**The Society for Ecumenical Studies**

**BREAKING DOWN DIVIDING WALLS IN THE 21st CENTURY**
A week for seeking new ecumenical inspiration on Iona, September 10-16, 2005

# Bob The Builder, Jamie Oliver And The Famous Five: Ecumenical Role Models For Today?

## *Keynote address by Alison Elliot, Centre for Theology and Public Issues, New College, Edinburgh*

### Introduction

It's a great privilege to contribute to this conference, and to reflect on my experience of the ecumenical movement, with so many young people from churches across the British Isles and further afield. I have been extremely fortunate that the Church of Scotland, over the years, has trusted me to represent it on ecumenical bodies, and, more recently, to represent it as Moderator of its General Assembly. These responsibilities have involved visits to churches right round the world and I will plunder that experience for illustrations for this talk.

### An illustration from South Africa

Let's start in Guguletu. Guguletu is a township in Cape Town and I made a visit there as Moderator last October. We were headed for J L Zwame Memorial Presbyterian Church, a church that has made a name for itself in supporting the victims of AIDS. Its minister is Rev Spiwo Xapile and, some time back, he made a point of talking about AIDS every time he preached. It was par for the course that when we were there he was in Germany raising funds for the church, but we were welcomed by his wife and other members of the team. After a presentation about the work the church does and its history, we were entertained by a group of 16 young people from the township, chosen as a result of a

Pop Idols contest, who sang for us. They started with a song about ABC – Abstain, Be faithful, use a Condom – and then one in Xhosa about the various myths about AIDS, myths which lead to the raping of infants. They rounded the recital off with the chorus from Messiah that ends “And all flesh shall see it together”, a favourite text of the church.

We visited several townships and one thing that struck me was that, very often, beside all the shacks, the only civic building you could see was a church. This wasn’t the case in Soweto, which has been around for a hundred years. There you found schools and community centres and so on, but in most of the other places, it was the church that stood out. Correction! It was the church**es** that stood out, just as at home, Methodist, Presbyterian, Anglican, each at their own corner.

Of course, the ecclesiastical variety had been augmented in South Africa by apartheid and a history of black and white churches of the same denomination. The focus of our visit, and our hosts for the time there, was the Uniting Presbyterian Church of Southern Africa. It had been formed five years before, out of the Presbyterian Church of South Africa and the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Interestingly, and honestly, its title was the Unit**ing** Church, not the Unit**ed** Church. Partly, this was because they had hoped, and were still hoping, that another church of the reformed family would join them. But they also acknowledged that they still had a long way to go in sorting out the differences in the legacies they brought to any such union. Realistically, they reckoned that if they waited until all the detail was agreed, it would never happen.

Roughly speaking, the former RPC had been a black church during the apartheid era. It was the one that the Church of Scotland had historical links with and did have a few white ministers in it. The PCSA had been a white and coloured church with some black ministers. Both had the same Presbyterian source but constituted very different cultures.

For a start, they wore different uniforms. I addressed a gathering of women in a township in Port Elizabeth. All were in uniform. Some wore black hats, white jackets and black skirts. Others wore white hats, white jackets with black collars and black skirts. I understand that it is standard in the African church to have uniforms like this and that there is often theological significance in their design. Each church had settled on a

different composition for their uniform. I needn't tell you that the decision of which uniform to adopt in the Uniting church was one of the most hotly disputed debates.

But there were more fundamental differences. Although both churches subscribed to what they called "The Manual", which was the Standing Orders for their Assembly or Presbytery meetings, they had diverged from it in different ways. The PCSA had kept it up to date, modified it regularly, and each meeting was conducted formally, according to the rules, in a quasi-Parliamentary fashion, with voting. The RPC had recovered their traditional kind of assembly, which they called *indaba*, where discussion continued in a free-flowing way until decisions emerged. It was a fascinating debate, all the more so because it echoed similar ones in other parts of the church. In Scotland, we had been exploring with the Quakers the way they conducted their meetings, to see whether there was a model there of consensus decision making that the rest of us might adopt. It seemed that their practice had a lot in common with the *indaba*. And on the world stage, I was reminded of the frustration among the Orthodox churches after the Harare Assembly of the WCC about how alien they found the nature of the Council's decision-making from their tradition.

