the Archbishop of Cape Town said on this issue earlier this year, at the Primates' meeting which has already been referred to, 'We are running out of time.' My prayer is that, by talking about it a little – even though it may be, as John Barton said this morning, from a great height – we will at least encourage the key influencers to be proactive on the world stage.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of five minutes.

Revd Ian Stamp (Manchester): This is my maiden speech. I had considered coming to this group of sessions to squander my maidenhead, so to speak, on the apportionment review: coming from a diocese like Manchester, I feel that it is important in the apportionment of our common purse. However, I will try to speak in that debate, though not any longer as a virgin!

Looking at the agenda, one of the other items I considered was *Working with the Spirit*. What is that about? It seems almost as though that title is seeking to assure us of its own truth. 'Care of Cathedrals Measure' – with apologies to deans and provosts – (*The Chairman rang the bell*)

The Chairman: Mr Stamp, I am glad to hear what you are not speaking on, but I would like to hear you speak to the motion.

Revd Ian Stamp: I am coming, Chairman. With apologies to deans and provosts, all the cathedrals in the world are not worth a single human life, and you cannot eat bishops. At least, some of them would be a little chewy.

I chose to speak on this debate because this, with the one before it, seems to be the most important of the whole group of sessions, if not the quinquennium. I challenged my son, who deliberately refused to vote at the last general election, on his not voting; he said, 'The problem with elections is that a politician always wins.'

Much of what we have talked about today is likely to be lost in the porridge of political vagaries that form our national political life. Important though the last debate

was, the reason I chose to speak in this one is because this one speaks of direct action and whether or not it is acted upon will be clearly seen in our nation's life.

We have already heard it said that whilst we speak people are dying, because of their indebtedness to us. Whilst we enjoyed our lunch today people were dying, because of their indebtedness to us. Jubilee 2000 was a wonderfully biblical concept that enlivened all sorts of people, but 2000 was simply not a year of jubilee for most of the world's poor. To drop the idea now, to cease the pressure, would be a tragedy. Thank God for the improvements made already, but we need to drop the debt now. The irony is that, as a nation, we shall not even feel it – unilaterally if necessary, wastefully if we have to.

We have heard all the excuses about the money falling into the wrong hands. If trickle down theories of social improvement have been good enough for the poor of this nation over the last decades, what is wrong with those theories for the poor in other countries – and, by God's grace, wasted on us in every breathing moment of our lives? We need to drop the debt now. We need to send a loud and unequivocal message to our Government. How dare we even discuss these issues whilst we continue to collect debt at the cost of lives in many parts of our world?

I support the motion and invite the Synod to do the same.

Ms Jacqueline Humphreys (Bristol): I speak to the amendment standing in my name, as good news. You will see that the part I wish to delete is that which says 'if necessary including unilateral cancellation of debt by the United Kingdom'.

The motion was framed by Roger Godin in November. In December we had a fantastic answer to prayer and, as near as you can get there in political reality, the Government has unilaterally cancelled the UK debt. As from 1 December last year all debt payments to the UK from 41 of the world's poorest countries have either stopped or are now being held in trust for the day they can be returned to the country they came from, to fund poverty reduction. This is what Gordon Brown said on 2 December at the final Jubilee 2000 rally in London.

Because poverty is so great and the need so urgent, neither you nor I want the richest countries to benefit any more from the debts of these poorest countries. So I can say to you and to all 41 HIPC countries on behalf of the British Government I will renounce our right to receive any benefit from the historic debt owed by all the 41 most indebted countries. From today, all debt payments received by us will be held in trust for poverty relief, paid when poverty reduction plans are agreed and backdated to this day.

Unsurprisingly, he received a standing ovation. All bilateral debt between the UK and the 41 HIPC countries has now effectively been cancelled: either truly cancelled or

held in trust to be paid back, once the country concerned had, for example, ceased armed conflict or put in place a poverty reduction plan. This is to ensure that the debt relief that has been promised goes genuinely to fund poverty reduction and does not go into buying armaments to promote the civil war or whatever other difficulties the country is currently experiencing. It is not politically possible to cancel some of those debts completely now, but the reality is that we, the British people, will not benefit from a single penny of them.

