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ABSTRACT

John Howard Mayo was the Anglican Bishop of Armidale, New South Wales, from 1924–1954. This thesis is an investigation and assessment of the career of Bishop Mayo as a public figure in Christian social engagement. It concerns his vision for the role of the Church in society, and the steps he took in that direction. It is not a biography of John Mayo. Neither is it an exhaustive survey of the Social Gospel movement in Australia or anywhere else. Although they both feature prominently throughout. The year 1925 has been chosen as the starting point since this was the year Mayo was appointed Bishop of Armidale. It was from this point onwards that Mayo became a national figure and that his views between widely disseminated, not only in Anglican circles, but in the public in general. Speeches that he made to an untold audience were made when his election to the See of Armidale.

The thesis comprises an introduction, five chapters, and a conclusion. Chapter 1 provides an historical background to the Social Gospel movement and a review of the relevant primary and secondary sources drawn upon throughout. Chapter 2 introduces and ana lyses Mayo’s vision for the Church in society. His seven Macarthur Lectures, given in St Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, in November 1941, have been selected as the framework for this chapter, since they meet with the majority of the issues that occupied his mind. These included social and racial justice, education (Mayo was one of the driving forces behind the founding of the University of New England), ethics, and the elimination of war. Mayo’s other works, both published and unpublished, also feature prominently. These include materials that have not been utilised by previous scholarship, such as Mayo’s lesser known works, manuscripts in his private papers.

They feature in the National Archives and television and radio broadcasts held by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Chapters 3 and 4 represent case-studies of Mayo’s active involvement.

Til mine børn, Camilla og Benjamin: det største rigdom i verden.
ABSTRACT

John Stoward Moyes was the Anglican Bishop of Armidale, New South Wales, from 1929-1964. This thesis is an investigation and assessment of the career of Bishop Moyes as a study in Christian social engagement. It concerns his vision for the role of the Church in society and his contribution to that effect. It is not a biography of John Moyes. Neither is it an exhaustive history of the Social Gospel movement in Australia or anywhere else, although they both feature prominently throughout. The year 1929 has been chosen as the starting point since this was the commencement of Moyes' episcopate in Armidale. It was from this point onwards that Moyes became a national figure and that his views became widely disseminated, not only in Anglican circles, but in the general community. The vast majority of all Moyes' writings and speeches that reached the national audience were made after his election to the See of Armidale.

The thesis comprises an introduction, five chapters and a conclusion. Chapter 1 provides an historical background to the Social Gospel movement and a review of the relevant primary and secondary literature drawn upon throughout. Chapter 2 presents and assesses Moyes' vision for the Church in society. His seven Moorhouse Lectures, given at St Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, in November 1941, have been selected as the framework for this chapter, since they deal with the majority of the issues that occupied his mind. These included social and racial equality, education (Moyes was one of the driving forces behind the founding of the University of New England), ecumenism, and the elimination of war. Moyes' other works, both published and unpublished, also feature prominently. These include materials that have not been utilised in previous scholarship, such as Moyes' lesser known works, manuscripts in his private papers, files located in the National Archives and television and radio broadcasts held by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Chapters 3 and 4 represent case studies of Moyes' active involvement.
in specific events in Australian history. Chapter 3 assesses his role in the successful bid to prevent the Menzies Government from proscribing the Communist Party of Australia in 1950 and 1951. Moyes was the first clergyman to publicly voice his opposition to the Government’s proposals. Chapter 4 assesses his role in leading the first public protests in Australia, in 1965, against the Menzies Government’s policy towards the developing conflict in Vietnam, later known as the Vietnam War. Chapter 5 compares and contextualises Moyes with eight leading Christian figures during his lifetime, all of whom in some way were connected with the Social Gospel. These are: Walter Rauschenbusch, Ernest Burgmann, William Temple, George Bell, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Reinhold Niebuhr, Martin Luther King Jr and André Trocmé. This chapter deals at length with a central component of the Social Gospel; the Christian response to violence.

It challenges the view that when national sovereignty is threatened, as was the case in World War II, the Christian response must be to support the government’s call to war.

It is argued here that John Moyes was unable to find a solution to the theological and moral challenges raised by the threat to Australia’s national sovereignty during World War II, but that his vision for the Church in society was one of the most positive, humane, and articulate of all church leaders in Australia during his lifetime.
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My interest in John Moyes first arose during undergraduate study of Australian church history. Here was a senior prelate of the Anglican Church who had been ordained as a priest before the First World War and whose episcopal career commenced at the dawn of the Great Depression, continuing until the middle 1960s. During all of those years he had expounded a vision of the Christian Church as a dynamic force for change and reform in the community at large, not merely as an instrument of personal salvation or a vehicle through which one could acquire access to a benevolent afterlife. In retirement, when he was well into his ninth decade, Moyes was still taking the lead in berating the Australian Government over its policy towards the rapidly escalating conflict in Vietnam. Further research concerning this articulate and broadly educated bishop revealed social engagement in a wide range of issues such as racial equality, the social and economic order, education, marriage and sex, ecumenism, and movements for peace and the elimination of war. This led to an interest in the Social Gospel in Australia and its antecedents in Britain and the USA.

The period of decline in Christian societal relevance in Australia since the second half of the twentieth century has brought forth a wealth of literature and a host of ideas concerning the measures required for the churches to maintain, or regain, some semblance of relevance in contemporary society. Although this issue lies outside the scope of this thesis, since it does not extend beyond the death of John Moyes in 1972, Christian relevance is one of its central themes. Moyes, and some of his colleagues, especially Ernest Burgmann, sought to keep their church in the public sphere at all times. Life was not to be compartmentalised into private and public, sacred and secular. Every issue had to be assessed in terms of how it conformed to what they
considered to be the message of Christianity. Their careers coincided with the perception in the
1930s that Capitalism had failed, and that the internecine carnage of the two world wars had
compelled humanity to find an alternative to the use of state-legitimised violence. For John
Moyes, and the others who embraced Social Gospel ideals, the churches had to bring their
influence to bear on the community and to take the lead in effecting the reforms necessary for
creating what they regarded as a Christian social order. The Anglican social gospellers drew
inspiration from the influence wielded in England during the first half of the twentieth century by
the Archbishop of York, and ultimately Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, who shared
many of their ideals.

The reasons for the successes and failures of John Moyes and the Social Gospel are
manifold, but none is greater than the tragedy that has always afflicted Christianity, especially
since the sixteenth century as far as the Western world is concerned, that it has never been able
to speak with one voice. A genuine consensus concerning what Christian morality actually
means has proved to be elusive. The Social Gospel was an optimistic reading of Christ’s message
that placed faith not only in God, but in the capacity of human beings to rise above their moral
limitations. The social gospellers wanted to build the Kingdom of God on earth; not to wait for it
to happen. They deprecated financial greed, emphasising the common good, and in particular,
the collective nature of sin. The condition of the handicapped, the marginalised and those
languishing at the bottom of the socio-economic scale was thus the responsibility of all. If the
Christian churches still desire to command a position of respect and relevance in the third
millennium, the career of John Moyes and the ideals of the Social Gospel may well contain some
valuable insights.
The number of people whose assistance needs to be acknowledged is considerable and it is therefore not possible to list them all by name. Special thanks go to the teaching staff in the Department of Studies in Religion, University of Sydney. These include my principal supervisor, Iain Gardner, who ensured that I did not launch into a utopian societal blueprint for all eternity; Carole Cusack, who is the living embodiment of ‘If you want something done, ask a busy person,’ and Christopher Hartney, who offered welcome words of encouragement and advice. Research trips to Armidale were very enjoyable thanks to the assistance given by the diocesan archivists, Jean Newall and Shirley Dawson, and also the diocesan secretary, Miriam Newall. I received valuable assistance from William Oates at the University of New England Heritage Centre, from John Moyes’ daughter, Monica Moyes, who was very helpful in answering my questions and sending material of all kinds concerning her father, and from Joy Lancaster, widow of the former Vicar of Inverell. Assistance was also provided by the staff at the various libraries, in particular, the Mitchell Library, Sydney, and the National Library, Canberra. Also of critical importance was the assistance offered by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, Sydney, and the National Archives, Canberra. In London, I was assisted by Jean Penney, the Churchwarden at St Swithun’s, Lewisham, and John Coulter, the Local Studies Librarian, Lewisham. General thanks go to fellow students in the Department of Studies in Religion, University of Sydney, whose work daily repudiates the prophets of doom who contend that our education system is not producing the quality of yesteryear.
INTRODUCTION

John Moyes

John Stoward Moyes was the Anglican Bishop of Armidale, New South Wales, from 1929-1964. This thesis is an investigation and assessment of the career of Bishop Moyes as a study in Christian social engagement. It concerns his vision for the role of the Church in society and his contribution to that effect. Before explaining the methodology employed in this thesis, it will be useful to state from the outset that it is not a biography of John Moyes. Neither is it an exhaustive history of the Social Gospel movement in Australia or anywhere else, although they both feature prominently throughout. The year 1929 has been chosen as the starting point since this was the commencement of Moyes' episcopate in Armidale. It was from this point onwards that Moyes became a national figure and that his views became widely disseminated, not only in Anglican circles, but in the general community. The vast majority of all Moyes' writings and speeches that reached the national audience were made after his election to the See of Armidale.

Below is a chronological summary of Moyes' early life and career until his episcopal election.

Date and Place of Birth: 1884, Koolunga, South Australia, son of John Moyes, headmaster of Thebarton School.

Primary and Secondary Education: Gladstone; Naracoorte; St Peter's College, Adelaide (dux in final year, 1902).

1905 University of Adelaide, BA (Honours in Mathematics).

1907 University of Adelaide, MA (Classics, Logic and Psychology).

1908 St Barnabas Theological College, Licentiate in Theology (Th.L.) awarded by the Australian College of Theology.
1908 Ordained as priest by Bishop Arthur Nutter Thomas, St Peter's Cathedral, Adelaide.

1908-1910 Assistant Curate at St Paul’s Port Pirie, South Australia.

1911-1913 Assistant Curate at St Mary’s, Lewisham, London.

1913-1919 Rector of St Cuthbert’s, Prospect, South Australia.

1918 Chaplain to the Australian Military Forces.

1919-1921 Rector of St Paul’s, Port Pirie, South Australia.

1921-1925 Rector of St Bartholomew’s, Norwood, South Australia.

1925-1929 Archdeacon of Adelaide.¹

The aim here is to explore the efforts of one of the Anglican Church’s most gifted twentieth century representatives in Australia to keep his church at the centre of Australian life. It is an examination of his Social Gospel ideals, and the extent to which he was able to bring them to bear on the community at large, not only in his diocese but throughout Australia. The career of J. S. Moyes is only known in the twenty-first century to those with an interest in the history of the Anglican Church in Australia, but from the 1930s to the late 1960s he was one of his church’s most high profile spokesmen. Moyes, who is probably best described as an ‘evangelical liberal,’ occupying an area somewhere in between ‘low’ and ‘high’ Anglicanism, in a liturgical sense, had warned before, during, and after his episcopal career that purely personal salvation and personal holiness constituted an incomplete Christian life. The Church, in his opinion, had to bring its influence to bear on every aspect of existence. In particular, this entailed social justice for the disadvantaged. Moyes believed that without social justice, it was impossible to build the Kingdom of God on earth. The Anglican Primate at the time of Moyes’ death, Archbishop Frank Woods, told the mourners who had come from all over Australia that:

¹ *Armidale Express*, 31 January 1972, pp. 1-2, and ABC Radio interview of John Moyes by Michael Parer, 1 February 1968. Dates concerning Moyes’ early life vary in the printed sources. Those listed here have been checked with Moyes’ own statements made in the above radio interview.
God is strangely sparing in His gift of prophets to His Church. There
have not been many outstanding prophets: I would dare to name two—
Bishop Burgmann and Bishop Moyes…One cannot help linking his name
with that of the great Archbishop William Temple. What Temple was for
England, John Moyes might well have been for Australia had he been
listened to.\(^2\)

Whether any vestiges of Temple’s influence remain in twenty-first century Britain is a matter for
another debate, but the invocation of Temple’s name in a eulogy for John Moyes was highly
germane. Born three years after William Temple, in 1884, Moyes shared to a large extent
Temple’s vision for the role of the Church in twentieth century society.

Moyes was part of a small group of social gospellers amongst the Anglican clergy,
mainly in New South Wales, in the 1930s and 1940s. Others included the Bishop of Goulburn,
and later, Canberra and Goulburn, Ernest Burgmann; the Primate of Australia (1935-1946) and
Archbishop of Perth (1929-1946), Archbishop Henry le Fanu; the Bishop of Bathurst, Horace
Crotty; the Bishop of Riverina, Reginald Halse; Canon E. J. Davidson of St James’, King Street,
Sydney; the Dean of Bathurst, H.R. Holmes; John Hope, Rector of Christ Church St Laurence,
Sydney; P. A. Micklem, Rector of St James’, King Street, Sydney, and other clergy and lay
Anglicans, in particular those associated with St John’s College, Morpeth. The active
contributors at Morpeth, apart from the aforementioned Burgmann who was Warden before his
election to Goulburn, included Roy Lee, A. P. Elkin, who later became Professor of
Anthropology at the University of Sydney, and G. V. Portus, who became Professor of History
and Political Science at the University of Adelaide. The Warden of St Paul’s College, University
of Sydney, Arthur Garnsey, was an energetic voice, as was Reverend W. G. Coughlan in his role

\(^2\) Armidale Express, 11 February 1972, pp. 1-2.
as Director of the Christian Social Order Movement, an initiative of the Social Questions Committee of General Synod, of which Moyes was Chairman. Several of the above mentioned identities were labelled ‘red’ or ‘pink’ due to their public pronouncements concerning the compatibility of Christianity with some of the ideals of Communism. Although Moyes was also labelled in similar terms from time to time, his work has survived the demise of Communism in a manner not achieved by several of his fellow social gospellers who displayed a naive attachment to the Soviet Union, especially before and during World War II.

The issue of World War II leads to one of the most difficult areas for the proponents of the Social Gospel, in that peaceful resolution of conflict was central to Social Gospel theology. This is an issue that will be discussed at greater length later in this thesis. While only a few social gospellers advocated total pacifism, it was, however, generally held that force should only be employed as the last resort. In this context, the experience of Fascism, Nazism, and Stalinist Communism posed grave challenges to the integrity of Social Gospel ideals. By 1939, the aggressive *realpolitik* of Nazism had appeared to have exposed, and even mocked, the impotence of the peacemakers. Ten years later, the ally who had borne by far the heaviest burden in the defeat of Nazism, the USSR, appeared to many in the West to be charting a similar course in foreign affairs to its Nazi enemy. It is no wonder, in such a political climate, that the Social Gospel lost much of its support. Reinhold Niebuhr’s *Christian Realism*, published in 1953, was thought by many to have dealt the final, highly articulate blow.³

Despite the moral depths to which humanity had sunk during World War II and the ‘realist’ onslaught, the Social Gospel rose again in a revised edition in the 1950s, led by a gifted, young, black American Baptist minister. Echoing to some extent the ideals of Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr preached a gospel of social justice and racial equality to be achieved by

non-violent resistance to state-legitimised oppression. King was more than prepared to dive into the fetid cloaca of politics and by the time of his assassination the legislative program that he had inspired was well on its way towards implementation.

The research for this project has revealed that one of the most important and formative influences on Moyes' thought was William Woodcock Hough, Moyes' vicar at Lewisham, London, while he was curate there from 1911-1913. Hough later became Archdeacon of Kingston-upon-Thames, and Bishop of Woolwich from 1918-1932. Moyes recorded in his unpublished memoirs the huge impression the two years with Hough at Lewisham had made on him and how they had inspired him to work for social justice in Australia. Another lasting influence on Moyes was the previously mentioned William Temple. Temple's works were known to Moyes, as they would have been to most Anglican clerics and scholars, before they met at Lambeth in 1930. If one can be permitted to indulge in a perilous attempt to encapsulate a man's vision in one sentence, Moyes' vision for the Church, not only his Church, was an echo of Temple's often quoted maxim that the Christian Church is the only institution in the world existing exclusively for those who are not its members. When presenting his view that the Church should be an integral part of life at every level, not retreating or withdrawing from a world with which it will not compromise, Moyes asserted bluntly that "the Church, the congregation, which is not doing this, is irrelevant, meaningless."

The Social Gospel

In 1923, the Anglican Bishop of Zanzibar, Frank Weston, told the Anglo-Catholic Conference, in London, that: "You cannot worship Jesus in the Tabernacle if you do not pity

---

4 J. S. Moyes, 'My Confessions: An Australian Remembers,' unpublished manuscript held at Armidale Diocesan Archives, pp. 15-16; and ABC Radio interview with Michael Parer, 1 February 1968.
5 Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 289.
Jesus in the slum. While most Christians may agree with such a statement in principle, the Social Gospel asserted that this required more than words and individual acts of charity. Wide ranging reform of society along those lines was necessary to facilitate the building of God's Kingdom on earth.

The Social Gospel, or Christian Socialism, as it was originally known in England, is not novel, having existed for more than one hundred and fifty years. Its roots in England can be traced back to Frederick Maurice, Charles Kingsley and John Ludlow in the middle of the nineteenth century. Some have argued that its origins are of still greater antiquity, and include William Godwin, Robert Owen, and the Oxford Movement among its antecedents. In the United States of America (USA), it first became prominent in the second half of the nineteenth century through the writings of Washington Gladden, Richard T. Ely and later, and in particular, Walter Rauschenbusch. In Australia, the Catholic Church has fought tenaciously on behalf of its flock, which until the second half of the twentieth century was largely working class. Of the non-Catholics, there was, during the 1930s and 1940s, (in the case of John Moyes, to the middle 1960s) the previously mentioned small group of talented bishops and priest-intellectuals within the Anglican Church, and some Protestant ministers, who preached and wrote extensively in favour of Social Gospel ideals. It shall be argued here that Moyes' legacy has proved to be the

---

7 The term Christian Socialism is often used interchangeably with Social Gospel. Christian Socialism has been the term used in the British Isles since the nineteenth century. Social Gospel was more widely used in the USA and Australia.
8 Non-Catholics in Australia have often referred to the Catholic Church as the Roman Catholic Church. This nomenclature has a multi-layered historical background and does not require discussion here. It has not been employed other than in citations and italics due to the fact that, apart from all else, it is not the terminology used by the Catholic Church itself. This titular methodology has been followed throughout. There should be no confusion between 'catholic' in a universal sense and the Catholic Church, whose head is the Bishop of Rome, since the terms do not interact in this case. The Anglican Church in Australia was officially titled the Church of England during Moyes' lifetime, although it had promulgated its own Constitution in Australia in 1962. It officially adopted the title, Anglican Church of Australia, in 1981. Its individual members, however, were, and still are, referred to as Anglicans. The term, Anglican Church, has therefore been employed throughout when referring to the Australian context.
least dated, most articulate and ideologically consistent of the Australian church leaders who
promoted the Social Gospel, or some form of Christian Socialism.

Fundamental to the Social Gospel interpretation of Christ’s teaching was that the
Christian life was incomplete if the churches over-emphasised the individual aspects of the faith,
such as the promise of an endless afterlife, personal salvation, and individual acts of charity. The
social gospellers argued that by placing excessive weight on eschatological, parousial and
soteriological matters, the Christian churches were allowing, if not fostering, the development of
an egocentric faith among their individual members. Under the motto, ‘The Fatherhood of God
and the Brotherhood of Man,’ the adherents of the Social Gospel took Jesus at his word. Citing
the Lord’s Prayer, they argued that Christ had charged his followers with building the Kingdom
of God on earth: “Your kingdom come, your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.” This, to
them, involved more than practising personal holiness in an attempt to secure one’s own entry
into heaven. It also entailed more than tossing a coin to a beggar or contributing to a charitable
organisation, since such action was merely palliative and did not attack the causes of the
problem. Sin, when seen through the eyes of Social Gospel theology, was not merely a personal
issue. It was therefore imperative that the collective nature of sin was also acknowledged. This
would hopefully lead to Christian support for social reform at the political level. To achieve this,
the churches had to be actively involved in all aspects of society. While the vast majority of
social gospellers deprecated public allegiance to any political party, they devoted considerable
attention to striving to influence policy-making on behalf of those at the lower end of the socio-
economic scale. They did this because they refused to accept that God desired that the
disadvantaged should remain disadvantaged, arguing that Christians could not dismiss the

---

problem as being caused by the indolence or the sins of the disadvantaged themselves. Nor was it morally responsible to simply assign the inequities of society to the inscrutable will of God. The social gospellers argued that, due to the collective nature of sin, the state of society was a reflection on all of its members.

**Methodology**

The thesis comprises this introduction, five chapters, including a literature review, and a conclusion. Apart from John Moyes' published works, the sources drawn upon include materials that have not been utilised in previous scholarship, such as Moyes' lesser known works, manuscripts and letters in his private papers, files located in the National Archives, and television and radio broadcasts held in the archives of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

Chapter 1, the literature review, deals not only with the primary and secondary material relevant to John Moyes, but also provides a selective review of the literature pertaining to Christian Socialism in England and the Social Gospel in the USA. Although this entails, at least partly, assessing material that preceded the career of John Moyes, it has been undertaken in order to develop a thorough understanding of the movement and its historical antecedents. Without such an understanding, it is difficult to interpret and assess the role and the aims of John Moyes and his fellow social gospellers.

Chapter 2 presents John Moyes' vision for the role of the Church in society using his most complete work in that regard as a basis. This was his series of seven Moorhouse Lectures, given at St Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, in November 1941. They were then published immediately in book form. These lectures, detailed in the introduction to Chapter 2, provide a framework for assessing Moyes' vision on most of the issues that occupied his mind. Material from the entire literary corpus of John Moyes also features prominently in this chapter. It shall be
argued that Moyes was a compassionate and progressive voice on most of the issues he canvassed.

Chapters 3 and 4 present case studies of how Moyes sought to bring his vision to bear on society. Chapter 3 deals with his contribution to the successful campaign to defeat the Menzies Government’s attempt to proscribe the Communist Party of Australia in 1950 and 1951. Chapter 4 deals with the Moyes-led episcopal protests in 1965 against the Menzies Government’s policy towards Vietnam immediately prior to the announcement of the dispatch of Australian combat troops to what became known as the Vietnam War. These two case studies do not only assess Moyes’ direct involvement in the issues at hand, but place him in the overall context of the subject. The historiography of these two critical episodes in Australian history is thus an integral part of both chapters.

In the case of Chapter 3 and the attempt to ban the Communist Party, it shall be argued that Moyes was not only the first clerical protester, but that his contribution was the most useful and rational of any church leader in a fractious debate that was characterised by unseemly examples of sectarianism. This debate, culminating in the referendum of 1951, developed into one of the most acrimonious political struggles in Australia’s history. It not only pitted politicians against politicians but churches against churches, and bishops against bishops. The sources for this chapter, apart from Moyes’ own works, range from the newspapers from all over Australia, church newsletters and journals, the National Archives, and contemporary and current secondary literature.

In the case of Chapter 4 and the Vietnam War, Moyes was not only the first church leader to protest, but arguably the first protester with any public profile in the nation. Several years passed and many lives were lost before views similar to his took root in the general
community. Nevertheless, it was John Moyes who first placed the wisdom and morality of the Government’s decision on the national agenda. He steered clear of seeing the problem as an issue of evil Capitalist imperialism attempting to destroy the self determination of a people that had, at least in part, already become Communist. Moyes also avoided the thinly-veiled and often mindless anti-Americanism that came to characterise the debate in some quarters. He argued that the Vietnamese, regardless of which side of the border they resided on, were all God’s children. Bombing them to death and destroying their nation was a decidedly unchristian and absurdly tragic strategy for protecting or ‘liberating’ them from Communism. The sources drawn upon, apart from Moyes’ own works, comprise the Prime Minister’s Department File and other relevant material held at the National Archives, newspapers from all over Australia, in particular, the Anglican, church newsletters and journals, and contemporary and current secondary literature.

Chapter 5 contextualises John Moyes with several leading representatives of Christianity in his lifetime. This chapter pays particular attention to the problems the social gospellers faced when attempting to deal with the Christian response to violence. The view that the Christian churches and individual Christians had no choice, once the reality of World War II had set in, but to embrace the Allied cause and fight violence with more efficient violence is challenged in this chapter. Several leading social gospellers, plus Niebuhr, all of whom lived and worked within the time-frame of Moyes’ career, have been chosen for comparison and contextualisation. These are Walter Rauschenbusch, Ernest Burgmann, William Temple, George Bell, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Reinhold Niebuhr, Martin Luther King Jr, and André Trocmé. The French pastor, André Trocmé, has been chosen as the example of how not only a Christian theological defence of non-violence can be constructed, but also of how it can be lived in practice. Trocmé spent the
entire war in a situation in which not only his personal safety was constantly in danger, but where the sovereignty of his nation had been usurped. None of the others chosen was faced with comparable circumstances. Bonhoeffer’s situation was also clearly untenable, but at the time of his execution, Germany had not been occupied by foreign armies. It shall be argued here that Moyes was one of the last prominent clerics in Australia to abandon a position of non-violence with regard to World War II. He never fully embraced the ‘call to war’ and his acceptance of the situation was reluctant, but the defence of the nation eventually overrode his pre-war commitment to non-violence. The sources drawn upon in this chapter principally comprise the works of John Moyes and those of the authors under discussion. In the case of Reinhold Niebuhr, due to his importance in the case against the Social Gospel, secondary literature has also been employed to a greater extent than is the case with the others. It shall be argued that Moyes’ attempt to expound a coherent theological and moral response to state-legitimised violence, or war, was more successful than some but less successful than others. Unlike Temple and Niebuhr, who gave unqualified support to the Allied cause in the Second World War, including the wilful bombing of civilians, on one side, and the refusal of Trocmé to countenance violence in any circumstances, on the other, Moyes’ position was most proximate to that of George Bell. Both men had hoped to the last moment that war could be avoided. Neither of them gave wholehearted support to their nation’s call, but neither did they condemn the war as they had condemned all war during the 1930s. They were thus trapped in a moral no-man’s-land, from which they could find no exit.

It has already been stated that this thesis is not a biography of John Moyes or a history of the Social Gospel movement, but it could reasonably be asked why Liberation Theology has been omitted, since many would argue that it represented the last meaningful manifestation of
Social Gospel ideals to date. The omission is no reflection on the importance of Liberation Theology or the abilities of its most prominent representative, the Peruvian priest, Gustavo Gutiérrez, who is arguably the most gifted advocate for Social Gospel ideals ever to put pen to paper. However, Gutiérrez’s *obra maestra*, *A Theology of Liberation*, did not reach a wide audience until after the demise of John Moyes, and this date has been employed as the termination point for the material under discussion in this thesis. References are made at certain points in the following pages to Gutiérrez’s work, but Liberation Theology does not occupy a central position for the reason stated above. Leave has been taken to conclude this Introduction with one citation from *A Theology of Liberation* concerning the collective nature of sin, so crucial to the Social Gospel rationale.

