

Charity number: 1175312



The Hans Albrecht Foundation CIO

Report and Financial Statements

For the period 23rd October 2017 - 1st January 2019



Reference and administrative information covering the period:
23/10/2017 – 01/01/2019

Charity Name: Hans Albrecht Foundation

Type: Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO)

Registration Number: 1175312

Address: 325 Ditchling Road, Brighton. East Sussex.

Trustees who have served during this period

Name	Date commenced	Date Resigned
Alan Rosenbach (Chair)	23/10/2017	
Professor Erik Millstone	23/10/2017	
Ms. Sue Berelowitz	23/10/2017	11/05/2018
Ms. Judy Ironside	23/10/2017	11/05/2018
Dr. Barbara Warnock	10/04/2019	

Trustee Report

The Hans Albrecht Foundation (HAF) trustees present their first annual report and financial statements covering the period 23/10/2017 – 01/01/2019. The CIO was first registered on 23/10/2017.

We amended the charitable objects in May 2019 to better reflect the ambitions of the HAF. In essence we amended the objectives to move away from an annual lecture to a periodic lecture albeit still by an eminent and relevant practitioner. We have retained the award to be given to an individual or organisation that has made a significant contribution to maintaining and supporting human rights.

Charitable Objects

Objects to promote human rights (as set out in the universal declaration of human rights and subsequent united nations conventions and declarations) throughout the united kingdom by: educating the public about human rights and raising awareness of human rights issues by means of lectures delivered by eminent practitioners and establishing an award to honour an individual or organisation that has made an outstanding contribution to human rights.

Deliverables

Our first lecture and human rights award was held on 2nd November 2017 at the Wiener Holocaust Library in London. The lecture was delivered by Professor Francesca Klug OBE who is a visiting professor at the London School of Economics, Centre for Studies on Human Rights. The human rights award was given to Lord Alf Dubs for his efforts to secure safe passage for unaccompanied child asylum seekers into the United Kingdom. The event was well attended with around 90 attendees reflecting a diverse audience in terms of age, ethnicity, experience and expertise.

A copy of the lecture is appended to the report at Annex 1.

Alan Rosenbach (Chair) on behalf of the Trustees of the Hans Albrecht Foundation.

APPENDIX 1



HAF
Hans Albrecht Foundation

In association with
The Wiener Library
for the Study of the Holocaust & Genocide

HAF Annual Lecture
Professor Francesca Klug OBE

Human Rights Award
Lord Alf Dubs

The Wiener Library
29 Russell Square, London WC1B 5DP
18:00-20:15, 2nd November 2017
£12 Adults/£7.50 Concessions
Refreshments provided

Professor Francesca Klug is a Visiting Professor at LSE's Centre for the Study of Human Rights and has written, lectured and campaigned on human issues for over 30 years. Lord Dubs has fought tirelessly to bring unaccompanied child refugees to safety in the UK.

US
University of Sussex
Centre for German-Jewish Studies

Hans Albrecht came to England on the Kindertransport. The Hans Albrecht Foundation (HAF) strives to advance and promote human rights particularly in relation to: children, equalities, disability, children who are refugees and/or fleeing conflict and freedom from persecution on the grounds of race, ethnicity and faith.

LIFE IN A SUITCASE.

“ I could only take with me a suitcase and a rucksack,” writes Hans Albrecht in his short, but moving, ‘autobiography’. A matter of fact statement which struck me, when I read it, as a metaphor for his entire life!

The historian Simon Schama has described Jews as *historically* a “suitcase people.” In Hans’s case his multiple moves and displacements had multiple causes – they occurred because he was a child, because he was Jewish, because he was autistic – sometimes because of all 3. (I think this is called intersectionality these days).

I would love to have met Hans but over the last few weeks, reading his self-described ‘life history,’ published in 2005, and speaking with his good friend Alan Rosenbach, I feel I *have* got to know him a very little.

- Hans was someone whose ordinary childhood became extraordinary once he collided with some of the most tumultuous events of mid20th century Europe;

-he was a person with some exceptional qualities who during his long life encountered the best and the worst in his fellow human beings;

-a warm man with an extraordinary capacity to remember the names of almost everyone he'd ever met,

Here was a child who, like any other child, needed love, security and certainty to develop and flourish.

Instead, at the age of 9 Hans had to escape Vienna on the Kindertransport.