The other G7 countries have made similar agreements to cancel almost 100 per cent of their bilateral debt, and so have Australia and Norway. Things are moving forward. However, the other part of my amendment is to insert the words 'particularly debt held by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund'. That is because, sadly, there is still some bad news. The first part of the bad news is about delivery. \$100 billion of debt was pledged to be cancelled under the Cologne initiative, announced in 1999. Any of you who were there, campaigning on the side of the river, will remember that fantastic announcement. Of that \$100 billion, \$12 billion have been delivered. Only 22 of the 41 countries identified by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund as in need of debt cancellation have yet received any. Where debt cancellation has taken place, life for the poor is improving. We heard earlier from Naomi Lumutenga about the improvements in Uganda; in particular, the doubling of the number of children in primary education. Another example is in Mozambique, which now has \$500,000 to spend, immunizing children against diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough. On average the 22 countries that do have debt relief are paying 27 per cent less in debt payments a year.

There is one bizarre matter, however. According to World Bank figures, two HIPC countries – and those are Highly Indebted Poor Countries, recognized by the World Bank as potentially eligible for debt relief – are paying more, having reached decision point and gaining debt relief, than they were before.

There is also still \$200 billion of uncanceled debt; 34 per cent of the uncanceled debt in the 22 countries who have received debt relief is owned by the World Bank and the IMF. If you look at the very well-produced document GS Misc 640, the chart there shows the percentage of debt that is still held by the World Bank and the IMF. The World Bank and the IMF are the leading players in the multilateral debt – (*The Chairman rang the bell*)

Mr David Webster (Rochester): It was my privilege in Synod almost five years ago to move a motion very similar to that of Roger Godin, in particular endorsing the aims of Jubilee 2000, then in its earliest days, to work for a comprehensive and one-off remission of unpayable debts owed by countries, on terms acceptable to both creditors and debtors on a case-by-case basis: cancel the unpayable debt of the world's poorest nations by the end of the year 2000, and release them to finance their own education, health and other development programmes for their own people. The vision made sense to ordinary people. Jubilee 2000 tapped into a rich vein of public

opinion and a sense of justice. My amendment asks Synod to acknowledge the role it played.

In Britain and throughout the world Jubilee 2000 forced Third World debt, as my amendment indicates, to the top of the international political agenda. It helped people to realize that the problem is political as well as international. It legitimized the expectation of debt cancellation, challenging current definitions of reality by the powerful. We have heard in the previous debate from Dr Mukarji, Paul Roberts, Naomi Lumutenga, Mark Bryant and others, about the ways in which it worked. The campaign empowered millions of people. Over 24 million signatures took Jubilee 2000 into the record books. Some 70,000 people travelled to Birmingham in May 1998 to form a human chain round the G8 meeting. A year later, many did the same in Cologne. Later that year, round the Treasury in Whitehall, many thousands gathered together with the blaring of trumpets, recalling the biblical heraldry of the Jubilee year.

There were frustrations and disappointments, however. Roger has referred to those and so has Jacqueline Humphreys. There has also been good news, as we have heard. We know, however, that this has not been enough. The burden of debt remains and, despite the achievements of Jubilee 2000, as the Bishop of Selby makes clear in *Drop the Debt*, many countries are still being forced to spend more on repaying debt than on health and education. We know that there is much work to be done.

We also know that the spirit of Jubilee 2000 is unstoppable. The supporters, through its successor *Drop the Debt*, are carrying on to fight for debt cancellation and for justice in the earliest years of the new millennium. Many are pushing for a new deal on debt at the G8 summit later this month – with the focus very much now on the World Bank and the IMF, as Jacqueline Humphreys has indicated in her proposed amendment.

In my final few seconds may I say that we should be grateful for the support given to Jubilee 2000, particularly by the Archbishop of Canterbury with his meetings with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with the heads of the IMF and the World Bank, and by his award of Lambeth degrees to Ann Pettifor, director of Jubilee 2000, to Bill Peters and Martin Dent, the two main founders of the campaign, and Dr Isabel Carter, who played a key role in the promotion of Jubilee 2000 and in its fundraising. Those degrees mark the end of Jubilee 2000 as a UK coalition, but the campaign for debt cancellation continues, and must do so. This is why I hope Synod will give overwhelming support to Roger Godin's motion.