But in the liberation approach sin is not considered as an individual, private, or merely interior reality – asserted just enough to necessitate ‘spiritual’ redemption which does not challenge the order in which we live. Sin is regarded as a social, historical fact, the absence of fellowship and love in relationships among persons, the breach of friendship with God and with other persons, and therefore, an interior, personal fracture. When it is considered in this way, the collective dimensions of sin are rediscovered.¹⁰

1.1. Introduction

The review of the literature studied during the preparation of this thesis deals with the Social Gospel in England, the Social Gospel in the USA, and the literature pertaining to John Moyes and the Social Gospel in Australia. Although Moyes and the Social Gospel movement in Australia were primarily influenced by the works of British, mainly English, Christian Socialists, it is also essential for any student of the subject to immerse him or herself in the wealth of literature from the USA. While Moyes and the other Australian proponents of the Social Gospel generally took their lead from England, new ideas pertaining to the ways in which Christians could influence the struggle for social justice were moving across the Atlantic in both directions from the second half of the nineteenth century.

This literature review is selective, not only due to the constraints of space, but also due to the nature of the thesis. Works deemed to have been of major importance and influence have been chosen with respect to England and the USA. In regard to John Moyes and the Social Gospel in Australia, Moyes' own works are treated as primary sources. The review of secondary literature in connection with Moyes does not deal in detail with works that are examined and assessed in detail in chapters 2, 3 and 4. Likewise, the literature studied in connection with Chapter 5, which includes Martin Luther King Jr and the post-World War II Social Gospel in the USA, is dealt with in the chapter itself. This review therefore examines a selection of works dealing with the development and the ideals of the Social Gospel movement in England and the
USA, and the literature pertaining to John Moyes and the Social Gospel in Australia that is not an integral part of the ensuing chapters.

1.2. Background literature for an understanding of the history of the Social Gospel in England

1.2.1. Primary Sources

As outlined in the Introduction, the antecedents of English Christian Socialism can be traced, to some extent, back to William Godwin, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Robert Owen, and the Oxford Movement, but with regard to the primary sources, it was Frederick Maurice who first made a theologically coherent nexus between social justice and the Church, in his case, the Church of England. Maurice was a distinguished Anglican intellectual and one of the original triumvirate, alongside Kingsley and Ludlow, that has been credited by historians with having initiated the Christian Socialist movement in 1848. Maurice’s understanding of Christian Socialism, and his importance in the eyes of later Christian Socialists, has to a certain extent been misunderstood. His Christianity was undoubtedly and quite radically universalist for the time, believing Christ to be present in all human beings, and he chided the churches for an unbalanced focus on the expiation of individual sin. However, he opposed government action in the cause of social justice and equality. Maurice held that the Kingdom of God was a present

---

1 W. Godwin, *Enquiry concerning Political Justice, and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, New York: Knopf, 1926 [1793]. This work was not a tract on Christian Socialism, but rather a utilitarian blueprint for an anarchist society. It was highly influential and controversial in England at the time due to its exposure of an unjust social order. Godwin was Mary Shelley’s father.

reality but that its continued realisation was a question of ethics and education, not state
intervention. He abhorred the selfishness inherent in economic competition, but by advising the
clergy to instruct their wealthy parishioners to embark upon acts of charity without agitating for
social reform he was pursuing palliative measures rather than structural and long term
improvements. Maurice was, however, one of the first Christian intellectuals to connect Socialist
aims with Christian ideals.

There were many works of fiction focusing on themes of social justice from a Christian
standpoint to reach the public in the second half of the nineteenth century. *In His Steps*, by
Charles Sheldon, is perhaps the most widely read work with Social Gospel themes.\(^3\) Originally
titled, *In His Steps: What would Jesus do?* it was first published in 1897 and has never been out
of print. Sales estimates vary due to copyright disputes in its infancy, but it is probable that the
book’s international sales exceed thirty million. The book was written as a challenge to the moral
consciousness of Christians in the late nineteenth century when the negative effects of industrial
capitalism on the working classes could no longer be ignored. A vagabond mysteriously appears
at the door of the Reverend Henry Maxwell only to be turned away. He appears two days later at
the Sunday service where he addresses the congregation, reminding them of their moral
obligations as Christians before collapsing and dying in the church. The remainder of the book
develops the theme, What would Jesus do? through the lives of an assortment of characters.

*Unto This Last*, by art critic John Ruskin, began its life in 1860 as a volume of essays on
political economy.\(^4\) The book was highly critical of industrial Capitalism, proposing a Christian
economy based on the equality of all persons in all situations as a solution. In his rejection of
unhindered Capitalism Ruskin displayed a tendency to lapse into utopian idealisations of the


\(^4\) John Ruskin  *Unto this Last and other writings*, Penguin Classics, 1985. [*Unto This Last*, first published in 1862].
Middle Ages, something that was common to many Christian Socialists in the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century. In these four essays on political economy, however, he offered theories of social justice that had considerable influence on the later development of Christian socialist thought and the development of the British Labour Party. The title is an excerpt from the Parable of the Vineyard found in the New Testament: “Take that thine is, and go thy way: I will give unto this last even as unto thee.”\(^5\) Ruskin proposed in the main body of the book that wages should be fixed at the same rate for every type of work and as is clear from the above, he drew upon the words of Christ for his justification in making such a ‘Socialist’ proposal.\(^6\) In questioning the fundamental Western definition of wealth, espousing that there is no wealth but life, Ruskin’s ideas bear many similarities to the program of the Green Movement of the early twenty-first century. Mohandas Gandhi regarded it as one of the most important books in the development of his ideas on social justice, having first encountered it in South Africa. He translated the book into Gujarati in 1908 under the title, Sarvodaya (welfare of all).

Charles Kingsley’s *Alton Locke,\(^7\)* which was a pessimistic but sympathetic view towards the Chartist Movement, and Edward Bellamy’s Socialist utopian vision, *Looking Backward,\(^8\)* were two of the most influential and widely read Social Gospel novels on both sides of the Atlantic, selling over one million copies each.\(^9\)

---


\(^6\) Ruskin, *Unto this Last and other writings*, pp. 173-174.


Another highly important text for the development of the Social Gospel movement was *Ecce Homo: A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ*[^10] by Cambridge history professor, Sir John Seeley. Widely read in Britain and the USA, this book provided material for the social gospellers in several areas. Although it was criticised in its time for being hostile towards Christianity, Seeley’s portrait of a Christian state with Jesus Christ as its head was to have a lasting effect on Christian thinking with regard to church involvement in the movement for social change. Seeley’s discussion of the development of brotherhood was particularly useful. He argued that it had progressed from the most primitive stages of only regarding one’s immediate family as deserving of equal treatment to the wider family, the tribe or clan, people of the same language, and to those who have the same coloured skin and appearance.[^11] Seeley was writing only a handful of years after Darwin’s ground-breaking theory had been published. When the Eversley Edition was published in 1895, the book had been reprinted twenty-two times. Seeley’s chapter, ‘The Enthusiasm of Humanity,’ was also a great inspiration for the social gospellers.[^12] It was the book’s exclusive concentration on Christ’s humanity that aroused so much controversy at the time of its publication.

The collection of essays known as *Lux Mundi: A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation*,[^13] edited by one of the leading figures in the English Christian Socialist movement, Bishop Charles Gore, engendered great levels of interest and controversy in ecclesial and theological circles when it was published in 1891. Although its focus was not specifically the Christian Socialist cause - the incarnation and the intricate theological questions pertaining to the

divinity of Jesus were the themes of the collection – the twelve essays argued powerfully for the acceptance and utilisation of biblical criticism and evolutionary scientific research.

Leo Tolstoy’s *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*,\(^\text{14}\) first published in 1894, presented the argument for non-resistance to evil as the genuine message of Christianity, as opposed to the alleged perversion of Christ’s teaching that had been perpetrated by the churches. Tolstoy argued that Jesus’ injunction to practice non-resistance was equally binding in cases of national conflict as in cases of personal conflict, thus making the ‘just war’ doctrine and state-legitimised killing, a contravention of Christ’s teaching. He maintained that with few exceptions, notably that of the Quakers, the churches had always been more than willing to support international warfare, thus placing the protection of national interests above human life. His contention that Christians could not participate in government resulted in the espousal of a particular brand of Tolstoyan, communal anarchy. *The Kingdom of God Is Within You* exerted a considerable influence on pacifist movements all over the world and, like Ruskin’s *Unto This Last*, made a formative impression on Mohandas Gandhi.

The following work has been given extended treatment here. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: An Historical Study*, by Richard Tawney,\(^\text{15}\) was a scholarly work that had great influence, not only on the Christian Socialist movement, but also on the development of the Welfare State in Britain. Like many Western writers on religion at the time, including William Temple, Tawney regarded ‘religion’ as well nigh synonymous with Christianity. But despite being a creature of his age in that regard, the above work, published in 1926, gave scholarly approbation to what many Christian Socialists, especially Anglo-Catholics, had been preaching since the nineteenth century; that something had gone terribly wrong for Christianity since the


27
Reformation. Much was made of Jean Calvin having given the green light for the widespread utilisation and acceptance of interest, or what was previously known as usury. This, coupled with other bedfellows of the Reformation, such as individualism, nationalism and Enlightenment-inspired scepticism, had, in the eyes of many in the Christian Socialist movement, led not only to secularism but also to ruthless Capitalism and the economic enslavement of millions. Tawney was a persuasive writer who mounted an impressive case for the total condemnation of the morality of Capitalism. Although he did not express himself with the ideological fervour of many who adopted his message, he exerted widespread influence in church and government circles in the 1920s and 1930s. It is important to note that Max Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* was not readily available in English until the 1930s. Tawney, who contributed the Foreword to the first English translation in 1930, concurred with many of Weber’s assessments of Capitalism, but he considered Weber’s thesis to be mono-dimensional in its concentration on the Calvinist influence on the economic development of the West. Tawney’s *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* began its life as the Henry Scott Holland Memorial Lectures in 1922. As far as a figure of influence is concerned, Tawney was of greater relevance than Weber for Christian Socialism and the Social Gospel in the Anglophone world that shaped the views of John Moyes.

Tawney underlined the fact that Capitalism had existed on a large scale in certain parts of Catholic, medieval Europe, arguing that if Capitalism signified the direction of industry by the owners of capital for their own pecuniary gain, and the social relations that developed between

---

them and the wage-earning masses whom they controlled, then Capitalism had flourished both in medieval Italy and in medieval Flanders. If the term, spirit of Capitalism, implies the state of mind that is prepared to sacrifice all moral scruples to the pursuit of profit, it had certainly been known to the saints and sages of the Middle Ages. He asserted that it was the economic imperialism of Spain and Portugal, “not the less imposing, if more solid achievements of the Protestant powers,”¹⁸ which impressed contemporaries as far as the late sixteenth century. “It was predominantly Catholic cities which were the commercial capitals of Europe, and Catholic bankers who were its leading financiers.”¹⁹ Tawney argued, however, that the unintentional effect of the Reformation was to release the ideological forces that eventually allowed the morality of Capitalism, at an individual level, to become, not only acceptable, but virtuous. He noted that:

If it is true that the Reformation released forces which were to act as a solvent of the traditional attitude of religious thought to social and economic issues, it did so without design, and against the intention of most reformers.²⁰

Tawney was nevertheless highly critical of the effects of Calvinism on the socio-economic development of the West, contending that a large part of the difference between the early Lutheran and Calvinist views on wealth and money stemmed from the fact that Lutheranism espoused a rural, village outlook whereas Calvinism was an urban movement, spread from country to country by merchants and traders. Rural, village society was, he argued, a natural, rather than a money, economy, consisting of the petty dealings of peasants and craftsmen in the market square, “where commerce and finance are occasional incidents, rather than the forces

¹⁸ Tawney, *The Rise of Capitalism*, p. 84.
¹⁹ Tawney, *The Rise of Capitalism*, p. 84.
²⁰ Tawney, *The Rise of Capitalism*, p. 84.
which keep the whole system in motion."\textsuperscript{21} In this model there was an absence of preoccupation with economic interests over and above the necessities of subsistence, and the middleman was stigmatised as a parasite and the usurer as a thief. On the other hand, Calvinism urged everyone to use their talents and make the most of the opportunities God had offered them, and this included financial opportunities. "It was on this practical basis of urban industry and commercial enterprise that the structure of Calvinistic social ethics was erected."\textsuperscript{22} According to Tawney, good works were not to be abandoned, but they were not a means of attaining salvation. They were regarded as proof that salvation had been attained. He charted the inexorable rise of Capitalism and money values, and the inability of the churches to restrict the excesses arising from the above following the relaxation of the law prohibiting the charging of interest in 1571.

Tawney reserved his most grandiloquent prose for a scathing condemnation of Puritanism, which he argued was the most fundamental movement in seventeenth century England, and that it, rather than the Tudor succession from Rome, was the true English Reformation. He argued that it was from Puritanism that the seeds of modern England emerged.\textsuperscript{23} An extended citation is included here since it encapsulates much of the Social Gospel view of Christian developments in the centuries following the Reformation as far as the misappropriation of what the social gospellers considered to be Christ’s message was concerned.

Those who seek God in isolation from their fellow-men, unless trebly armed for the perils of the quest, are apt to find, not God, but a devil, whose countenance bears an embarrassing resemblance to their own. The moral self-sufficiency of the Puritan nerved his will, but it corroded his sense of social solidarity. For, if each individual’s destiny hangs on a private transaction between himself and his

\textsuperscript{21} Tawney, \textit{The Rise of Capitalism}, p. 103.
\textsuperscript{22} Tawney, \textit{The Rise of Capitalism}, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{23} Tawney, \textit{The Rise of Capitalism}, p. 198-199.
Maker, what room is left for human intervention? A servant of Jehovah more
than of Christ, he revered God as a Judge rather than loved him as a Father, and
was moved less by compassion for his erring brethren, than by impatient
indignation at the blindness of vessels of wrath who sinned their mercies. A
spiritual aristocrat, who sacrificed fraternity for liberty, he drew from his
idealisation of personal responsibility a theory of individual rights, which,
secularised and generalised, was to be among the most potent explosives that
the world has known. He drew from it also a scale of ethical values, in which
the traditional scheme of Christian virtues was almost exactly reversed, and
which, since he was above all things practical, he carried as a dynamic into the
routine of business and political life.24

The inspiration provided by Tawney is clear in the work of John Moyes through his Moorhouse
Lectures, which are dealt with in detail in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

The subject of money as a value unto itself, something that also played a large role in
Moyes’ work, was given considerable attention by Tawney. He contrasted the instruction
attributed to St Paul found in 1 Tim.6: 7-10 (If we have food and clothing, let us be content with
that...For the love of money is the root of all evil), with Puritanism. Here, sufficiency for the
needs of daily life was not recommended. The Puritan was to strive for limitless increase and
expansion. Qualities that previous ages had denounced as social vices emerged as economic and
moral virtues. In Tawney’s view, the Puritan saw the world not as something to be enjoyed, but
as something to be conquered, arguing that “a society which reverences the attainment of riches

as the supreme felicity will naturally be disposed to regard the poor as damned in the next world, if only to justify itself for making their life a hell in this.°

Tawney concluded that "compromise is impossible between the Church of Christ and the idolatry of wealth, which is the practical religion of Capitalist societies...." He contended that although the phenomenon of the strong exploiting the weak is common to all societies, the modern, Capitalist age is different since it consists in "the assumption, accepted by most reformers with hardly less naivety than by the defenders of the established order, that the attainment of material riches is the supreme object of human endeavour and the final criterion of human success." Such an assumption, in his view, may sustain a societal system or it may fail, but that which is certain is that it cannot, except by metaphor, be described as Christian.

Arguments can rage over whether the rise of money to the position of supreme importance can be traced to Jean Calvin's decision to legitimise the charging of interest in Geneva, thereby creating a nursery for the Capitalist mentality, or whether it was an inevitable concomitant of the rise of individualism and nationalism that also accompanied the Protestant Reformation. It was Tawney's view, however, that in the three hundred years between the end of the fifteenth and the end of the eighteenth centuries, a fundamental shift in consciousness had occurred. Rapid wealth acquisition had been transformed from being a sign of sin to a sign of virtue. The churches in mid-nineteenth century England were thus grappling with the great and enduring side effect of the Reformation in that the shattered unity of the Medieval Church had resulted in many different Christianities, all convinced of their legitimacy. The conception of one, universal church that bestrode the Middle Ages as the soul of a Christian civilization, however wistful that conception may have been, was gone. Individuals were now free to view

their fellows as sources of profit. For those who hold that all that is left of Christianity in the twenty-first century, at least in its traditional heartland of the Western world, is a ‘religion of money,’ no greater advocate can be found than Richard Tawney.

As the dominant figure in English Christianity between the two world wars, William Temple is unavoidable in any discussion of Christian Socialism in England. Although he was not among the ranks of the most radical proponents of the above, Temple nevertheless gave a great deal of exposure to the ideals of the Christian Socialist movement through his leadership and influence as Bishop of Manchester (1921-1929), Archbishop of York (1929-1942), and finally, as Archbishop of Canterbury (1942-1944). His most well known work, Christianity and the Social Order, which he deliberately composed with the general public in mind not long before his untimely demise, was a user-friendly guide to Christian social engagement; in some ways a distillation of his ideas on social issues, many of which had been proposed earlier in his more theological and scholarly works. His influence on John Moyes was considerable and will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. Temple’s views on the social order drew heavily upon the work of his life-long friend, the previously mentioned economic historian, Richard Tawney. In contradistinction to the vagueness of many Christian Socialist tracts, Christianity and the Social Order presented a host of practical suggestions for how Christians could attempt to steer their communities in the direction of a more just and equitable social framework. Temple’s desire for Christians to influence all political parties rather than establish a specifically Christian party can be seen as self-contradictory since the vast majority of his suggestions fell left of centre and were in step with much of the policy of the British Labour Party. Temple is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

1.2.2. Secondary Sources

Gilbert Binyon’s *The Christian Socialist Movement in England: An Introduction to the Study of its History*\(^{30}\) is, despite its age, one of the most perceptive of all accounts of the Christian Socialist movement in England. He argued that Socialist principles were originally Christian principles. This is not tantamount to contending that Socialist principles were unknown to humanity before the advent of Christianity, but Binyon’s argument was that they emerged in the nineteenth century in secular form because the Christian churches had lost touch with their roots so completely that they were unable to recognise Socialist principles as their own when they saw them.\(^{31}\) Writing in the same generation, Binyon, like Tawney, lamented the shift in values that had occurred in the wake of the Protestant Reformation. Most notable for both of them was the attitude towards the rapid acquisition of wealth, which had been transformed from a sign of sinful activity to one of virtue. A key factor in the above, not only for Binyon, but for the majority of the Christian Socialists, was the raising of the taking of interest on loans from the level of dishonest dealing to that of respectability.

Binyon listed Robert Owen as the founder of British Socialism. Owen, an industrial Capitalist, introduced labour and educational reforms at his mills in New Lanark. He also proposed that the conditions of industrial workers should be regulated by an act of parliament. As early as 1816 he was arguing for ‘Villages of Co-operation’, not only to provide employment for the poor but to provide centres of social life and education. Owen also started utopian communities in North America. These villages were to be based on co-operation and not on competition. Owen incurred the wrath of the churches, however, when he issued his ‘Denunciation of all Religions’ in 1817. Binyon argued that the denunciation was really directed


at all systems of theology known to Owen rather than to religions, and that his movement remained Christian in tone. In connection with Owen, Binyon noted the importance of the non-conformist sects in the early development of the trade union movement in England. The anti-trade union Combination Laws were repealed in 1832, resulting in a rapid expansion of trade unionism. He also regarded Samuel Taylor Coleridge an important figure in early socialistic conceptions of a Christian society. Although not an explicit follower of Owen, Coleridge argued strongly that Christianity contained a social ethic.

Binyon provided thorough accounts of the principal organisations and leading figures that dominated English Christian Socialism. These included the triumvirate of Frederick Maurice, John Ludlow and Charles Kingsley, the Guild of St Matthew, the Christian Social Union, the Church Socialist League, the Lux Mundi essays, Charles Gore, Stewart Headlam, Henry Scott Holland, Brooke Westcott, Keir Hardie and Conrad Noel. Binyon saw 1848 as a pivotal year in that the European revolutions commenced almost simultaneously with a series of publications on Christian Socialism from Maurice, Ludlow, Kingsley, and others. He argued that Maurice, Ludlow and Kingsley, even though they had a divergence of views concerning political democracy, considered Socialism and Christianity to be akin to each other; the one being the development and manifestation of the other. Despite their divergence of views, they all emphasised co-operation over competition in economic matters. The first president of the Christian Social Union, Brooke Foss Westcott, also argued the above, adding that the nineteenth century evangelical revival had done something to:
purify social habits and to awaken the national conscience. But it had no
sympathy with the past. It failed to realise the thought of a Catholic Society, a
Body of Christ, living and learning through the ages. 32

Binyon also dealt with the official Anglican response to the Christian Socialist
movement. At the first two Lambeth Conferences, 1867 and 1878, no mention was made of
social and economic issues. The encyclical from the 1888 conference, however, went so far as to
state that:

It will contribute no little to draw together the various classes of society if the
clergy endeavour in sermons and lectures to set forth the true principle of
society, showing how property is a trust to be administered for the good of
humanity, and how much of what is good and true in Socialism is to be found in
the precepts of Christ. 33

The 1907 Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury boldly stated clearly
that “the idea of individual salvation has been disastrously isolated in Christian teaching and in
current Christian belief from the social idea of original Christianity and the teaching of
brotherhood.” 34

The Church Socialist League had been founded in 1906. Its stated aim was that of
Socialism:

The political, economic, and social emancipation of the whole people, men and
women, by the establishment of a democratic commonwealth in which the

community shall own the land and capital collectively, and use them co-operatively for the good of all.\textsuperscript{35}

Binyon argued that the Church Socialist League “never settled what its position was,”\textsuperscript{36} in terms of how the above was to be realised, and that by 1914, the entire position of Christian Socialism, both theologically and sociologically, was confused. He conceded that individuals may have been clear-headed concerning their positions, but that “there was no common mind.”\textsuperscript{37} Binyon chose Charles Gore, who later held three episcopal appointments as Bishop of Worcester, Birmingham, and Oxford, to express the fundamental problem. In his Bampton Lecture of 1891 entitled ‘Incarnation of the Son of God’, Gore asserted that:

> It is not that commercial and social selfishness exists in the world, or even that it appears to dominate in society; but that its profound antagonism to the spirit of Christ is not recognised, that there is not amongst us anything that can be called an adequate conception of what Christian morality means.\textsuperscript{38}

Although sympathetic to the cause of Christian Socialism, Binyon contended that the various organisations formed under its banner were never sufficiently theologically equipped to achieve a greater impact than they did. Their aims were vague and their methods lacked detailed and coherent planning. This is exemplified by the Christian Social Union’s objective that social practice should be governed by the Christian Law, given that it never defined what the Christian Law was.\textsuperscript{39} Binyon’s overall view is perhaps best encapsulated in the following: “…just as Christianity has been twisted to Mammon-worship, so it may be utilised for social service in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{35} Cited in Binyon, \textit{The Christian Socialist Movement in England: An Introduction to the Study of its History}, p. 190.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Binyon, \textit{The Christian Socialist Movement in England: An Introduction to the Study of its History}, p. 203.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Binyon, \textit{The Christian Socialist Movement in England: An Introduction to the Study of its History}, p. 203.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Binyon, \textit{The Christian Socialist Movement in England: An Introduction to the Study of its History}, p. 197.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
such a way that it loses in time its really religious character and becomes merely humanitarian, and at last secular.40

A different angle was presented by Edward Norman in his *Church and Society in England 1770-1970*.41 Norman contended throughout this book that the principal figures in Social Christianity in Britain portrayed the Victorian churches as having done very little about social issues. He claimed that this was not the case and that great efforts were made at the parish level, although these were, for the most part, palliative measures. Norman also provided valuable statistics, including church attendances, as evidence for his argument that the churches, especially the Church of England, was unable to attract the working class. The census of 1851, taken during the first wave of English Christian Socialism, revealed that 66 per cent of available church pews were unoccupied and that the few churchgoers from the ranks of the lower rungs of the economic ladder were Irish Catholics.42 The lack of non-Catholic working class churchgoers, according to Norman, presented a huge obstacle to the Anglican clergy in that they were perceived by the working class to be representatives of the aristocracy and therefore defenders of the established social order. Norman also observed that it was the social behaviour of the clergy and not their ideas that alienated them from the masses. “The more radical their ideas, in fact, the less sympathetic were they often likely to appear; many forms of Socialism and collectivism were unpopular because they were bourgeois in origin.”43 This had a perverse effect by the end of the nineteenth century when the conversion of several leading bishops to the Socialist cause continued to separate them from the masses given that they were then in opposition to the prevailing trend of *laissez-faire*. Bishop Walsham How underlined this point further: “A Church

which talks about another world, but does not seem to take much interest in this, is one which will embrace within its fold a limited number of the working class. Norman listed the Irish Catholic churches as exceptions due to the fact that, in Ireland, “the Church did not represent an alien social order.” In concluding, he maintained that in twenty or one hundred years hence, church leadership would continue to reflect the prevailing political and social trends present amongst the intelligentsia and that a few would completely identify Christianity with views that appear to be extremely radical at the time. Norman cited Bishop Hensley Henson, a sceptical observer of Christian Socialism, for an even more sober assessment. Henson contended that Christians “wish to placate their consciences by reconciling their actual practice with their professed belief; on the other hand, they seek to conciliate secular society in order to Christianise it.”

Owen Chadwick’s *The Victorian Church*, and K. S. Inglis’ *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England*, are also useful research texts for this period. They provided invaluable sources for Norman’s work and were widely drawn upon by him in his research. Another of Norman’s works, *The Victorian Christian Socialists*, is a solid introduction to the work of a selected group of the most prominent figures in the Christian Socialist movement. These include the original triumvirate of Maurice, Kingsley and Ludlow as well as two of the later leaders, Headlam and Westcott. *Unto This Last* is also the subject of a chapter.

---

Bishop Hensley Henson’s *Christian Morality: Natural, Developing, Final,* has been useful as a well articulated and critical view of the Christian Socialist movement. Henson argued that the fundamentally optimistic view of human nature inherent in the Christian Socialist ideal was naive and that it ignored the problems of sin and evil. His more pessimistic view of humanity’s moral potential is best captured by his own words in the following:

I tacitly disclaim that directness of political and economic leadership which is now often claimed for the Christian Church...It is not, in my belief, justifiable to use language which, if it have any serious meaning, implies that Christians as such are specially responsible for the social and economic ills of society, and that, if only Christians did their duty, these ills would disappear. We may all admit that, if Christians were free from the faults and limitations of human nature, and if they understood rightly the requirements of their profession in all the complicated situations of modern civilized life, and if they loyally satisfied those requirements, the world would be, to the full extent of their personal influence, greatly benefited, but, since none of these conditions are, or can be, satisfied, there is little advantage in assuming the contrary.

