

# God, People and Resources

A Christian comment on  
the values of Australian  
society



TO THE GLORY OF GOD AND IN COMMEMORATION OF  
THE FOUNDATION OF  
THE BROTHERHOOD OF ST LAURENCE  
ON THIS SITE 8 DEC 1930  
CO-FOUNDER FATHER G K TUCKER

Oliver Heyward

Occasional Paper — Companions of St Laurence — 1982

BROTHERHOOD OF ST. LAURENCE  
67 BRUNSWICK STREET, FITZROY  
ARCHIVES

1982-17  
15

# God, People and Resources

## A Christian comment on the values of Australian society

The Second G. T. Sambell Memorial Oration  
delivered by

*The Right Reverend Oliver Heyward, M.A.*

on

5th December, 1982 at the  
52nd Foundation Festival of the  
Brotherhood of St Laurence

Companions of St Laurence  
1982

First published in 1982 by  
The Companions of St Laurence,  
67 Brunswick Street,  
Fitzroy,  
Victoria, 3065

© The Rt Revd Oliver Heyward 1982

National Library of Australia  
Cataloguing-in-Publication entry

Heyward, Oliver, 1926—

God, people and resources: a Christian comment  
on the values of Australian society.

Delivered on the 5th December 1982 at the  
52nd Foundation Festival of the Brotherhood  
of St Laurence

Bibliography

ISBN 0 9594389 2 0.

1. Social values. 2. Christianity and culture.  
3. Australia — Social conditions. I. Companions  
of St Laurence. II. Title. (Series: G.T. Sambell  
memorial oration; 2). (Series: Occasional paper  
(Companions of St Laurence)).

306.4

Typeset and printed by  
PIT Press,  
Plenty Road, Bundoora, Vic. 3083

## FOREWORD

### *In honour of Geoffrey Tremayne Sambell*

Geoffrey Tremayne Sambell was born in Broadford, Victoria in 1914 and later attended Melbourne Boys High School. His leadership qualities were recognised when he was selected for the Lord Somers Camp, after which he played rugby with Powerhouse. This fostered his interest in young people and led him into a leadership role in the Church of England Boys Society.

During a short but promising business career he was involved with St Mark's Social Settlement during the 1930s. He was then called to the ministry and he entered Ridley College and was ordained in 1940. After serving a curacy at St John's East Malvern he served with great distinction as a Chaplain with the Australian Military Forces, both in the 57/60 and 2/11 battalions in New Guinea where he was mentioned in despatches. After the war he completed his B.A. at Melbourne University.

In 1947 he was appointed Director of the Melbourne Diocesan Centre, a co-ordinated multi-parish and chaplaincy venture based in the inner city. While in that position he was appointed as Archdeacon of Melbourne in 1961 when he became for a time the Director of Home Missions. In the midst of his Diocesan responsibilities, and his leadership of the Brotherhood of St Laurence he was also Warden of the Mission to Streets and Lanes, and involved in other welfare activities including the Victorian Council of Social Service. He was consecrated Bishop in St Paul's Cathedral Melbourne on 24th February 1962 and subsequently enthroned Archbishop of Perth in 1969. He died in December 1980 after an outstanding Episcopate in Western Australia and throughout the national church.

The G. T. Sambell Memorial Oration has been established by the Brotherhood of St Laurence to commemorate his work. His connection with the Brotherhood was longstanding and arose out of his deep social concern which had been the chief among the several forces which led him into full-time service of the church. He had great organising ability, recognised by Fr Tucker who invited him to join the Brotherhood in 1949. He was firstly involved as a member of the Board of Directors, then as Bursar, Director of Social Services and in 1956 Director and Deputy Chairman of the Board. Later in the 1960s he became Chairman of the Board, a post he retained until he moved to Perth.

