



CHARTER

Volume 8 Number 1

The newsletter of the British Charitable Society

March 2003

In this issue

President's Letter
Page 1

Fund-Raising - The Results
Page 2

Outreach
Page 3

Thank You Notes
Page 4

Anglo-American Relations -
An Address by H.M. Consul-
General, Boston
Page 5

Society Officers

President - Tim Hunt M.B.E
Vice-president - Kathy Tunsley
Executive Secretary - Susan Dugdale
Treasurer - Charles Platt
Recording Secretary - Jackie
McGrail

Executive Committee

George S. Ames
Jan Carrigan
Micheal Dawson
Robert A. Groom O.B.E. (Past presi-
dent)
Geoffrey Hall
Peter Howard-Johnson
Eileen Morley
Geoff Mullis (Past president)
Paul Stanislas O.B.E.
Roger Tunsley

President's Letter

As I write, the temperature outside is threatening to go down to zero tonight. But I think of some of the heartwarming events for the British Charitable Society reported at our recent Executive Committee meeting. Quite directly related to the temperature, we heard of the successful plumbing job effected for an elderly lady in upstate New England. For a relatively modest sum of money (which she could not afford) her water pipes were relocated to the higher part of her little home where they won't freeze and she will, once again, have hot water.

We had a number of quite moving notes from clients who we were, or still are, helping and I think it would be interesting and important for the whole membership to hear what they said. Obviously, we treasure such feedback, showing we are making a difference for a few people with little else to fall back on.

However, the fact is we have been able to identify a gently increasing number who are qualified for our help. This has been done by the efforts of our membership, especially Committee members. Of note recently, has been the increasing broadcast of our existence to various agencies around New England. The net result of the past year is shown by the preliminary accounts just presented by Treasurer Charles Platt, wherein we spent, once again, more than necessary for IRS purposes. Also, our expenses for the year (85% for relief to individuals) exceeded our income by \$6,548. This compares with 2001's deficit of \$27,787.

Last year's deficit would have been greater had it not been for our first Annual Appeal, which raised \$14,174 and which is discussed in greater detail by Charles. We believe this was a great success and encourages us to continue our efforts to seek worthy individuals whom we can help. We are most grateful to all who contributed to this Appeal. I hope you all feel very good about being able to add to the work which the Society has been doing. While the Society's investments have done no worse than the market in general, even the yield on short term investments has diminished substantially (as those who rely on their money market funds know only too well). So, as we properly congratulate ourselves on shaving the deficit in 2002, our "success" in helping others suggests we shall continue to ask the membership to be charitable.

Newsletter: Roger Tunsley, 12 Rhodes Avenue, Sharon MA 02067
Tel: (781) 784-7955 Email: rtunsley@attbi.com

Other successes in 2002 included some social functions which doubled as fund raisers. Our fish'n'chips supper in Gloucester, organized by Eileen Morley was great fun, high lighted by an auction of various British goods and services by Katie Hall. In the fall, Kathy & Roger Tunsley introduced us to a delectable Indian buffet dinner in Milford. At this event, we drew the winner of a raffle for 2 tickets to the UK gen-

erously donated by Virgin Airways. This raised over \$3,000. We hope to have these or similar events in 2003. Stay tuned and, if you didn't come last year, don't miss the next one.

We had a new member of the Committee elected during the year, since Simon Sherrington has not been able to participate in our meetings due to his duties at Brandeis. Our new member is

Michael Dawson, who has hit the ground charging, not just running. His abilities with computers and energy in spreading the word about the Society have been a tremendous asset to our work. Indeed, all members of the Committee have contributed enormously to our efforts, which makes the work of the President so much easier and enjoyable and I thank them all most heartily.

Fundraising - The Results

- One corporate gift of \$5,000. Many thanks for this generous donation from Salem Five Bank.
- 2 individual gifts of \$1,000 to \$4,999
- 4 individual gifts of \$500 to \$999
- 21 individual gifts of \$100 to \$499
- 9 individual gifts of under \$100

There were a total of 36 individual gifts representing 27% of the total membership, a great response, thanks to all who donated.

The grand total raised was just over \$14,000

Fish and Chip Supper

Yes, the juggling fish is back. After last year's very popular and successful fish and chip supper, we're hosting another in May in Gloucester. You will all be receiving more details in the mail. One small secret that I will let slip is that we will again be conducting a raffle, to which British Airways have very kindly and generously donated:

The Grand Prize - Two round-trip business-class tickets from Boston to London with British Airways



Outreach

by Michael Dawson

In the autumn of 2002 an effort was made to make the Society more visible in the six New England states. This was a three-pronged approach consisting of talks given by the Executive Secretary, meetings with United Way, and the mailing of nearly 600 new brochures.