This view is very similar to that expounded by Reinhold Niebuhr. It is challenged in detail in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

Two works by Maurice Reckitt, one as author and one as editor, have also been useful for an understanding of the English Christian Socialist endeavour. Reckitt’s Anglo-Catholic and Christian Socialist predilections were apparent in his largely laudatory treatment of the central

---

figures in his subject, but he and the other authors offered incisive criticism of the inability of the English churches to collectively respond to the situation pertaining to social justice in the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

An attempt in 1996 at addressing social Christianity in Britain, USA and Canada by Paul T. Phillips was useful in many ways, but suffers from an imbalance in that it devotes the greater part of its attention to Christian Socialism in England. *A Kingdom on Earth: Anglo-American Social Christianity, 1880-1940* did not provide a broad comparative study between the three nations. It did contain, however, apart from information dealing with issues and events common to most histories of the topic, valuable insights into neglected areas of Social Gospel historiography. These include the Quaker experiments of George Cadbury and Joseph Rowntree. Phillips argued that Cadbury’s Bournville and Rowntree’s New Earswick were among the most successful of all the colony experiments. The ‘garden cities’ of W. D. P. Bliss and Josiah Strong were two successful and similar examples in the USA. Phillips’ assessment of William Temple was incisive in that he argued that Temple’s influence on the development of the Welfare State in Britain had possibly been exaggerated, but that:

> his attempt to place the church at the centre of an emerging consensus in that direction was a shrewd tactic on behalf of an institution that could easily have remained on the fringes of the discussion.

This aspect of Temple’s influence was perhaps the most important of all with regard to John Moyes. Throughout his entire career, and during his retirement, Moyes strove to keep his church

---


as a driving force within the community, and to prevent it from sliding into irrelevance or abandoning the public arena.

For an account of English Christianity concentrating solely on the twentieth century, Adrian Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920-2000*, updated from its first edition in 1986, provided a fresh angle in that Hastings was a Catholic priest and historian, albeit an unorthodox one. It was not surprising that he allotted more space to the Catholic Church than has been the case with other English historians, but Hastings gave Christian Socialism an adequate reading without attempting any profound discussion of its theological rationale. His conclusion to the 2001 edition exuded the quiet resignation and acceptance of declining relevance found in many of the offerings made by Christian authors of his generation.

The literature reviewed here in connection with the Social Gospel in England reveals that it survived the decade leading up to World War II without sustaining the near fatal blows inflicted upon it in the USA, and maintained considerable influence at least until the death of William Temple. On the other hand it did not experience anything like the resurgence that occurred in the 1950s and 1960s during the Civil Rights movement in the USA.

1.3. Background literature for an understanding of the history of the Social Gospel in the USA

1.3.1. Primary Sources.

Walter Rauschenbusch has been listed under the USA even though he inspired social gospellers all over the world. His most well known work, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, has had immeasurable influence. Rauschenbusch’s ideas can be found in the works of Christian

social order reformers as disparate as John Moyes, Gustavo Gutiérrez and Martin Luther King Jr. He challenged both Christian orthodoxy and orthopraxy in countless ways but his impact is too substantial to be assessed here. He is discussed at length in Chapter 5. His attempt at providing a theology for the Social Gospel, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, reiterated most of the same themes as *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, but was also useful despite not falling into the category of strictly defined systematic theology.58 *A Rauschenbusch reader: the Kingdom of God and the social gospel*, compiled by Benson Y. Landis, contains well known excerpts but also examples from Rauschenbusch’s lesser known writings. It does not however introduce themes or directions not covered by his two principal works listed above, both of which feature significantly in Chapter 5.59

The work that became something akin to an economic bible for Christian Socialists on both sides of the Atlantic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was *Progress and Poverty* by the American political economist, journalist and politician, Henry George.60 The book rapidly became the fundamental text for land tax after its first of many editions, in 1879. George proposed that all taxes should be abolished, save for that on land values. A person’s work was his own property, physical or intellectual, but the land belonged to all humanity. He opposed revolutionary confiscation of land by governments, advocating instead the introduction of taxation that would gradually make the state the universal landlord without assuming any new functions. At the height of the book’s success, George made an extended tour of Australia in 1890.61

61 George visited Australia on a lecture tour for three months in 1890, giving forty-eight lectures and nine Sunday sermons in ninety-eight days. He spoke in thirty-eight cities and towns, covering 11000 kilometres. See John Pullen,
George gave the incipient Social Gospel movement in the USA an erudite, scholarly ballast through a talent for writing that matched his understanding of economic theory:

The march of invention has clothed mankind with powers of which a century ago the boldest imagination could not have dreamed. But in factories where labour-saving machinery has reached its most wonderful development, little children are at work; wherever the new forces are anything like fully utilised, large classes are maintained by charity or live on the verge of recourse to it; amid the greatest accumulations of wealth, men die of starvation, and puny infants suckle dry breasts; while everywhere the greed of gain, the worship of wealth, shows the force of the fear of want.  

The blueprint for social justice expounded by George in his *Progress and Poverty* gave the social gospellers valuable economic ammunition in their quest to rid society of greed and selfishness and usher in the Kingdom of God on earth. George also shared their optimism and faith in societal changes. "A civilisation like ours must either advance or go back; it cannot stand still." According to George, "What has destroyed every previous civilisation has been the tendency to the unequal distribution of wealth and power." For Henry George, the secret of human progress was not to be found in the improvement of human nature, but in the amelioration of society: "The advances in which civilisation consists are not secured in the constitution of man, but in the constitution of society."

*Henry George in Australia: where the landowners are "more destructive than the rabbit or the kangaroo",* The American Journal of Economics and Sociology, April, 2005, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0254/is_2_64/ai_n13803248/, retrieved 22 December 2011.

63 George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 373.
64 George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 374.
The Italian statesman, Giuseppe Mazzini, who played a leading role in the unification of Italy, was acknowledged by Rauschenbusch as a major influence on his thinking. Mazzini’s *magnum opus* in this regard was *Dei doveri dell'uomo* (*The Duties of Man: and other essays*). 66

In *The Duties of Man*, Mazzini expounded his vision of a society based on individual duties rather than rights, since rights are only relevant when one has the opportunity to exercise them. With respect to the above, he exposed the weaknesses of blanket calls for liberty and freedom. In discussing the revolutionary cries for individual rights he declared:

> But of what use was the recognition of their rights to those who had no means of exercising them? What did liberty of teaching mean to those who had neither time nor means to profit by it, or liberty of trade to those who had nothing to trade with, neither capital nor credit? 67

In Mazzini’s vision the responsibility of all to the welfare of their neighbours was paramount and that to neglect this duty was as great a sin as any other. His views are succinctly captured in the following:

> We must convince men that they, sons of one only God, must obey one only law, here on earth; that each one of them must live, not for himself, but for others; that the object of their life is not to be more or less happy, but to make themselves and others better; that to fight against injustice and error for the benefit of their brothers is not only a *right* but a *duty*; a duty not to be neglected without sin – the duty of their whole life. 68

---

67 Mazzini, *The Duties of Man*, p. 10.
68 Mazzini, *The Duties of Man*, pp. 15-16 (original italics).
1.3.2. Secondary Sources

There are many excellent histories of the Social Gospel movement in the USA. In a similar vein to the historiography of Christian Socialism in England, historians have agreed upon a triumvirate of first generation leaders, namely, Washington Gladden, Richard T. Ely and Walter Rauschenbusch. The consensus among historians of the Social Gospel in the USA is that its influence grew until the First World War and survived into the 1930s. However, the course of political events in Europe during that decade coupled with attacks from talented critics such as former adherent, Reinhold Niebuhr and his doctrine of Christian Realism, undermined its message, arguing that its belief in the inevitable progress of humanity was far too optimistic and naive. The early chroniclers of the Social Gospel did not predict or expect its return in the 1950s and 1960s when it re-emerged with the added dimensions of race relations, the peace movement, liberation theology, feminist theology and much more.

Howard Hopkins and Ronald White argued that Niebuhr’s *Moral Man and Immoral Society* was crucial to the decline of the Social Gospel. They also posited the view that the Social Gospel “went astray in being too optimistic in its strategy for transferring the ‘spirit of love’ or the ‘law of Christ’ from the individual to the social sphere.” This is a highly contentious issue pervading the entire historiography of the Social Gospel movement. It has repeatedly been employed against Rauschenbusch and it was Niebuhr’s principal argument.

---


contra Social Gospelism in the USA and Henson’s in England. However, its own rationale makes just as many assumptions regarding human nature as that of the social gospellers. One can argue that the opposite of its claim is more likely. If laws are introduced enforcing certain types of behaviour on the entire community by way of the imposition of strong penalties, then, over time, these laws and the spirit behind them may indeed come to influence individual behaviour. Although still far from complete, this has proved to be the case with laws prohibiting racism, sexism and other legal measures designed to protect minorities. Reforms that involve the reduction of privileges for some require the application of moral and legal pressure over time. In many cases this means great lengths of time, for those with little are unsure of what they stand to gain, while those with much are certain of what they stand to lose. Assessing previous attempts at fundamental reform such as that of the Social Gospel as having been too optimistic, or having moved too fast, is a safe and not particularly useful position to take. The road to the abolition of slavery was littered with failed attempts, but the assumption that the length of the road was not reduced by those failed attempts does not follow from such a realisation.

Hopkins and White allotted welcome space to movements and groups associated with the Social Gospel, such as the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, which they argued “gave great impetus to the women’s movement in the late nineteenth century.” They made an impressive case for greater recognition being accorded to Frances E. Willard’s role, which was largely forgotten until quite recently due to the Temperance Movement’s image as that of a puritanical, moralising Christian organisation invading the privacy of individuals. Woodrow Wilson, the only career academic ever to occupy the White House, was also given meaningful treatment, including some extended citations that revealed a profound thinker on social and religious issues. Wilson echoed Rauschenbusch, opining that God, not man, was the centre of all

---

things and as a result, sin was tantamount to selfishness. "For when a man most forgets himself he finds himself... A man finds himself only when he finds his relation to the world."\textsuperscript{74} Such views were regularly expressed by John Moyes.

The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920, edited by Robert T. Handy is reviewed here since it provides an excellent compilation of Rauschenbusch, Thomas Ely, and Washington Gladden. As previously noted, Rauschenbusch is assessed in detail in Chapter 5. Gladden has been given the title of the Father of the Social Gospel movement in the USA by American historians of the subject. He was from the generation before Rauschenbusch, living from 1836-1918. A Congregational minister, Gladden was an early supporter of the trade union movement and collective bargaining. He was an inveterate opponent of Capitalist exploitation, but he distrusted Socialism, and defended the right of every individual to private property. A firm believer in the inevitability of progress, he tended to interpret historical events as lending credence to the view that the human race was moving inexorably towards the Kingdom of God on earth. With the passage of time, Gladden's most interesting contribution would seem to be his writings on the Christian scriptures. He wrote extensively on the Bible and its putative infallibility. Gladden was not afraid to point out what many have preferred to avoid; that the Bible makes no claim to infallibility. The claim is, in fact, one of Christian tradition. Gladden argued that it was not historically, scientifically or morally infallible and that the infallibility doctrine arose in the seventeenth century, possibly as a replacement for Protestantism's rejection of infallible councils and infallible popes.\textsuperscript{75} Gladden defined the Bible as "The book of righteousness;"\textsuperscript{76} the record of the development of the kingdom of righteousness in the world."\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75} Handy, ed., The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920, pp. 84-89.
\textsuperscript{76} Handy, ed., The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{77} Handy, ed., The Social Gospel in America, 1870-1920, p. 91.
Richard T. Ely, an influential American economist during the Progressive Era, attacked what he saw as the development of the Protestant preoccupation with the self during the nineteenth century. He focused his attention on the lack of altruism in the contemporary hymnody of the Protestant churches:

Let the reader take any hymnbook he pleases and read hymn after hymn, and seek for the hymns expressive of burning, all-consuming altruism. He will not find them, though he will find any number which turn the heart in on itself and tend to nourish a selfish, individualistic piety. I and me – I and me – these are the frequently occurring pronouns.\(^\text{78}\)

The above is pivotal to an understanding of the interpretation of the Christian \textit{εὐαγγέλιον} as presented by the advocates of the Social Gospel. They asked for whom the message of Jesus constituted good news. Was it really all about Jesus having died for ‘me,’ and that through him ‘I’ could have everlasting life? In some, mainly Protestant, Christian traditions, it was preached that belief in Jesus would transform the believer into a more successful and dynamic person who could reach the top of his or her profession, enjoying the accompanying financial benefits. For the social gospellers, the Christian message, and ergo the mission of the Church, was not about ‘me.’ It concerned everyone but ‘me’ and was, in its very essence, communal. Believing in Christ was not a matter of what he could do for the individual, but about what each person could do for others and through them come closer to God. In this edition of Christianity there must be room at the inn, for if Christians desire to meet Jesus at the end of time, they must prepare themselves to recognise him when they meet him here.

Ely was in step with Wilson in his existential thoughts on the role of human beings in the greater scheme of things. "You must in very truth renounce yourself to find yourself, and give up yourself to save yourself." His observations on the lack of working class attendance at churches in his home city of Chicago were also perceptive, arguing that the only acceptable position for one of lower social rank was that of janitor. The middle and upper class parishioners regarded poverty as a disgrace, "but by their vulgar display endeavour to perpetually remind the poor man of his poverty." As was the case in England, the inequities of Industrial Capitalism in the USA were producing strong and radical re-interpretations of the Christian message and the role of the churches in the community. Due to the fact that there has never been an Established Church in the USA, the movement for social change in the churches possibly had more far reaching support at grass roots level, but the message was fundamentally the same. It was not sufficient for the churches to preach a Christianity that primarily consisted of a personal and private relationship between the individual and God. Everyone must be urged to recognise their Christian responsibilities to their fellows, and that the nature of sin was not merely personal, but also collective. Only when this was realised and accepted could the Kingdom of God be built on earth.

1.4. The primary and secondary literature of and about John Moyes.

1.4.1. Primary Sources

Australia: The Church and the Future, being the Moorhouse Lectures delivered in St Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, November, 1941, is the most complete exposition of Moyes’

vision for a Christian social order with the Church at its centre. The seven lectures that constitute the book provide the methodological framework for Chapter 2. The manuscript collection of Moyes’ private papers, held at the Mitchell Library Sydney, comprises fifty-one volumes. This has been a crucial source for the preparation of this thesis, providing invaluable new evidence in connection with Chapter 2 and Chapter 4. The Armidale Diocesan Archives have material that is not found in the Mitchell Library Collection, such as books of sermon notes, Moyes’ own Greek translations, and some Synod Charges. The manuscript of Moyes’ unpublished memoirs, ‘My Confessions, An Australian Remembers,’ is also held at the Armidale Diocesan Archives. Although important evidence concerning the impetus for the Vietnam letters, which are the subject of Chapter 4, was unearthed, Moyes’ official writings such as Synod Charges, published books, and articles provide a greater window to his vision. Copies of the Armidale Diocesan News, Yearbooks and Synod Charges are held at both the Mitchell Library, Sydney, and the Armidale Diocesan Archives. They have been a rich source of information. Several pieces of information were discovered in the private papers of Francis James, the Manager of the Anglican newspaper during the 1950s and 1960s. James was a regular correspondent and confidant of John Moyes. The ‘Francis James Collection’ is held at Penrith City Library, Penrith, New South Wales.

American Journey, In Journeyings Often, America Revisited: Minneapolis and Evanston, 1954, and Third Time of Asking, were accounts in book form of Moyes’ visits to Lambeth

81 John S. Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, being the Moorhouse Lectures delivered in St Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, November, 1941, Sydney: Robert Dey, Son & Co., 1941.
82 John Stoward Moyes, ‘Papers 1875-1972,’ Textual Records, MLMSS 2319, held at Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney. Several permutations of Moyes’ name were employed throughout his life as an author. On some occasions he was listed as John S. Moyes, on other occasions, as J. S. Moyes, and on yet other occasions, as John Stoward Moyes. He was also listed simply as The Bishop of Armidale. These titular anomalies have not been harmonised.
83 J. S. Moyes, ‘My Confessions, An Australian Remembers,’ unpublished manuscript held at Armidale Diocesan Archives.
Conferences, various ecclesial meetings in the USA and Canada, and fact finding trips to Europe on behalf of the Australian Government and the World Council of Churches. These books are revealing in that apart from providing reports on the relevant conferences, one can follow the broadening of Moyes' mind. He recounted his impressions of a wide variety of experiences the like of which were unavailable to most Australians at the time, including, for example, personal interviews with the American Trade Union leader John L. Lewis, observing the trial in an American court of a black man accused of raping a white woman, and sitting on the steering committee of the Religious Art Exhibition in Chicago.

The issues through which Moyes first drew attention to himself with the English hierarchy of the Anglican Church were marriage and sex. William Temple placed him on the relevant committee at the Lambeth Conference 1930. On the sea voyage home Moyes wrote a book based on the deliberations of the conference titled, *Marriage and Sex: The Church’s Task.*

On a similar theme was a booklet: *War, womanhood and survival*, written by Moyes during World War II, probably designed to inculcate a greater sense of ‘sexual responsibility’ among the armed forces in wartime. *The Church and the Hour*, ignored in previous scholarship, was one of several articles in a series by Australian writers titled ‘The Christian and the War’, by leading clerics and academics. It has been of great importance for this thesis in connection with the Christian response to violence. This article reveals Moyes’ difficulty in establishing a

---


theologically coherent position regarding the perceived challenge to Australia's sovereignty during World War II. 87

Jesus and People: Five Studies in the New Testament, written as a study guide for the Australian Student Christian Movement, was published in the middle of the Communist Party debate discussed in Chapter 3. Moyes utilised his study of Caiaphas in his argument against the federal government's plan to proscribe the Communist Party. 88 His book, The Communist's Way of Life and the Christian's Answer, was based on several sermons given after he had received an adverse reaction to his stance in the above mentioned debate. The book became somewhat of an apologia and proved to be very popular. It was reissued thirteen years after its original publication in 1952. 89

Coventry Campaign was an account of the Australia wide missionary visit to Australia of the Bishop of Coventry, Cuthbert Bardsley, President of the Church of England Men's Society. Moyes was the National President of the Church of England Men's Society in Australia. Together they travelled throughout Australia for eight weeks in 1959 preaching sermons and making speeches to the local Church of England Men's Societies. 90 The Anglican Way, being the text of four addresses given during the Diamond Jubilee celebrations at St John's Theological College, Morpeth, 1959, was a series of four addresses made by prominent members of the Anglican clergy. The four addresses in the above were made by Frank Woods, Moyes, Ernest

87 John S. Moyes, The Church and the Hour, 1940, p. 13. This was one of several articles in a series by Australian writers titled, 'The Christian and the War', by leading clerics and academics. No publishing details. The general editor was C.E. Storrs, Archdeacon of Northam, Western Australia. The booklet was printed by Sands and McDougall, Perth. Sourced at Mitchell Library, Sydney.
Burgmann and T. T. Reed. Moyes’ address was titled ‘The Priest as Prophet.’ The Anglican Church also published Moyes’ E. J. Davidson Memorial Sermon, titled *The Christian Doctrine of Man in Society and Industry*. This was one of the few occasions when Moyes addressed Christian Socialist history. He revealed a well balanced and nuanced view of the development of Social Gospel ideas, refusing to align himself with Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical positions, but expressing a wistful preference for Frederick Maurice and what might have been.

The chapter contributed by Moyes to *White Australia, Time for a Change?* was a thorough exposition of his views on Australia’s immigration policies at this time, two years before his retirement. It is addressed in detail in Chapter 2. At this stage, the ‘populate or perish’ mantra was still present in the public arena. Moyes argued that there was nothing to be afraid of in a larger and more varied migrant intake and that the Anglo-Saxons were the most colour-prejudiced people on earth. He also urged Australia to recognise sooner rather than later that it was part of the Asian world. *White Australia, Time for a Change?* is the published version of three addresses given at the inaugural meeting of the NSW Association for Immigration and Reform, at the Macquarie Auditorium, Sydney, on 20 June 1962. The other speakers were Professor Julius Stone and author, Morris West.

Moyes’ ‘Papers’ reveal that he was regularly featured on radio as a spokesman on religious matters, chiefly for the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The majority of these broadcasts have not been preserved, but the ABC has supplied the extant examples. These

---

91 *The Anglican Way: Being the text of four addresses given during the diamond jubilee celebrations at St John’s Theological College, Morpeth, 1959*, Sydney: Church of England Information Trust, 1959.
94 The first president of the association, incumbent at the time, was Edward St John Q.C. St John was later elected to the Australian Parliament as the Liberal Member for Warringah, in 1966. He served in that capacity until 1969.
include an appearance on the flagship current affairs television program, Four Corners, a radio interview in two parts conducted by Michael Parer, and Moyes’ ‘Testament,’ recorded in 1950, on condition that it would not be broadcast until after his death. His last surviving child, Monica Moyes, has kindly supplied a cassette tape of Moyes’ acceptance speech in connection with the Doctor of Letters degree conferred on him by the University Of New England in 1961. Moyes spoke on the symbiotic relationship between obedience and freedom, and the importance of the role of the university in the community. Monica Moyes has also supplied other miscellaneous material such as newspaper clippings and copies of articles that have become difficult to source due to the passage of time.

1.4.2. Newspapers, Journals, Articles, Reports, Electronic links, etc.

Newspapers played a far greater role in the dissemination of not only the news, but also of ideas during the lifetime of John Moyes. Moyes had already entered middle age before there were any electronic news services in Australia. He was seventy-two years old when television finally arrived in his own country. Newspapers and journals are therefore vital as primary sources in the present context. In that regard, many hours have been spent scanning the Australian newspapers, church publications and scholarly journals from the relevant era. Moyes did however live to be featured in many radio broadcasts and made several television appearances in his old age. The modern era of instant electronic communication and the seemingly endless possibilities of the internet have made it possible to access a wide variety of

95 ‘Four Corners,’ 4 September 1965. The report was titled: ‘The Church in Politics.’ The program is available at ABC Commercial.
96 ABC Radio Interview. John Moyes interviewed by Michael Parer, broadcast in two parts: 1 February 1968, and 9 October 1968. Supplied by the ABC.
98 J. S. Moyes, Doctor of Letters acceptance speech, 14 October 1961 at University of New England, Armidale, NSW. Unpublished cassette tape recording kindly supplied by Monica Moyes, daughter of J. S. Moyes.
archival material. The many sources drawn upon in the above categories are listed in the bibliography.

1.4.3. Secondary Sources

There are two works that approximate the description of biography in connection with John Moyes. The chronologically earlier account was written as a Bachelor of Letters thesis in 1976 by D. H. Ingrouille at the University of New England.99 The second work was composed by Paul Lamb as part of a project to record the history of the Anglican Diocese of Armidale. It was published by the diocese in 1997.100 In addition to this was a series of seven articles by a former member of Moyes’ Armidale clergy, Archdeacon Richard Daunton-Fear. These articles were published weekly in the Northern Magazine in 1976.101

All three of the above have been useful in different ways. Both Lamb and Ingrouille concentrated primarily on Moyes’ work in the diocese of Armidale, which is what they set out to do. Ingrouille’s account was solid and thorough without attempting to contextualise Moyes to any great extent. His principal contribution was the information gleaned from Francis James in personal interviews. Lamb did not have this opportunity due to James’ death in 1992. James was a somewhat eccentric character and his accounts of events were not always regarded as completely reliable by those who knew him. One must therefore view his testimony with a sceptical eye, but such testimony is no less revealing because of the above. Neither Lamb nor Ingrouille interacted with secondary sources in order to assess Moyes’ role and influence on events in Australia’s history, which is what has been attempted here. Daunton-Fear was an

101 The Northern Magazine was a supplement to the local newspapers in the New England area of New South Wales. Daunton-Fear wrote the articles during his retirement in England.
unabashed admirer of Moyes and his articles did not contain critical assessment to any degree. He was however an able writer in possession of many personal anecdotes concerning his subject. His account is a warm and respectful portrait of his ‘boss’ for many years. Of all the episcopal clergy known to Daunton-Fear during his career, the title of ‘the bishop’ was reserved for John Moyes.102

Joan Mansfield’s work has been drawn upon by most scholars of Australian Anglicanism when addressing the subject of the Social Gospel. Her two articles, published in the 1980s,103 and to a lesser extent her Masters thesis completed in 1979,104 provide a detailed account of the Social Gospel and, in particular, the Christian Social Order Movement (CSOM). She devoted most of her attention to the director of the CSOM, Reverend W. G. Coughlan, but Moyes was one of the figures most frequently cited in her articles and thesis. It is therefore surprising that she never realised that he was J. S. Moyes and not A. G. Moyes, which is how she constantly referred to him. The same error was still being made in 2010 in a study of Australian referenda.105 However, Joan Mansfield’s work on the Social Gospel within Anglicanism in New South Wales remains very useful, especially with regard to the decades of the 1930s and 1940s. Mansfield did not explore the theological difficulties presented to the social gospellers by World War II to any great extent, but she noted that Moyes held out longer than his episcopal colleagues before reluctantly accepting the reality of the War.106 By 1938 Burgmann had

accepted that war was inevitable and that preparations for defence were necessary.\textsuperscript{107} Reginald Halse, Bishop of Riverina, reached the same conclusion in 1938 that although Australia may face a choice between two evils, those who are forced to make that choice should not be judged too harshly.\textsuperscript{108}

Mansfield identified three definable attitudes in the Anglican Church towards social issues between the two world wars. The first, the Anglo-Catholic and Broad Church tradition, emphasised the social relevance of the Gospel and “pressed for a more active role for the Church in society.”\textsuperscript{109} The second, most prevalent in the evangelical-dominated diocese of Sydney, held that individual salvation was “sufficient for social as for all other ills.”\textsuperscript{110} The third definable attitude stood between the other two, sympathising with the first but wary of radical change.\textsuperscript{111} She concluded therefore that the Anglican Church between 1929 and 1951 was not a “solid bloc of conservative social opinion.”\textsuperscript{112} She argued that there was an awareness of the relevance of Christianity to social ills, in varying degrees, in all types of churchmen. The great handicap, she contended, was “lack of consensus and of adequate structures at state and national levels through which to channel social concern.”\textsuperscript{113} There was only minority support for radical ideas, but there was also very little extreme conservatism. The majority of the church’s leaders placed themselves in the middle, and were aware of the “desirability of developing a social welfare state.”\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{107} Southern Churchman, 1 November 1938, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{108} Diocese of Riverina Year Book, 1940 (Synod Charge of 1938) no pagination.
\textsuperscript{109} Mansfield, \textit{Social Attitudes in the Church of England}, p. 316.
\textsuperscript{110} Mansfield, \textit{Social Attitudes in the Church of England}, p. 316.
\textsuperscript{111} Mansfield, \textit{Social Attitudes in the Church of England}, p. 316.
\textsuperscript{112} Mansfield, \textit{Social Attitudes in the Church of England}, p. 322.
\textsuperscript{113} Mansfield, \textit{Social Attitudes in the Church of England}, p. 322.
\textsuperscript{114} Mansfield, \textit{Social Attitudes in the Church of England}, p. 322.
Anne O’Brien’s article, ‘The Case of the Cultivated Man: Class, Gender and the Church of the Establishment in Interwar Australia,’\textsuperscript{115} introduced interesting, and to a certain extent, feminist themes to the historiography surrounding John Moyes. O’Brien argued that:

an Anglican bishop was perceived to wield considerable authority in the 1920s and 1930s...at a time when governments and institutions like banks had lost a great deal of popular respect, the way was open for prophetic churchmen to give leadership and direction. Furthermore, it was Moyes’ keenest hope that his leadership would act as a unifying cultural force during this period of political divisiveness – that he would play a part in ‘holding the centre.’\textsuperscript{116}

John Moyes did indeed ‘hold the centre’ in many contexts throughout his life. Even though he held many of the same views as, for example, Burgmann, he was careful to avoid making reckless public statements.\textsuperscript{117} He also stood in the centre within the Anglican liturgical tradition, regarded as too ‘high’ for some and too ‘low’ for others.