The Bishop of Guildford (Rt Revd John Gladwin): Karl Barth, in his commentary on chapter 12 of the Epistle to the Romans – essential reading for all Anglican clergy, who are tempted from time to time to instruct their congregations in that epistle – says that complexity not simplicity is the character of human life, and therefore of the ethical task, and that those who reduce issues to a level of simplicity pertaining to straightforward answers are almost always missing crucial aspects of reality. Faith, in

other words, engages with complexity. I was particularly glad to see in this motion the words, 'recognizing the complexities' and to hear in Roger's speech an emphasis on that.

I have recently returned from a visit to Nigeria: a visit which was about establishing some diocesan links, and also about engaging with the national structures of Nigeria regarding some of the problems they face which need to be communicated in the United Kingdom. During that visit I met the President of Nigeria with my party, and we had a long discussion on financial issues, including the debt issue. This raises all the issues of complexity. Most of the debt from Nigeria is owed to the British Government and to British institutions. First of all Nigeria was thought to qualify under the HIPC scheme and then, latterly, not. There is complexity number one. How do you judge whether or not debt is to be lifted? Nigeria now has the beginnings of a very fragile democracy. Its president is a practising Christian and committed to trying to move this, one of the most significant countries in Africa. If Nigeria fails a lot of Africa goes down with it, because of its size and significance politically and economically. He is trying to shift things. An anti-corruption law has now been passed; but, as we all know, enforcing that law and getting it into the culture of politics is a very long and difficult task.

What are we to do? The moral case for the lifting of debt is incontrovertible. There is the corruption of our own financial systems, if one dare say so, of offering finances to corrupt governments, in the way in which that has happened in Nigeria in the past. Most of that money has not got anywhere near the people of Nigeria. It has disappeared. Indeed, it is possible that some of it is back in British banks, having been squirrelled out of the country during the recent dictatorship. The Nigerians are trying to get it back via the Home Office and the Foreign Office, who have yet to sort out the procedures for getting the money, which is properly theirs, back into their country.

Both the Nigerian government, which is seeking to tackle the issue of corruption, and the British Government that is struggling with a difficulty between the Home Office and the Foreign Office about monies that properly belong in Nigeria, are hemmed in with the complexity of the law and the complexity of the globalization of our contemporary economy.

Then I ask myself what is the contribution to be made by the Christian Churches? I speak as the chair of the board of Christian Aid. I ask where are we getting our help in terms of thinking about these complex ethical questions. I think back in the twentieth century to the significant work that was done by Reinhold Niebuhr, who influenced American and British politicians; R. H. Tawney, who nearly wrote the 1945 Labour manifesto; J. H. Oldham and his significant contributions on work, and you ask who is doing that today. Why is the ethical task in the Church so individualized and so narrowly based theologically that we are not getting help with these issues?

I particularly welcome the reference to complexity in this motion. Yes, we have to aim

to lift this debt and to work with these people to do so; but in order to do so we have to engage ourselves with the complex issues of corporate life in our political and international world. That is not at all easy.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr George Carey): I also want to thank Mr Godin very much indeed for this motion and to thank the Bishop of Guildford for what he has just said about complexity.

Allow me to make three very quick points. First of all, gratitude. I want to support David Webster's amendment. I am glad that he drew attention to the significant role of people like Bill Peters, Martin Dent, Ann Pettifor, Isabel Carter and, on your behalf, on behalf of the Church, I felt that it was important to grant them Lambeth degrees this year, in recognition of their very significant contribution. I hope that when I do that on 24 July I will be able to do so with the fulsome gratitude of this assembly.
(Applause)

I wonder if we may also express our gratitude to the Chancellor, Gordon Brown, and the Secretary of State for International Development, Clare Short? They have been very significant leaders; they are very much on our side; they also want to make a difference. I shall be seeing the Chancellor shortly and I hope that I can pass on your greetings and encouragement.

Perhaps I may pick up where Ms Humphreys left off. She did not have an opportunity to finish her speech, and that may happen to me any minute. I do not want any favours! There is an impression around that the debt issue is over; that it is completed. I sat next to a businessman in London recently and when I talked about the Jubilee campaign he said, 'But it's surely over now? You have been successful.' I said, 'It has hardly begun.' \$380 billion is the global figure. We have been promised \$100 billion. In reality, I thought it was \$14 billion that had been paid; you may well be right to say that it is \$12 billion – but we are talking about less than 3 per cent. The job has therefore hardly begun.