These differences run deep. And what was also evident in that debate was the way that, on both sides, they generated suspicion and contempt of the other. Each suspected that the other way of doing things was open to too much manipulation by those in power. As of course they are! Manipulation is something you recognise when it happens to you, not when you're doing it yourself.

But there were other points of tension. The RPC had been organised in such a way that there were a few powerful mother churches which had outstations associated with them in a pattern of hub and spokes. It seemed to be a kind of feudal arrangement and the mother churches derived a lot of income from the outstations. The PCSA, on the other hand, had a more conventional presbytery structure and, when we were there, they were trying, as is the case in the Church of Scotland, to rationalise their congregations by uniting ones that are geographically close together. Of course, this was cutting through the RPC structure and causing distress and threats of secession by some of the large congregations. So there was some hard talking going on.

But not, as far as we could judge, about some of the obvious differences. The black churches had large congregations and little money. We were told that the discrepancy in the stipends of the ministers in the two former churches was of the order of 16:1 and the former RPC ministers we met had to have second jobs. There seemed to be little appetite to address what that was going to mean for the new church.

And there were other differences, which might be temporary or might represent deeper divisions in the associations of the people who make up the two communities. We attended worship in Lovedale, one of the most venerable churches from the Scottish missionary period. The service was in Xhosa, the church was packed, there was magical singing at every turn and, at the end, people were dancing in the aisles. Not, you might think, like a standard Church of Scotland service. But, despite all of that, I felt at home because the feel of the service was familiar and it was undeniably public worship. On the other hand, the PCSA service we attended felt alien, despite being in English with a more cosmopolitan congregation. There had been a strong charismatic strand in the PCSA and the service was thoroughly evangelical, with praise bands, not the tradition I belong to.

**Religious and social division**

An everyday tale of churchy folk. I hope you'll have heard elements of your own congregational or denominational situation in this account, all the more vividly because it comes from the other side of the world.

You can see how the historical basis of division between the churches (a racial division from apartheid times) has grown legs and developed into a complex package of differences of personality and social structure that is much more difficult to break down than simply saying that they should be one church. Or perhaps the original basis of division was shorthand for completely different outlooks on life in the first place that, for various reasons, attached themselves to different communities. Whatever the origin, once cultural differences are given the blessing of the church authorities, they become entrenched and get in the way of any search for unity.

In our own situation, we have to start with a similar analysis of what the real basis for distinction is between, say, Presbyterian and Episcopal approaches to church governance, what is theological opinion and what temperamental disposition, what the epiphenomena are that are more visibly different, what social distinctions have attached themselves to these differences and whether we have the will to dismantle **them**. Ecumenism of the inter-church variety is not just an exploration in theology but also an examination of historical, psychological and social differences which go wider and deeper than differences in what happens at our church assemblies.

The title of our week is *Breaking Down Dividing Walls in the 21st Century*. These are not just church walls but ones in society as well. And the two sets of walls are related, at least in their origins. Remember the observation that the only signs of civic buildings in the townships were churches? At one level, I was glad that the churches were the organisations that had had the courage and vision to recognise the civic and community needs of people in these poor areas. In this, they were following the lead of their missionary pioneers.

The positive legacy of that period is still evident. When we were in India, I laid the foundation stone for a girls' school in Jalna, a school that was expanding after missionaries two hundred years ago had championed the cause of girls' education. As they had education for the Dalits. And in Bangladesh, we were tremendously impressed by the work the church was doing with women. You know the argument. Empower the women, educate them sufficiently to run their own micro-credit schemes, follow it up with health education and nutrition classes and before long you have confident and prosperous communities. We saw indications of how successful they were being when we visited a Muslim village and the women there told us enthusiastically and confidently how their lives had been changed by the church's projects and, by the way, could they please have some sewing machines now?!

These are the kinds of success stories we like to hear about. They show a church shaping the values of the world around them in ways that are healthy. But it's not always like that.

I started with the example of J L Zwame in Guguletu, where the congregation was facing up to the matter of AIDS. And we heard of other small projects run by the church in a similar vein – nursery schools where many of the children were HIV positive and a remarkable hospice hidden in a run down row of shops in East London where people were being picked off the streets and given the chance to die with love and dignity by amazingly dedicated nurses. But the church was cautious about seeking publicity for these projects. And we also saw the other side of the story.