The campaign began with a meeting with Ann Goldenberg, the Program Coordinator of Special Funds of the United Way of Massachusetts Bay. The various United Way offices in New England act as "charity wholesalers" in the region. Mrs. Goldenberg was extremely helpful in guiding us in placing our outreach to where it would most likely be effective. There was no way we could reach our clients directly, of course, but we tried to inform those agencies most likely to be approached by them.

United Way has 76 offices in New England, and they often have people come to them directly for help in emergencies, although their main mission is to fund other charities in their areas. Brochures were sent to all the United Way offices, and contact was made with many of them by telephone. Most of the United Way offices have web sites, and these websites usually listed the charities which they supported. These lists were a place to start when compiling our own database of charities to send brochures.

Some judgement was called for in selecting the charities for our own list. We would not select detox. centers, for instance, or after-school child care centers, but we would usually select any organisation with the word "emergency" in its name. United Way of Connecticut has a huge computerised database of all the offices of all the charities in the state, whether or not they are funded by United Way. From this list of some 40,000 we bought 2,059 addresses which, in their opinion, would be most appropriate for us. Even that smaller population seemed to be large for our purposes so, by inspection, we selected 220. Altogether we sent out 341 brochures to individual charities.

All of the states have their own social services departments. Massachusetts, for example, not only has a Department of Social Services but also a Department of Transitional Assistance. The latter asked us for 100 brochures. Altogether we sent brochures to 96 offices of these agencies.

Our final client group was the Information and Referral operations which are beginning to take shape in New England. Sometimes they are called "211" or "First Call for Help". Connecticut is well advanced in this respect. Our effort here was mostly to ask that the Society be put in their computer databases.

The Society now has three mailing lists: state agencies, United Way offices, and private charities. These will be continuously kept up to date, and members are encouraged to send us names of suitable organisations which may not yet be on our lists. In addition we are beginning to computerise individual client case histories.

As a result of this activity, and also probably due to the weak economy, there has been a distinct increase in the number of calls for help. For instance, four new cases were reported at the December 2002 meeting of the Executive Committee. This increase has implications for our need to do some fundraising.

Thank You Notes

"Thank you so much for your kindness over this very difficult time for me. It was wonderful to see my family all be it under sad circumstances.

I truly appreciate the work and time you spend helping others."

"A sincere thank you for your consideration of my affairs and for your personal help. My daughter ... joins me in the thanks.

Also, we would be glad if you would pass on greetings to the British Charitable."

Thank you for the help we have received, it has made a 100% difference in our lives knowing that the mortgage is paid for. Your Xmas check came in a very timely manner - a miracle.

Thank you for your kindness.

To all at British Charitable,

With many thanks for your help and best wishes to all.

To all the members of the British Charitable Society,

Thank you all for helping us through the past two years, we are finally able to enjoy Christmas because of your kindness.

These Thank You notes are excerpted from Christmas cards received by Susan Dugdale. They are edited and unattributed for privacy reasons. However, Susan and the committee felt that you, the members, should see how much your generosity is appreciated and how you help make people's lives better.

Anglo-American Relations

A talk given by George Fergusson, H.B.M. Consul-General, Boston, at the Union Club, Boston on 23 January, 2003

I learned earlier this week that Massachusetts and New England once seriously contemplated leaving the Union in protest at an oncoming war. This was contemplated rather than fight against the United Kingdom in 1812. Indeed, the Governor of Massachusetts ordered a fast in penance at the very idea of fighting a war against the United Kingdom. There have been ups and downs in British-American relations in Massachusetts. That was an up which I had not been previously aware of. Happily our relations with America as a whole are a lot better now.

It's a particular pleasure that the New England Churchillians are here as well. When I first came to Boston I didn't know a great deal about what a Consul-General was, or did. But, having been in Mozambique briefly in a previous job, I knew that when Winston Churchill escaped from a prisoner-of-war camp in Pretoria during the Boer war, he had spent five days hanging underneath railway trucks, hiding in hay stacks, and mine shafts and so on, before arriving in Lourenço Marques, now Maputo, underneath a train at about three in the morning. He knew that Lourenço Marques would be full of Boer agents, and that like any other distressed British subject he needed to get to the British Consulate-General quickly. And he went there very quickly. He got there about five in the morning. There weren't any lights on, so he began to heave

gravel at an upstairs window in the hope of getting some attention. After two or three handfuls of gravel the window opened, and the Consul-General leaned out and said, "Go away! We don't open until nine in the morning." Nowadays, of course, we have all sorts of things like Service Delivery Agreements, and Customer Relations courses, and so on. And, more than that, we here in Boston have taken the precaution of having our office fifteen floors up.