As John has said, it is very complex. There are fundamentalists on both sides. There are the debt fundamentalists – 'Do this and it will solve the problem.' That is not satisfactory. There are also the fundamentalists who say, 'Global poverty, poverty reduction – we do not need to bring the debt issue into it.' I would also reject that.

I do not know if you have come across the UNICEF report, *The State of the World's Children 2001*, but it shows very starkly that debt overshadows basic social services throughout Africa. If one takes Tanzania, nearly 50 per cent of the national budget goes to external debt; only 10 per cent to social services, education included. This is a quote from it: 'Heavy national debt is stealing basic care from children. Changing debt liability to investment in children is key to ending poverty.' It goes on to say, talking about governments, 'Failure to respond seems an increasingly callous stance for governments to take.' It brings in the moral dimension to all of this.

Lastly, some encouragement. Jubilee 2000 is winding up – or down – but Jubilee Debt Campaign UK is taking its place. Ann Pettifor is developing Jubilee Plus, which is focusing on research. I hope that we can support both of these campaigns.

Mr David Webster (Rochester): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘After the words “this Synod” *insert* as a new paragraph (a):

“(a) acknowledging the role of Jubilee 2000 in making Third World debt the international political issue of our time; and”

and re-letter the remaining paragraphs accordingly.’

Mr Roger Godin (Southwark): I am very happy to support the amendment.

The amendment was put and carried.

Ms Jacqueline Humphreys (Bristol): I beg to move as an amendment:

‘*Leave out* all words from “if necessary” to the end and *insert* the words “particularly debt held by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund”.’

Mr Roger Godin: As my colleagues in Southwark know, I am a very gentle person and I never argue with anybody. That is why I am so happy to accept these amendments. It is a pity, however, that Jacqui did not get to the bit about the IMF and the World Bank because it is a key issue.

In the web page for the World Development Movement they say that these substitutes for the structure adjustment programmes, called PRSP, offer a real new opportunity but they could actually make things worse. Over the page, WDM say this:

WDM believe the time is right to put the IMF in the spotlight, making them justify how their policies will bring about poverty reduction. WDM believe the time is right for the IMF to overhaul their analysis in favour of moral economics. WDM believe the time is right to make sure debt relief does not make poor people poorer.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, as always, is so right. A lot of people feel that the issue is all over. Now that the World Bank has changed to PRSP, everything in the garden is lovely – but it is not. I am therefore very happy to accept the amendment.

The amendment was put and carried.

Mr Colin Lea (Leicester): In last night's debate on the House of Lords a member

rightly said that he would have liked to hear the views of young adults. Here at York we now have 10 young adult members of this Synod and a group of 15 young adult observers. We must remember though that young people should not be expected to comment in debates just because they are young.

I have chosen this debate for my maiden speech because I have a particular interest and knowledge of this subject. My degree is in economics and my dissertation, for which I received a First, was on the external debt problems of sub-Saharan Africa. I am utterly convinced, by hours of study and lots of midnight oil burnt, that this issue is immensely important. This issue alone could change millions of lives.

Being a member of the government of our Church I am, more often than not unfortunately, disappointed by it. I do not see the radical vision that we need for the twenty-first century, but I do see this today. We do have a chance to be radical here: a chance to change the world we live in. Now that the Jubilee 2000 campaign is over, we must lead the way in keeping the *Drop the Debt* message going. Talking is one thing, but if each of us goes back to our dioceses, our deaneries, our parishes, using our unique talents and resources, tirelessly campaigning on this issue, then we will be radical, we will be making a difference and we will be fulfilling our Christian calling.

We must not give up on debt. Millions of children in developing countries will die if we do. It is time to double our efforts and to show that, as a Church, together we can do so much for an unequal world.

I would like to finish with some words from a new song, part of *Songs for a New Millennium*, that for me sums up this whole message.

So hear my prayer
Let your spirit lead me on
to where I stand with the broken.
It's what Jesus would have done.

Dr Elaine Storkey (London): I want to review questions about the debt, why it was incurred and what happened to some of the funding, and then to look at two particular issues that I think are relevant and which have not been mentioned in the debate.