Imagine it! Two powerless Austrian parents living under tyranny, putting their only child, whom they knew to have special needs, on a train alone to travel to goodness knows what future in the UK –not knowing whether they would ever see him again but desperate for him to survive

Describing the events that led up to this, Hans writes:

“ I started going to school when I was 6 years old in September 1937...I was the only Jew in the school. Hitler marched into Austria on Saturday 13 March 1938 and on 21 May all Jewish children had to leave their school.”

Hans was then educated with other Jewish children of multiple ages in a school in Linz. With remarkable recall, he lists all his teachers and all the children in his class, including those “who did not come back,” as he put it.

On 15 August 1938 all cafes, parks and swimming baths were closed to Jews, Hans writes, and after Kristallnacht on 10 November his second school was closed down. Hans explains that “ all Jews had to leave Linz because it was the birthplace of Hitler. We moved to Vienna. ...I lived for six months in Vienna til May 13 1939 when I left for England on a Kindertransport.”

[Hans was one of **10,000 children saved by the Kindertransport**; this is to be celebrated but a very small number compared to the million and a half children who were killed in the Nazi Holocaust].

Hans's displacement does not end there. As a child refugee with special needs Hans moved many times.

“ First I lived for 3 weeks in Brighton with a family” he writes “but they sent me away because I was mentally handicapped”.

He moved to a home for refugee children in Margate but soon he was fortunately reunited with his mother in Worthing.

Later on, he writes, “ all refugees from Worthing had to leave Worthing” and he moves again and again, sometimes happily, sometimes less so.

For four and a half years in the 1960s Hans lived in a home where he says he was “very unhappy” because he was “lost completely to Judaism” but from the late 1980s, Hans lived in Rachel Mazzier House in Brighton. He described this as the best home that he ever lived in: “ I was no more happier than here” he concludes.

Hans died in 2015 aged 84. I know from Alan that he is still sorely missed. Hans faced more challenges and prejudice in his life than most of us can possibly imagine. But he survived it all, enriching the lives of those he met.

I don't know why, but from the youngest age it was people like Hans whom I most admired, who became my unsung heroes and heroines. Encouraged, as we all are, to look up to people in the public eye, I was more often struck by those who *shun* publicity. Human beings who in the face of the most testing circumstances –from poverty to persecution or both– manage to keep going, often with little or no support.

I haven't admired such people because they were all saints or faultless, but because they found the inner strength to survive. The kind of inner strength that I'm sure we have all observed, with awe, in the survivors of the *devastating* Grenfell Tower fire.

[And I am so honoured that young people from the Kensington Aldridge **Academy** (KAA), formerly situated at the base of the Tower, are here with us tonight].

The Hans Albrecht Foundation, as I understand it, is aimed not just at remembering Hans, but at giving voice and recognition to *all* the Hans Albrechts of the present and future whose lives, and struggles, so often go unnoticed.

I imagine that Hans would be a tad surprised that we are meeting tonight to remember him but he would probably be even more surprised to learn that lessons from his life, and the many like him, provided the stimulus for the most translated document in history: NO, NOT THE BIBLE, but the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (or UDHR), adopted by the United Nations on 10 December 1948. [It will reach its landmark 70th birthday next year].

The origins, legacy and relevance of the UDHR for the moment we are living through now (*of which more later*) are the main subjects of my lecture tonight.

There were 8 Abstentions when the UDHR was adopted –South Africa, Saudi Arabia and the Soviet block. They made for interesting bedfellows!

But the most extraordinary aspect of the UDHR, it has often been remarked, was that it was drafted at all!

It is almost impossible to imagine such a visionary document being drafted by UN delegates now.

At least not one, like the UDHR, which goes way beyond civil liberties to includes the economic, social and cultural necessities that all humans need to make life liveable, requiring states to protect citizens from poverty, unemployment and ill health and *certainly not* one that includes "the right of anyone everywhere to seek and enjoy asylum in other countries" when their own government won't protect them (which was the forerunner of the 1951 Geneva Convention for the protection of refugees).

The UDHR would probably never have got off the ground without the leadership of the *formidable* Eleanor Roosevelt (the former President's wife). [It was Eleanor who once said –"a woman is like a tea bag- you only know how strong she is when she gets into hot water!"].

The UDHR's significance lies in 4 separate ideas : Universal, Declaration, Human and Rights which I'll try to unpack as I go along (though not in that order).