Geoffrey Sambell was a big man, in body, mind and spirit. Long before he died (at the age of 66) his influence had been felt far and wide in the Anglican Communion and in the ecumenical movement beyond. He twice represented the Australian Church at the East Asia Christian Conference, and was the representative of South-East Asia on the Executive Officer's Advisory Committee of the Lambeth Consultative Body. In Australia he was the dynamic Chairman of the General Synod Social Responsibilities Commission, which under his leadership spoke out for the national church on social questions. He was respected and listened to by Government at both State and Federal levels, and in 1978 he was appointed Chairman of the Federal Government's Social Welfare Advisory Committee.

He was a forceful character who could, and sometimes did, ride roughshod over opposition, backing his judgment and knowing that he was right. But behind the bluff ex-

terior he had the heart of a pastor who never spared himself for anyone, clergyman or layman, who needed his help. He had vision, but it was a very 'down to earth' vision; he was a loyal Anglican but at the same time a wholehearted ecumenist; he was a missionary and a missionary, but spurned paternalism or ecclesiastical triumphalism; he was an ordained priest, but no one welcomed the rediscovered 'priesthood' of the laity more than he did or had more friends amongst them.

Leader, pastor, organiser, financier — he was all these, but much more, a man of God.

**December, 1981**

# GOD, PEOPLE AND RESOURCES

## A Christian comment on the values of Australian society

During the past 10 years there has been a significant change in the values of Australian society. This has probably been caused by a complex mix of events which include the long period of economic boom which ended in the mid-seventies. With that came big advances in technology, producing a confidence in the capacity of human beings not only to manage their own affairs, but to control the world in which we live. This coincided with a period in which the Church lost confidence in its message and ceased to speak with certainty as increasing numbers of people felt that they had no need of belief in God.

Preliminary figures obtained from the Bureau of Census and Statistics on the questions relating to religion from last year's census show a decline in allegiance to the Christian Churches over the previous ten years of 9.8 per cent, from 86.2 per cent to 76.4 per cent. This is also paralleled by a rise of 8.7 per cent of those who claim no religion or who declined to reply to the questions.<sup>1</sup>

Through lack of a standard on which to base their judgements of right and wrong many Australians now judge only by what will bring them the greatest personal advantage. This advantage is conceived in highly materialistic and hedonistic terms. There is little sense of responsibility towards other members of society, and almost none towards the natural resources of the country. Values are seen to be short-term and the wider implications of what is being done are rarely considered.

Of course, human beings have always been selfish. There have always been those who have been ruthless in their exploitation of people and property, and who have risen to great wealth and power as a result. At the same time there have always been those who have suffered as a result of this process. We ought always remember that this country was founded on the suffering of its original inhabitants and of those who, convicted of crimes against their own society, were exiled here to become a substitute for cheap slave labour which Britain had made illegal at just that time.

Despite the apparent inevitability of human greed and selfishness, it is possible to see a spread of its influence in our society which is greater than in the past. Perhaps it is because the competition for the wealth of the country is more evenly distributed than in earlier periods of our history. This has resulted in an attitude, both corporate and individual, that because everyone is out for all they can get, each must fight for their own share. It is here that a decline in religious belief becomes significant, because a vacuum of values makes it possible for a selfishness to flourish that denies any need to be responsible for the part of the world we control or the people who live here or in other countries.

Having said that this situation has in part been caused by the failure of the Christian Church in this country to be definite enough in its teachings, we must now turn to those fundamental aspects of the Christian faith which speak very clearly to the moral situation of our Australian society today.

---

1. <i>Bureau of Census and Statistics</i> figures:	1971	1981
a) Allegiance to a Christian church —	86.2	76.4
b) No religion —	6.7	10.8
c) Declined to answer question on religion —	6.1	10.7

## I: CHRISTIAN CERTAINTIES:

The summary of this teaching given by Jesus himself is the point at which to begin, because it is a point which would still be recognised even by many of those who claim to have no religious affiliation. In Matthew's version it reads —

You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it. You shall love your neighbour as yourself. On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets.