One Sunday, we took part in a service in a large church, full of several visiting congregations and recorded on video. At one point in the service, two girls were brought out to the front of the congregation. We were told that, at a meeting of the Kirk Session the previous evening, it had been decided to discipline them. They had strayed from the path and were to be suspended from church membership for an unspecified period. They were then replaced at the front by four other girls who had served their period of punishment and were to be readmitted to communion. It was hard for us to explain to the clergy just how appalled we were by this. They thought they were upholding the tradition they'd been given by our Scottish predecessors.

And they were right. I remembered that if you visit Greyfriars Church in Edinburgh as a tourist, one of the items on display will be the Cutty Stool. It's a simple wooden piece, rather like the step you'd use in an old-fashioned library to get at the books on the top shelf, and it's crying out for a vase of flowers to be put on it. But, in its day, it was a serious instrument of torture. Anyone who'd fallen foul of the Kirk Session and was thought to have strayed from the path was displayed in shame in front of the congregation as a lesson to others. Things have moved on, I'm glad to say, and in our less judgmental day the idea of the Cutty Stool is regarded with a sense of revulsion. But it is a timely reminder that the church does damage as well as good in its influence on the society around it. If South Africa was a less prudish culture in sexual matters, it might be that AIDS would not have taken hold to the extent that it has.

So, if we want to consider breaking down dividing walls, we need to be aware of how intertwined the dimensions are of the churches and the societies that support them. People can reject the church and yet be shaped by its teachings and practices. It has

come as no surprise to people in Scotland that Donald Dewar could refer to himself as a cultural Presbyterian and Robin Cook as a Presbyterian atheist because the Presbyterian heritage reaches way beyond the church itself. But so, too, does its underside and the recent concern about a sectarian culture in Scotland has thrown up how awkward many Roman Catholics feel in this predominantly Protestant society, despite the attenuation of church membership of either kind. Many of the religious walls we are addressing are reinforced by social and cultural considerations.

**The Example of Europe**

Nowhere more so than in Europe. For eight years now, I've been a member of the Central Committee of the Conference of European Churches, a fellowship of churches that stretches from the tiny Portuguese Presbyterian Church to the vast Russian Orthodox Church, including the Lutheran National Churches of Scandinavia and small reformed churches in strongly Catholic countries like Poland and Italy. It has 125 member churches, testimony to the proliferation of ecclesiastical walls in our continent, and that is before we start on Pentecostal or new church movements. It doesn't include the Roman Catholic Church but we have good and continuing relations with it through CCEE, the Council of Bishops Conferences in Europe. With them, we are working at present on the third European Ecumenical Assembly, which will take place in Romania in 2007. CEC was set up forty-five years ago, to be a channel of communication (however imperfect) between the churches on either side of the Iron Curtain.

What is fascinating about CEC is the way in which the divisions between the churches, and their search for unity, are paralleled by political tensions and developments. Just as the European Union is seen for the most part (everywhere but in the UK) as a project for securing peace in a continent that has torn itself apart over the centuries, so CEC has a primary role in trying to heal and reconcile church communities that are suspicious of each other and have been separated for centuries from a common Christian heritage. The fact that these divisions are more than liturgical preferences and still have blood in them is only too evident in a continent that contains both Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia.

I know it would be too simple to characterise either of these conflicts as religious, but the religious divisions offer people competing identities at a time when they are feeling insecure and so religion adds fuel to the conflict. I keep coming back to a quotation of His Beatitude Archbishop Anastasios of Albania who commented at the time of the war in Kosovo that the oil of religion can be used both to heal the wounds of conflict and to fuel its flames. What CEC tries to do is accentuate the healing, reconciling feature of religion in a continent where there is widespread suspicion of it because of its violent history. It tries to spread understanding across denominational divides, supports reconciliation projects in places of conflict and brings participants in conflict together. During the war in Kosovo, I attended one such meeting. Churches in Europe had, by and large, followed their national governments' policy over the question of military intervention in the conflict in Kosovo and there was a real danger that CEC would split apart over this. It did hold together but it was an uncomfortable meeting as raw words and memories flew across the table, or were exchanged in corners.