Why it was incurred is complex. There was a great overenthusiasm for lending money. Keen eyes looking for profitable new markets; exuberance about Third World development; and a great deal of irresponsibility in the whole idea of lending money without looking at where it was going to go, and so on. What happened to much of the funding we know. It is just rehearsing what we already know. Some of it did find its targets in the Third World, especially amongst women's collectives, and helped the economy enormously. Much of it went into the wrong hands. A lot of it was corruptly used, and the Bishop of Guildford has already opened up this issue for us. Much of it

came back to the West in bank accounts, so we are still profiting from it. A lot of it was tied to arms deals. Some of it was tied to buying Western products, and a great deal of it went on high-status projects, which are completely out of place in the Third World and very insensitive.

I understand this latter point. I am president of Tearfund, and in March I went to Haiti to look at some of the projects we were funding. We went to a vocational school, where we are funding very basic projects, helping youngsters to acquire skills to earn a living. We looked at the sewing projects and so on. We kept walking past this room that was locked. When we eventually said, 'What is behind those locked doors?', the principal sheepishly opened the room and revealed an immaculate, pristine computer lab. We asked, 'Why aren't you using it?' 'No electricity', he said. The generators were fallible and weak and kept breaking down. A lot of that went on in debt loans and in issues connected with that. For whatever reason, a lot of the money did not find its targets.

Debt today is not about debt. It is not about owing money. The world's greatest debtor is the United States, and no one is getting in a sweat about that. It is about all the things that go along with debt, like health issues, economic issues, global and environmental issues, justice issues, and so on. It is particularly penalizing the Third World, as we know.

I want to deal with two issues – the environmental and the global. Debt repayment means that, in order to repay the debt or to repay the interest, countries have to grow cash crops for export. Many countries in Latin America, for example, are growing these cash crops. Where do they grow them? They grow them on plantations. What plantations? The plantations you get when you chop down the forests. What else happens when you have chopped the forests down? It is a good idea if you are in debt, because then you will have timber for export and plantations to grow your crops. Actually, it is disastrous environmentally because it reduces biodiversity; deforestation has implications for the absorption of carbon dioxide; it eliminates crucial habitats; it destroys wildlife, and so on. It produces more problems when the cash crops have to be grown quickly, using fertilizers and pesticides, with pollution, damage to the ozone layer, et cetera, et cetera.

Environmental problems are inevitably woven in with debt. Many countries need the best farmland they can have to produce these cash crops, in order to export. That means other countries are farming marginal lands in order to feed their own families, their own neighbourhoods, their own people – land that was never meant to be farmed. The environmental issues and the issues about debt are therefore closely tied in together.

Globalization issues are also tied in. Globalization is frankly a misnomer. In areas of debt it becomes extremely obvious that it is a misnomer, because global economics are not global. It is First World economics imposed on the rest of the world. For example,

debt repayment is not in just any currency; it is in dollars. Therefore, as Third World countries find that their exchange rate drops and their currency is devalued, it is costing them more and more to repay the debt all the time. The interest is calculated according to First World economic system calculations, imposed on the Third.

What the West gets back in servicing and debt repayment, therefore, is four times more every year than it actually gives in aid to these countries. There is a net outflow from the poorer countries to the richer countries in terms of wealth. We are benefiting every year in terms of debt repayment; there is a net outflow in this way.

Mr Godin appealed to the biblical cancellation of debt and the principle of jubilee, which has been much called upon. Jubilee is about God's grace and mercy. Biblical cancellation of debt is that, even though we are sinners, God died for us in Jesus Christ and God's mercy and grace is unconditional and undeserved. I think that this is misleading here. It is not an issue of debt; it is not an issue of undeserved grace. The passages in Leviticus and Deuteronomy are less relevant than the passages in Isaiah and Hosea. Ultimately, it is about sharing our bread with the hungry, releasing the yoke of oppression and letting the captors go free. Dropping the debt is not charity; it is not mercy; it is not even compassion. It is justice, and we have to press for it for all we are worth.

The Chairman imposed a speech limit of three minutes

Mr John Freeman (Chester): Just to put the Archbishop of Canterbury out of his misery and to galvanize all of you as to why you should keep writing letters, filling in postcards and so on – the reason why you should put pressure on the UK Government over IMF and World Bank debt is because the UK, together with the other six G7 countries, own 45 per cent of the World Bank and the IMF. That gives them 45.5 per cent of the voting rights too, in contrast to sub-Saharan Africa which, including many poor countries, does not even manage 5 per cent. The USA has 17.6 per cent against Uganda's 0.9 per cent; i.e. they have 20,000 per cent more voting power. The G7 has the power to control the direction of the World Bank and the IMF and direct its policies to a debt cancellation. It was the G7 that brought the \$100 billion debt package in 1999 and it is the G7 that can bring almost complete cancellation of debt owed to the IMF and the World Bank – if it has the will to do so.