Some of O’Brien’s other arguments are a little more problematic. Disenchantment with governments and banks was not an opportunity for prophetic churchmen necessarily because they were churchmen. In Australia in the 1930s university degrees of any kind, least of all masters degrees, such as that held by Moyes, were by no means common. This was even more pronounced in country areas. Provincial bishops were thus often the most well educated citizens in the area. As a result their pronouncements were accorded solid coverage by the press. The public disgust with corrupt financial institutions in the first decade of the twenty-first century has not led to renewed interest in the prophecies of churchmen, partly because the influence of

\textsuperscript{115} Anne O’Brien, ‘The Case of the ‘Cultivated Man’: Class, Gender and the Church of the Establishment in Interwar Australia,’ \textit{Australian Historical Studies}, 107, 1996, pp. 242-256.

\textsuperscript{116} O’Brien, ‘The Case of the ‘Cultivated Man’: Class, Gender and the Church of the Establishment in Interwar Australia,’ p. 243.

\textsuperscript{117} See Chapter 3 for examples of Burgmann’s public statements.
Christianity in general has waned, but also due to vastly higher levels of education in the broader community. One must also remember that the two events in which Moyes arguably had his greatest influence on Australian society were in 1950-1951 and 1965, both occurring long after the 1930s and the Great Depression. O'Brien's argument for religion, and in this sense, the job of clergyman, allowing space for gender integration and an emphasis on the feminine that was not possible in other professions was an interesting proposition, but a difficult case to make in an Anglican context. During Moyes' lifetime women were prohibited from being Anglican priests, whereas in some of the smaller, Protestant, denominations such as the Salvation Army, where women had enjoyed equal status with men since the nineteenth century, the argument would have been more successful.

Judith Raftery's 'Betting Shops, Soup Kitchens and Well Kept Sundays: The Response of the South Australian Churches to Some Social Issues,' 1919-1939; is an excellent overview and analysis of the methods adopted by the churches in the face of poverty. Raftery put forward a strong case for the churches not only confining themselves to palliative measures, but that they "assumed the neutrality of the political and social system, and were unaware of the ways in which their own way of life or political stances implicated them in the suffering of others." Paul Nicholls' 'Australian Protestantism and the Politics of the Great Depression, 1929-1931' presented useful information concerning Anglican and Protestant attitudes during the Depression, but did not explore, or was unaware of, the developments within the Anglican Church regarding Social Gospel ideas. When discussing the incidences of a few notable
Anglicans, including Burgmann, who were challenging the traditional association of Protestants and Anglicans with moral and economic conservatism, he contended that “such men appear to have been the mentors for a generation of young clergymen and ordinands in the 1930s who, after World War II, were to give Australian Protestantism a far more radical political appearance.” It is debatable whether Australian Protestantism was more radical in the 1950s. The ‘radicals’ were still only a small minority.

Brief references to John Moyes have been made in most of the histories of the Anglican Church in Australia. The Social Gospel has also been addressed in the majority of Australian religious reference texts, especially with regard to the 1930s. These references are, due to the size and scope of the topics, necessarily superficial, but nevertheless useful for general knowledge. Tom Frame, in Anglicans in Australia, argued that concerning the Depression, the Church “needed to offer more than parish pastoral care and well-meaning self-help community strategies if it was to proclaim the Kingdom of God to the whole world.” Frame summarised in this book the views of bishops Horace Crotty of Bathurst, Ernest Burgmann of Goulburn, John Moyes of Armidale, and the Dean of Bathurst, H. R. Holmes. He argued that “Moyes’ greatest concern was that humanity had become fixated with economic activity as an end in itself.” This was fundamentally the same as Frame’s contribution to Anglicanism in Australia:

124 Frame, Anglicans in Australia, p. 235.
125 See, in particular, Horace Crotty, ‘The Holy Spirit in the World,’ Morpeth Review, vol. 2, no. 20, June 1932, p. 60. Crotty argued that “sacrifices for the brotherhood of man are oftener made under the flag of politics than under the cross of Christ.”
126 Frame, Anglicans in Australia, p. 239.
There are also references to John Moyes in Peter Hempenstall’s biography of Ernest Burgmann, but apart from one uninformed criticism of Moyes’ stance on World War II, which is discussed in Chapter 2 of this thesis, not a great deal with which to engage vis-à-vis Moyes’ ideas and vision. Burgmann’s own works are assessed at length in Chapter 5.

1.5. Summary

The list of selected works regarding Britain and the USA provides a solid overview concerning the development and goals of the Social Gospel. In both the USA and Britain, the movement arose at a time when the inequities of Industrial Capitalism could no longer be ignored. Many in the churches chose to continue to believe in the post-Reformation view that personal salvation was the kernel of Christian faith. If one’s circumstances in life were characterised by extreme hardship, the answer was not government assistance but to ‘get oneself right with God.’ During the second half of the nineteenth century, however, this view was challenged by a growing minority of leading churchmen in both countries. Sin was seen by these Christians as selfishness, and from this view developed the awareness that sin was not only a personal failing but a collective, social fracture between the community and God. Focus then shifted from the preoccupation with eternal life in heaven for the righteous and condemnation of sinners to the building of God’s Kingdom on earth. For the social gospellers, the struggle for social justice and equality thus became essential to the Christian life. It was this vision of Christianity with an active role in society for the Church that John Moyes came to espouse. In some cases, such as Rauschenbusch in the USA, and some of the more radical adherents in England, the afterlife lost its position as a core element of Christianity.

Most historians argue that although the movement grew and even came to dominate some sections of the churches and to wield influence in politics at the highest level in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries on both sides of the Atlantic, its belief in the inevitability of progress and the capacity of human beings to eliminate selfishness was dealt a terrific blow by the two world wars and the staggering evidence of the evil perpetrated in both of those conflicts. By the end of World War II, Hensley Henson, in England, and Reinhold Niebuhr, in the USA, had appeared to have been vindicated in their attacks on the perceived optimism and naïveté of the Social Gospel movement.

The review of the literature pertaining to John Moyes and the Social Gospel in Australia revealed that despite two very useful monographs emanating from Armidale, one commissioned by the diocese, and the other an unpublished thesis, a detailed examination of Moyes’ contribution to Australian public life and an assessment of his vision in a national and international context remained to be undertaken. Such a task has been attempted in this thesis. Chapter 2 begins this task, examining Moyes’ vision for Australia, the Church and the future.
CHAPTER 2
JOHN MOYES AND HIS VISION

2.1. Introduction

When John Stoward Moyes was enthroned in St Peter’s Cathedral as the Anglican Bishop of Armidale on St Andrew’s Day, 1929, he preached on one of the enduring themes of his life, Matthew 6:24, “No man can serve two masters...Ye cannot serve God and mammon.” The unity Moyes sought was like the whole world becoming a choir:

...each part different yet combined in a loyalty to the conductor producing a glorious harmony; everyone forgetting himself in that higher loyalty...I hope throughout the parishes that we offer ourselves to the service of God and, the Christ life may control our lives so that the music and harmony may rise in obedience to the Great Conductor.

With the benefit of hindsight, the signs of what was to come can be found in Moyes’ inaugural sermon cited above, but it is doubtful that any of those present in the crowded St Peter’s Cathedral on 30 November 1929 would have imagined that in the future they would accuse their bishop of being a Communist. This is, however, what occurred on several occasions during his episcopate, most notably during the Communist Party debate in 1950 and 1951. Chapter 3 deals with this period in depth.

This chapter shall present John Moyes’ vision for the Australian community with the Christian Church as its driving force and focal point. The most complete presentation of his

---

1 Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 44, p. 111.
3 J. S. Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 69.
vision is found in his Moorhouse Lectures,\(^4\) given at St Paul’s Cathedral, Melbourne, in November 1941. The Moorhouse Lectures,\(^5\) given annually, often but not always by leading Anglican clergymen, were very prestigious and widely reported in the media, as well as being published in book form. Ernest Burgmann delivered these lectures in the following year. Under the title, *Australia: The Church and the Future*, Moyes placed great emphasis on the person as the bearer of values as opposed to an economic unit in a system that encouraged greed and self interest.\(^6\) Apart from the above, material will also be drawn from Moyes’ private papers, his unpublished memoirs, his other books, synod charges, sermons, speeches and many newspaper and journal articles. *Australia: The Church and the Future* comprised seven lectures; 1. Australia and Australians; 2. Education and Civilisation; 3. Marriage and Sex; 4. The Economic Order; 5. Money as an Instrument; 6. Politics and Citizenship; 7. The Church and the Nation. Most of the issues that occupied the mind of John Moyes were expounded in these lectures and as a result the methodology employed here will be to use them as the framework for the following analysis and interpretation of his work. Contextualisation of Moyes with leading Christian spokespeople on the social order will not be undertaken to any great extent at this point since this will take place in Chapter 5.

It will be demonstrated that Moyes had a progressive and compassionate vision, a Social Gospel for the churches in Australia, and that although he steered clear of openly aligning himself with political parties he was not afraid to apply it in all circumstances. He envisioned a

\(^{4}\) Moyes, *Australia: The Church and the Future*.

\(^{5}\) James Moorhouse was the Anglican Bishop of Melbourne from 1877-1886 before returning to England as the Bishop of Manchester.

\(^{6}\) Moyes named one particular source of inspiration in his preface: W. R. Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921. This work was the publication of the Gifford Lectures given at the University of Aberdeen in 1914 and 1915. William Sorley was Professor of Philosophy at Cambridge University from 1909-1933. Also of importance in the development of ideas pertaining to personality and individuality, and whose ideas reached a wider audience than that of Sorley, was the Jesuit, Jacques Maritain. His work was widely read within and without Catholic circles. For example, see Jacques Maritain, *Scholasticism and Politics*, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Image, 1960 [1940].
church that did not confine itself to Sunday worship, emphasising personal salvation and the many moral prohibitions that its members were bound to observe, while refusing to engage with the world at large. Moyes wanted the churches to find and cure the sickness afflicting the social order of his time. In this context he fought throughout his life against the trend, a trend that he believed had been fostered by the ramifications of the Reformation and that had become firmly entrenched in the consciousness of Western culture long before his lifetime; that the worth of a human being could be measured in financial terms. It appalled this bishop that money, and lots of it, had become the yardstick of assessment for individual human beings. There was no common ground between God and mammon for John Moyes. He believed that a ‘Christian society,’ or the Kingdom of God of the Social Gospel, was one in which all members were encouraged to seek and develop their particular gifts. This necessitated an economic order and an education system in which the majority were not compelled to think of remuneration first and job fulfilment second. Similar views to these were held by the small coterie of social gospellers but were by no means common currency within the Anglican clergy at the time. For example, Moyes’ neighbouring bishop from 1931, Francis de Witt Batty, of Newcastle, argued simply that the Kingdom of God was not of this world and that “there was no reason to suppose that an improved social and economic order would bring its establishment any nearer.”

Moyes deplored Australia’s White Australia policy, arguing against racism of all varieties and agitating for a genuine relationship with the peoples of the East, since relationships were the key to his vision of Christianity. It was through a relationship with God that one could understand and love other people, and through relationships with other people that one could recognise and love God. “In every human situation there is a relation...This is the basic

---

manifestation of transcendence in human life." In other words; we are what we are through our relationships.

In many areas Moyes impressively transcended the prejudices of his time while in others he struggled to find a way forward. Many of his ideas can be, and were, attacked for their naivety and impracticality, which are charges that have always been made against the advocates of the Social Gospel. Moyes also faltered, as so many others have done, at the final hurdle in one area critical to Christian theological coherence and relevance, that being the Christian response to violence. Taken as a whole, however, John Moyes deserved the title bestowed upon him in later life as the 'Conscience of the Church.'

2.2. Australia and Australians

Moyes was already the subject of controversy after his first lecture of the Moorhouse series. The Age (Melbourne) vigorously attacked his argument, stating that it was not necessary to hear more than the first lecture to conclude that Moyes' presentation was a disappointment. The newspaper's lengthy editorial accused the lecture of indulging in an "indiscriminate diatribe" against Australia and Australians and of waxing nostalgic about the radicalism of the past. What Moyes had done was to challenge the insular consciousness of Australia and its perceived place in the destiny of the British Empire and, at an even broader level, the supremacy of the white race. He immediately struck a blow against one of the most controversial policies in Australia's history since federation:

More than any other people in modern life we, in Australia, have had the isolation that in other days gave the background for the development of nations

---

8 J. S. Moyes, Doctor of Letters speech, 14 October 1961 at University of New England, Armidale, NSW. Unpublished cassette tape recording kindly supplied by Monica Moyes, daughter of J. S. Moyes.

9 Age, 26 November 1941, p. 6.
and peoples. Not less than others we too have had the innate prejudices that
have issued in a White Australia policy.\textsuperscript{10}

In this, the first of seven lectures, he also combined the theme of the calamitous conjunction of
British and Aboriginal cultures with an environmental awareness that was quite advanced for its
time. This is not surprising given that Moyes always kept his mind well furnished with
contemporary intellectual streams of thought. He was also acquainted with the Anglican priest,
A. P. Elkin, the highly influential Professor of Anthropology at the University of Sydney, who
was known to Moyes, not least through his association with the \textit{Morpeth Review}, a cutting edge
Anglican journal whose \textit{primus motus} was the warden of St John’s College, Morpeth,\textsuperscript{11} from
1918-1934, Ernest Burgmann.

On Australia’s colonisation, Moyes had this to say:

There are no relics, no influence to make impact on the moderns who came here
from the old world. True, there were tribes from whom we might have learned
had we had the wisdom to try to know and understand them, had we had sense
enough to know that there were things to know about this strange and lonely
land. But the natives were a stone age people and for them our ancestors had
naught but contempt. They had succumbed to their environment and became a
communist race, living scantily, just existing. We came, individualists to the
core, we slew them and misused the land – and in our characters as well as on

\textsuperscript{10} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, pp. 7-8.
\textsuperscript{11} St John’s College, Morpeth, near Newcastle, which had earlier been situated in Armidale, was an Anglican
theological college.
our livelihood, the results have been written. We have succumbed to our
environment as really as they, though in different fashion.\textsuperscript{12}

In 1941 terms such as 'Stone Age,' were widely employed to describe indigenous cultures, but if one accepts these as time-conditioned terminologies and probes deeper into what Moyes was alluding to, one finds the common theme that dominated his life's work. Cooperation with God, other human beings and the environment as opposed to competition, was the only path in Moyes' vision for the building of the Kingdom of God on earth. In the context of Australia's colonisation, a wiser policy would have been for human beings to cooperate with the environment that God had created for them. If they had attempted to cooperate with the Aborigines they would have learned valuable lessons concerning survival in a land vastly different from the place whence they had come. The environment was thus to be shared and enjoyed by all, not to be plundered and destroyed. He developed these themes further:

\begin{quote}
Australia is a land inhospitable to those who do not know her – who do not take the trouble to know. Certainly she had no domestic animals, no staple foods, no native fruits of any importance. All these facts were our opportunity to make this land just the Paradise we desired. But instead we treated Australia almost as a foe, a land to be exploited, her forests despoiled, her grasses eaten out, until the countryside is dotted everywhere with the graveyards of dead trees and lined with dry, broken watercourses made in root-free soils. A country to be
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{12} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 9. It was somewhat ironic that Moyes argued against racism in his Moorhouse Lectures. Bishop Moorhouse had articulated a somewhat different view in the \textit{Church of England Messenger}, 14 June 1879, during his tenure as Bishop of Melbourne: “God did not make the earth simply for the savage tribes to wander over; He made it to be the scene of happy homes which were supported by honest industry, and if a set of men stood in the way of another set of men doing that work it was the order of divine Providence that the hinderers should be swept away.”
exploited, not a land to be loved— that is Australia's epitaph until today. We
still have a future but can we escape our past?  

In discussing Australia's development as being contemporaneous with the Industrial
Revolution, Moyes asserted that:

The conditions of life were the unavoidable result of the laws of supply and
demand and prices could only be determined by the unimpeded bargaining of
buyer and seller. Selfishness had been elevated into a public virtue... the flaw in
laissez-faire was that it regarded man as a self-sufficient unit like a machine. It
forgot he was a person, a bearer of values in himself. It forgot that he grew. It
saw him only as a means to production. It failed to see the individual as a
member of a continuous society and that the effect of undernourishment, bad
housing and unemployment and injustice were not confined to the immediate
victims, but passed on to their descendants.  

Reminiscent of Rauschenbusch, the above passage is central to Social Gospel ideology. For the
social gospellers, Christianity is not simply a personal relationship with God. Human beings are
what they are through relationships; their relationships with others and their relationship with
God, whom they encounter through other people. Rampant individualism thus led to rampant
Capitalism and even more importantly, human beings assuming that they are the sole masters of

\[\text{References:}\]

13 Moyes, *Australia: The Church and the Future*, p. 11. A far greater development of Moyes' ideas on a synthesis
between Christianity and environmental concerns was produced by one of the most prominent
theologians of the twentieth century, Jürgen Moltmann. See Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: an Ecological
[1967], presented a decidedly optimistic view echoing many of the ideas present in the work of the social gospellers
of the 1930s. In Moltmann's vision the Church could still lead the way to the future, not merely as a vehicle for
personal salvation, but as the hope for the realisation of a more just and peaceful international order.


15 Such views can be found throughout Rauschenbusch's most well known work; Walter Rauschenbusch,
dition contains the complete text of the original work: 'Christianity and the Social Crisis', first published in 1907.
their environment and their destiny. What Moyes was arguing in the final sentence of the above was that individuals had to understand the collective nature of sin, anticipating the position expounded with great clarity in the late 1960s and early 1970s by the most prominent spokesperson of Liberation Theology, Gustavo Gutiérrez. The negative assessment of individualism continued:

Man has become a number in a world of work, and even our insistence that everyone within this world be paid a minimum wage, in the end, provides only that which will enable a man with a small family to exist, and to go to work to earn the cash to buy food and get the strength to go to work, etc.

Based on the above, Moyes would have been bemused by the development that took place in most Western countries from the 1980s onwards in which the drive for reduced working hours as a sign of social progress was replaced by a passion for working longer hours. The combination of greed and the peer pressure associated with social status proved to be impossible to resist for many who became trapped in the cycle of working more and more in order to meet the repayments on loans taken to finance the purchase of bigger houses and extra automobiles that the owner rarely had time to enjoy due to the need to work longer hours in order to meet the terms of the loan repayments.

In 1937 Moyes had warned of the dangers of racism and had identified perceptions of Christianity that still exist in many parts of the world in the twenty-first century:

In a day when intercourse between peoples has become more easy than ever before, it is tragic that there should be a marked growth in racialism and in nationalism based on race. Unhappily it cannot be denied that racial barriers

---

exist even within the Christian Church herself, and it is no matter for surprise
that Mohammedanism can in some lands plausibly offer itself to the non-white
people as the only religion in which a real equality and brotherhood is
possible.\textsuperscript{18}

In the same year, Moyes commented on a controversy in his diocese over Aboriginal children
attending a local school. He supported the Minister for Education who refused to segregate the
children on racial grounds when some of them had to be removed due to the problem of
contagious diseases. Moyes reminded his readers of St Paul’s seminal text on race relations for
Christians: “neither Greek nor Jew, barbarian, Scythian bond nor free, male nor female,”\textsuperscript{19}
admonishing them that “there should not be, and need not be, any race or colour prejudice
amongst us if our outlook on life is right.”\textsuperscript{20} In 1940, the year before the Moorhouse Lectures,
Moyes probed more deeply into the issue of racism and the ability of human beings to see it in
others while lacking the self awareness to see it in themselves. He urged Australians to discover
one of the most valuable human qualities, the ability to stand aside and observe oneself with the
honesty and clarity of the disinterested critic:

We mock at the racialism of the German people, forgetting that we were the
first to propound the doctrine in our White Australia policy. We wax indignant
over Germany’s treatment of the Jews and Japan’s treatment of the Chinese,
when we ourselves have killed in their thousands the Aborigines of this land
and dragooned many more – at times by the compulsion of hunger – into

\textsuperscript{18} J. S. Moyes, \textit{God, Man and Freedom}, A Charge delivered to the first session of the Twenty-Third Synod of the
Diocese of Armidale, 27 September 1937, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{19} Paraphrase of Galatians 3:28 and Colossians 3:11.
\textsuperscript{20} Armidale Diocesan News, September 1937, p. 1.
reserves; while our treatment of the Chinese and Kanakas is a black page in our history.\textsuperscript{21}

In June 1943, Moyes and Dr Wilson Macaulay, Moderator-General of the Presbyterian Church, were chosen to attend a conference at Princeton convened by the American churches, titled Economic Consequences of the Peace.\textsuperscript{22} The conference was chaired by John Foster Dulles, the future Secretary of State under President Eisenhower. General Douglas Macarthur arranged transport across the Pacific Ocean for Moyes and Macaulay on a Liberator bomber, in which the two clerics slept on the mail bags. Moyes recounted the experiences of this trip in his book, \textit{American Journey}. One can sense the further development of his ideas on racial issues in his account of a court case that he was permitted to attend. The trial concerned a white woman who claimed to have been stalked by a black man. Moyes does not state where the trial was held but his visit to the USA was largely confined to California, where he arrived, and the east coast states of New Jersey, New York and Maryland. There were no witnesses at this trial, simply a complaint from the woman, which was denied by the black man. The judge sentenced the man to sixty days gaol. He remarked to Moyes afterwards: “We must stop every semblance of trouble with these people.”\textsuperscript{23} Moyes’ assessment was succinct: “Fear on the part of the whites will outlaw justice, and make impossible the true integration of these peoples within the nation.”\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{21} John S. Moyes, \textit{The Church and the Hour}, 1940, p. 13. This was one of several articles in a series by Australian writers titled: ‘The Christian and the War’, by leading clerics and academics. No publishing details. The general editor was C.E. Storrs, Archdeacon of Northam, Western Australia. The booklet was printed by Sands and McDougall, Perth. Sourced at Mitchell Library, Sydney.

\textsuperscript{22} The report of the conference was published as: \textit{A Christian Message on World Order from the International Round Table of Christian Leaders}, Princeton, July 1943, National Council of Churches of New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{23} Moyes, \textit{American Journey}, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{24} Moyes, \textit{American Journey}, p. 61.
In 1947 Moyes addressed the racial question again in his letter to the diocese titled: “Have You a Colour Prejudice?” In a series of numbered points he underlined the decimation of the Aboriginal population, including the complete extinction in Tasmania. Without naming his sources, he compared the spending on Native Americans in the USA and Canada with the spending on Aborigines. In 1939 it was £23 per person per year in the USA, £10 per person per year in Canada, and £3-10 on Aborigines in Australia. He went on to remind his parishioners that in two Australian states all Aborigines were excluded from voting regardless of educational standard. Their failure to develop the land was not due to idleness nor lack of training but to the fact there were no seeds nor trees that could be cultivated for food, nor any animal that could be domesticated to supply milk and meat. Moyes argued that we had not done better than they; we had simply imported our cereals and animals and then developed them. In the same issue of Armidale Diocesan News, another heading read: ‘The Aborigines: What Can We Do?’ Professor Elkin was quoted as stating that the Aboriginal population on some missions was increasing. The article stated the need for nurses to be employed in each place to assist with childbirth and child rearing. It goes on to mention ‘interference’ with Aboriginal life, contending that “it has gone on since 1788; it increased during the war.” The article conceded that it could not be stopped but recommended some measures to be taken, including “health centres, work (and wages) recreation and education.”

By 1948, after an extended tour of Europe, the USA and Canada in connection with the Lambeth Conference, and during which he reported on migrant screening centres for the Chifley Government, Moyes found himself even more troubled by the White Australia Policy and what

---

he perceived to be Australia’s isolationist state of mind. In connection with a visit to the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, which at that time housed one of the largest collections of Chinese weapons, glass, china and relics, etc, outside of China, he mused over the attitude of Australia towards the world’s most populous nation:

> What fools we Australians are to deny ourselves a close fellowship with a people whose culture, skill, and artistic genius and refinement have developed to ever richer expression over 3,500 years, while we, whose culture is hardly yet born, if born at all, keep ourselves aloof as though we were a superior people!

As early as 1947, he had exhorted the public to abandon its colour prejudice since any visit to an Australian beach revealed young people attempting to darken their skin. “Why should we object to people who have become coloured a little further?” He did, however, in the same article offer more useful advice, encouraging the public to welcome immigrants as equals, not to regard them as slaves or cheap labour, and to be willing, not only to teach them the ways of Australia but to learn from them. By the end of the 1950s he was agitating for greater levels of Asian immigration, arguing that Australia’s exclusion of Asians was a “Maginot Line as futile as the original.” He saw no reason why the quotas applied to European migrant intake should not be applied to Asian immigration: “The more fellowship we can have with the Eastern peoples on the various levels of life, the better for us.”