Churches are very conscious of divisions and can spot them a mile off. It is for this reason that CEC spends a lot of time warning officials of the EU of the potentially divisive effects of the boundaries of the EU on the countries of wider Europe. CEC rejects the assumption, which is in many people's minds, that "Europe ends where Orthodoxy begins". Instead, it deals with a Europe that stretches from the Bay of Biscay to the Urals. Its member churches are anxious about the possibility of reinstating another wall down the centre of Europe and creating new tensions and instabilities round the Union. Part of CEC's strength is that it can probe beneath the surface political issues to the underlying cultural dynamics. Perhaps it can't do much to resolve these tensions, but pointing to them and their importance is still valuable. It is interesting that the EU official who was appointed to relate to "communities of faith and conviction" also had in his remit relations with states on the Union's boundary.

Other divisions are also before the churches' concerns as well, in particular, poverty and refugees, gashes in our common life that are explored and monitored in CEC meetings as well as being addressed more intensively by our sister organisations, Eurodiaconia and CCME, the Churches Commission for Migrants in Europe. I used to be a member of the Commission on Church and Society of CEC. Each meeting would have a session

where delegates exchanged stories from each other's countries, so that a Portuguese and a Romanian delegate could talk about the reasons for, and the consequences of, the influx of Romanian immigrants into Portugal. Or people from Finland could compare notes with delegates from Poland about the stress caused to people in work by changing over to liberal economic arrangements in anticipation of EU membership. These observations were then harvested for presentation to dialogue meetings with members of the European Commission or lobbying material in dialogue with national governments.

These examples may seem far removed from your church experiences. But they provide an important context for any ecumenical discussion, particularly about breaking down dividing walls. For a start, they remind us that the divisions between the churches do carry a bloody legacy. They matter, and not only theologically (which I'll address soon) but in lives still being lost. So, overcoming divisions between the churches is not just an exercise in rationalising resources, saving on the cost of youth workers, or hoping that the media will pay more attention if we speak together. We have soiled and scarred our heritage appallingly.

The second lesson from the European perspective is that our attempts to overcome our divisions can be of use to those struggling to reconcile other precious identities and to build a community of unity in diversity. We're not the only people struggling in this way. It may be our frustrations and failures that we share but the sharing is still a contribution to a wider reconciliation. In the period just after the Parliament was established in Scotland I spent a strange time, being a member both of the Central Council of ACTS and of the Council of the Civic Forum, a body set up to facilitate communication between the Parliament and the various civic groups anxious to make their contribution to a better Scotland. At times, it was hard to remember whether it was the church group or the civic group I was attending, so similar were their concerns. Deeply hidden in the churches are resources of civic and political skills that can be put at the disposal of others. Would that it were our skills in reconciliation that were on offer!

**Constructing Unity**

So far, I've been looking at the churches as social and political institutions, which they are. Their influence comes and goes but they are still an important part of the public

landscape, politically as well as architecturally. We kid ourselves if we think that we're different from other institutions altogether, protected from their failings, and this kind of analysis and perspective does have to be followed through. For many people, ecumenism is simply fixing these institutions, so that they work together better, use their resources better and look more attractive to potential clients! This is the Bob the Builder model of my title.

And the natural mode in which to enlist the builders is that of demolition. Walls and the buildings they enclose are the bane of many ministers' lives, leaching time and resources from hard pressed congregations. But they also represent an enclosed, circumscribed way of thinking that is timid and cosy. The Church of Scotland recently received a report on its mission and outlook, popularly called the *Church without Walls* report, and there is much in it to encourage the church to reach out beyond its walls to the world beyond – the world that it, the church, needs in order to understand itself and its message. And in ecumenical terms, we gravitate easily to our verse in Ephesians that characterises the hostility between members of Christ's body as dividing walls. To be broken down.

But talking about this on Iona adds a different twist to this tirade. We are in the Abbey, lovingly put together again by clergy and masons, jointly constructing, jointly repairing a beautiful building, a solid building. I remember being on Iona twenty years ago on a stormy July evening and watching people streaming to the Abbey to worship and to shelter from the summer hailstones. A sheltering space, a safe space, creative space. More and more, this picture of ecumenical space is shaping our thinking, space where we can come together and learn about each other. Space where the hostility can be quietened. And, for the space to be safe, it needs boundaries.

As usual, R S Thomas has a poem about it, and, as usual, it's Johnston McKay who told me about it! It's called "The Garden".