(Matthew 22:37-40)

Immediately this marks the difference between the teaching of Jesus and the general humanitarianism of many people of good will in this country. Those who follow 'the golden rule' do genuinely try to 'love your neighbour as yourself'. But for Jesus, and for his followers, that is secondary. The great and first commandment is — 'You shall love the Lord your God'. When that comes first there is some hope of the second following. Without it there is little hope when the final analysis is made.

### God who creates:

To love God is to recognise who he is, and the response that he requires of us. The Bible opens with the words —

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

(Genesis 1:1)

He is a being who is personal and rational, and the whole universe, 'the heavens and the earth' are the result of his deliberate act. The universe does not just exist for its own sake. It had a beginning in God's intention. It continues because he wills that it should, and its end is dependent on him. Because he is personal we can relate to him, and can co-operate with him in the continuing process of his creation.

God cannot be equated with the measurable existence of the universe. Because he created it he is different from it. Yet those who have considered him so distant from his creation as to have no effective relationship with it, have always been wrong. The Christian tradition insists that the material universe proceeds from the loving being of God. Though he is different from his creation, he cares for it; and we human beings must therefore act responsibly and caringly towards it.

The first creation story of the book of Genesis describes man's relationship to God and the basis of his responsibility towards creation.

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves upon the earth'.

(Genesis 1:27-28)

and in the second, more intimate creation story it says —

The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it.

(Genesis 2:15)

Though these are stories from the period of man's nomadic and early agricultural existence describing his current understanding of himself, they contain certain absolute truths. Having God's image, man is to rule over the non-human creation with care, preserving it and furthering its development. His charter is not to exploit it, but 'to till it and keep it'.

The image of God in man is a description of his freedom, and his duty to make responsible moral judgements about how he exercises his dominion over the created universe. This freedom provides for the possibility of sin, and in the continuing stories of Genesis it is shown how God's intention for man was destroyed. Grinding toil and violence, personal suffering and national rivalry are the result of human sin and the selfish desire for power and possessions.

### **God who saves:**

The good news of Jesus Christ adds a new dimension to this understanding of God and the created universe. It states that in becoming human God actually shared himself in the life of his creation. In doing so he provided the way in which human sin could be overcome. He renewed the covenant which he had made with the whole creation. The promise of this was made concrete and visible in the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

The Christian gospel is one of hope, not only for human beings in their spiritual relationship with God, but for the whole creation. St Paul shares his vision of this hope in his letter to the Romans —

For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God; for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the sons of God.

(Romans 8:19-21)

The Christian hope is that the whole creation will finally be brought to completion in the intention God has for it. While the greed of human beings goes unchecked the material universe is exploited and its use perverted. The hope is frustrated through human sin. But when sin is overcome those who have power over creation will exercise that power responsibly and the future is filled with hope.

In the New Testament there is a paradox in its teaching about the last things. On the one hand there is the picture of judgement when good and evil will finally be separated and all that is against God's will consigned to the fire. But there is also the promise of universal salvation, when God will be all in all and when not only the human race but the whole creation will be caught up into a new heaven and a new earth. As with the many other paradoxes of the Christian faith these two views complement each other, and particularly so when they are seen to apply not just to the fate of individual people but to the ultimate destiny of the whole universe.

### **Neighbours to love:**

When we look for the meaning of 'love your neighbour as yourself' in the teaching of Jesus, we find that he gave this commandment to people living in a context with many similarities to our own. The Jewish society of his day was bitterly divided. There were the conservative Sadducees, the more liberal Pharisees and there were the

political opportunists who co-operated with the Roman army of occupation. There were the wealthy through inheritance and the wealthy through corruption and unscrupulous business dealings — the taxcollectors! There were the poor who are always there in any society, and those who through ill-health or social circumstances had been driven to the edges of society.

In this context Jesus taught a standard of human behaviour that was meant to illustrate God's own treatment of those who are his children. I will quote just two passages to describe that standard.