The *idea* of fundamental rights did not begin in 1948 of course but the Universal Declaration was undoubtedly a watershed in human history.

It was the source of the modern, twin ideas that :a) human rights are *universal* in the sense that *everyone* is eligible for them(not just primarily white, European, Christian men) *and* b) that they are *international* in the sense that national sovereignty should *no longer* provide a cloak behind which governments can hide, by claiming that abuses against their own citizens or residents are no-one else's business, because they comply with national laws.

Very often when people hear the phrase 'human rights' they clock the second word: '*rights*' and barely stop to consider the *first* word: '*human*'.

But it is *human* which should be in bold -in neon lights. Why? Because ultimately it is human beings who are the inspiration, drivers and custodians of human rights. It is for that reason that the Universal Declaration is *primarily addressed to* human beings, not states.

The UDHR is what it says on the tin – it's a *Declaration*- but it's had a huge legal and moral influence around the globe, spawning at least 50 instruments that *are* legally binding, including the European Convention on Human Rights and its equivalents in Latin America and Africa.

It has also begat many single issue instruments ranging from torture to gender and race, heralding the introduction of the first ever anti-discrimination laws. Virtually all of these treaties explicitly acknowledge their UDHR parentage in their preambles. The most ratified is the UN's Convention on the Rights of the Child, widely recognised as the strongest statement of children's rights in history.

All of us just take for granted that this is how the world is now –but just 70 years ago there was no international human rights architecture at all.

None of these developments came out of the ether. *All* of them came after prolonged struggles and negotiations, largely by the people most affected.

This is an astonishing achievement when you think about it! When Hans was segregated at school and required to move town the Nazis were able to argue they complied with the rule of law –their own law, that is.

The Nazi's pre-war racial policies covering black people, Roma, Sinti and Jews, were set out in statute, mainly under the so-called Nuremberg laws. There were no international mechanisms like the European, Inter-American or African Courts of Human Rights which now enable individuals to take their own governments to court.

There was almost no *legal* basis for one state to interfere with another in the treatment of their *own* citizens or residents *at all*, at least not without breaching the then almost sacrosanct principle of national sovereignty.

In the world Hans grew up in, nation states had almost limitless sovereignty to treat their citizens as they wished or even deprive them of citizenship altogether. Some fairly feeble attempts to engage the League of Nations - the ineffectual precursor to the UN- in ending (*or even just robustly condemning*) racial and religious persecution in the Nazi Reich got absolutely no-where.

This abject failure of the international community to prevent legalised discrimination, and ultimately genocide, at the heart of mid 20th century democratic Europe–despite the writing on the wall for over a decade- was one of the key drivers behind the campaign for the nascent United Nations to adopt an *international* bill of rights.

Amongst those campaigning were the oldest American civil rights group, the NAACP, the American Jewish Committee and the now renowned academic lawyers Rene Cassin and Hersch Lauterpacht.

They themselves were both refugees from fascism. Rene Cassin, who went on to play a major role in drafting the UDHR, was a French resistance member who fled to the UK early in the war. Like other lobbyists, he knew his Jewish family was in mortal danger in Occupied France.

So for many of these campaigners this was not simply an intellectual project for NGOs and lawyers but a very personal pursuit for global justice and equality.

Some were therefore bitterly disappointed when a *Declaration*, rather than a legally binding treaty, was drafted by the UN's Commission on Human Rights, chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt.

In this sense, the use of the word 'rights' is to some degree misleading. The drafters may just as well have called it a Declaration of 'human dignity' or 'ethical demands,' as the philosopher Amartya Sen has put it.

But a *legal* prism is anyway only one way of understanding the Declaration, its impact and legacy.

The others two can be described as geo-political and ethical/inspirational. I'll discuss each of these 3 in turn.

Although not itself legally binding, the UDHR was aimed at *shaping* and *influencing* law- and establishing a means of evaluating domestic legislation so that regimes, like Nazi Germany, could never again claim that *if* they were following their *own* laws, they were in the clear.

Without this *indirect* legal effect, the Declaration might have been dead and buried by now. It's *this* which has given it bite and visible impact. And precisely because it's a Declaration of *broad* ethics, it's remained relevant by evolving fresh norms to meet *new* circumstances.