Moyes’ most expansive contribution to the eventual abolition of the White Australia Policy was contained in the book published by the NSW Association for Immigration Reform in

28 Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ pp. 151-152.
29 Moyes, In Journeyings Often, p. 98.
30 Sydney Morning Herald, 19 June 1947, p. 4.
31 Sydney Morning Herald, 10 March 1959, p. 11.
32 Sydney Morning Herald, 10 March 1959, p. 11.
1963, *White Australia: Time for a Change?* He argued that fear was the greatest obstacle to overcome in the public perception of people of other races and skin colour. He cited United Nations Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjöld, as saying that the task of the churches was to help people banish fear from their lives, "because fear, he said, is hypnotic, and it helps to bring to pass the things of which we are afraid." 33 There were also hints that by this stage of his life, at seventy-nine years of age, he was prepared to concede that Christianity was not the only revelation of the divine:

> We have got the opportunity to build a better civilization, a better fellowship, and a fellowship of nations, not based on colour, nor on language, nor even on the one religion, but based on the fellowship of many peoples of many outlooks and many abilities, but of fine character. These are the things I think we should have in mind as we look for a reform in our migration policy. 34

He argued that the previously cited text from Galatians made it impossible for a Christian who took their faith seriously to support any form of government policy that was based on discrimination by race. 35 Maintaining that Australia found itself in the Asian world, he pleaded that "we must learn to be part of it, and to make ourselves at home and other people at home with us." 36 He took his argument further in the following:

> ...we are not just a people who can stand here and argue the sovereignty of our nation. The idea of national sovereignty has really been one of the curses, I

---

33 Article by J. S. Moyes in *White Australia, Time for a Change?* p. 10. The article by Moyes was originally a speech given in 1962.
35 Moyes in *White Australia, Time for a Change?* p. 12.
36 Moyes in *White Australia, Time for a Change?* p. 12.
think, of the whole European world, and a wider world still to-day. We have got to learn that there is a brotherhood of nations. We have got to learn that we must consider one another, and try and work with one another.\textsuperscript{37}

The critical view of national sovereignty expressed in the above is an issue that leads us seamlessly into the next subject discussed by Moyes in his first Moorhouse Lecture, that of the Christian response to violence. It is a theme that was prevalent throughout his life’s work and one for which he never really found a solution. On the issue of race, colour and the White Australia Policy, his position was consistent with the Social Gospel mantra; the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. The Christian response to violence, however, presented a more complex problem since the life of Christ and his ultimate sacrifice in the face of violence was, and is, contra to the most powerful human instinct, that of survival:

Hitherto, in the Western world, men have loved their country and that national love has given rise to hatred and suspicion of one another. The world waits for a land whose people love God more than self. Only that country and people will have cause to be beloved by all men and will be able to reveal the hidden meaning of man’s unity in diversity.\textsuperscript{38}

Moyes quite presciently identified the precipitous descent from national pride to xenophobic jingoism, but he struggled with how to translate his observations into a Christian response to violence. His writings during the 1930s, while not explicitly advocating pacifism, supported the prohibition of war. On his return from Lambeth in 1930, he penned an article for the \textit{Church Standard} in which he underlined the spirit of the Lambeth Conference: “We must convince the people of the world that the risk involved in trusting one another is far less grave than the

\textsuperscript{38} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 8.
inevitable consequences of mutual distrust." In asserting that the claim of Christ was supreme, he appeared to radically encourage conscientious objection by arguing that the state could only demand the total loyalty of its citizens when its actions were guided by the same moral principles that it expected private citizens to apply in their relations with their neighbours. Moyes held out great hope for the Kellogg-Briand Pact, under which, at the time of writing, fifty-eight countries had renounced war as an instrument of national policy. Most of the fifty-eight nations had also signed the optional clause pledging to submit all disputes to arbitration.

According to Moyes, Lambeth had presented peace in a truer light, not as static but as dynamic, not as the end of the struggle, but as the condition for advance. In terms characteristic of the Social Gospel, he declaimed with confidence that: "Innumerable tasks of service, and conquests of evil, disease, ignorance and death await man's consecration in a nobler war than that of nations." By the late 1930s this confidence had begun to wane but for most of his first episcopal decade he continued to preach this line of attack.

Moyes' 'Papers' contain a plethora of articles collected by him on the call for international peace, an end to class divisions, the latest scientific discoveries, the abolition of war, the improvement of democracy through the establishment of an international lending library, and new thinking in education, from the British publication, Public Opinion. These include President Calvin Coolidge's call for naval disarmament in 1927, an article on the benefits of the National Unemployment Insurance Fund in Britain, an article on the obscenity

39 Church Standard, 31 October 1930, p. 6.
40 For an excellent exegesis of Romans 12 and 13 arguing the case of non-violence concerning the obligations of Christians to the state, see John Howard Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, pp. 194-211.
41 Church Standard, 31 October 1930, p. 6.
42 Church Standard, 31 October 1930, p. 6.
of war,\textsuperscript{45} and an article on a United States of Europe in which it was claimed that there was a great deal of popular support for a triple entente between Britain, France and Germany in all three countries.\textsuperscript{46} In an extended article titled ‘The Churches and the Next War,’ Moyes had underlined the following passage:

No shred of justification can be found for modern warfare as a method of attempting to settle international disputes, for the simple reason that no dispute can be settled by violence, that war only breeds future wars, that victors and vanquished alike suffer and that the extermination of whole populations of men, women and children in their homes is an eventuality against which spiritual human beings should set their face with determined resistance. The audience is there ready for the speaker, the response is there ready for the appeal.\textsuperscript{47}

The article also argued that war was possible because statesmen could rely on the public to accept that other nations, races or groups of people were their enemies, but that the Church should never accept such a wholesale breach of fellowship. If another war takes place, it will be, in the opinion of the author, that the Church will bear the responsibility since it did not, while there was still time, warn the world that the professed disciples of the Prince of Peace could never again allow themselves to be involved in battle.

The inspiration of the above was clear in Moyes’ Armistice Day address in 1932. At this time, after the experience of World War I had imprinted itself upon the consciousness of

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{45} Public Opinion, 8 June 1928, in Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 44, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{46} Public Opinion, 11 January 1929, in Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 44, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{47} Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., ‘The Churches and the Next War,’ Public Opinion, 1 February 1929, in Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 44, p. 41. Ponsonby was a well known peace activist in Britain, having opposed Britain’s participation in World War I. He served in the House of Commons as a Labour Party member during the Ramsay MacDonald Government. After being elevated to the peerage as a baron in 1930 he was the Leader of the Labour Party in the House of Lords from 1931-1935. He resigned from the Labour Party in 1940 over its decision to join Winston Churchill’s wartime government.}
Australians, but before the advent of Nazi Germany and World War II, he expressed his views in the following terms:

War was not a guarantee of justice, because the one in the right might be the loser. War was damnable, not only because of its costs in things, but also because it was against all that was high and holy in human life and relationships and against God.48

When referring to what private citizens could do, he argued that:

Today they must realise that to love one's country is not enough, they must demand of the nations that they sink their individuality and mutually agree to merge their personal claims into one for the common safeguarding of life through law and arbitration.49

Three years later, in 1935, the Church Times for the Church of England in Australia, for which Moyes sat on the editorial board, published a powerful editorial on 20 April, dealing with the proximity of Good Friday and Anzac Day. Referring to the ANZACS and the secular religious fervour that had infused the Anzac Day ceremonies, the leader article declaimed that:

"We cannot affirm them sinless, or free of stain of self; we dare not even assume without question that in their conviction of a righteous cause they were completely justified."50 In assessing their sacrifice, the article stated that the approbation of the Master may be applied to "many of them" and goes on to quote the Gospel According to St John: "Greater love hath no

48 Moyes' Armistice Day Address, 1932, Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 45, p. 141.
49 Moyes' Armistice Day Address, 1932, Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 45, p. 141.
50 Church Times for the Church of England in Australia, 20 April 1935, p. 2.
man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends. Less would be injustice, more would be irreverence." The leader writer concludes by expressing his fear thus:

Is there no cause to fear that we have found it easier to mourn our individual and national loss than to mourn our God...Have we allowed national sentiment to supplant religious devotion?..The Christian will never make the mistake of equating the soldier with the Saviour...  

Ernest Burgmann’s biographer, Peter Hempenstall, was surprised at Moyes attitude towards World War II. When discussing the Archbishop of Sydney, Howard Mowll’s wholehearted support of the war, Hempenstall stated:

Even the liberal Bishop Moyes, in his Moorhouse Lectures of 1941, suggested that the war might help Australians –'if we take it seriously and the iron enters our souls.' That was the only weighty comment on the war’s burdens in seven lectures.  

This was a disappointingly superficial assessment from Hempenstall. If he had studied the Moyesian literary corpus more widely, especially the synod Charge of June 1938 and The Church and the Hour, from 1940, he would have discovered a highly nuanced view, albeit incomplete, of perhaps the most complex issue for those attempting to expound a theologically coherent position. D. H. Ingrouille, in his Bachelor of Letters Dissertation, also presented a somewhat superficial summation of Moyes and World War II:

51 Church Times for the Church of England in Australia, 20 April 1935, p. 2.  
52 Church Times for the Church of England in Australia, 20 April 1935, p. 2.  
Moyes appears to have made no public comment on issues of the war and seems to have remained outside the bitter political debate which divided Australian society. His independent assessment of contemporary problems together with his tendency towards radicalism would suggest that Moyes took a pacifist view of the conflict and was opposed to conscription. The public advocacy of the pacifist view and the 'No' vote would have branded Moyes a traitor.\(^{54}\)

It was unlikely that the threat of calumination would have deterred Moyes from taking such a stand if he had genuinely held it. He had already endured countless public attacks during the 1930s. In recounting events from his career in 1948, in connection with his second Lambeth Conference, he thanked the people of the diocese for their financial support, although some had been more charitable than others. One parishioner sent him a cheque offering to double it if Moyes promised not to return.\(^{55}\) He added: "It was common for me to be dubbed a Communist in a community where few had the slightest idea what Communism really meant."\(^{56}\)

As the threat of war had become more real, in 1938, Moyes was more expansive, contending that most Western communities shared a belief that peace was simply the absence of war "instead of as the harmony that comes from diverse nations fulfilling diverse functions in a common service."\(^{57}\) He considered it folly to have built fences against enemies rather than trying to make friends and in a telling analysis, accused Australia of having preferred to "lose our sons to losing our money."\(^{58}\) Moyes wanted the Christian Church to impress upon the various nations that the welfare of each depended on the welfare of all. He still held out hope for the League of Nations in June 1938, when, referring to the mistakes of the Versailles Peace Conference, he


\(^{55}\) Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 104.

\(^{56}\) Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 104.


\(^{58}\) Moyes, *Church and Nation*, p. 16.
took aim at ‘realism,’ which was later presented as a Christian position by one of the most influential American theologians of the twentieth century, Reinhold Niebuhr:59

Our past sins may make realism as it is called the only way, but merely to defend the past is to condemn the future to live or die under its shadow. A League of Nations, whose members have vision enough to see a world, and nations, in perspective therein, is still the hope of mankind.60

The ultimate issue between Christian Realism, as formulated by Niebuhr, and all forms of pacifism was one of moral priorities. Is a nation’s sovereignty, property, pride and honour worth more than the lives of the people who live in it? It was this issue that Moyes was unable to resolve. In his synod Charge of June 1938 he struggled at length to find a way forward, although it is difficult to fault his analysis in asserting that Communist Russia was beginning to substitute Christ with Stalin as a type of priest-king, accorded all the trappings of religious reverence:

To-day Europe is more intensely religious than for centuries past. Fascism and Communism are religions, they have their symbols, their creeds, their rites, their martyrs, their plan of salvation, their coming judgement and their better world.

They are pagan religions in modern dress.61

In a section of the same synod Charge, entitled ‘War and Peace,’ he argued clumsily that the question of whether war was right or wrong was not simply one of the moral righteousness of the use of force. It was wrong because it was unchristian. God was left out of the equation when

60 Moyes, Church and Nation, p. 16.
61 Moyes, Church and Nation, p. 6.
the nation became “the judge of its own cause, a thing that can never be true.”62 At the same time he was harsh on pacifism, contending that the total condemnation of the use of force indicated a “pure individualism and disowning of all political and social responsibilities.”63 Such a pacifism forfeited the individual’s right to share in the life of the state in times of peace, “since the equilibrium of the State is in part at least due to the use of force.”64 For Moyes, this lack of resistance was only consistent in a Kingdom that is “not of this world.”65 In what was crucial to his understanding of the Jesus paradigm he then attempted to address the issue of non-violent resistance, struggling to relate it to his original premise that the issue of the morality of war was not one concerning the use of force:

The second form of pacifism means the (sic) urging the necessity of non-violent types of power in place of violence. Unfortunately, power of any kind leads to abuse. There is no reason to suppose that the substitution of non-physical for physical forms of coercion will make a permanent contribution by itself, to the problem of power, though every wise society will try to discourage violence. Even spiritual weapons have proved at times, as tyrannical as material.

We must recognise and affirm that the problem is not primarily the problem or the use of abuse of force at all, and look elsewhere for our solution66

The above encapsulated the dilemma for most of the social gospellers who had argued against the preparations for war that were being made during the 1930s. When their recommendations for the avoidance of war through the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man rather than

63 Moyes, Church and Nation, p. 14.
64 Moyes, Church and Nation, p. 14.
65 Moyes, Church and Nation, p. 14.
66 Moyes, Church and Nation, pp. 14-15. It would appear from Moyes’ Charge that he had digested the arguments put forward by Niebuhr on the nature of coercion in Moral Man and Immoral Society, published two years earlier (Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1936, passim) Unfortunately, Moyes was unable to build a case one way or the other.
confrontationalism, suspicion and the building of military defences had failed, they were left with no choice but to participate in the war that they abhorred. The example of André Trocmé, who lived out a Christian response to the moral challenges of World War II by interpreting the life of Jesus as one of non-violent resistance to evil was unknown to them at the time. The entire basis of their Christian response to violence was thus compromised. Moyes was no exception. His negative assessment of the realist position left his own in an even greater depth of confusion:

A realist policy which is only concerned where its own seeming interests are involved is, I believe, not only shortsighted, but finally unreal and its long range results promise disaster. The so-called realist leaves God out of account.

He was thus left in a theological and ideological no-man’s-land with nowhere to go other than to reluctantly accept what had occurred and to contribute to the war effort in his diocese, which he did.

In his Bishop’s Letter, issued at the outbreak of World War II, in September 1939, he was still arguing forcefully against the Government’s policy of cutting back social services in order to pay for increased defence spending:

To cut down social services means more unemployment, it means that the poor carry the chief load in loss of clothing, education, decent homes, perhaps food, while the utmost the better-to-do surrender will be luxuries...If we are to defend

---


68 Moyes, *Church and Nation*, p. 16.

property and our national freedom – and let us remember that these are the chief things defended by war – (for war does not defend lives, it takes them) this defence should be the extra, over and above the cost of our people’s welfare at home...the Christian community should say, and say clearly that no man, woman or child is to lack education facilities, employment opportunities, good housing, clothing or food, for the sake of national defence.70

Moyes presented a similar view in the Sydney Morning Herald, when representing the Provincial Synod, he challenged the Government in an article titled “Sydney’s Slums,” that “if the Commonwealth could find £70,000,000 for war, it should be able to raise the money to house people in a decent fashion.”71 His anti-war position was still solid when he stated in the December 1939 issue of Armidale Diocesan News that “No peace will ever come by force alone. We can hold down lives for a time – but not for always.”72

Moyes consistently refused to be cast as an advocate for the war. Archbishop Wand, of Brisbane, had proposed that the Anglican bishops should make a united call to arms but according to Francis James, in an interview with Ingrouille in 1975, Moyes and Burgmann voiced strong opposition, thus preventing such an action from being taken.73 In his Lenten Letter, 1940, he expressed doubts that the Australian people possessed the spiritual depth to construct a

71 Sydney Morning Herald, 15 November 1939, p. 10.
73 Interview with Frances James, 18 June 1975, in Ingrouille, John S. Armidale, p. 88. Moyes blamed Wand for blocking the drive for an Australian Constitution for the Anglican Church in the 1930s: “But unhappily Archbishop Wand brought rather arrogant ideas of the authority of bishops and once again just when we thought we had agreement his emphasis (quite a mistaken emphasis Archbishop Temple told me, as far as England was concerned) once more blocked us and we were thrown back into constant arguments for 20 years.” (Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 196). Also, according to Francis James, it was due to opposition from Wand, who had become the Bishop of London, that nothing came of British Prime Minister Clement Attlee’s offer to Moyes in 1948, in the garden at 10 Downing Street, of the See of Salisbury. Even if James’ account was accurate, it was highly irregular given that Attlee had not conferred with the Archbishop of Canterbury. In James’ words, Wand viewed Moyes as a ‘dangerous radical.’ (Interview with Francis James, 18 June 1975, in Ingrouille, John S. Armidale, p. 98.)
harmonious peace when ultimate victory in the war was achieved. In that context, however, he expressed a subtle change of attitude, confessing that he agreed with those arguing that Australian was fighting a righteous war.74 Later in the same year, in an article titled *The Church and the Hour*, Moyes expounded his thoughts on the war at greater length. He argued that it was the Church’s business to bring eternal life into everyday affairs, the life of God into the doings of men, propounding the same view that landed him in trouble with Robert Menzies when he led the Vietnam War protest twenty-five years later, and which is dealt with in Chapter 4:

*It is not our business as a Church at this time to weigh the pros and cons of the war. We cannot see clearly to do so if we could, and probably we should end by echoing the world’s talk and hate, for the world can so easily clothe its doings in noble garb. The Church needs more God-consciousness rather than nation-consciousness…*75

The danger for the Church was that it should be lured into making compromises “in the hope that the nation will listen to it the more.”76 Despite his eloquence and the noble sentiments of the above, he lost his way when arguing that the Church could not throw its weight behind the war ‘Crusade’ of the Government or the cry of the pacifists:

*She cannot ignore the fact that the war has not just happened – but is the inevitable product of a social order and international system that refuses the way of love. At the same time the Church must see the hopelessness of merely*

74 Armidale Diocesan News, March 1940, p. 4.
75 Moyes, *The Church and the Hour*, pp. 6-7.
76 Moyes, *The Church and the Hour*, pp. 6-7.
challenging war when she has condoned far too easily, and shared too willingly, the fruits of the order which has ended in war.\textsuperscript{77}

There was ample nuance and analytical perception contained in the above, but such a position leaves one open to accusations such as those made by Trocmé and Gutiérrez that a neutral, or reactive, position taken by the Church in which it exposes the frailties of both sides of the argument without advocating a course of action is tantamount to support for the Government.\textsuperscript{78}

Unfortunately, we do not have any useful statements pertaining to the war from Moyes after the commencement of hostilities between Australia and Japan. This was clearly a more challenging situation for anyone attempting to enunciate a clear, Christian position since the threat of direct invasion was perceived to be very real. A clear position in the face of a direct, physical threat was presented by André Trocmé, who was compelled to deal with the invasion of his own country, France, in 1940, at a personal and national level.\textsuperscript{79} This will be discussed in Chapter 5.

At the end of the war, Moyes reiterated his view that the world needed more God consciousness than nation consciousness, arguing that it was the role of the Church to show the world how God intended life to be. At this point he was still issuing warnings concerning what he considered to be the vanity of nationalism:

\begin{quote}
It is an emotion which costs little, for the credit of belonging to a nation is only dependent on the achievement of being born...but a nation retains its value only
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{77} Moyes, \textit{The Church and the Hour}, pp. 6-7.
so long as the aggressive self consciousness – which is nationalism – enters not
in. 80

Moyes’ perennial difficulty with the question of armed resistance was still evident in his views on how to deal with the perceived Communist aggression during the Cold War: “It is quite possible that force may be necessary to limit the manifestations of evil and of violence of an enemy. We cannot allow our community to be in the position of being forced to yield to overwhelming power – if we can save it by defence.” 81 He appeared to be arguing against war as anything other than the last resort: “But let us beware of those who would suggest that nations should seek what they call a preventive war. It is a devilish idea, false and foolish.” 82 He then exposed, albeit quite eloquently, the incompatibility of Christianity with the position he had propounded in the above:

As Christians we know very well that the cause is not finally won or lost by military weapons; we know that we can’t defeat evil by violence, for victory is finally a spiritual fact. Where that is forgotten, war, however it ends, leaves all the problems unsolved and adds more to them. 83

The above could easily have been authored by André Trocmé but it proved too great a practical challenge for the vast majority of Christians who claimed to espouse it.

As far as the Cold War was concerned, Moyes argued in The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer that Communism had made itself the religion of State in the USSR, but that Christians must recognise that in Christianity it is the person, not the state, that is the
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final act. His threefold solution was characteristic of his lifelong evangelical liberalism. His first and third suggestions amounted to little other than that Christians should attempt to defeat Communism through their personal witness. His second suggestion, however, was an admonition to the Capitalist world to develop a "social order nearer to the Christian ideal." 84

In summary; Moyes' interpretation of the colonisation of Australia, the use of racism as an instrument of national policy and the degradation of the environment is one that, by and large, was prescient and compassionate, broadly nuanced, and has been quite successful in withstanding the test of time. His attempt to reconcile the example of the life of Christ with the choice of armed conflict as the response to violence at the international level did not reach a satisfying or theologically coherent conclusion and this theme will be developed further in the final chapter.

2.3. Education and Civilisation

Education was an area that occupied Moyes' attention throughout his life. He began working with a small group of people in New England for the establishment of a university college in Armidale upon his arrival in the city in 1929. Between 1934 and 1937 he was a regular spokesman for this group in its negotiations with D. H. Drummond, the Minister for Education in the New South Wales Government. Drummond extolled Moyes as one of the leading figures behind the establishment of the University of New England. 85 Moyes was a member of the 'Provisional Council of the establishment of a University College in the North' that raised £10,000 for the project. In addition to this he was a member of the sub-committee dealing with the curriculum for the University College. When the college began teaching in 1938 Moyes was

84 Moyes, The Communist's Way of Life and the Christian's Answer, p. 22.
made a member of the Advisory Council. He remained a member of this body until the incorporation of the University of New England in December 1953, which is the oldest provincial university in Australia. He was then a member of the University Council until 1967. From 1960-1967 he served as Deputy Chancellor, having the degree of Doctor of Letters bestowed upon him in 1961. Moyes also chaired the boards of the New England Girls School and The Armidale School. In 1942 Moyes fought successfully against the proposed requisitioning by the military of the University College for conversion to a hospital. The Armidale School and New England Girls School were also spared conversion for military purposes through the efforts of Moyes and others.

The overarching theme of Moyes' vision for education in Australia was that it had to be steered away from what he saw as an overemphasis on employment prospects. As he saw it, in the Australia of the 1930s; "The child is an individual who must be trained to earn his living." He was very concerned about the current trend in training specialists at a very early age and the lack of a sufficiently broad education encompassing the humanities and the arts. Education had become far too closely aligned with livelihood, occupying a period of years in which the student’s mind was “crammed with facts and certain examinations are passed.” His press clippings from Public Opinion support this view.

He argued that life was more than logic, and that it was full of paradox, requiring the ability to recognise nuances:

88 Drummond, A University is Born, p. 90.
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91 Article on the negative effects of examinations in secondary education expresses the belief that knowledge acquired exclusively for examinations is quickly forgotten. Public Opinion, 1 April 1927, in Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 44, p. 23.
The more a man looks at a thing the less he can see it. He gets used to that at which he looks and misses its significance. He sees it alone – fails to relate it up to life and so has lost or never found its final meaning.92

Moyes contended that men and women had lost the ability to entertain themselves and that in previous ages they sang, danced and made their own games. "Today we listen to others sing. There have always been performers and audiences, but it is significant that in our day the spectators increase, the performers diminish."93

Two essential failures in educational policy were addressed. The first was expenditure: "The skinflint policy of limiting expenditure on education and then pouring money into wars needs to be changed."94 One of the responsibilities of the Church as far as the social gospellers were concerned was to bring societal inequities to the attention of the Government and to agitate for systemic action. The lack of educational opportunities for those at the bottom of the economic ladder was one of those inequities Moyes sought to rectify. We have seen in the previous section how he was castigating the Government for allotting more funding to the war effort while ignoring the pressing demands of slum clearance and adequate housing in Sydney. In this second lecture he applied the same principle to education. Moyes saw the second essential failure in educational policy as the undervaluing of teachers. He regarded this as being due to the poor conception of the importance of education held by the public. In arguing that teachers have a great influence on our entire outlook on life and that the reverence of a child for a teacher is one of the most beautiful things in life, he considered it vital that teachers be valued accordingly: "Our teachers should have a status as do our doctors, clergy and lawyers."95 Moyes' fear was that

92 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 19.
93 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 20.
94 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 22.
95 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 23.
if the community did not value its teachers then the profession would not attract outstanding candidates. Those becoming teachers would not regard their vocation as a calling, but simply as a means to making a living. He also expounded a theme that he had applied elsewhere to the training of the clergy:

If we valued our teachers, if we valued our education, we should demand a richer and fuller training for all our teachers. There was a time when doctors took a course in Arts before turning to medicine. Everyone who enters the teaching profession should have that opportunity before he is trained in the special task of his vocation. We need richly stored lives with breadth of knowledge, with alert thinking powers, with the balance that comes of culture and the adventure that belongs to faith, in the men and women who train the young. 96

Hints of Steinerism were present in his recommendation that students should be free from the restrictions of syllabus and examinations in secondary education, arguing that, without the pressure of the above, teachers would be in a position to broaden the educational experience, thus making it possible for the students to "provide evidence of their interests and their bent in life."97 The problems in education were symptomatic of the regrettable compartmentalisation of life that Moyes contended had taken place since the Reformation: "Since the break-up of Medieval Christendom the Church has lost control on social life, and life has become a thing of departments, separate from, and even closed from each other."98 His optimistic vision, so characteristic of the social gospellers, was one of a society offering much more than material

acquisitions. In a delightful passage he waxed lyrical over the possibilities inherent in an educational revolution, which was seen to be vital by the social gospellers to the realisation of the Kingdom of God on earth. Moyes argued that if teachers could inculcate in children the view that life amounted to much more than work with money as the sole incentive, a world “full of delectable pleasure” could be revealed to them. Students could then realise that “the joy of being alone with an alert, well trained and well stocked mind” is more fulfilling than amassing an array of possessions, and that “the thrill of fashioning something with your own hands is better than champagne.”

His success at the University of Adelaide as a classics scholar was also bought into play: “What we need is ‘work and make music.’ For music in the Greek sense includes literature, drama, art and refinement; the things that are more excellent. In a word it means joy.” According to this romantically inclined bishop, if this could be achieved, “teachers would have helped solve the central problem of humanity...for it is giving, not getting that makes happiness, as the New Testament reminds us.”

The above provides a piquant example of the gulf between the liberal, Social Gospel reading of Christianity that flowered in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and Christian Realism, led by Reinhold Niebuhr, which developed as a reaction to it. This will be explored more fully in the final chapter but the principal point of disagreement requires identification here. The Christian Realists accused the liberals and social gospellers of a naive belief in the possibility of ‘curing’ humanity of its selfishness, weakness and evil through education, moral training and social conditioning. World War I gave the Christian Realists ample ammunition and the incomprehensible barbarity of World War II appeared, for a time, to have
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put the argument to rest. However, within a decade of the Third Reich’s demise, Martin Luther
King Jr was demonstrating that the gloating of the Christian Realists was somewhat premature
and that there was life remaining in the Social Gospel ideal. The final chapter will address and
compare the shortcomings of the Christian Realist position with that of liberal, Social Gospelism.