Then Peter came up and said to him, 'Lord how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? As many as seven times?' Jesus said to him, 'I do not say to you seven times, but seventy times seven'.

(Matthew 18:21-22)

Four hundred and ninety times! Clearly that is absurd, and it is meant to be. The forgiveness we must offer our neighbours must be like God's forgiveness — without limits.

Jesus' own expansion of 'love your neighbour' is —

You have heard that it was said 'You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy'. But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven,

...

The same point is made again. God's love is limitless, and ours must be too. This is extended further in what follows —

for he makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust.

(Matthew 5:43-45)

God does not discriminate between men in the provision of the blessings of his creation — all are equal before him. The clear teaching is that we must treat all men and women equally and ensure that all receive a fair share of what God has provided.

The circumstances of Jesus' ministry show that he was constantly aware of the inequality of his own society. He healed the sick, thus enabling them to return to a proper place in the community. A common theme of his teaching was the use of riches for the relief of the poor. To the rich young man he said —

You lack one thing; go sell what you have, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.

When he went sadly away Jesus commented to his followers —

It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.

(Mark 10:21 & 25)

In all his teaching Jesus is not giving a detailed prescription for daily life but is presenting a picture of how far love extends. The picture is drawn many times over — the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, the rich man and Lazarus, the dishonest steward, the talents. In all there is the same element of exaggeration which sharpens the focus on how we must behave towards our fellows, and the reason for it — to act as God himself would act.

You must be perfect — just as your Father in heaven is perfect.

(Matthew 5:48)

How then can this utopian teaching be applied to today's Australia, a greedy and wasteful society that appears to have very little concern for spiritual realities and even less for the sanctions of faith? The answers may not be acceptable to many but to those who do have faith they are the ultimate answers, and cannot be ignored.

## II: TODAY'S MORAL QUESTIONS:

Many of the urgent moral questions which are raised about Australian society today can be clearly answered by reference to these Christian certainties which have been outlined. Jesus' deceptively simple rules of love for God and love for neighbour challenge directly the attitudes adopted by the majority of Australians towards their fellow citizens, the physical resources of this country, and the use we make of them for ourselves and in relation to the rest of the world.

Much of what follows will be familiar to most people, but we must not allow our own familiarity with these issues to blind us to the fact that a majority of our fellow citizens do not see them in the same light. The Christian gospel has lost its cutting edge for our generation, so we must not allow our sense of Christian responsibility to be dulled by this fact. To apply the teachings of Christ to the great public issues of our day is a prime duty for all of us.

One of the great statesmen of our Anglican Communion at this present time is the Bishop of Winchester in England. In 1975 he published a small book entitled *Enough is Enough*. An important quotation from that book provides a setting for our consideration of certain specific moral questions —

Excess is the subject of this book, and the enemy which I shall invite you to fight year in and year out. It confronts us in our rich countries whichever aspect of our situation we look at — our consumption of food and our accumulation of goods, our wage claims and price rises, our waste and pollution, the concentration and congestion of our cities, our destruction of living creatures and our plunder of fuels and minerals, our expenditure on armaments and the wanton disproportion of the way we use them — excess is the word that comes continually to mind: ruthless, unbridled, unthinking excess. We are being made to expect too much. We are taking too much. We are paying, and compelling others to pay, far too high a price.<sup>2</sup>

### World responsibilities:

We are increasingly conscious today of the interdependence of every part of the world community. Australia is an island continent, but its economy is depressingly dependent upon the economies of its powerful trading partners. We are caught up in world recessions and booms over which we have no control.

This should make us recognise that we have responsibilities to the rest of the world for the use we make of the resources of this country. We are a small population inhabiting a very large area of land. Much of it is arid and very sparsely populated, but much of what is fertile is also being used by very few people.

2. John V. Taylor, *Enough is Enough*, S.C.M., London, 1975.

- a) Our first responsibility in our management of this country is that it should be used for the benefit of the greatest number of people. One way in which we are doing this is in the provision of basic foodstuffs for a world in which the population is growing faster than the available supplies of food. We are one of the world's most efficient producers. On average each Australian farmer grows enough food for 70 people, compared with 59 in the USA and 19 for the heavily subsidised European farmer.