The UK Government has taken the lead in bilateral debt cancellation. Gordon Brown is known to be always banging on about debt relief in G7, and more power to his elbow. As a Synod, let us call on the UK Government to make renewed efforts to cancel the remaining \$200 billion at the G7 meeting in Genoa by voting in support of this motion. Let us also in our prayers later on remember those who are going to Genoa.

Mr Barry Barnes (Southwark): I beg to move:

'That the question be now put.'

This motion was put and carried.

Mr Roger Godin, in reply: Thank you very much for the debate. I am sure that the three minutes that Colin Lea used for his maiden speech will, now that he has made it, be even more valuable in future. It was a very strong contribution. It occurs to me, by the way, that it was my maiden speech!

On the question of whether it is going to do any good, I think that we can say that if, for example, Moses, Nehemiah and David had not spoken up against the system at the time, it would be rather a different Bible that we would be looking at today. Jubilee 2000 has surely shown that the world does listen when people get their act together.

I must have a theological debate with Elaine some time. I am bound to lose it! In terms of the other points she raised and the computers without power, that is common. In Peru they have a phrase, '*los disenfranciados*', for people who are not plugged in! It happens around the world. Another form of powerlessness, if you like. It is so sad that misplaced aid has cost them millions.

I would finish by again stealing from a speech by the Archbishop of Cape Town, because I think he said it so cogently.

Borrowing has its place only inasmuch as it releases growth for human well-being. Morally righteous people in the world fought against slavery and won. Morally righteous people in the world fought against apartheid and won. In our time, the challenge to us is to make a world where human values take priority. Although poverty reduction is more important perhaps than debt cancellation, it is necessary to free people from the hopeless downward spiral of poverty created by unpayable debt.

I hope that, after this long day and talking about global issues, we will now focus our minds on this desperately important motion, trusting in God's power that it will have an effect for the powerless of this world.

The motion was put and carried, 259 voting for and 0 against, in the following amended form:

‘That this Synod

- (a) acknowledging the role of Jubilee 2000 in making Third World debt the international political issue of our time; and
- (b) noting with regret that at the end of the year 2000 AD wholly insufficient progress had been made towards the relief of the Third World debt burden; but

- (c) recognizing the complexities of some of the issues and acknowledging the lead already given by Her Majesty's Government,

encourage Her Majesty's Government and politicians of all parties to continue to press for urgent action by the more affluent nations to cut debt, particularly debt held by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.'

(Adjournment)

THE CHAIR *Canon Jane Sinclair (Sheffield)* took the Chair at 8.30 p.m.

The Chairman: We move now to Questions; 165 have been tabled for answer this evening and, for the benefit of new members, that is some 50 per cent more than the maximum ever tabled at any other Synod session. I am sure that it demonstrates a very healthy level of energy and commitment to our process of accountability in Synod but it also means that we shall have to exercise quite a high degree of self-discipline this evening if we are to make good headway through the Questions. So let the hearers understand! Because of the quantity of Questions, I would like to seek the general consent of the Synod now, under Standing Order 14(e), to extend this sitting by not more than fifteen minutes. Does Synod give its consent? *(Agreed)*

Questions

Questions asked in accordance with Standing Orders 105–109 were answered as follows, those for written answer being marked with an asterisk:

Board of Education

1. *Mr Geoff Locke (Lichfield)* asked the Chairman of the Board of Education:

Following publication of *The Way Ahead* by the Church Schools Review Group, how does the Board plan to maintain this very positive report's 'impetus for action'?

The Bishop of Blackburn (Rt Revd Alan Chesters): Over the next few months the Board will be working with dioceses to ensure that the report is widely discussed and its vision communicated to the whole Church. We will fully engage with Government on their proposals for an extension of faith-based schools outlined in their February Green Paper on education. We intend to circulate a short leaflet to all parishes summarizing the report and to arrange a number of regional conferences early in 2002 to explain the report's main recommendations. In addition, we have commissioned audio-visual material on Church schools for use by deaneries and others. Together with the National Society we will be producing supporting material for schools and