While many in the general community, and the teaching community, may find
themselves in agreement with the bishop’s views on education as presented in the above, it is
doubtful whether he would garner substantial levels of support today for his advice on religious
education. Moyes lamented the lack of, or poor standard of, religious education in Australian
public schools. Rather than have secular subjects taught five or six days a week with religion
brought in from outside as an extra subject on one day, he argued that: “We can only get a
genuine Christian education if each subject is taught as having its place in the world of
knowledge unified by Christian faith.”

In relation to the above, it is noteworthy that Moyes stood virtually alone amongst his
Anglican colleagues and Protestant clerics in supporting the New South Wales Government’s
decision in 1951 to approve the application from the Catholic Church for the establishment of a
Catholic University. He argued that he could see no reason why the Catholic Church should be
prohibited from providing a university, from its own funds, on a religious basis and that he
supported it specifically because it would be religious and not secular. Given the history of
denominational education in Australia, the opposition by Anglicans and Protestants to the idea
was exposed by the Sydney Morning Herald editorial as being purely sectarian and that the only
logical position one could adopt was the one presented by Moyes. 104 1951 was a decidedly
‘sectarian’ year in Australian politics and shall be dealt with at length in Chapter 3. The Catholic

104 Sydney Morning Herald, 23 February 1951, p. 2.
University issue was one of the rare occasions on which Moyes received support from Sydney’s leading broadsheet. His views were usually too left of centre to be looked upon with favour.

On education in general, there is no evidence that Moyes rejected evolutionary science, and his knowledge of the contemporary trends in biblical research, ecclesial history, social commentary, archaeology, etc, suggests that he would not have been in favour of teaching creationism as a literal truth or anti-Darwinian variants of intelligent design in schools. He would, however, certainly have supported intelligent design in the sense of the teleological argument for the existence of God. The more profound problem for his argument in the modern context lies with the modern perception of morality and ethics. This would include questions such as whether there was anything unique to Christianity in what was in times past considered to be Christian morality, and whether the Christian churches can continue to claim that there is a Christian ethic when the study of other religions reveals that very little, if anything, in that regard is incontrovertibly unique to Christianity.

Another aspect of Moyes’ educational vision has proved to be durable as an issue worthy of debate. He regarded education as too important to be placed entirely under the control of the prevailing government alone. He recommended that:

...the State should hand over its authority to a commission, really representative of the wide interests of the community, so that the community might educate and be finally responsible for the form of education. A body representative of educational experts, of the Churches, of experts in Social Service, in recreation, in industry, both employers and employees, could make real headway in working together to achieve an aim of true control, and real creativeness.105

In the above context Moyes hoped that the churches would be able to rise above their denominational differences and plan a syllabus for religious education. He also envisaged a time when headmasters “might have some say in the appointing of their own staffs.”

Many of the above views on education were presented by Moyes in an article in *New Day*, Volume I, No.9, April 1944. *New Day* was the journal of the Christian Social Order Movement (CSOM), founded in 1943. The CSOM is discussed in greater detail in section 2.5., The Economic Order.

Moyes argued vehemently against state aid, which meant Commonwealth funding for religious schools, contending that the Anglican schools would lose their independence and that it would increase religious segregation. Driving his argument was a lifelong belief in ecumenism. He urged far greater attention be paid to religion in the existing state schools, thus “avoiding on the one hand the Scylla of the present unsatisfactory system, and on the other the Charybdis of segregated schools, self-consciously developing their own communion’s life and power.” He noted that, although the church schools had achieved some good results in education, far too many children were precluded from attending them due to the costs. To ameliorate this situation, he proposed a radical revision to the tax system whereby the parents would receive substantial rebates. The issue of state aid caused a temporary rift in the relationship between Moyes and the Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, Ernest Burgmann, when the latter accepted the Commonwealth’s offer of financial aid to church schools in Canberra.

---


108 Scylla and Charybdis were Greek mythological sea monsters on opposite sides of the Strait of Messina. Odysseus was forced to choose between them, losing some of his sailors in the process.

109 J. S. Moyes, *Religion and Education*, A Charge delivered to the first session of the Twenty-Seventh Synod of the Diocese of Armidale, May 1, 1950, no pagination, but found on final page.

110 Letter from Moyes to Francis James, 13 August 1956, in Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 4, p. 361. Moyes revealed in this letter that he had made such a proposal to Prime Minister Ben Chifley in the late 1940s.

111 Letter from Burgmann to Moyes. 22 August 1956, in Moyes ‘Papers,’ vol. 4, p. 367. Burgmann created considerable consternation in the minds of many Anglicans when he accepted state aid for Canberra schools in 1956.
Moyes was still fulminating against state aid when the final obstacles to its implementation were being removed by the Menzies Government in 1964.112

In summary, John Moyes' greatest legacy in the field of education is the pivotal role he played in the establishment of Australia's oldest regional university, the University of New England. He clearly recognised the advantages provided to him by his own broad educational background from the first decade of the twentieth century in which he had excelled in Mathematics, Classics and Theology. He worked for thirty-eight years in order to improve educational standards for the people of New England, the result being the thriving university of which he was once Deputy-Chancellor. He eventually proved to be on the losing side of the argument concerning state aid, and by the early twenty-first century billions of Commonwealth dollars were being granted each year to institutions still somewhat incongruously referred to as 'private schools.' His broad, holistic vision of the educational process has proved to be more durable, despite the fact that Australia is a society, like other Western states, in which economic growth outweighs all other considerations. Many students, parents and teachers in modern Australia regularly voice their frustration at what they see as an educational system that is training students to do little other than pass examinations in order to acquire a qualification that will earn them large sums of money, which is precisely what Moyes had warned against. There are however some alternative schools in Australia that see education in a similar light to John Moyes, and some of the more mainstream public and private schools have established impressive programs for the development of the humanities and the arts. This depends to a great extent on the tradition of the particular school and the influence of the Principal; it is not systematic.

Moyes had written to Burgmann concerning funding for church schools, clearly chiding Burgmann for going it alone. The latter replied that all the provincial Anglican bishops were guilty of such an offence since they rarely met and were thus compelled to go it alone.

Moyes' hopes for an educational system with Christianity as its pervading feature have become less relevant in a society where Christianity itself has lost much of its relevance.

2.4. Marriage and Sex

It was through the issues of marriage and sex that John Moyes first made an impression in the wider Anglican Communion. As the newly elected Bishop of Armidale, his diocesan council resolved to support his proposal to attend the seventh Lambeth Conference, in 1930. He later lamented the fact that: "...the whole conference had been planned as if they (the English bishops) were the conference and the rest of us from across the world were guests. The Americans felt it rather deeply."

On the issue of marriage and sex, Moyes thought the English bishops intolerably conservative and took the first opportunity to attack their attitude at the preliminary session dealing with those two subjects. In a speech that attracted the interest of the Archbishop of York, William Temple, he later recounted that: "The physical fellowship of marriage was not, I felt, to be looked on as a regrettable necessity, but as a sacramental act which had a value for husband and wife quite apart from the conception of children." Temple then placed Moyes on the relevant committee. Moyes' booklet, *Marriage and Sex: The Church's Task*, which was written on his way home from Lambeth, was widely read and, as Moyes recounted, "evoked opposition."

The conference passed a greater number of resolutions concerning marriage and

---

113 Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 52.
114 Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 52. Moyes' wife, with whom he had six children, was Helen 'Nellie' Butler, daughter of South Australian Premier, Sir Richard Butler. For an assessment of the difficulties Moyes experienced in practising his own model for married life, see Anne O'Brien, "The Case of the Cultivated Man: Class, Gender and the Church of the Establishment in Interwar Australia," *Australian Historical Studies*, 107, 1996, pp. 254-255.
116 Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 53.
sex than any other subject, but while it confirmed Moyes’ view that sex within marriage was a sacramental act that enhanced the relationship of the participants,\textsuperscript{117} it was vague on the question of contraception. This conference was hailed as a breakthrough in the area of the churches and sex in that it supported the use of artificial contraceptives in certain circumstances. In fact, the relevant resolution only condoned artificial contraception in one circumstance:

\[
\ldots\text{in those cases where there is such a clearly felt moral obligation to limit or avoid parenthood, and where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence, the Conference agrees that other methods may be used, provided that this is done in the light of the same Christian principles.}\textsuperscript{118}
\]

It is difficult to see how such a formulation could have been of any particular use given that the moral obligations and morally sound reasons referred to were never defined. The resolution concluded with a categorical condemnation of “any methods of conception control from motives of selfishness, luxury, or mere convenience.”\textsuperscript{119} Moyes’ loyal and largely uncritical archdeacon in Armidale, Richard Daunton-Fear, contended that without Moyes’ influence the conference may have shelved the issue, leaving the Anglican Church in a similar position to that in which the Catholic Church still finds itself.\textsuperscript{120} Moyes may indeed have wielded considerable influence in this case but not all of his ideas were adopted by the conference. In his own writings he went much further, arguing in 1931 that there were three strands of thought concerning sex at the time. The first of these he termed atheistic, in which sex was regarded as inconsequential and not vital to creativity and spiritual development. The second he termed, quite curiously, agnostic, in

\textsuperscript{120}Richard Daunton-Fear, \textit{The Northern Magazine}, 1976, part 5. This was one of a series of seven articles.
which sex was for many people the cause of a "sense of half shame at an instinct they do not understand."

and the third, in which sex had its place "in the very depths of character-forming...the attitude that is most likely to express the truth...", he referred to as Christian. In this exposition of the significance of sex:

love means the acceptance of another life and the giving of one's own...the sex act is indeed the inevitable expression of love, it is a bond, an enhancement of love...a spiritual force and a power for comradeship in marriage. Sexual Communion is then capable of being sacramental."

Despite the eloquence of the above and that it challenged many of his own flock and of other Christian churches, it can obviously be countered that there was nothing specifically Christian about it, since most other religious traditions and many people without any religious affiliation would espouse the same sentiments.

Moyes was one of the first prominent Anglican churchmen in Australia to re-marry divorcees. This issue, and his correlative views on the role of women in general are worthy of exploration. He cited statistics current in 1941 concerning divorce in Australia. In 1871, less than one percent of marriages ended in divorce. By 1930, they were at 15.5 percent, and by the time of writing, in 1941, one in six marriages in Australia ended in divorce. Although Moyes disapproved of divorce in most cases and of couples living together outside of marriage, he was not of the opinion that his contemporaries were "worse than their fathers" or that Australia

121 The Bishop of Armidale, Marriage and Sex: The Church's Task, p. 8.
122 The Bishop of Armidale, Marriage and Sex: The Church's Task, p. 8.
123 The Bishop of Armidale, Marriage and Sex: The Church's Task, p. 17. It is slightly ironic that his own church had jettisoned the sacrament of marriage from its platform when it seceded from Rome in the sixteenth century.
124 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 31.
125 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 31.
had begun “a special slide to wickedness.” In noting that the fear of physical consequences for women had been greatly lessened due to the use of contraceptives, he considered the problem to be that, “in new circumstances we have not found our standards, having lost the old ones.” He also opined that women were still unconsciously regarded by men as property and that it was understandable why women were experimenting with sex before marriage since, although some women found happiness through their children, many women were unhappy due to the fact that they were living in loveless marriages. Moyes held that there were two currents of thought concerning marriage, which he considered to be equally destructive. The first being the older conception of marriage being the state in which women were seen simply as a man’s property and as the bearers of children, thereby preserving and propagating the race. The second current of thought is the more individualistic and modern, where marriage is exclusively the concern of the two people involved. He stressed his belief that real love is creative and that this should manifest itself in the growing fellowship of the partners and the creation of children and a family. Lust was defined as mean and selfish, “something which exploits another life without responsible selfgiving. It is destructive, not creative.” As already noted, he supported the use of contraceptives within marriage.

Moyes suggested a list of points describing how the Church could have an influence on marriage in society. While some of them are not specific enough to be particularly useful, he urged the State to consider the importance of conciliation courts whose hearing would be prior to a divorce court. He also urged the Church to:

---

provide courts where, when a home has been broken up irrevocably and one member refuses the grace of Christ and the Christian life, the other can be freed by the Church to seek a Christian marriage, in accordance with the Pauline privilege.\(^{129}\)

In support of the above he observed that the Church had adopted a mainly negative attitude allowing anyone to marry, but none to divorce. "We care not who gets married so long as they never seek to be unmarried."\(^{130}\) His views on sexual infidelity were also progressive for the time, arguing that adultery was never the only sin in a broken marriage: "...it is bound up with the whole level of life, and as a problem cannot be solved merely by legislating with regard to marriage."\(^{131}\) A life-long commitment was clearly the Christian ideal but Moyes asserted equally that the Church "has the right and duty to seek to call those who failed of purity to penitence and a new life, and in their new fellowship to reconcile them to Christ and his Church."\(^{132}\)

Concerning women, Moyes argued that inestimable harm had been caused to women through the ages by the association of sex with shame, and he was not reticent in accusing the Church of having nourished the idea that women were a temptation and that sexual relations, even within marriage, were a "concession to human depravity."\(^{133}\) In a startling observation, Moyes opined that it was not surprising that many women were frigid and found it hard to

---

\(^{129}\) Moyes, *Australia: The Church and the Future*, p. 43. The *Privilegium Paulinum* refers to the text found in 1 Corinthians 7:10-15. It was used as a rationale for dissolving marriages in which, in most cases, neither of the partners had been baptised. In case of a divorce where one of the partners had converted to Christianity and the other had not, the Christian partner could be free to remarry. The Petrine Privilege is a papal dispensation dealing with the situation in which one of the partners had been baptised and the other never agreed to baptism. Since marriage is a sacrament in the Catholic Church, such a union can be considered as *non ratus* (not confirmed as a sacramental union). In some circumstances the Pope can dissolve such marriages.

\(^{130}\) Moyes, *Australia: The Church and the Future*, p. 103.

\(^{131}\) The Bishop of Armidale, *Marriage and Sex: The Church's Task*, p. 27.


\(^{133}\) Moyes, *Australia: The Church and the Future*, p. 32.
"realise the beauty of the sex relationship in its right place in life."\textsuperscript{134} The bishop’s methodology concerning the ascertainment of the above is perhaps best left unexamined. He did not, however, countenance any suggestions that sex should be indulged in outside of marriage. His views on the dangers to individuals and society of unrestricted sexual activity were representative of nineteenth century England and seem antiquated to modern readers. His unsupported claim that any society in which sexual restrictions are removed loses its creative energy has proved to be unfounded:

> Even in a community the group which keeps the greatest self control displays the greatest energy and dominates the community. Unhappily no civilised society puts up for long with the limitation of sexual opportunities. It finds reasons for the relaxation of self control – and it goes downhill and is replaced by another society, another class who will accept the discipline.\textsuperscript{135}

During World War II Moyes composed a booklet concerning the dangers of casual sex, probably intended for distribution among servicemen. While conceding that sexual relations can provide as much pleasure for women as it can for men, \textit{War, womanhood and survival} has not aged well and is based on the premise that extramarital sexual behaviour is always a case of men exploiting women. This remains a hotly debated issue in some cases, particularly in the production of pornographic images, but stable and loving sexual relationships between adults outside of marriage have rendered the bishop’s views untenable in the present age. The booklet also contains the view that Moyes had propounded in \textit{Marriage and Sex: The Church’s Task}, that societies exhibiting the least amount of energy are those in which chastity before marriage is not observed. One interesting historical detail pertaining to the durability of Australian maidenhood

\textsuperscript{134} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 32.  
\textsuperscript{135} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 34.
was revealed within its pages. Moyes warned against the dangers of widespread condom usage in society: "they cause women to lower their standards; they are found in handbags of society girls, and in the possession of children still of school age."\textsuperscript{136}

Moyes was a vocal supporter of greater female participation in business, sport, politics and religion,\textsuperscript{137} and most importantly, he saw how the influence of women could help to "create a society cooperative rather than competitive, and how her influence finally tends to construction while man instinctively is destructive, because selfish and individualistic."\textsuperscript{138} The influence of women on society as a whole was thus vital to John Moyes' Social Gospel vision of building the Kingdom of God on earth.\textsuperscript{139} This was seen to be possible only if the basis of communal life moved from a competitive structure to one of cooperation. As always, Moyes argued for greater work from the Church in creating an environment for successful marriage rather than rigid legislation and punishment of sinners.

The issue of equal pay for women was one of many instances in which Moyes aired his frustration at the fact that the churches were largely absent from the debate. During a week of engagements at St Andrew’s Cathedral as the guest of the Dean of Sydney in 1950, he remarked on an “immensely interesting – but distressing” conference at Federation House in which the issue was being discussed. He found it distressing because almost all of the participants, representatives from trade unions and other organisations, had nothing to do with the Christian

\textsuperscript{136} John S. Moyes, \textit{War, womanhood and survival}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{137} We do not have any record of Moyes' opinion concerning the 1930 Lambeth Conference's resolution 67 stating that: "The order of deaconess is for women the one and only order of the ministry which we can recommend our branch of the Catholic Church to recognise and use." \textit{The Lambeth Conference: Resolutions Archive from 1930}, http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/downloads/1930.pdf, retrieved 4 August 2011.
\textsuperscript{138} The Bishop of Armidale, \textit{Marriage and Sex: The Church’s Task}, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{139} See Anne O’Brien, ‘The Case of the Cultivated Man,’ \textit{passim}. O’Brien’s argument for religion, and in this sense, the job of clergyman, allowing space for gender integration and an emphasis on the feminine, is an interesting but subjective one. Hilary Carey devoted considerable space to the feminisation of religion in Australia in Hilary M. Carey, \textit{Believing in Australia: A Cultural History of Religions}, St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1996, pp. 111-139.
Church, “and we, as far as I can see, are doing nothing to bring them face to face with the claims of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

In summary; Bishop Moyes’ views on marriage and sex appear, at first glance, to be dated, outmoded and quaint in the twenty-first century when the public debate is no longer concerned with pre-marital sex or the divorce rate, which seems to have levelled out at circa 30 percent, after decades of increases. At the time of writing this thesis the debate concerning matters sexual is focused on whether the Marriage Act should be amended to include homosexual unions. Also on the agenda is the question of what constitutes pornography and to what extent it should be available on the internet. There was however a level of compassion in Moyes’ view of divorce and his abhorrence of the exploitation of women that remains impressive, eighty years after its publication. It was characteristic of the Social Gospel that reconciliation before an irrevocable breakdown, rather than punishment after the event, was required in order to build the Kingdom of God on earth. It was this view that coloured John Moyes’ view of marriage and divorce. His warning that too many marriage partners in 1931 considered their unions to be exclusively their own concern is still worthy of reflection today, irrespective of whether one relates it to Christianity or not. Apart from the obvious impact on children where relevant, the Social Gospel was a gospel of fellowship, a brotherhood of all humanity, and Moyes’ position on marriage was consistent in that context. He urged the Church to offer far greater levels of support to faltering marriages, and even if the dissolution of a marriage was unavoidable, such a breakdown was not to be judged as an unrightable wrong after which the Church would refuse to recognise new relationships begun by either of the participants.

2.5. The Economic Order

The most salient feature of Moyes’ contribution to the national debate on the economic order, which was of paramount importance when he was installed as Bishop of Armidale since it was contemporaneous with the beginning of the Great Depression, was that he, like his Social Gospel comrades, believed that the churches should be making their voices heard in all areas of life, not simply in those of personal morality and salvation.

Anne O’Brien argued convincingly that, in Moyes’ case, it was his “keenest hope that his leadership would act as a unifying cultural force during this period of political divisiveness – that he would play a part in ‘holding the centre’.” Less convincing was O’Brien’s attempt to retrospectively psychoanalyse Moyes in order to provide an explanation for the putative contradiction in his relationship with the working class and the attraction of status and the establishment:

...his labour sympathy and his yearning for status were inextricably linked, born of the memory of his mother’s rejection by squatters in the south-east of South Australia when he was a boy.

The evidence cited by O’Brien was speculative, at best. Moyes’ penchant for clerical collars and gaiters could have simply reflected sartorial preferences as much as anything else. The claim that “he always drove a large Ford customline with the cross of St George on the bonnet,” is misleading. The Armidale Diocesan News reported in 1935 that the diocese was desperately attempting to raise money to purchase a new car for the bishop’s use. It stated that his present vehicle was in such a state of disrepair as to be dangerous. The diocesan appeal ultimately failed

---

to raise the required funds with the result that Moyes eventually paid for the car himself. The opinion of the Acting Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England at the time of Moyes’ death, Professor G. J. Butland, also appeared to contradict O’Brien’s assessment. Butland stated that the bishop had been a “very humble but forthright and sincere person. Once one really knew him one was convinced that here was a very great man.”  

Although status and money do not necessarily accompany one another, Moyes’ stipend remained the same in Armidale for the last fifteen years of his episcopate, at £1200 per annum. This was less than most Sydney rectors received.

In 1931, at which time the Depression had already ravaged the Australian workforce, Moyes made his case very clearly:

> There is no doubt a very widespread public opinion supposing that there is, in matters concerning the public life of the community, an ascertainable frontier marking off the Church’s legitimate concern. There is not! No department of human life lies outside the scope of moral principle...The Church’s limit is not of area but of method.

It was namely the area of method that proved to be problematic for the social gospellers. Moyes described himself privately as a life-long supporter of the labour movement but he did not consider it the role of the churches to endorse particular political parties or programs, despite the fact that his views on most issues were left of centre and rarely aligned with those of the right. It is therefore conjectural as to whether the Social Gospel movement would have had greater

---

146 Profile article on John Moyes by Graham Williams in the Australian, May 31 1965, p. 7. In the same issue on page 2 was a report on Moyes’ speech at the Vietnam protest meeting held at the Sydney Town Hall, 30 May 1965.
147 Ingrouille, John S. Armidale, p. 172.
149 Letter from Moyes to Francis James, 8 March 1956, in Moyes ‘Papers,’ vol. 4, pp. 323-325.
influence if it had stated publicly what was clear from its message; that the Australian Labor Party represented a position closer to its ideals than the conservative parties. The social gospellers, despite counting some of the most talented Anglicans in the nation among their ranks, only constituted a minority in the Anglican Church. The damage caused to the internal workings of that church as a result of openly supporting the Labor Party could have been considerable. Accusations of Socialist and Communist sympathies would have inevitably accompanied such a decision. It can, of course, be pointed out that such accusations did occur, particularly in relation to Moyes, Burgmann, Canon E. J. Davidson and others, but the consequences would have been more severe if senior members of the Anglican Church had publicly endorsed the Labor Party, which was suspected by many on the conservative side of politics of being sympathetic to Communism. The issue of sectarianism is also of great importance. Australia was in the 1930s a highly sectarian community and despite the anomaly of Joseph Lyons, a Catholic and former Labor Premier of Tasmania, leading the United Australia Party Government as the Prime Minister, the public perception was that of the Catholic Church wielding influence in the Labor Party. The resulting association of senior Anglicans with such company would have created a serious issue for many lay Anglicans at the time.

In Moyes' Moorhouse Lecture on the Economic Order he drew heavily upon Richard Tawney's highly influential work, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. He was bold and

---

150 For William Temple's guide, made while he was *primum inter pares*, on how the Anglican Church could bring its influence to bear on the social order, see: William Temple, *Christianity and the Social Order*, Penguin, 1942, pp. 26-34.  
151 Bruce Kaye, general editor, *Anglicanism in Australia: A History*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2002, pp. 100-108. The author of this section, Tom Frame, contributed concise assessments of the work of some of the more prominent social gospellers, including Bishop Burgmann, Bishop Moyes, Bishop Crotty and the Dean of Bathurst, H. R. Holmes.  
153 R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. Tawney was responsible for giving Christian Socialism a highly qualified historical and economic rationale. He had commenced his education on the same day at Rugby as
forthright in his condemnation of Capitalism: “Material wealth is not our primary need and because of its treatment of human life Capitalism is not the ideal order for the Australian future.” 

Like Tawney, Moyes contended that the growth of Capitalism was inextricably linked to the rise of individualism that emerged from the Renaissance and the Reformation. He accused England of having “led the world into the morass of capitalist industrialism,” adding a quaint and, many would argue, a forlorn hope that Australia, a child of England, would “help lead the way out.” In respect to the above, Moyes’ opinion of the state of Australia as a society was not dissimilar to that expressed in the 1980s by the Australian historian, Manning Clark. In the epilogue to his six volume history of Australia, Clark expressed the view that by the second half of the twentieth century all that was left of the many hopes and dreams for the Great South Land “was the idea of Australia as a place of uncommonly large profit.”

Moyes lamented the separation of religion and all other aspects of post-Reformation life. He saw this compartmentalisation as one of the regrettable repercussions of the spread of Capitalism, which was anathema to the social gospellers; “Religion was held to be only a department of life – separated by an impassable barrier from the world of work.” Much of the blame was laid at the feet of Jean Calvin and English Puritanism. This reading of Christian history had been disseminated very effectively between the two world wars by the above mentioned Tawney, who was perhaps the most influential academic within Christian Socialism in Britain at the time. Calvin’s influence on the repealing of the law prohibiting usury in 1571 was seen by Tawney as pivotal to the development and spread of Capitalism. Tawney did not

his lifelong friend, William Temple, Archbishop of York and ultimately Archbishop of Canterbury. They were both closely associated with the architect of the Attlee Government’s welfare state program, William Beveridge. In 1909, Beveridge married Tawney’s sister with Temple performing the marriage ceremony.

154 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 45.
155 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 45.
157 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 46.
accuse Calvin of wilfully instigating a capitalist revolution but argued that eventually, Calvinism, through its influence in the great financial centres such as Amsterdam, Antwerp and London, abandoned the medieval outlook in matters of money: “They thus broke with the tradition which, regarding a preoccupation with economic interests beyond what is necessary for subsistence as reprehensible, had stigmatized the middleman as a parasite and the usurer as a thief.”158 Moyes echoed this interpretation:

Never till this era had the desire for riches been openly held to be the sole motive of working and never till this time had instruments been invented for the support of this idea...In the sphere of economics covering nine-tenths of man’s daily life, the test of every activity increasingly has come to be not, is it just, but does it pay.159

Moyes railed against monopolies. Quoting sources from the Left Book Club, he declared that fifteen men in New South Wales, controlling forty-two companies with a capital of seventy-five millions, dominated the whole economic structure of the state. The situation, he argued, was similar in Victoria where an inner ring of a dozen men had control of the key points of industry, while a group of forty men were in charge of the entire economic structure of the State. His assessment was damning:

It is obvious that if this form of industrial life is allowed to develop further in Australian life, whatever political freedom its people may seem to have, Hitler’s accusation that democracy is really controlled by a financial oligarchy, will certainly be true.160

159 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 47.
160 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 48.
The level of the unemployment allowance was also a concern. Moyes argued against the prevailing policy of keeping the dole payments far below the average wage in the belief that if it were raised many would not work at all. He cited figures from the Australian Year Book of 1937/38 giving the yearly production per capita in Australia at £504 as proof that “society could easily carry them.” Moyes’ views, so clearly on the left side of Australian politics at the time, nevertheless identified one of the central shibboleths in the “right versus left” battle in Australian politics: “We still find people who believe that if a man is unemployed it must be his own fault, and that to receive relief is degrading.” Such sentiments were common, not only in right wing political circles, but also within the churches, especially the evangelical wing of Anglicanism and some of the Protestant denominations. These groups worked tirelessly through their charitable organisations on behalf of individuals and families in distress but regarded political action in areas of social reform as outside their sphere of interest. If one was in financial difficulties, one was encouraged to seek or to re-establish a right relationship with God. The answer was not to be found in Government ‘handouts.’