We can be justly proud of this efficiency but we must realise that much of the food we are producing is for markets in the rich countries of the world. The need of the poor countries is not for meat, but for plant foods which are rich in oil and protein. We should be confining our meat production to land that is not suitable for cropping, and we should be increasing our production of crops such as lupins, sunflowers, rape seed and peas for markets in the developing world.

This would need to be a national policy because individual farmers should not be expected to carry any losses caused by such a change. We could produce food for nearly twice as many people as we do at present, but it would only be of value if it could be sold to the countries that need it most at a price that they could afford. It is not beyond the resources of Australia to do this.

- b) Alongside this is a second and parallel responsibility to use the non-renewable resources of this country for the benefit of the greatest number of people. Many of us are conscious of the current excessive rate of exploitation of our mineral resources. We are removing coal, iron, bauxite, oil, gas and smaller quantities of more precious products such as diamonds, gold and uranium at a prodigal rate. Their formation took millions of years, and in one single generation we are using them, and then throwing them away with no thought at all of the generations that are to follow us. It is not only those who are making large fortunes out of this process who are to be blamed, but the whole community which, in its demand for an ever-increasing standard of living encourages this exploitation.

Apart from minerals there is another non-renewable resource which is rapidly diminishing — the top-soil. Since recorded history began more than half the resources of arable soil on the earth have been lost. In the past the human race was ignorant of what it was doing in clearing the land of trees and stocking it with too many animals. The result through erosion and salinity is making deserts of our fertile country. We are rapidly doing this in Australia, and it is time that the whole community took the matter seriously. Even here in Victoria, the rich plains of the Murray and its tributaries are rapidly falling prey to salinity, and much of it could be desert by the middle of the next century if action is not taken now.

- c) When we move from resources to people the same picture emerges. Australia seems determined to maintain its very high standard of living rather than to share it with those who desperately need a new home. Of course, we do admit a number of refugees, and in the past the number has been relatively large. But when the enormity of the world's refugee problem is put alongside the use to which most of our land is put we cannot be complacent. We must be prepared to share more generously the wealth and opportunity of this country. It may mean a change to a simpler life-style for many of us, but if that is so then we must accept it.

In all these ways we have a responsibility not only to the rest of the world, but to God. We hold this land and its resources in trust for him, and he requires that we use it

not only for our own benefit now, but for the benefit of the whole human race both now and in the generations to come. They are our neighbours and God requires that a part of our love for him shall be expressed in our love for them.

## **Development:**

In recent years there has been steadily growing unease with the concept of development as the aim of every human society. Where once it was thought that there need be no limits to man's desire for wealth, it is now clear that there are very definite limits and that the so-called 'developed' world may already have reached them.

The Report of the Brandt Commission entitled *North-South: a programme for survival*, published in 1980 states —

... development involves a profound transformation of the entire economic and social structure. This embraces changes in production and demand as well as improvements in income distribution and employment. It means creating a more diversified economy . . .<sup>3</sup>

That transformation has taken place in Australia and the time is right for us to ask how much more development should we look for. At what stage does this process cease to improve the quality of our life, and begin to work against it?

An example may be taken from the changes that have occurred in rural living over the last 60 years. Advances in mechanical and chemical technology have almost completely abolished the need for agricultural labour. Those same advances have resulted in much larger farms with a consequent drift to the cities and a further decrease in rural population. In some districts an area which once contained ten farms with families on each is now only one farm worked by its owner and possibly one of his sons. At the same time the amenities of country living have greatly improved. Electricity, running water, telephone and above all the motor car have reduced the inconvenience and isolation, and rural incomes are now comparable with those in urban areas.