This evolutionary approach applies to some of the most significant legal landmarks under the UK's Human Rights Act, which is effectively the grandchild of the UDHR with most of its standards drawn from the European Convention on Human Rights. Often it's people like Hans who have pushed these legal boundaries, finding themselves up against a faceless, modern bureaucracy with little or no opportunity for redress outside the courts.

One of these was Steven Neary, a 21 year old autistic young man, like Hans, who lived with his father Mark in Hillingdon. I will let Mark tell you what happened in his own words, (from interviews on his story):

"Steven's childhood was pretty normal. He went to a local special needs school, we would go to football, we would go to concerts. Being autistic, once Steven gets into something he's into that thing for the rest of his life.

Our social worker had always encouraged me, if ever I needed a break just phone the manager of the respite centre..[but] It became clear quite early on that they weren't prepared to let Steven come home"

One year later Mark found himself in the High Court which ruled that the Council breached Stephen's rights to liberty and family life, by detaining him in a care unit for a year .

" It didn't occur to me at all that his human rights were being breached, " Mark said, "but when his barrister brought it up it seemed blatantly obvious. All the kind of things we take for granted; all these kinds of tiny details that make his life fulfilling, that's the value of the Human Rights Act," Mark concluded.

I know this will be counter-intuitive for many of you, but Keir Starmer, the former Director of Public Prosecutions (and now MP-shadow minister for BREXIT) has stressed –contrary to all tabloid-driven assumptions – that it's crime *victims*, not criminals, who have been the overwhelming beneficiaries of modern developments in UK human rights law. This includes those who have suffered domestic violence, child abuse and terrorism.

But the association of human rights with law has come at a price!

Most of the contention in the UK has centred around a very small minority of *ex-prisoners* gaining the right to remain in the UK *after* they have served their sentence on the grounds that there is a real risk they will be tortured if they are returned to the country they fled from, or where the family life of their partner or children would be irreparably severed if they are deported.

that hard cases make bad guides to understanding human rights I can understand why these decisions are controversial!

Perhaps it helps to have had 4 immigrant grandparents like I have, and an entire extended family of refugees and migrants –not all of whom were completely virtuous- to imagine the chaos and heartbreak caused by a husband or father (as it invariably is) permanently exiled in a faraway land. But there is no doubt and yet that is the *only* prism most people in the UK get to see them through.

Blunted by the paradox of legalism- by which I mean that the aspect of human rights which makes them *directly* effective *also* often obscures their meaning –ie the law- for too many people here in the UK human rights are understood only as the last case they have read about, usually through the tabloid press. The ethic of human rights is drowned out in the cacophony that ensues. Yet as the Appeal court judge Sir Rabinder Singh has affirmed, the *concept* of human right is *not* “primarily a legal one,” but “a moral” one.

The UDHR’S legacy has likewise faced a battering from the geo-political reading of human rights, the second prism through which human rights are often viewed.

This view of the Declaration as an early example of the failure of the UN to live up to its lofty aspirations cannot be disputed, IF the *only* means of judging its impact is whether human rights abuses have been eliminated worldwide. Self-evidently they haven’t- quite the contrary!

Accountability and transparency *have*, however, improved through UN mechanisms created to uphold the standards in the UDHR (and I’m not referring to courts here, but various Review Committees and special human rights Rapporteurs or Ambassadors).

A recent UN Inquiry into the Rights of People with Disabilities in the UK, for example, shone a widely publicised light on the disproportionate impact of benefit cuts on disabled people. They have taken the brunt of austerity measures, introduced by successive governments to meet a deficit caused –not by disabled people- but by failing banks, greed and indebtedness.

If that sounds strong read the UN Report! It did not mince its words and has been used by disability campaigners to add to the mounting popular pressure against austerity measures in the UK.

When Hans was growing up there were *no* international monitoring bodies to speak out about the mass murder of people with disabilities by the Nazis, let alone about benefit cuts!

It took far too long, but after years of lobbying, the UN's Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities, another of the UDHR's descendants, was adopted in 2006 and established the Committee which conducted the UK review.

This is what my LSE colleague, Professor Conor Gearty, has called the 'visibility project' of human rights- where the goal is to illuminate the lives of people too easily ignored and empower them to demand equal and dignified treatment on the simple basis of our common humanity.

But these same UN mechanisms have simultaneously sometimes brought the whole project into disrepute.