Moyes summed up his view of capitalism thus:

The capitalist system thus stands condemned because it has made wealth its purpose, has made man a means to an end, has linked work and wages as essentially to be conjoined, and has discarded man in favour of the machine and

left him unemployed, without significance and without any real share in the
nation's wealth.\textsuperscript{164}

In discussing the responses of the churches to the Great Depression, Anglican historian Tom Frame argued that due to the fact that the Depression was a national and global phenomenon, the Church needed to offer more than “parish pastoral care and well-meaning self-help community strategies if it was to proclaim the Kingdom of God to the whole world.”\textsuperscript{165} He underlined that Moyes’ greatest concern was that economic activity had become the overriding concern of humanity. The manner in which Capitalism had developed, with its factories of mass production, had resulted in the working class becoming alienated from fulfilling labour. Frame also maintained that “Anglicans did not continue to discuss ‘big questions’ after the Second World War,”\textsuperscript{166} This was accurate enough as far as a unified voice from the majority, or the hierarchy, was concerned, but Moyes, Burgmann, Davidson and others continued to make their voices heard in the public arena after World War II, as exemplified in the events discussed in Chapter 3 when the Federal Government attempted in 1950-51 to introduce changes to the Constitution of Australia that could have had far reaching consequences for the future of parliamentary democracy. Moyes was still trying the patience of the Government when he, in 1965, at the age of eighty, placed the morality of Australia’s Vietnam adventure on the national agenda. This is the subject of Chapter 4.

John Moyes stopped short of ever endorsing a fully Socialist or Communist planned economy, arguing that many who had reacted to the evils of Capitalism with calls for total state control were still living in the “world of Economic Man”\textsuperscript{167} and had not liberated themselves

\textsuperscript{164} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{166} Frame, \textit{Anglicans in Australia}, p. 242.
\textsuperscript{167} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 50.
from the goal of material wealth. Communism, for Moyes, was not the solution since it simply transferred the monopolies of individuals to that of a state bureaucracy.

Moyes made several suggestions for an improved social order in Australia.\(^{168}\) Firstly, essential services and large scale productions were to be brought under state control.\(^{169}\) He argued that this had proved necessary and successful in war-time and that neither politically, morally nor economically, could the nation afford essential services to be controlled by private groups for profit. Secondly, the state was to work towards ensuring that everyone could own their own home and that liberty in small scale enterprise was preserved in order that “men can express the vocation they have found in the course of their education,”\(^{170}\) thus relating to his argument pertaining to education in general. Moyes would have people becoming their own producers, with groups cooperating to provide commodities or to sell them. The essence of this new social order was to be the satisfaction of the needs of the community, not the production of goods for the sake of wealth. Thirdly, Moyes introduced an interesting argument for increased child endowment. He took issue with the prevailing wisdom that money, or self interest, was the only motivation for work: “It is true that we are constantly reminded that unless work and wages are linked indissolubly together there will be no work done.”\(^{171}\) He used the example of soldiers: “…who would suggest that there is any compatibility between a soldier’s pay and a soldier’s service?”\(^{172}\) In this context he contended that widows and the heirs of the wealthy had for centuries lived without the financial requirement of doing any work, yet they were not considered to have had their self respect undermined, as was the case with the public perception
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168 These were quite similar to those proposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, in William Temple, Christianity and the Social Order, pp. 103-120.
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of the unemployed. Many of the above mentioned groups had rendered great service to their respective communities in the areas of social work, art and literature. Moyes argued that if all children were to receive greater levels of financial endowment from birth, first paid to the parents and later to the child, upon the attainment of his or her majority, for life, a more self respecting community would result. The endowment was not envisaged to be, and could not be, so substantial that the recipient would be absolved from working, but Moyes argued that it would encourage people to pursue their passion instead of choosing a job purely on financial grounds. This would hopefully result in a more harmonious society. Fourthly, and in direct relation to the above, he reiterated what he considered to be the Christian vision for society, that: “Christianity asks that man be treated as a person, as a member of society bearing values in his life. Industry and goods and wealth are for man – and not man for industry.” 173 The fourth point listed above was a theme to which Moyes returned on countless occasions in his synod charges, sermons and journal and newspaper articles. In 1961 his view was still that the disorder of the day as compared to earlier years was “the rupture of personal relations and the depersonalising of man, which is in part due to technics,” 174 but he argued that the above was the result of the human attitude to production and so “we are brought back ultimately to the human element.” 175

Moyes always considered Communism and Capitalism to be products of the same spirit of secularism, both godless, where goods had priority over people. “They are blood brothers despite their hatred for each other.” 176 Moyes applied his keen analytical mind in connection with Communism, arguing in The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer, in 1952, that there was no reason why it should ever conquer the world. Referring to Russia, he wrote that:

173 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 53.
It has been planted upon a primitive nation which had no middle class, on a nation which had never known freedom, on a nation whose religion was one of resignation to the powers that be, on a nation where injustice and oppression had been the keynote of life for centuries.\textsuperscript{177}

Most importantly, he reiterated his belief that religion could not retreat into itself and ignore the issue. He maintained that it was not sufficient merely to understand the challenge of Communism; it was equally necessary to understand what Christianity should mean in everyday relations between people. As a true Prince of the Church, he argued that:

Those who tell us that religion should stick to what they call its own task and keep clear of the realms of politics and economics are, no doubt unconsciously, untrue to the Christian faith and, also unconsciously, giving their vote for Communism. For how can any human interests or human concerns be outside the influence, guidance and love of the God who became Man?\textsuperscript{178}

Moyes emphasised Marx’s Jewish heritage and that Communism’s passionate pleas for social justice for the poor and underprivileged were highly redolent of the Old Testament prophets. He argued that Christianity and Communism parted company in that there was no God above Communism and no “sense of sin and corruption within it.”\textsuperscript{179} The Communist version of the Kingdom of God was thus entirely within history whereas the Christian Kingdom transcended death and included a world to come. There was no-one to pass judgement on a Communist society devoid of religion. He contended that in societies where God is acknowledged, men were willing for their social order to be criticised: “as, for example, we criticise Capitalism quite

\textsuperscript{177} Moyes, \textit{The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{178} Moyes, \textit{The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{179} Moyes, \textit{The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer}, p. 12.
freely today, knowing it stands under God’s judgement, but Communism refuses to be judged.” 180 In respect to the final point above; arguments can be put forward in support of parliamentary democracy flourishing in the so-called Christian West, but during Moyes’ lifetime the examples of Fascist Spain and Italy, plus certain regimes in South America where God was also ‘acknowledged,’ make his case very difficult to defend.

Moyes’ concluded his Moorhouse Lecture on the Economic Order with a customary optimistic assumption correlating directly with his views on education:

The time has come for us to realise that if we train children for a vocation, and teach them that to live is to give, showing them the reality of this through the years, by the community’s treatment of them – the time has come for us to realise that very largely they will respond and work for the joy of serving, and give a better best than is obtained to-day on daily wage or piece work. The best service will come when the compulsion to work in order to live has been made so tenuous that service is free. 181

During Moyes’ first visit to the USA, in 1943, he met, and was impressed by the influential trade union leader, John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers of America. 182 Moyes had a letter of introduction to Lewis from the Miner’s Association of New South Wales. Lewis told Moyes that the first necessity for integrating the mining community into the national life was economic betterment; “The community despises those whom it
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182 John L. Lewis (1880-1969) was one of the most powerful and controversial trade union figures in United States history. He was an important factor in the success of Roosevelt’s New Deal but favoured isolationism in American foreign policy and later broke with Roosevelt. Moyes’ claim that he strove for the welfare of his nation as well as his class was controversial since Lewis called his men out on nationwide strikes in the middle of World War II, thus, in the opinion of many, sabotaging the American war effort.
Moyes visited Lewis again on his second American sojourn, in 1948. On his return he wrote a long article about their meeting in the *Armidale Diocesan News*, December, 1949, referring to him as “a man with ideals, a man who has striven for the welfare of the nation as well as the class whom he led.” He quoted Lewis at length:

> That the strong should help the weak is a cardinal principle of this organisation, and it is the great underlying concept and factor that wields together the men of the mines into a closer fraternity, and a more united brotherhood than exists in any other industry in our land. Nay, there is not only a fraternal understanding, but there is positively a spiritual relationship between the men who go down into the bowels of the earth and with their naked hands produce that commodity upon which our present day civilisation is truly founded.

The impression made upon Moyes by the immensely powerful Lewis, whose support played a leading role in the landslide second term victory of President Franklin Roosevelt in 1936, was clearly evident from the fulsome praise that overflowed from Moyes’ article. It was barely a year later that Moyes leapt energetically into the Communist Party debate in defence of the trade union position. The inspiration of the recent meeting with John L. Lewis was still fresh in his mind.

Many of Moyes’ views on the economic order were presented in *New Day*, the journal of the Christian Social Order Movement. The CSOM was an Anglican organisation for promoting Social Gospel ideals drawing its inspiration from the Malvern Conference convened by the then
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Archbishop of York, William Temple, in 1941. It originated from a decision taken by the Social Questions Committee of General Synod, of which Moyes was Chairman. The social gospellers' cause was aided by the fact that the Anglican Primate at the time, Archbishop Le Fanu, was sympathetic to their cause. Reverend W. G. Coughlan, Rector of Holy Trinity, South Kensington, in Sydney, was appointed as Director of the CSOM. Moyes became Chairman of the CSOM Council from its inception in 1945. Its Manifesto, which was a radical articulation of Social Gospel measures for a Christian society began thus:

The Objectives of the Movement are:-

a) The development throughout the Church and the Community of the religious social conscience, whereby the Christian principle of social well-being which is based on the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, as revealed by Jesus Christ, shall be applied to every aspect of life.

b) The initiation and development of a program of education for a social order and a citizenship true to the ideals of the Kingdom of God.

Such a vision of the social order could have been composed by Walter Rauschenbusch himself. Due to his episcopal responsibilities Moyes was unable to devote all his energies to the organisation, but he was a regular contributor to the journal. The three leading figures in the

---


188 The Movement towards a Christian Social Order, Manifesto, '1944, sourced at the National Library of Australia.

CSOM were Coughlan, Moyes and the Rector of St James, King Street, Sydney, E J. Davidson. The CSOM campaigned in favour of the Labor Government’s defeated 1944 referendum proposals for extended constitutional powers for the Federal Government. It was disbanded in 1951. Moyes described the closure of the CSOM as being due to complacency stemming from increased prosperity after the war. “In 1951 it seemed wisdom to us all to disband the organisation.”\(^{190}\) Joan Mansfield, who made a detailed study of the organisation, was more forthcoming in attempting to explain its demise:

At the theological level its insistence on a social interpretation of salvation militated against its acceptance in conservative evangelical circles in Sydney, the centre of its operations, and entangled it in animosities of divisions over churchmanship... Its efforts to develop an educated opinion that avoided the extremes of Right and Left made it a target of attack from both sides, and for its development as a 'third force' it lacked not only adequate contacts but support in the Church.\(^{191}\)

In summary; Moyes subscribed to the view widely held in English Christian Socialist circles, and supported by the eminent scholarship of Tawney, that a great fracture had occurred since the Reformation in the spiritual life of Western culture. This compartmentalisation of life, wherein religion and work had become divorced, caused a calamitous realignment of the human value system. The rise of the individual and the ruthless pursuit of personal gain had led to a situation whereby the majority of twentieth century Australians appeared to have replaced human welfare with financial advantage at the top of its list of priorities. The churches now occupied the margins of the public arena, having retreated to the safety of their own sanctuaries, concerning

\(^{190}\) Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 69.
themselves primarily with personal regeneration and individual morality. For Moyes, it was an abdication of responsibility for the churches to neglect speaking out against an unjust economic order that permitted some human beings to languish while others amassed great wealth. In his view, such an order was contrary to the spirit of Christianity, and simply wrong in the eyes of God.

2.6. Money, An Instrument

"There is more in the New Testament about its danger than about anything else...It is an instrument, the extension of personality, 1 Tim.6:9-10. It is for use, not for love."192 Moyes' views on money as, if not the root of all evil, at least the cause of many evils, were largely encompassed by his work on the Economic Order. His assessment was that money had evolved from a medium of exchange into a value in itself, metamorphosing from servant to master:

Money had been so amazing as a means to aid the world of industry that men were moved to make money instead of goods. Money thus became the end instead of the means to goods. Goods have become the means to money instead of vice versa. Mammon is God and money a commodity, desirable in itself or as a means of power over others, rather than as a means of exchange.193

When summarising the attitude of the early Christians towards money, he invoked the support of one of the most respected social commentators between the two world wars, Walter Lippmann. In Lippmann's A Preface to Morals, he had argued that the original followers of Christ had regarded money making as avarice and interest as usury. Too great a focus on business would

193 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 63.
thus create a passion and desire for riches within humanity so powerful that only one’s odd moments could be devoted to God.\textsuperscript{194} Moyes reiterated his views on the post-Reformation change in attitude towards the charging of interest from that of sinful to acceptable and finally to approval. The thesis of this Moorhouse Lecture was simply that the community must be in control of the instruments of human fashioning and use them for the general good, instead of for private gain. “As so often in life, what man makes becomes the idol he worships.”\textsuperscript{195}

Moyes urged the need for governmental action during peace time as well as during war (he was writing in late 1941). He advocated a Central Bank that controlled the volume of credit. This, he argued, was the most important factor in determining price levels and “would be able to create conditions leading either to expansion or to monetary stringency.”\textsuperscript{196} He also viewed as necessary control of interest rates by the Central Bank or a National Investment Trust. The churches were upbraided for having succumbed to the worldly view of money, allowing the wealthy to pay for their church pews and raising money through gambling.\textsuperscript{197} Moyes advised Christians to view money as the claim a person has on the community for goods and services, for example: “what services I render to the community in return for my money, and what I do with my money when I have earned it.”\textsuperscript{198} Charity, that which every person sets aside for God’s service at home and abroad, for the poor and the handicapped, should be “the first, and not the last, decision in every life.”\textsuperscript{199} In the asking the following rhetorical questions Moyes identified the dilemma that every reforming government must face:
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Are the idolatry of wealth, the lust for power, the love of prestige, so strong that vested interests will fight to thwart this evolution of society, while the dead weight of a widespread indifference in Church people as in others, may damp down the enthusiasm of reformers?²⁰⁰

As for the realisation of the “evolution of society” that he sought, Moyes was characteristically optimistic, agreeing with Plato, that the creation of the world of civilised order is the victory of persuasion over force. He could have added that in order to effect change, one must convince the privileged that their losses will, at worst, cause minor damage to their status and that the prospective gains to the under-privileged will be as real as promised.

In a widely reported speech in Newcastle in October 1931, Moyes savagely attacked the banks and the banking system in Australia for what he regarded as their selfish exploitation of struggling workers.²⁰¹ He proposed that the banks become public utility companies, responsible to the people as a whole, not merely to a small collection of shareholders. He attempted to reassure his audience that this was not a call for nationalisation of the banks, arguing that there was a huge difference between the Government assuming control of the banks and those who control the banks undertaking some of the duties and responsibilities of Government.²⁰² The catalyst for this speech was Moyes’ recent encounter with a bank manager in his own diocese. A local bank in New England had foreclosed on a mortgage and turned “a splendid man off the land.”²⁰³ When Moyes approached the bank manager he suggested that the bank owed this man something as a client and that if it continued to pursue such a policy the result would be

²⁰⁰ Moyes, *Australia: The Church and the Future*, p. 70.
²⁰¹ Much of the same territory was covered in J. S. Moyes, ‘The Present Temper of Australian Politics and Society,’ *Australian Quarterly*, 14, March, 1931, pp. 7-16.
²⁰² *Newcastle Morning Herald*, 9 October 1931, p. 9. This speech was extolled by the *Labor Daily* (Sydney) 13 October 1931, p. 4. By the time Moyes reached Newcastle in order to deliver this speech he had been taken ill with influenza. The speech was delivered by another in his stead. It was however the printed version that caused so much uproar.
²⁰³ Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 58.
counterproductive since it would force down land values. The bank manager replied that: "We are responsible only to our shareholders." 204 This event must have created a profound impression in Moyes' mind since he recounted it in detail in his unpublished memoirs circa forty years later.

That which is crucial in the above is not John Moyes' knowledge of monetary policy, or lack thereof, but the presence of his overarching message that all economic activity was to be harnessed for the general welfare of the whole community. Although he conceded that there were certain elements in Communism and Capitalism to be recommended, he inveighed against them both as ultimate solutions in their present forms. Communism was always regarded as the most dangerous due to its espousal of a dictatorial system. This was made clear in Moyes' reply to criticism of his speech. He underlined that he regarded Capitalism as having a future: "But Capitalism must express ethical values, more human ideals; it must indeed gain and incorporate what is best in communist and socialist ideals." 205 Moyes was criticised from many quarters during the 1930s for his negative views on banking policy including one admonishing letter from the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank. Moyes was informed that he had attributed powers to the banks that they did not have and, in an acknowledgement of the influence no longer enjoyed by bishops in the twenty first century, that: "Your utterances will be accepted without question by those who are unable to reason for themselves." 206 The banking issue returned to the forefront of the political agenda in Australian after World War II, culminating in the Chifley Government's failed attempt to effect nationalisation in 1949. In 1950 Moyes joined the public debate over the proposal to stagger the working week so that businesses could operate on all seven days, making it possible for work to be continuous. Moyes was totally opposed, citing
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206 Letter from the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank to Moyes, 26 September 1933, Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 1, No. 329.
man’s greed and misunderstanding of the role of money in his arguments. Since the days of the Newcastle speech, given in the middle of the Great Depression, reforms to the banking system and the economic system in Australia in general have resulted in Capitalism adopting a human face, incorporating elements of socialisation, such as the substantial expansion of the welfare sector. The triumph of money as a value unto itself, on the other hand, has simply become a worst case scenario when seen in the context of Moyes’ assessment.

In summary; the guiding principles of the Social Gospel pervaded Moyes’ views on money as thoroughly as on any other subject. The Kingdom of God was to be one of fellowship; fellowship with God and with humanity. Money was therefore an instrument to be employed in facilitating the building of the Kingdom. God’s will could not be done on earth as it is in heaven if men and women were worshiping money, or anything other than God. Moyes may have attributed a greater level of selfishness to the bankers than was actually the case, and he may have been misguided in his understanding of monetary policy, but his arguments were always on behalf of those whom he considered to be in need of assistance. It is difficult to disagree with his analysis of the position money held in the value system of Australians during his lifetime.

2.7. Politics and Citizenship

Moyes centred his argument in this lecture on the premise that Australian democracy has always been characterised by an excessive emphasis on rights rather than duties and responsibilities. It was clear from such an analysis that Moyes had digested the ideas of the Italian statesman, Guiseppe Mazzini, whose Dei doveri dell’uomo (The Duties of Man) had been highly influential in Social Gospel circles, particularly with Walter Rauschenbusch. Moyes
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contended that Australian democracy was not a mirror image of the democracy of Australia's mother country. He claimed that English democracy, in a highly romantic assessment, developed by way of a belief in function and responsibility and had to endure waves of foreign invasion. The Church however had been a constant and unifying influence.²⁰⁹ It was drawing a long bow on Moyes' part to make a connection between the waves of foreign invasion and the development of English democracy since by the time the invasions had ceased, and long after, there was yet nothing remotely resembling democracy in England. He continued to assert that Australia, by contrast:

has never been compelled to seek unity by reason of dangers from without, nor has she had the religious life of a single and united Church, to exercise any unifying influence within, during her one hundred and fifty years.²¹⁰

His point concerning the unifying influence of the Church is relevant, despite the upheavals of the English Reformation and the cataclysmic schism between the papacy and one of its erstwhile most loyal supporters, Henry VIII, but within a few short months of Moyes' Moorhouse Lectures the "unity by reason of dangers from without" was directly upon Australia through the war with Japan. The ferocious political struggles of the immediate post-war period, one of which is the subject of Chapter 3, proved that such unifying factors can be very transient and short lived.

Moyes was however on much safer ground when he analysed the state of Australian democracy and proposed his Social Gospel vision for its future:

It is not too much to say that self interest has been deified in Australia and politics defiled. The ideal of a true democracy is not primarily a search for

²⁰⁹ Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 71.
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wealth but for personality, not for material efficiency and gain as much as for
developed lives, and its basis is the sense of value in every life, the something to
contribute to the common good, and the importance of giving the life every
chance in view of its potential values.\textsuperscript{211}

In passage reminiscent of Mazzini,\textsuperscript{212} Moyes claimed that: "...our method of democracy thus
developed laid stress on rights, not on contributions, not on duties."\textsuperscript{213} He continued to make
these points well into old age. In his speech upon being awarded a Doctor of Letters degree from
the University of New England, of which he was Deputy Chancellor at the time, he argued that
modern Australia had changed the idea of democracy as freedom, to democracy as equality, and
that it was now measured in terms of money. "Our method of judging our equality is in terms of
money...The scramble for wealth is the chief employment of the majority and in this we still
exploit men."\textsuperscript{214}

Moyes deprecated forcefully the adversarial nature of Australian party politics and quite
percepibly identified the nature and shortcomings of the Australian parliament in a
characterisation that has perhaps increased in relevance during the intervening decades:
"Democracy as a political method should mean a process of discussion, but with us the party
pushes through the purposes decided outside Parliament, and discussion has no effect."\textsuperscript{215}

On international relations, Moyes was scathing of Australia's contribution, or lack
thereof, to world peace. He cites the case of the Prime Minister during World War I, Billy

\textsuperscript{211} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{212} "We must convince men that they, sons of one only God, must obey one only law, here on earth; that each one of
them must live, not for himself, but for others; that the object of their life is not to be more or less happy, but to
make themselves and others better; that to fight against injustice and error for the benefit of their brothers is not only
a right but a duty; a duty not to be neglected without sin – the duty of their whole life." Mazzini, \textit{The Duties of Man
and other essays}, pp. 15-16 (original italics).
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Hughes, who vehemently opposed the proposal made by Australia's ally at the time, Japan, of a racial equality clause to be included in the League of Nations charter. As part of the disagreements that ensued, Woodrow Wilson's efforts to insert a clause on religious freedom were also rejected. Bearing in mind that Moyes was writing one month before the Pearl Harbour bombings, his assessment of the fruits of Hughes' work demonstrated a far greater level of objective and disinterested perception than the vast majority of his contemporaries: "The whole story is illuminating not least in light of subsequent happenings in the Far East."  

Moyes bemoaned the centralisation of higher education in the cities, making it a necessity for young people to move from the country. He argued that every child was compelled to leave his or her village in order to pursue higher education and those with above average ability had to move to the cities to find work in the many areas not supported by provincial life. This had resulted in the "deplorable sameness and deadness of much of the countryside." The exploitation of the Australian countryside had robbed it of its natural beauty and the villages were populated for the most part:

- by inert, slow moving and slow thinking people, without real education, without living interests, without homes of any beauty, their village without a library or any cultural means of any kind other than the Church.

His own contribution to solving this problem was the previously mentioned leading role he played in the establishment of the University of New England, in Armidale.

Moyes' observations on the demographic course upon which the nation was embarking are worthy of revisiting. He complained of the amount of debt accruing in the cities and that
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centralisation was forcing up values until the residential portions of cities were being thrust further and further out. "Old homes are sold up, great blocks of flats, the precursors of slums within a generation, are built and the crowds learn to live the artificial life that follows the loss of touch with mother earth and a garden." He argued for a clear distinction between the taxation rating on houses and grounds dwelt in and used by their owners as homes, and on those owned and let for income’s sake. The issue of the workability of the Australian federal system, something that periodically figures on the national agenda, was also on the bishop’s radar. He maintained that one central government and far greater involvement in local government would serve Australia better than the federal system with state governments. Voicing his concern for the environment once more, he warned that the era of exploitation had come to an end. "We must consider our continent as well as ourselves." In connection with the question of populating Australia, he argued that if the White Australia policy was to be anything more than "a red rag to our neighbours," the whole question of populating and using the continent would be a task to "tax the vision and the brains of our Parliament."

It is clear from Moyes’ views on land speculation that he had studied the work of Henry George. In terms similar to those expounded by George, Moyes railed against the rampant speculation in land that he viewed as characteristic of capitalist economies. He also drew support from Lewis Mumford’s *Culture of Cities*, arguing that it was only in a Capitalist civilisation that people had come to believe that land could be the object of buying and selling, subdivision, monopolisation and speculation like any other commodity. Echoing Tawney’s analysis of
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economic history, he contended that: "Feudal times knew no such levity." In this context, the issue of 'closer settlement' of land had been fiercely debated in Australia since the onset of the Depression. Many owners of large tracts of land, much of which was often unused, were seen to be preventing a 'fair go' for small farmers. Moyes had attracted controversy throughout the 1930s for his stand against the actions of the large landholders. His most forthright and widely reported contribution was that published in Farmer and Settler, the official newspaper of the Farmer and Settler Association of New South Wales. Moyes had chosen the occasion of his annual address, as Chairman of the Armidale School Council, to attack the policy of the Country Party regarding 'closer settlement.' He argued that it was difficult to understand the attitude of the Country Party:

which one would expect to have the development of the country and the settlement of the country as its first platform, has no such platform at all but rather seems to be trying to hold the land in few hands and thus force more people into the cities. 226

Farmer and Settler supported Moyes wholeheartedly, accusing the Country Party of listing the nationalisation of the means of production – the land, as the first plank in its platform.227 Both Moyes and Farmer and Settler argued that it was not confiscation, as maintained by their opponents, to compel 'land barons' to sell unused sections of their land to those who wanted farms. The newspaper also underlined that many of those who desired to purchase farms were sons of experienced farmers.228

227 Farmer and Settler, 2 January 1936, p. 1.
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At the conclusion of this, the sixth lecture in his Moorhouse series, Moyes exhorted Australians to exhibit a greater level of communal and international responsibility, warning that they must learn to live among other peoples, cultures and races in an ever shrinking world. They could not consider themselves in isolation. He spelled out the optimism of the Social Gospel once more, and most importantly, he reminded them that sovereignty and security depend on humility and mutual respect:

If we keep our continent it will be by the assent of other nations recognising our rights... We need a vision of a nation called by God, of a nation where class bitterness and greed for personal wealth have been banished, of a nation humble in its privileges and friendly to neighbours, reverencing other peoples as we desire to be reverenced.\(^{229}\)

In summary; Moyes was an advocate of the Mazzinian vision of a society equally aware of the duties of its citizens as it was of their rights. Apart from his occasionally romantic and rose coloured interpretations of British history, which were largely incidental to his argument, he demonstrated a sharply tuned awareness of the lack of foresight present in the exploitation of the Australian landscape and he reiterated his distaste for racism and classism of any kind, warning that racism as an instrument of national policy could rebound with destructive results. His analysis of the flight to the cities in Australia barely requires adjustment in the early twenty first century, when an even greater percentage of the population resides in the capital cities. His considerable and long lasting contribution to the decentralisation of higher education in Australia has been previously discussed. Moyes' vision for politics and citizenship in Australia was that of a Social Gospel nation where greed and self interest were sublimated and channelled into the

\(^{229}\) Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 88.
welfare of all. Only in such an environment did he believe that the Kingdom of God could be built on earth.