The intensity of British-American relations is now probably greater than any time in my memory.

The subject I have been asked to talk about is British-American relations, clearly a subject close to the surface at the moment; clearly, also, a subject very close to Winston Churchill's heart. I might just point out that the United States Navy maintained in its battle plan until 1925 active plans for fighting the Royal Navy, more than ten years after Winston Churchill had first become the First Lord of the Admiralty. So maybe the answer is that you should always be prepared for anything.

But what a time to be talking about this subject! The intensity

of British-American relations is now probably greater than any time in my memory. In all prominent areas our relations are very close indeed. In some we have some robust disagreements. And why not? Before getting on to the livelier and more topical issues, I think it's worth just reviewing the underlying relationships. Some are the same issues that I might have been talking about before September 2001. As was mentioned, I used to be in the Northern Ireland Office, where, in a slightly cynical way, our crime figures were always divided into two categories: there were terrorist crime statistics, and there were the statistics that dealt with what was known as "ordinary decent crime". I suppose you could consider these other issues ordinary, decent issues. There is a fundamental closeness of history, of culture, of institutions of law. Close relationships between families, many of which are represented in a very lively form here today. More or less a connection of language. Closeness represented by actors, too. I have been taken to more than my usual quotient of films in the last few months, by my children. One of things that I find slightly puzzling, is that almost all the American films I have seen have been full of British actors putting on American accents. And almost all the British films I have seen have been full of American actors putting on British accents. They seem to do it quite well. I guess

that's another example of cultural overlap.

Getting a bit harder-nosed: in the world of business, we now have \$110 billion dollar's worth of combined trade. More dramatic than that is the colossal amount of mutual investment between our two countries. I had a group of Boston public school children come to our office recently, and I asked them, as a sort of teaser, what Dunkin' Donuts, Citizens Bank, Star Market, Ben and Jerry's, and Shaw's Supermarket might have in common. Not unreasonably, they just looked a bit blank. Their teacher had a go, and asked if they were all businesses that did business with the UK in some way? When I said that they were all British companies, it produced quite a gasp. And I think some of their parents might do the same. To balance that, British children would be equally astonished if you told them that Jaguar, and Kelloggs corn flakes, were American owned. The overlap between companies that we think of as our own, which actually belong to the other, is really very striking.

Each of us is the other one's biggest inward investor. No foreign country owns more business in Britain than America, and no foreign country owns more business in America than Britain does. It applies also in science. This year we are working towards a commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the structure of DNA. A Briton and an American, together with a New Zealander, shared a Nobel prize for that. In each of the last three

years at least one of the Nobel science prizes has been shared between a British and an American scientist. It carries on.

Each of us is the other one's biggest inward investor.

The phrase "special relationship" itself is not, I think, altogether helpful. If I dare say it, it has a slight undertone of Boston's so-called rivalry with New York. It's passionately discussed, at least by the press, in the smaller partner; and it's often not really noticed by anyone in the larger. But there has been a desultory debate for the last twenty years - longer, maybe - in Britain as to whether a special relationship really exists. It's sometimes been a surrogate for those who are suspicious of the UK having closer ties with Europe. The thinking goes something like "If we must cuddle up to someone, why not the United States who at least speak more or less the same language". I think the events of the last eighteen months, anyway, have shown that, whether or not it's a special relationship as such, there is something in the relationship that is special. But even best friends and families have arguments, and we have these too. There are various areas of developing international law where we see recent events as strengthening the case for a strong framework, and we haven't always been able to get the American administration to share our view: The International Criminal Court; the International Conven-

tion Against Torture; a new protocol to strengthen the convention against biological warfare; things like action against global warming, including amendments to the Kyoto protocol; tariffs, where we were disappointed that a free trade government, which was averse to new taxes, imposed what we would see as distorting new taxes on steel imports. And so on, and so on. These are all issues where we have strong disagreements, and we will continue to argue for our side. These are the sort of issues which you would have heard more of if I was at this platform in August 2001. In which case, you probably wouldn't have invited me!