A frequent accusation is that in the name of universality, and to counter accusations that human rights are a product of western imperialism, some of the world's worst human rights abusers are represented at the UN Human Rights Council, [the body charged with the promotion and protection of human rights around the globe].

In a report presented to the Council in September, for example, many Middle Eastern states including -Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Israel, Oman, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates - were named and shamed for reprisals against campaigners for human rights; usually their own citizens.

Yet three of these - Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the UAE - are themselves members of the Human Rights Council, the very body responsible for preventing such abuses.

But although further reform to the UN human rights architecture is *permanently* overdue, to judge human rights through the lens of such inter-state bodies is to miss the main action. The drafters of the UDHR knew from the outset that it was a paradoxical objective- and one only likely to be minimally effective- to charge *states* with the main responsibility for upholding human rights when they are invariably going to be the chief violators.

This is why the UDHR Preamble insists that a "common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the[ir] full realisation".

In other words it's down to us—*including all of us in this room*—to keep the norms and spirit of the UDHR alive.

This leads me to the third and final prism for reading the Declaration, which I'm calling '*ethical/inspirational*'; the one whose legacy, I would argue, is most enduring and relevant for our times.

Meeting in the wake of a catastrophic war which impacted on most of the globe and culminated in the world's only nuclear conflagration—so far!- the drafters of the UDHR were conscious of being at the dawn of a new era.

Aware of the enormous responsibility and expectations placed on them by NGOs and activists who had campaigned for years for this moment, they weren't *primarily* focused on UN enforcement mechanisms or even *legal* rights.

At their very first drafting session Dr Charles Malik, the Lebanese delegate, lamented that they needed “poets, prophets and philosophers” more than politicians, diplomats and lawyers.

Although the delegates were a bit short on poets, prophets and philosophers hovered over all their deliberations. Not only because they referenced biblical prophets, and Confucian and Enlightenment philosophers, but because they received the written advice of a pantheon of (then)living thinkers, such as Mahatma Gandhi, Aldous Huxley, Harold Laski and Jacques Maritain.

The main questions the drafters asked themselves were:

- a) “ How does the world conceive of the “essential worth and dignity” of humanity in the middle of the twentieth century?” as Dr Malik, put it
- b) what are the lessons our political leaders –and all human beings –should learn from the catastrophic events that had just befallen their world?
- c) What do human beings, communities and nations need to make life liveable and to live in peace and harmony with each other?

Hans might have been surprised to hear this, but it was people like him who had lost ‘the right to have rights’ (as the philosopher Hannah Arendt notably put it) who were uppermost in their minds when they sought answers to these questions.

The responses they landed on could be described as the polar *opposite* of the rhetoric gaining traction today.

With the “barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind” (as the Preamble puts it) haunting every deliberation, the drafters set themselves the task of facing up to the *failure* of so-called Enlightenment values to prevent the annihilation of millions of people who did not fit a perverted European norm because they were disabled, or gay, or Roma, or Jewish or just ‘other;’

They confronted the *failure* of European democracies – nation states which treasured their national sovereignty -to protect themselves from descending into tyranny because- from the election of Hitler onwards -what happened afterwards was deemed to be the democratic ‘will of the people,’ decided by the popular vote.

Instead of ‘make America or Britain or wherever great again’ – a perfectly imaginable response by the victorious but devastated Allies at the end of WW2 -the Declaration declares, in its very first sentence, that “We are all member of the human family” and that far from international relations being a zero sum game -a competitive race between nations for ‘greatness,’ – “freedom, justice and peace in the world” [as the text puts it] can only be achieved when the equality, dignity and human rights of all is respected.

Instead of a discourse about ‘taking back control’ from transnational bodies, the Declaration called time on nation states only policing themselves, for even democracies had proven capable of self-destruction.

Instead of asserting, that “If you believe you’re a citizen of the world, you’re a citizen of nowhere” (that was our PM last year) the whole purpose of the project, in Cassin’s words, was to “stress the fundamental principle of the unity of the human race.” This was the central

meaning given to the term 'universal' when part way through the deliberations the title was change from 'International' to 'Universal,' signifying a shift from states to humans.

This emphasis, Cassin explained, was because Hitler had "started by asserting the *inequality* of men [even] before attacking their liberties."

The 'moral claims' advanced by the UDHR –their answers to the questions I listed a moment ago- can be distilled into 3 simple assertions that (*you might think*) are ever more relevant in the world today.