What has been lost is the community structure of many country districts. As the population has declined the symbols of local community have gradually disappeared, the general store, the post office, the school, the public hall, the church. Over this same period of time there has been a growing dissatisfaction with urban living, its lack of community sense, and pollution of the atmosphere. City people are searching nostalgically for country life when what they are looking for is now almost gone.

The ideal of development is based on the belief that higher incomes and improved technology will automatically lead to a better life. What we are learning, having acquired those things, is that while the hard grind of physical labour has been removed something of great value in the quality of life has been lost. The loss is because human values have been overlooked, the warm human relationships of small communities have been sacrificed to technological advance and economic gain.

## **Decision making:**

While Australian society has always set itself an ideal of equality of opportunity and a fair share of its resources for every member, present trends are moving us steadily further away from that ideal. This is happening for a number of reasons. Prominent among them is the fact that higher technology reduces the possibility of the participa-

3. Brandt Commission Report, *North South: A programme for survival*, Pan Books, 1980, p.48.

tion of all but a small elite in the decision-making process. The basis on which many decisions of national importance are made is so complex that the ordinary citizen is excluded.

This is true in the political field and it produces an authoritarian tendency in government whichever party is in power. Political accountability is reduced if decisions are made on the basis of information which cannot be shared. It is also true in the economic field where it contributes to the confrontationist style of relationship between management and unions with which we are so familiar.

In Australia many of the most important industrial decisions are made by the heads of large corporations based outside this country. They therefore have no ultimate responsibility either to our government or our people. It is not surprising therefore that trade unions who cannot influence the management decisions should be unable to feel responsible towards the company that employs them. Those decisions are made in an atmosphere of commercial competition with profits as the final arbiter.

The present period of recession with high unemployment is showing the social consequences of this restricted involvement in the process of decision-making. If our society is to be more responsible to God and to its individual members for its use of people and of resources some changes must be made. First, government must be made to be responsible to the whole community rather than to a party structure which decides who is to be nominated for election. Secondly, those who develop the technology must allow greater public participation in the control of their initial research and the use to which it is put. Thirdly, industrial corporations must be reduced to smaller units of management where human values and local needs can be considered in the making of policies.

### **Accountability:**

One of the most serious moral questions facing Australian society today is that of the accountability of the individual to the whole society. A great deal of evidence has recently been produced of those who have refused to pay their share of the taxes required to run the country. There may be a legal difference between tax avoidance and tax evasion but there is no moral difference. It is not only company directors and wealthy businessmen who have been doing this, but tradesmen and the owners of small businesses who have used cash which cannot be traced.

What has changed is that people no longer feel any inner compulsion to obey the law in spirit as well as in letter. The whole of our economic system encourages them to think about themselves and not the common good. The capitalist system presupposes that self-interest will be tempered by a widely accepted moral code. It is now clear that that code, which was the Christian one, is no longer accepted. It is not possible to impose a moral code on a community by force of law; any more than it is possible to have a society in which everyone puts the good of the whole before their own self-interest.

The only way that we can begin to break the present pattern of community selfishness is for a significantly large group of individuals openly to assert their determination to put the common good first. The members of the various branches of the Christian Church could be that group. Initially, of course, we would be disadvantaged because many would continue to use the system to get as much as possible for themselves. But if we were determined to accept that fact as the price to be paid for the reintroduction of an accepted moral code, much could be achieved.

In the end Christians really have no option but to adopt such a position, because we know that we are accountable to God. His concern for every individual in society must be reflected in our concern. The resources God has given to this country must be used for the benefit of the largest number of his people, and that is the ultimate reason why their selfish use should be replaced by accountability both to the whole community and to him.

### III: CONCLUSION:

The previous section has endeavoured to consider some contemporary moral questions in the light of the Christian certainties proposed at the beginning. J. Philip Wogoman in his book *A Christian method of Moral Judgement*, says —

In theological terms, the doctrine of creation may finally prove decisive in laying the foundations for a methodology of Christian moral judgement. This is so because it is through a doctrine of creation that we express our understanding of how it is that God himself is related to the structures and events of this world.<sup>4</sup>

This principle has been followed here in looking at some aspects of Australian life today.