Two topics at the moment which have had a very distinct impact on our relationship, and on which I think our relationship has had a distinct impact, are terrorism and dealing with countries developing weapons of mass destruction. On the efforts against terrorism, the U.K. was with America fully, very fully, from the 11th. of September, from the beginning of this current phase. I don't think I need persuade anyone here of that, but it's worth looking at some of the reasons for it. It was partly sympathy for a grievously wounded friend. It was partly that we too were victims, though much less than the United States. There were 67 British victims. At one stage it looked as though it might have been 700. The United Kingdom till then thought that it was familiar with terrorism. We'd had thirty years of terrorism related to Northern Ireland; we'd had a lot of sporadic Middle Eastern terrorism, and terrorism of various

kinds. We thought we'd got used to it, but 67 victims was more than double the number of terrorist victims we had had in one day my lifetime. So we saw ourselves as having been victims, but even more there was an awareness that it could very very easily not have been the World Trade Center, but the NatWest Tower or Canary Wharf, and that is something which we are still very conscious of. It's not just that it could have been, it could still be.

In the anti-terrorism campaign, the United Kingdom and the United States are in it together, whether we like it or not. Some of the events which immediately followed the attack of 11th September brought out both the sympathy for the grievously wounded friend, and our common interest. One of the most striking ones-in a way it was very striking because it was small-was the changing of the guard ceremony at Buckingham Palace, where the American national anthem was inserted into the programme at short notice, without Civil Service committees thinking about it. The Queen thought it would be the right thing to do, and the natural thing to do. It expressed people's feelings at home in a very dramatic way. That's a rather British way. It's slightly as though a statue has raised its eyebrows. Some of our traditions are very static. But even a small change in an old tradition like the changing of the guard is instinctively appreciated by people in Britain and in America as a major gesture.

And Tony Blair's visit. In the course of an extraordinary

sequence of crossing oceans, and attending meetings in four different countries in two and a half days, he visited Ground Zero, he attended a service in Saint Thomas's Church in New York with the British relatives of those who had been killed, and met your President, and attended the joint session of Congress that evening, all in the space of an afternoon. Then again it struck a big chord in Britain, and I think struck a big chord here. I remember hearing a radio account of the Changing the Guard episode when a man was in our house trying to fix the air conditioning. He put his head round the kitchen door where my wife and I were having breakfast, and said, "Thank God for Great Britain! Without you we'd be alone in this world." It's not true, but it very clearly came from the heart, and we had many other spontaneous, and heart-warming, and very moving responses of that kind.

In the anti-terrorism campaign, the United Kingdom and the United States are in it together

There was also a practical follow-up. One of my favourite was, for reasons which I don't know, and they're not my business, during the Afghanistan operation, the United States Navy aircraft operating from the Gulf and the Indian Ocean could not be refueled by United States Air Force tankers, but they could be refueled by Royal Air Force tankers. So for

two months, if I may put it this way, in one of the most intimate ways you can imagine aircraft connecting with each other, British and American aircraft were cooperating very, very closely. And at one point the United Kingdom had more troops in Afghanistan per head of population than the United States did.

The efforts against terrorism, and their costs in our own back yard, were brought home very sadly on Tuesday of last week when Detective Constable Oates in Manchester, in the course of a police raid on a house which was linked with biological warfare, was stabbed to death. We are in this together. Let me tell you one very brief anecdote on this. When I first came to Boston in 1982, a couple of times, and stayed in the house where I now live, in some ways things were rather different here then. There were regular pickets outside our house, and the then mayor was quite often a participant. I had the pleasure of inviting the former mayor to lunch last year, when we had as a guest the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. Two days later, on Saint Patrick's Day, I went to a Saint Patrick's Day dinner and the former mayor was the keynote speaker. To my astonishment, but it was also something I found rather moving, he only made two points in his speech. One was that two days before he'd been to lunch at our house. He'd been there before but then he'd been picketing outside it. This time he had enjoyed meeting the British Secretary of State. He no longer had a quarrel with British policy in Northern Ireland. He wished us

well with implementing the Good Friday Agreement. But secondly, and I ask you to remember that this was to an Irish audience on Saint Patrick's Day, he said the events since the 11th of September had taught him that the United States had no closer friend than Great Britain. That day, that audience, that speaker. It was very striking.

Shall we move on now to the issues of weapons of mass destruction and, specifically, Iraq? The British government completely shares the American government's assessment of the risk of countries like Iraq having weapons of mass destruction, and the risks of defiance of United Nations resolutions. We are willing to share in the costs and the risks of doing something about it if we have to. To be very topical, we would like to see a second U.N. resolution if we have to come to that. But not having one, doesn't necessarily rule out further action. Again, we see our own interests at stake in this, in terms of our security, and in terms of global issues as well.