- 1) That existence bereft of dignity is like a human being without a soul and that freedom without the economic wherewithal to live a dignified life is no freedom at all.
- 2) That when the chips are down, and life and liberty are at stake, humanity should always trump nationality.
- 3) That if democracies are not to crumble into ethno-nationalist tyrannies, a system of accountability to a *higher* set of norms and institutions must moderate assertions of national sovereignty and majority rule.

Or, as our first female Supreme Court judge, Brenda Hale, has eloquently put it, a little more recently: "It is a purpose of all human rights instruments to secure the essential rights of members of minority groups, even when they are unpopular with the majority. Democracy values everyone equally [she said] even if the majority does not."

As we are once again confronted with political leaders who thrive on divisions, it's striking how virtually every Article in the UDHR and the treaties it begat (including the ECHR), begins with the word 'everyone.' But it's a *solidaristic*, rather than *individualistic*, take on this word.

The purpose of the UDHR was emphatically *not* to encourage the nihilistic individualism which led Karl Marx to damn the 'so-called rights of man' a century earlier, but to bolster the *social* nature of humans who, the text asserts, have "duties to the *community*, in which alone the free and full development of personality is possible" (A.29).

Or as the Chinese delegate, Chang Peng-Chun, put it, the aim was "not to ensure the selfish gains of the individual but to try and increase man's moral stature" and sense of mutual responsibility.

Cassin went so far as to maintain that the concept of human rights was in fact biblical, with the first Article of the UDHR beginning with the commandment that "[We] should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

This, he explained, corresponded to two iconic biblical injunctions – one concerning those we know and the other aimed at those we don't: [you guessed it:]

"Love thy neighbour as thyself," and "You shall not oppress a stranger, for you were strangers once" [repeated at least 36 times in what is known as the Old Testament].

As some Islamic human rights scholars affirm, Koranic values of ‘justice’ ‘mercy and ‘goodness’ are also apparent as is the Catholic idea of ‘natural law’ .

These cross-cultural metaphysical allusions are less surprising when you consider the input to the draft from so many nations and cultures including (in alphabetical order):

Australia, China, Egypt, India, East and West Europe, Iran, Lebanon, Mexico, the Philippines, New Zealand and USA. The final product bore the marks of Latin American socialists, European social democrats, Marxist Soviets, a Chinese Confucian, Middle Eastern Muslims, Lebanese and European Christians, a Hindu and a Jew”.

But the drafting process should not be sentimentalised –the whole of sub-Saharan Africa was unrepresented due to Europe’s imperial rule of the continent, leading to understandable criticisms about whether it’s legitimate to call the Declaration *Universal* at all.

The universalism I understand the Declaration to be proclaiming is not hectoring others into submission to a common way of life and value system, other than when ideology or faith threatens the *fundamental humanity* of men, women or children. [There’s *no UN officials writing to the LSE, demanding the names and curriculum materials of human rights professors, I’m relieved to report*].

Calling the Declaration *universal* was simply intended to underlie that “*all* human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights,” as the 1st Article declares, and that *all* states, without exception (and increasingly non-state powers) should be held to account if people are treated otherwise.

Universalism, in other words, not just intended to refer to the *victims* of rights violations but was an appeal to the “reason *and* conscious” (as the text says) of “ *all* individuals” so that human rights violations would become everybody in the world’s business; we *all* share a responsibility to speak out and take action when we can (was the point).

To some degree theoretical debates about universalism have anyway been overtaken by ‘facts on the ground’; by what human rights scholars call ‘human rights practice,’ where norms and ideas have infiltrated the demands and mindsets of human beings and NGOs around the globe.

As a consequence, the West has long ceased to be the centre of the action. All over the globe people are using the language of human rights, and sometimes its legal provisions or enforcement structures, to stake a claim for a better world for themselves and their communities. Countless activists and NGOs who once might have described themselves as Marxists or nationalists, now frequently frame their campaigns in human rights terms.

It is this ‘human rights practice’ -stemming from peoples’ struggles against all forms of abusive power and turbo charged by an ever-expanding social media –

which the renowned ethicist Mary Midgley has described as “an immense enlargement of our moral scene” creating a sense of an interconnected global community.