In conclusion, we can point briefly to three basic assumptions which are challenged in the foregoing argument.

\* *The economic theory that 'growth' in production and consumption is the ultimate solution to our economic problems.*

Most of what has been discussed calls for a slowing-down of the rate of growth. This is only possible if the community is prepared to accept a reduction in the rate of growth in their standard of living. That is a further element of accountability which Christians must consider seriously.

\* *The belief that technological advance is capable of solving the problems of the human race and the communities it forms.*

Up to date there has been very little recognition of the fact that in solving some human problems technology has created others. It has reduced the need for unskilled labour but has undoubtedly contributed to the growth of structural unemployment in this country. The moral principles outlined most certainly apply to the application of technology and to the research which develops it. The community must demand a greater accountability in this area as well.

\* *The widely held view that religious belief is a private matter, and that the church should not involve itself in public issues.*

This is God's world and those who believe in him are failing in their responsibility to him if they do not apply their faith to matters affecting the community, the environment, the quality of life and the use of resources. Our personal relationship with God can develop only to the extent that we allow his love to influence every aspect of our life.

---

4. J. Phillip Wogoman, *A Christian method of Moral Judgement*, S.C.M., London. 1976. p.68.

One has a right to speak on these issues through being a citizen of this country and an elected leader of a significant group within it. There is an even greater responsibility to call the Christian community to action on these matters. The challenge to Church members is summed up by the world-wide conference of Anglican bishops in a statement first issued in 1978. Christians are called upon —

- \* to create a moral climate which enables governments to act for the benefit of the world community rather than sectional interests.
- \* in situations where the interests of minorities are in conflict with large-scale development schemes to give consideration to the needs of persons rather than economic advantage.
- \* to review their life-style and use of the world's resources so that the service and well being of the whole human family comes before the enjoyment of over indulgent forms of affluence.

#### IV: SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Also includes sources cited in the text.

- BIRCH, Charles: *Confronting the Future, Australia and the world: the next hundred years*, Penguin, 1975
- MONTEFIORE, Hugh (Ed.): *Man and nature*, The report of a group appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to investigate the relevance of Christian Doctrine to the problems of man and his environment, Collins, 1975
- NEVILE, J.W.: *The Root of all Evil — Essays on Economics, Ethics and Capitalism*, Australian Council of Churches, 1979
- REPORT of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues (Brandt Commission), *North-South: A programme for Survival*, Pan Books, 1980
- REPORT of the Lambeth Conference 1978, Church Information Office, London, 1978
- REPORT of the World Council of Churches Conference on Faith, Science and the Future, *Faith and Science in an Unjust World*, Vols I and II, W.C.C., Geneva, 1980
- TAYLOR, John V.: *Enough is Enough*, S.C.M. Press, London, 1975
- WOGOMAN, J. Philip: *A Christian method of moral judgement*, S.C.M. Press, London, 1976

The Right Reverend Oliver Heyward has been Bishop of Bendigo since 1975 and Chairman of the Social Responsibilities Commission of the Anglican Church of Australia since 1980, in succession to its founding Chairman, Archbishop Geoffrey Sambell.

He was born in Tasmania in 1926 and after obtaining a degree in Arts became Tasmanian Rhodes Scholar for 1949. He read Theology at Oxford and trained for ordination at Cuddesdon College.

Bishop Heyward was ordained in England and returned to Tasmania in 1956 serving in two country parishes and at St David's Cathedral before being appointed Warden of Christ College in the University of Tasmania in 1963.

During his time in Bendigo the Diocese amalgamated with the Diocese of St Arnaud. He is a strong advocate of Christian social concern in matters of rural policy. He is also a member of the Missionary and Ecumenical Council and a leader in ecumenical discussion at various levels.

Bishop and Mrs Heyward have four sons and two grandchildren.