> It is a gesture against the wild,
> The ungovernable sea of grass:
> A place to remember love in,

To be lonely for a while:
To forget the voices of children
Calling from a locked room:
To substitute for the care
On one querulous human
Hundreds of dumb needs

It is the old kingdom of man.
Answering to their names
Out of the soil the buds come,
The silent detonations
Of power wielded without sin

Anyone who has spent time in the Abbey, preferably after the tourists have left, will hear resonances in that poem. “A place to remember love in, to be lonely for a while” A place where faith can be nurtured. A place of gentle growth and sinless power, of a very special kind of freedom

That’s the paradox of our time, a time of 9/11 and now 7/7. Our freedoms are fragile and seek protection, but in protecting them, how far do we need to go in limiting the freedoms of others? “It is a gesture against the wild, the ungovernable sea of grass”. Our freedom, our human dignity, is protected by laws, which structure the way we treat each other and the way we respect other people’s right to disagree with us. And how that is to be done is a hot issue today and one which will be keenly prayed about here, with Iona’s tradition of reflection on Justice and Peace.

But this debate echoes tensions that can be traced throughout the bible and throughout Christian communities today. Our freedom is built and sustained by rules, and commandments and the stories of faith. But these very stories are stories of vulnerability and trust, stories of movement and of change. For some, keeping faith with the rules has meant separation from the world, the construction of closed communities, or communities alienated from the world around them. For others, Christ calls them out

from a protected fortress into the vulnerable messiness of the world God loves, protected only by his love.

Many of the dividing walls in the church did not have their origins in hostility but in this wish for space to be free to be faithful. You **can** regard walls as serving a useful purpose. There's a poem by Robert Frost that pictures two neighbours going on their annual inspection of the wall that divides one man's apple orchard from the other's pine forest. As they pick up the fallen boulders and replace them, one has the temerity to suggest that the wall serves no useful purpose because the distinction between apple orchard and pine forest is clear enough. But the other keeps muttering, "Good fences make good neighbours". And good neighbourliness is also a Christian virtue.

One of the ecumenical dramas that has been played out in Scotland over the summer is the crisis over the future of Scottish Churches House, a little row of cottages in Dunblane that are owned by Action of Churches Together in Scotland. Having this building, neutral as to ownership of any one church, has been a great bonus for the churches in Scotland. Several church representatives have commented on how important it has been that they didn't have to meet on someone else's premises. The house is a symbol of church unity. Yet, faced with the possibility of the house having to close, many felt that there was now sufficient trust between the churches that they would feel comfortable about accepting hospitality from each other. Indeed, without realising that there was a question mark over the house's future, some of the ecumenical networks had been making a request to visit each other's offices, to learn more about their partners.

How do we make our unity visible? Do we **have** to live together or can we just be good neighbours? Remember that it is the hostility between us that is the problem, in Ephesians, and that is characterised by dividing walls. Hostility between races, genders, ages, people of different status can be entrenched by structures, physical or political, that strive to keep people apart. Can the hostility go and the walls remain?

**Modelling Unity**

The assumption underlying the Churches Together model of ecumenism is that it is possible to have benign walls that preserve separate identity but allow communication

across and through them. Respecting the richness of Christian revelation that is within the churches is seen, either as a good in itself, or as a necessary staging post to a more unified church. Or is that a cop-out?

I believe that ecumenism should move in the direction of gain, not of loss. It's in worship, rather than church assemblies, that that gain is most often captured. I hope that all of us here have found it thrilling to share worship with people from other traditions and, in that, to learn what there is to value in our own. I've been privileged to attend Assemblies in Basel, Graz, Trondheim and Harare and each has left indelible impressions on my mind. Carving the stone in Basel, baskets of fruit in Graz, water in Trondheim, leaves in Harare, each an imaginative symbol freshly woven into the service. And yet ... I also remember the pleasure in Graz of capturing the Anglican vespers one evening and singing some real English hymns and realising the poverty of the words of much ecumenical worship.

Last year, I attended the URC Assembly. It was one of the most enjoyable weeks of the year and I felt at home in that church. The URC is proud of its ecumenical commitment, and rightly so, since it is itself a successful union of three churches. Yet I found myself complaining that, after all the effort of uniting two churches, what they had come up with was … another church. A church that had all the same concerns as other ones – tensions between ministry and mission, how to attract young people, what to do with their buildings, how to regard the tax concessions on manses.