You don’t have to have heard of the UDHR, in other words, *let alone to have read it*, to have absorbed its norms which have seeped unknowingly into national and international discourse, [much like the thinking of the great prophets and philosophers- from Allah, Moses and Christ, to Kant, Freud and Marx- that Dr Malik wished he could consult when they were drafting the Universal Declaration].

Yet there is also some evidence that the UDHR's *direct* visibility is wider than some of us might have assumed. An international YouGov poll of the 80 greatest landmarks of the last 80 years, placed the UDHR 4th, beaten only by penicillin, the Internet and computers.

I imagine Cassin would have been really chuffed to hear that! He insisted that "Our Declaration represents the most vigorous, the most essential protest of humanity against the atrocities and the oppression which millions of human beings have suffered through the centuries."

This 'inspirational reading of the UDHR' seems to be how Nelson Mandela heard it too. He later described how its "simple and noble words," [*as he put it*] introduced just as Apartheid was being entrenched in his country, provided "a sudden ray of hope" and that, in Mandela's own words: "During the many years that followed [it] served as a shining beacon and an inspiration to many millions of South Africans. It was proof that [we] were not alone..."

It's remarkable in many ways that this was Mandela's response, isn't it?. It would have been more understandable if he'd seen the UDHR as limp and impotent – a product, in equal measure, of Western imperialism and pious cant. But anyone familiar with the ANC's famous Freedom Charter can't help wondering about the influence of the UDHR on its terms.

One way of explaining this is that the UDHR reflected the '*wisdom of the ages*,' or as the human rights scholar Seyla Benhabib has put it, it "reflect[ed] the moral learning experiences not only of Western humanity but humanity at large....a distillation of ... collective struggles."

Perhaps if the past 70 years had not been an age of failed utopias the UDHR would be no more than a historical footnote by now.

But with the cruelties and perversions we have witnessed in the name of nationalism, Marxism, and faiths and beliefs of all kinds, even liberalism (or certainly *neo*-liberalism) the UDHR continues to empower and inspire.

Yet in the thirty years I've been studying and writing about human rights I can remember no period when we've been in greater danger of losing the insights and wisdom that came out of experiences like Hans's, to inform the Universal Declaration and an entire edifice of human rights standards and norms.

The times we are living in now have been variously described as a new age of nationalism, of anger, of extremes. I don't know if any of these are quite right, but I think we can all agree that we are living in volatile times.

Western democracies, like other states, have always abused human rights, of course, whilst valuing them as a means by which the West can judge the rest.

But there's never been a time since 1948 when the democracies which championed the UDHR have so fiercely articulated a world-view and mind -set which directly undermines its basic value system.

Whilst the world holds its breath when the President's senior advisors describe Trumpism as "a clear-eyed outlook that the world is *not* a 'global community' but an arena where nations..engage and compete for advantage," Europe looks on apprehensively to gauge whether the UK has the European Court of Human Rights in its sites next.

These shifts have been a long time in the making. They derive partly from a popular backlash against the grotesque inequalities and marginalisation of communities 'left behind'

by globalisation, ruthlessly exploited by those who have most benefited from it. But when a zeitgeist changes like this it can be quite sudden.

Whatever our political views, just 18 months ago I suspect few of us could imagine that Britain's or America's democracies would produce either Brexit or Trump.

And it is not just these outcomes that have taken many of us by surprise;

it's the reversing of a direction of travel towards increasing openness and inclusiveness, which many of us had complacently assumed was here to stay.

Amidst signs of a fight-back, the predicted victory for parties of the nationalist right in Austria, France and Holland has not materialised –ye!!- but ethno-nationalism has gained a stronger foothold in all those countries alongside the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary & Poland.

The return of 'strongmen rulers' who acknowledge no higher norms than the greatness of their own state, and who appear to reinforce each other, is gathering pace, whilst the epicentre of world power shifts inexorably from America to China, which has never *pretended* to value human rights; even on a hypocritical basis.

The UDHR was not written for the *past*, for that was already over and could not be changed.

It was written for an *exact moment* like *now*, to equip us when forgetfulness returns, as the drafters knew it surely would, and the lessons learnt from genocide and global war become overwhelmed by a new narrowing of the horizon, as national pride and international indifference re-emerge in fresh forms.

As 'us and them' increasingly replace 'we and everyone,' as our EU neighbours are described as 'enemies' and 'saboteurs,' the danger is not that the Declaration will be overturned or ridiculed in some future late night tweet.