Our instincts, British instincts, are to work with America, especially on the security-related issues, and we've done so.

Dealing with the risks of weapons of mass destruction and their proliferation was one of six global

issues which Tony Blair set out as needing a global response in a remarkable speech he made to the Labour Party conference a month after the attack on the World Trade Center. Besides the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, he referred to terrorism; to drugs; to environmental degradation, particularly global warming; and world under-development, particularly all of the problems which come together in Africa, which he described as a scar on the conscience of the world; and the necessity of resolving the Israel/Palestine issue. In very many respects these are interconnected. 80% of the heroin that came into the United Kingdom, before the fall of the Taliban administration, came from Afghanistan. All of these issues, in some way, are fairly easily connectible. All of them present global problems, and all of them need broad coalitions to deal with them. Our instincts, British instincts, are to work with America, especially on the security-related issues, and we've done so. We're doing so very visibly in making Iraq aware of the consequences of not complying with the U.N. resolutions. We share the U.S. assessment of the risks of doing nothing. There's a very big overlap in how we see the way forward. It's essential that Saddam Hussein sees the inevitable consequences of non-compliance with U.N. resolutions. It's also essential that progress is made with the widest possible coalition, and very much preferably within the U.N. framework, for political reasons, for practical reasons, and for legal reasons. The British government has

worked closely with the American government to show support and to offer advice as an ally. Today Jack Straw is in Washington, next week Tony Blair will be with the President. The next stages are largely up to Saddam Hussein himself.

But against this background, why are there anti-American feelings in Britain, and also in wider Europe? There have always been some. On the left, there have been feelings that America is the main pillar of capitalism in the world. And on the right, and to some extent on the left as well, there has been a feeling of concern, fear, resentment that the sheer power of American cultural influence might erode other national cultures. Some of these feelings are widespread now, despite the overwhelming and genuine sympathy worldwide after the World Trade Centre and Pentagon attacks. Tony Blair said in a speech last week that, "The problem people have with the U.S., not the rabid anti-Americans, but the average middle ground, is not that, for example, they oppose them on weapons of mass destruction, or international terrorism. People listen to the U.S. on these issues, and may well agree with them, but they want the U.S. to listen back".

We share the U.S. assessment of the risks of doing nothing.

So for the international community the Middle East peace pro-

cess is also important. Global poverty is important. Global warming is important. And the U.N. is important. And the choice to go through the United Nations over Iraq, which was a vital step in itself and as a symbol of wanting to work with others, was something that we were very keen on, and pleased, perhaps, it developed the way it did. As we see it, a broader agenda is not against United States interests. On the contrary. For example, the U.S. decision to back a new relationship between N.A.T.O and Russia has made both missile defense and N.A.T.O. enlargement a much easier thing to achieve and a much less divisive thing to achieve.

Britain will use its influence to keep this agenda broad, so far as we can. We believe all these other issues I've mentioned are important individually. Taken together, progress in any one of them will help progress on others, and an incidental by-product will be a strengthening of the recognition that the world finds American val-

ues attractive, and very largely shares them.

Fundamentally, we are the ally of the US not because America is powerful, but because we share its values.

I don't want to use the thoughts of Chairman Tony in the way they used to use Chairman Mao's little red book, but another extract from the speech that Tony Blair made ten days ago is, I think, genuinely interesting and worth reflecting on. Talking about Britain's relationship with the United States, he said, "The price of influence with America is that we do not leave the United States to face the tricky issues alone. By 'tricky' I mean the ones which people wish weren't there, don't want to deal with, and if I (Mr. Blair) can put it a little pejoratively, know that the United States should confront, but

want the luxury of criticizing them for it. So if the U.S. act alone, they are unilateralist; if they want allies, people shuffle to the back." That is a very pertinent comment on where we are at the moment. And it is not easy, as you will be aware. Mr. Blair is having to argue hard, both within the U.K. itself, and within wider Europe, for the position which he is currently taking.

In a speech in the House of Commons exactly one hundred years ago this year-as it happens, on the subject of free trade-Winston Churchill said "I believe that the friendship of the United States should be a main end of English statecraft". It can't be the main end. The United Kingdom must be, and is, an integral part of Europe, but we aim to remain the closest ally of the United States, and as allies influence you to continue broadening your agenda. But fundamentally, we are the ally of the US not because America is powerful, but because we share its values.