And I recalled a quote from a study by John Vincent, who was conducting a role play of the Great Feast in Matthew's Gospel. One by one, the participants gave their excuses for not accepting the invitation until one woman burst out, "It's not fair. If we could see the feast, we would come." Modelling the feast is part of what the church should be doing. And it's a rich, abundant, overflowing feast, for everyone. I doubt if we get there by negotiating hard over what should be kept in and what should be kept out in union talks. And that is why I was sorry to see the proposals of the Scottish Churches' Initiative for Union being, not just rejected, but not seriously considered by many church people in Scotland. It was a proposal that didn't look like a church and was generous in its ideas. It was an attempt to make something new, not a compromise out of the old.

That takes care of Jamie Oliver. What about the Famous Five?

**Discovering Unity**

The goal of ecumenism is often characterised as visible unity. But there's always the danger that that goal degenerates into the manipulation of an appearance of unity. Rather than asking what the unity is that we should be making visible, some people are quite clear about what church unity should look like – fewer denominations, joint action, the Lund Principle, El Escorial quotas on committees. And, as a discipline, these practices are valuable in preventing the churches from either being drawn into public competition that can feed sectarian attitudes or assuming a uniformity of view and practice when it doesn't hold. Majority churches, in particular, benefit from hearing how they are regarded by minority ones, and being reminded that their way of doing things isn't the only one. One of the difficulties today is the sense of self sufficiency of these bigger churches, and the difficulty the ecumenical organisations have in persuading them that their grasp of the Christian message is only partial. This was brilliantly and memorably expressed by Rowan Williams at the St Alban's conference. "Separately, we say: Don't listen to him, listen to me. Together, we say: Don't listen to me, listen to Christ and listen to Christ there as well as here!"

But this avoids the deeper question of what the unity is that is our gift in Christ. Again, Archbishop Rowan opened up this question memorably by taking the John 17 verse but laying the emphasis, not on "that they may be one", but on the following phrase, "as you and I are one" and asking what **that** might mean. He developed his theme in terms of attraction, of being drawn into unity through the essential attractiveness of Christ and the Father. There are echoes here of the great feast, but also of something much more fundamental.

How we address this question is much more difficult than how we construct an appearance of unity. Many of the processes may be the same, if only because we are limited in our imagination, but I believe we need a new attitude to them. Rather than a praxis of repair, of patching up the damage of the past, we need a praxis of discovery, strategies to uncover the unity that is already ours. Like the Famous Five, we should

think of ourselves as setting out on an adventure, not just doing maintenance jobs round the house.

What kinds of strategies for discovery might we adopt?

To begin with, we can search for clues in the past, revisiting old ideas, following paths that might have been missed in the climate of the day. This is not in the spirit of what Cardinal Kasper called an “ecumenism of return” but rather in the belief that revelation often comes in what is rejected. This is not my area at all, but I assume that is one of the reasons that there is so much interest in Patristics, in what Christian understanding was like before the church got its hands on it!

Secondly, we can test our understanding of unity by acting together. And we do, in Lent study groups, on Make Poverty History marches, in homelessness projects. But rather than being frustrated when difficulties arise, as they do, or wielding a heavy ecumenical stick to enforce compliance, we should see these difficulties as opportunities for better understanding. One of the debates within CEC in recent years came about when we incorporated into CEC the European Ecumenical Commission for Church and Society, a lean machine that had been operating efficiently in representing church views to the European Commission, predominantly on behalf of churches in Western European countries. That edge was blunted when the churches from the East, with their predominantly Orthodox way of doing things, entered the picture. We learned patience in that time and a readiness to recognise and probe further the differences between us, rather than presuming a blanket compliance with one view.

Thirdly, we can send raiding parties out beyond the walls of our churches themselves to learn from the witness and spirituality of people who do not speak our language. We must always remember that Christ is to be found in the whole *oikumene*, not just in the institutional churches. It is undoubtedly one of the weaknesses of ecumenism that we become so focused on the churches themselves that we blind ourselves to the liberating, soul-stretching insights that are outside and round the corner, where we might catch a glimpse of the unity Christ wills for us.

Iona is a great place to start this kind of adventure. It throbs with the spirit of the present and the ghosts of the past and you are always relentlessly directed outwards, away from this island to the light and the dark of the whole world. We have an exciting week ahead of us, so let’s get on with it!