The greater threat is that the norms of solidarity and humanity that the 'barbarous acts' gave expression to in the form of the UDHR will simply be forgotten; will wither away from lack of use and application.

To return to our PM's assertion –in full this time- that "if you believe you're a citizen of the world you're a citizen of nowhere; you don't understand what citizenship means," I can only assume that *she* cannot understand how this would strike families like Hans's, or the effectively stateless Rohingya from Myanmar, or the more than 4.3million Palestinians from the West Bank, Gaza and elsewhere registered with the UN for humanitarian assistance or Syrian refugees moved from pillar to post. Anyone, in fact, reliant on the global community recognising their claim to a 'higher citizenship' than the one they happened to be born into; if born into one at all.

This 'cosmopolitan norm' (so-called) introduced into the world by the UDHR, needs reclaiming not vilifying.

It wasn't aimed at diluting citizenship of individual states, quite the contrary, but creating a system of mutual responsibility so that every human being would know that in their darkest hour they'll be protected by the "one human family" the UDHR proclaims.

If supporting this norm makes me a citizen of the world -or of nowhere - I wear that badge with pride.

And if, at the end of this lecture, we still think the norms established by the UDHR have something useful to teach us, we should remember it is *we* ordinary folk who are charged with promoting them.

To remind us there have always been 'ordinary people' (so-called) who've taken an extraordinary stand, I will finish, as I began, with an extract from Hans's 'life story.'

" My mother had a very good friend living in the near town of Ebelsberg... The younger daughter was a schoolmistress called Theresa who was brought up in the Ursuline Convent in Linz. Later on she became a senior school teacher..and once ...when my mother went into the tram she went and sat next to my mother. My mother said: "don't sit next to me Theresa because this will put you in danger if you sit next to a Jew- it might cost you your job." And Theresa said " I would rather lose my job than my faith in you." All other people moved away when they saw a Jewish person in a train or tram and Theresa Postl did exactly the opposite," Hans concludes.

With that story to lift our minds and hearts, I bid you good night.



Receipts and payments accounts

CC16a

For the period from	23/10/2017	To	01/01/2019
------------------------	------------	----	------------

Section A Receipts and payments

	Unrestricted funds to the nearest £	Restricted funds to the nearest £	Endowment funds to the nearest £	Total funds to the nearest £	Last year to the nearest £
A1 Receipts					
Income from events	384	-	-	384	-
Donations	500	-	-	500	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
Sub total (Gross income for AR)	884	-	-	884	-
A2 Asset and investment sales, (see table).					
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
Sub total	-	-	-	-	-
Total receipts	884	-	-	884	-
A3 Payments					
Subscriptions	145	-	-	145	-
Computer costs	100	-	-	100	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
CCXX R1 accounts (SS)	-	1	-	-	28/10/2019

	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
Sub total	245	-	-	245	-
A4 Asset and investment purchases, (see table)					
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
Sub total	-	-	-	-	-
Total payments	245	-	-	245	-
Net of receipts/(payments)	639	-	-	639	-
A5 Transfers between funds	-	-	-	-	-
A6 Cash funds last year end	-	-	-	-	-
Cash funds this year end	639	-	-	639	-

Section B Statement of assets and liabilities at the end of the period

Categories	Details	Unrestricted funds to nearest £	Restricted funds to nearest £	Endowment funds to nearest £
B1 Cash funds	Cash at Bank	639	-	-
		-	-	-
		-	-	-
	Total cash funds	639	-	-

(agree balances with receipts and payments account(s))

OK

OK

OK

Categories	Details	Unrestricted funds to nearest £	Restricted funds to nearest £	Endowment funds to nearest £
B2 Other monetary assets		-	-	-
		-	-	-
		-	-	-
		-	-	-
		-	-	-
		-	-	-

Categories	Details	Fund to which asset belongs	Cost (optional)	Current value (optional)
B3 Investment assets			-	-
			-	-
			-	-
			-	-
			-	-

B4 Assets retained for the charity's own use

		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-
		-	-

B5 Liabilities

Details	Fund to which liability relates	Amount due (optional)	When due (optional)
		-	
		-	
		-	
		-	
		-	

Signed by one or two trustees on behalf of all the trustees

Signature	Print Name	Date of approval
	Alan Rosenbach	28th October 2019