2.8. The Church and Nation

The most revealing account of Moyes' vision of the Church and its role in the life of the nation is found in My Confessions. In describing his formative years as curate in London, Moyes wrote of the inspiration given to him by the Christian Socialist Movement and how the experience gained from witnessing the deprivation of his parishioners created in him the desire to work for a more just social order. He recounted that in one fortnight he had visited sixty-five homes, finding more than half of the inhabitants suffering from genuine hunger. The number of unemployed and ill, due to damp and undernourishment, appalled him. The juxtaposition of wealth and poverty in proximity left a lasting impression:

Next to my worst street was Lewisham Park, with stately mansions housing prosperous families, with gardens to which they alone had the keys, and with a total unconsciousness of the misery within a stone's throw of their comfort.

He expressed understanding for how Karl Marx formed his view of religion after living in London, seeing its degradation and deciding that the churches had nothing to offer in the way of ameliorating the causes of such impoverishment, which lay at the core of the social order. Moyes was confident however that the Anglican Church did indeed have something to offer through the Christian Socialist Movement, seeking to demand justice for the underprivileged. He then briefly

230 Moyes and his wife were highly regarded during their two year stay at St Mary's Parish. The 1912 Year Book (February 1913) reported: "We are losing the Rev. J. S. Moyes, who sails for Australia on February 28th. During their sojourn, Mr and Mrs Moyes have endeared themselves to all our hearts. We thank God that they have been with us, and for all the work they have done, and pray for God's blessing on them, on their little ones, and on Miss Butler in their return. Mr Moyes has been chosen Rector of the Parish of Prospect, Adelaide, and will commence work there immediately on his return."

231 Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 15.
traced the history of the movement through the work of Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley and, during his time in London, Henry Scott Holland, Charles Gore, William Woodcock Hough.\textsuperscript{232} his vicar in Lewisham, and others. Moyes credited the Christian Socialist Movement with being one of the influences that made it possible for Lloyd George’s legislation, “which brought down the curses of the comfortable but which saved England from revolution in the dark days that followed the first great world war.”\textsuperscript{233} The theme that constituted such a large part of Moyes’ thinking on social issues for the rest of his life was thus already present on his return to Australia in 1913:

\begin{quote}
I had come back from England with very real convictions about the sheer necessity for the community to look into the setup of our social order and to plan for the security of the ordinary man from unemployment and the dread poverty that follows it. Clearly the time had come for Christians to think of men more than money.\textsuperscript{234}
\end{quote}

The above was exemplified by Moyes’ involvement in the settling of the Port Pirie strike in 1921.\textsuperscript{235} It was clearly a formative event in his life since he recounted the entire episode in his apologia, entitled ‘What I Have Stood For.’ This was an audio tape, made at the request of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, on 6 June 1950, only to be broadcast after Moyes’ death. This was carried out on 12 April 1972.\textsuperscript{236} He also wrote extensively on the subject in \textit{My Confessions}. Within two months of his arrival in Port Pirie in 1919 the Broken Hill carpenters’

\textsuperscript{232} After his term as Vicar of Lewisham, Hough became Archdeacon of Kingston-upon-Thames and then Bishop of Woolwich from 1918-1932.

\textsuperscript{233} Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ pp. 16.

\textsuperscript{234} Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ pp. 19-20.

\textsuperscript{235} Nancy Wood, \textit{People of Port Pirie-Past and Present}, Port Pirie: Port Pirie Branch, National Trust of South Australia, 1988, pp. 232-233. For more on Moyes in Port Pirie, see \textit{Port Pirie Recorder}, 16 August 1921 and 26 August 1921; \textit{Port Pirie Advertiser}, 3 September 1921.

\textsuperscript{236} ‘What I Have Stood For.’ Recording supplied by William Oates, of the University of New England Heritage Centre. (At the time of the recording the Australian Broadcasting Corporation was a Commission, not a Corporation).
strike had shut down the Port Pirie Smelters and "for two years we battled among a people in poverty."237 When Broken Hill strike concluded, the Associated Smelters in Port Pirie announced that the men could return to work but that they would be medically examined. "The men suspected (for the Company would receive reports from the doctor) that any men who showed signs of lead poisoning would soon be dispensed with. They therefore refused to go back."238

Moyes, backed by his assistant, Cornish, and the Methodist Minister, approached the Mayor, Charles Geddes, and asked him what he was doing about it. When Geddes answered that it was not his business Moyes retorted with: "Yes it is. We citizens are the third party in this, crushed between the two opposing groups and you ought to intervene."239 Geddes agreed if Moyes would accompany him. The Union leaders were delighted that Moyes and Geddes had agreed to do something but stated that they could not go back on the present terms. The Company was not keen so Moyes urged Geddes to call a town meeting to urge the citizens to elect Moyes and Geddes to represent them. Five people were chosen, Geddes, Moyes, the Methodist Minister, a doctor, and another.240 Moyes interviewed the editor of the local paper (which was owned by the company) who agreed not to publish any leader articles on the dispute for a fortnight without consulting Moyes. Moyes claimed that he only censored one.241 An agreement was reached after several days of negotiation wherein no man in the employ of the Associated Smelters would be discharged on medical grounds without a pension. The strike was settled on grounds that held for many years. Moyes used this example of successful disinterested third party intervention to vent his frustration with the arbitration system in Australia in his later years.242 He was rebuffed many
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years later by the editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Douglas Pringle, when he suggested that he and Pringle should meet with the President of the Waterside Workers Federation, in an attempt to solve an industrial dispute.\(^{243}\)

Later in his life Moyes argued that during the nineteenth century subjective piety and an individualist conception of salvation had hindered Evangelicals from criticising the evils of an unjust social order and from realising that society could be an ordered way of life for expressing the will of God for humanity. The Tractarians, in his view, had also failed to take society seriously due to their preoccupation with the corporate nature of the Church. Only Frederick Maurice was credited with seeing society as an essential element in the divine purpose for human life. The ‘poor’ had to be raised into ‘men.’ The Church could not continue to treat them as ‘poor.’ This significance of human life as expressed by Maurice was for Moyes the essence of Socialism. In Moyes’ interpretation of the history of Christian Socialism Maurice was thwarted by a combination of forces. These included the individualism of churchmen and industrialists; another form of Socialism, that of Robert Owen, in which property was still the dominant theme, and eventually Marxism.\(^{244}\) What Moyes could have addressed was the inability of the churches, especially his own Anglican Church, to establish any meaningful communication and dialogue with the working class. This was particularly difficult for the Anglican Church, given its status as the Established Church in England and the accompanying perceptions of it as the ‘Tory Party at prayer.’\(^{245}\)

In the earlier mentioned recording, ‘What I Have Stood For,’ Moyes outlined what he considered to be the most important contributions he had made during his career. He expressed

---


great disappointment over the lack of unity within the Christian churches, emphasising that “a divided Church cannot be an efficient helper of a divided world because itself it is missing God’s will and therefore is bereft of His power.”

He argued that his efforts towards social reform and evangelism had made him realise how weak was a divided Christian front when faced with the great contemporary issues. He rejoiced however in the “fellowship of the student movement in the universities” and his work in the World Council of Churches.

John Moyes was never known for his contributions to Christian theology in the systematic sense. He was far more widely recognised for his liberal, Social Gospel interpretation of the Christian message and how it should be implemented. He did however occasionally venture into theological discourse. One of these occasions was a synod charge from 1936. In God or Chaos, Moyes, in similar terms to Rauschenbusch, expounded upon the theme of the Kingdom of God as a social idea in the synoptic gospels before assuming the epithet, eternal life, in the Gospel According to John. These two concepts thus provided Christianity with a theology for this world, and not merely the life to come; eternal life representing the soul, and the Kingdom representing the body. He argued that due to several reasons, such as the awaited but unfulfilled parousia, and the debasement of the terms, Kingdom of God and eternal life through worldly contact with the paganism that the Church had overcome, the concept of eternal life came to signify something in the distant future. This, it was argued, was never the case for the early Christians. “It was a present fact; it was a power, a new quality in life because it was a transforming force in the lives of men.”

Moyes had studied William Temple’s Gifford

---

246 ‘What I Have Stood For.’
247 ‘What I Have Stood For.’ Moyes was heavily involved in the Australian Christian Student Movement throughout his life.
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Lectures in which the issue of eternal life in Christian theology is dealt with in depth. To support his argument, Moyes called upon the Old Testament prophets, as did Rauschenbusch, arguing that the Kingdom of God as a ‘this world’ reality was the ancient Hebrew idea in which they denounced the social selfishness of their time. It was a power for today, not merely a futuristic hope. “It never became an aspect only of human life relating men to an existence beyond time.” For Moyes and many of the social gospellers, eternal life had for too long been preached by the churches as something to be enjoyed at the end of one’s days instead of a present challenge in this life. To receive Christ in such a way was not only the promise of an afterlife, “but of a life here, of the quality that can overcome death, because it can overcome selfishness.” A religion that preoccupied people with themselves was a sham religion for John Moyes. Real religion inspired humanity to express the Kingdom of God.

In laying out his argument for the Church and nation in his final Moorhouse Lecture, Moyes claimed that: “modern man is less open to the preaching of the Gospel than any of his predecessors.” He argued that this was due to five hundred years of humanism aided by a worldly Christianity. This can be questioned on many fronts. One of them being the godless nature of Australia’s formative years, referred to by Moyes himself. It is highly debatable whether the convicts brought to Australia in chains were more receptive to the word of God than the ‘moderns’ referred to by Moyes in 1941. Of greater interest was his assessment that the

250 Moyes wrote, in an article in the Armidale Diocesan News soon after Temple’s death in October 1944, that Temple had sent him his Gifford Lectures. When these were published as: William Temple, Nature, Man and God, London: Macmillan and Co., 1935, the chapter on eternal life occupied pages 452-472. Temple took pains to explicate the difference between the two Koine Greek words in the New Testament that have given rise to so much misunderstanding. That most commonly used was αἰώνιος, meaning the age to come; not its infinity. The less frequently used word, corresponding to the modern English, ‘eternal,’ was αἰών. Temple quite rightly stressed that because of the presence of the two words, it cannot be argued that αἰώνιος was the only choice available. (Nature, Man and God, p. 464).
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churches in Australia had been “spiritually unequal to combat the materialism that has marked our national life.”\textsuperscript{256} The first tragedy that he listed in this regard was Christian disunity in general.\textsuperscript{257} As an example, Moyes cited the one hundred and thirty-two missionary societies at work in China: “a sufficient advertisement to our shame.”\textsuperscript{258} He lamented the fact that diversity had led to division, resulting in breakaway denominations. This provided him with another opportunity to present the Social Gospel view that Christianity was now dominated by individualistic conceptions of its essence. While this was not a hindrance to, and had doubtless inspired many to high religious ideals in their private lives, it had engendered “but little influence on the social order.”\textsuperscript{259}

During the course of his discussion of disunity Moyes gave the Catholic Church a fairer hearing than many non-Catholics of his era but did not offer anything resembling an impartial assessment of the role played by his own church. He omitted the fact that the Anglican Church was at the centre of one of the most cataclysmic divisions of which he spoke and by breaking from the mother church had led the way for a plethora of smaller denominations emanating from the British Isles. The Anglican Church did not escape his judgement, however. He criticised it severely for its inability to reconcile its Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical wings, accusing each side of making exclusive claims to the truth and of worshiping the form in which their truth or worship is expressed, rather than the content. He saw the partisanship of both wings, which he described as “fanatical,”\textsuperscript{260} as potentially breeding an idolatry that would be destructive for all concerned. Moyes trod a via media between the Anglo-Catholics and the Evangelicals.

\textsuperscript{256} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{257} J. S. Moyes, \textit{Can the Church Save the Post War World?}, A Charge delivered to the third session of the Twenty-Fifth Synod of the Diocese of Armidale, 7 May 1946, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{258} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 92.
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\textsuperscript{260} Moyes, \textit{Australia: The Church and the Future}, p. 96.
throughout his career, always attempting to maintain cohesion in his church. In an article from 1930 he explained to the Evangelicals, through his knowledge of ecclesial history, that the importance and observance of the sacraments was not a medieval Catholic invention as was often claimed in some ‘low’ Anglican and Protestant circles:

For we must needs point out that Catholics did not invent the Sacraments or the doctrine of Sacramental Grace...Further, it was no medieval Catholic theologian, but Jesus Christ Himself who made the uncompromising statements:

Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.261

In this regard, he argued for one Anglican theological college in Australia comprising staff from all schools of thought rather than separate colleges of separate schools.262

The second tragedy listed by Moyes was the corrupted understanding of the Body of Christ, in the sense that it should represent the embodiment of Christ as active amongst humanity: “The Church is a means. We tend to consider it an end.”263 For the social gospellers, it was the means by which the Kingdom of God could be built on earth. It was not simply a place in which one could ease one’s conscience and socialise with like-minded people on Sundays. In this context, Moyes urged the churches and, most importantly their lay members, to involve themselves in all aspects of society. He also proposed that all candidates for church ministry should first acquire a broad based university arts degree. Echoing his views on education in general, he argued that the specialist without a broad foundation depth of sympathy was likely to

261 Church Standard, 21 November 1930, p. 6.
263 Moyes, Australia: The Church and the Future, p. 98.
“break his heart” or to become a “fundamentalist seeking some infallibility to give authority to his message.”

Moyes was expansive on the subject of how the churches were perceived by the general public, conceding that antagonism was quite common. He was concerned that the churches were largely seen as being negative in their morality: “as being constantly concerned to make more sins rather than inspire new virtues.” In warning that the world was not something to be conquered by the churches, but a community with which it had something to share, he drew parallels between the twentieth century churches and the Pharisees in the time of Jesus. The churches had to present a more positive message. They must abandon a position of ‘prohibition,’ and in that regard Moyes agreed with Immanuel Kant, that one cannot inculcate reverence for the highest by demonstrating that unhappiness is the result of wrongdoing. In other words; no man can be made unselfish by an appeal to his self interest. He argued that the churches were equally afraid of the world and each other, thus leading to policies of self preservation and prohibitionist preaching. Religion was redemptive for John Moyes, not a “refuge from the mess of life.” If it becomes the above, it is in a state of decay. In terms reminiscent of William Temple, he warned that a church in which the energies of the clergy are employed for keeping a congregation together and securing the finances of the parish has little reason to exist. In his final synod charge, in 1964, Moyes bemoaned the complacency and indifference of his church, asserting that: “the lean, the hungry, the tortured, the hopeless, the rejected, cannot feel at home in the attractive church of today.” By this time, Bishop Moyes was one of the last of the old
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social gospellers from the 1920s and 1930s left standing in Australia. The churches must have seemed to be full of parishioners who would have been equally shocked at hearing Christianity denied as seeing it practised.

In summary; The role of the Church in John Moyes’ vision was to be the means by which the Kingdom of God could be realised on earth. The Kingdom of God, or eternal life, was not a heavenly reward for regularly attending church services during one’s temporal life, but a transformation of society, the fulfilment of which the Church and all of its members, functioning as the Body of Christ, should work towards. For this to be possible, reconciliation within Christianity was necessary in order for the destructive disunity to be healed. Broad and inclusive theological colleges for the clergy were recommended by Moyes as a means to facilitate the above and to reduce the incidences of factionalism. The Church was to be the means, not the end; to become the soul of the community, the driving force behind the social order of the nation, the instrument through which God’s plan for humanity could be achieved.

2.9. Conclusion

John Moyes’ vision for Christian social engagement in Australia was, above all, a holistic vision. He warned against compartmentalisation in all areas of life, making him a prophetic voice in tune with the acceptance of many aspects of Eastern philosophies and religions in the West since his death. It is ironic, however, that although the ‘oneness of everything’ is a concept no longer foreign to the denizens of the Western world and regularly on the lips of the intelligentsia, specialisation, knowledge in isolation and the structuring of educational qualifications in terms of their economic potential - precisely what Moyes had warned against - are probably more prevalent phenomena in the work place than they were in his lifetime.
On the negative side, Moyes' dream of an educational system in which graduates evaluated their future prospects according to their talents and passions rather than their financial prospects has not come to pass. His views on marriage and sex, despite his abhorrence of the treatment of women by men and his compassionate suggestions for the reduction of the divorce rate, have been left behind by a society in which the majority have rejected the right of any individual or institution to tell them who they can love or with whom they can have sex. He condemned an economic order in which some had much and many had little. His experiences in London on the eve of World War I and during the Great Depression in Australia convinced him that Capitalism had to change and adopt a human face. Many of the suggestions made by him in respect of the above have, by various laborious and labyrinthine routes, been introduced into the Western economies. In Australia these have included effective state regulation of the banking system without calling it nationalisation, universal health care, without calling it a national health service, and more realistic welfare and unemployment benefits, without calling it Socialism. Money, however, is still, and perhaps more so than in Moyes' lifetime, the ultimate leveller in Australia; the standard by which a person's success or failure is judged. It is sadly common practice for Australians to relocate to a 'better' suburb in the metropolitan sprawl of Australian cities so that their home can reflect their progress as they climb up the ladder of financial and social status. On the political responsibilities of each citizen he urged that heed be taken of the importance of duties as well as rights in the democratic process. The welfare of all was the goal and in this respect he considered the adversarial nature of Australian politics to have failed in its task.

On the positive side, three aspects of Moyes' vision had become accepted by the broad majority of Australians by the beginning of the twenty first century. He was one of the early
voices to speak on behalf of the Aborigines, but he would doubtless be appalled by the situation that still exists for many of Australia's native people. His repudiation of the White Australia Policy and his advocacy of increased Asian migration were, by the early 1970s, well established and a part of Australian law. Likewise, the environment became one of the most enduring issues on the national agenda and was characterised by a far greater level of awareness concerning the repercussions of all actions taken in respect to the Australian landscape.

His views on the Christian response to violence have not fared as well. His position during the 1930s was that war must be avoided at all costs and that necessary Government spending on housing and education should not be reallocated to defence, even in November 1939, after World War II had begun. However, when confronted by the realities of the war, his position faltered and his compass failed, leaving him unable to wholeheartedly support the nation's call to war on the one hand, and deprecating the cry of the pacifists on the other. The example of non-violence given by Jesus of Nazareth is morally manageable for most while military conflict is taking place in distant theatres of battle, but when the enemy is on one's doorstep or within one's own sanctuary, it rapidly becomes the most challenging moral question of all. Is the survival of the nation more important than the lives of the people who live in it and indeed the lives of one's enemies? The vast majority of Christians and non-Christians all over the world have found the Jesus paradigm impossible to emulate and have chosen the nation when confronted by such an invidious choice. Moyes was clearly troubled by it and during the 1930s warned against the omnipresence of magnified tribalism, or nationalism. When war came he was unable to resolve the ultimate moral dilemma and, like so many others, wandered into a moral and theological no-man's-land.
Chapter 3 presents one of two major examples of how John Moyes sought to implement his Social Gospel vision of Christian social engagement. His contribution to the successful campaign to resist the drive by Robert Menzies’ Government to proscribe the Communist Party in 1950-1951 was part of a major political event in Australia’s history.

A. Introduction

The Communist Party Dissolution Act of 1950, its defeat in the High Court, and the referendum of 1951, engendered one of the most vivid and passionate political struggles in Australian political history. It was intensely contested in the press, which has almost been unanimous in its support of a “Yes” vote in the referendum, that the defeat of the proposed constitutional changes had represented a great triumph for the new leader of the Labor Party, Harold Holt, who had forced the Prime Minister, Robert Menzies, onto the defensive at the beginning of the campaign, a position from which the Government never fully recovered. It was also the opinion of the press, the political commentators and the contemporary historians that a small group of church leaders and academics had influenced the result. John Moyes was one of the most prominent of the church leaders who campaigned against the proposed Bill, the subsequent Act of Parliament and the referendum. It shall be argued here that Moyes brought the ideas of the Social Gospel to bear on the debate, providing for the public the most consistent, non-politically partisan and well-documented Christian opposition, free from the accusation that was introduced into the debate by other church leaders. The Communist Party issue that provides us with an important example of Christian social engagement.

Even though the major events discussed in this chapter have been referred to by many as having been crucial to both Australia’s political and legal history, there has only ever been one detailed and substantial analysis undertaken. This was made by Leicester Welsh in 1954. Welsh’s analysis will be assessed in the following pages.
CHAPTER 3

JOHN MOYES AND THE ATTEMPT TO BAN THE COMMUNIST PARTY

3.1. Introduction

The Communist Party Dissolution Act of 1950, its defeat in the High Court, and the referendum of 1951, engendered one of the most torrid and passionate political struggles in Australian political history. It was broadly conceded in the press, which had almost been unanimous in its support of a ‘Yes’ vote in the referendum, that the defeat of the proposed constitutional changes had represented a great triumph for the new leader of the Labor Party, Herbert Evatt, who had forced the Prime Minister, Robert Menzies, onto the defensive at the beginning of the campaign, a position from which the Government never fully recovered. It was also the opinion of the press, the political combatants and the contemporary historians that a small group of church leaders and academics had influenced the result. John Moyes was one of the most prominent of the church leaders who campaigned against the proposed Bill, the subsequent Act of Parliament and the referendum. It shall be argued here that Moyes brought the ideals of the Social Gospel to bear on the debate, providing for the public the most consistent, non-politically partisan and well formulated Christian opposition, free from the sectarianism that was introduced into the debate by other church leaders. The Communist Party issue thus provides us with an important example of Christian social engagement.

Even though the major events discussed in this chapter have been referred to by many as having been critical to both Australia’s political and legal history, there has only ever been one detailed and substantial analysis undertaken. This was made by Leicester Webb in 1954. Webb’s analysis will be assessed in the following pages.
This chapter is divided into two parts. 1. The Contributions of Bishop Moyes and other Church Leaders, and 2. The Influence of Church Leaders Assessed. Part 1 details and discusses the contributions of Bishop Moyes and other leading clerics, particularly Moyes' comrade in arms on many issues spanning several decades, Ernest Burgmann. One of the points to be stressed here is that Burgmann's contribution to the 'No' case has never been critically assessed in sufficient depth. It will be argued that his controversial ignition of the sectarian issue was largely negative, unnecessary and quite possibly counterproductive. His contribution in this case did not represent one of his finest hours, of which there were many in a highly distinguished episcopal career.1 Part 2 deals with the contributions of Moyes and his colleagues, assessing their influence on the final result of the Communism issue that culminated in the defeat of the referendum. It will be shown that Moyes was not only the first senior cleric in Australia to take issue with the proposed Bill to ban the Communist Party of Australia2 more than a year before

1 For an introduction to Ernest Burgmann's own works, see The Regeneration of Civilisation, Sydney, Robert Dey, 1942; Religion in the Life of the Nation, Morpeth, St John's College Press, 1930; The Modern World's Challenge to Christianity-The Challenge from Communism, Sydney, Colac, 1942; God in Human History, Morpeth, St John's College Press, 1931; The Education of an Australian, Sydney, Angus & Robertson, 1944. For more on Ernest Burgmann, see Peter Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest – A Life of Ernest Burgmann, St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1993. See also: Morpeth Review 1927-1934, Burgmann contributed an article to every issue of this quarterly journal from St John's College of which he was co-editor. Of particular relevance is his article 'The Christian Attitude to Russian Communism,' Morpeth Review, vol. 2, no. 20, June 1932. John Moyes also contributed articles to Morpeth Review after his election to the See of Armidale, in particular, 'Christian Principles and Finance,' Morpeth Review, vol. 2, no. 18, December 1931. Communism was a frequently discussed topic in the Morpeth Review at this time. See also Ian Tregenza, 'The Idealist Tradition in Australian Religious Thought,' Journal of Religious History, vol. 34, No. 3, September 2010, pp. 345-353.

there was any mention of a referendum, but that his Christian, Social Gospel arguments were not compromised by the cant of the age or the prevailing religious and political tribalism.

3.2. The Contributions of Bishop Moyes and other Church Leaders

John Steward Moyes was the first senior clergyman in Australia to publicly challenge the second Menzies Government's proposed law dealing with Communism.3 As the Bishop of Armidale since 1929 he had been, along with Ernest Burgmann, perhaps the most prominent Anglican proponent of the Social Gospel in the nation. Moyes was, at the time, the Chairman of the Social Questions Committee of General Synod, a body that promoted Social Gospel ideals, offering some critical assessments of the compatibility of Capitalism with Christianity.4 By this time he was well known as a spokesman for working people and for freedom of thought, whether it be lockouts in South Australia, coal strikes in Newcastle, or bank foreclosures in New England. He had also been vilified when he supported the Anglican Primate, Archbishop le Fanu, over the case of the censorship of communist literature by the Menzies Government in 1940. At this point, the USSR was not an ally of the USA or Britain, a development that later mollified anti-communist sentiment somewhat. Moyes was quoted as saying that:

"Freedom of speech is the greatest safety valve that a democratic community can have. Such beliefs as Communism are much more dangerous when underground than when their exponents have the opportunity of saying freely what they think, and the rest of the community can respond in like manner. I agree wholeheartedly with Archbishop le Fanu that it is both dangerous and

---

4 See Minute Book, Social Questions Committee of General Synod, held at Anglican General Synod Office, Sydney.
undemocratic to ban Communist literature, or indeed any literature that is
critical of our political or social life.⁵

The above was the subject of heated criticism in his own diocese.⁶

After World War II Moyes had been a leading voice in the establishment of the
Australian Committee for the World Council of Churches (WCC) in 1946. Following the
Amsterdam Conference of the WCC in 1948 the Australian Committee became the Australian
Council of the WCC. At its conference in February 1950 it stated that neither faith in
Communism, Socialism, nor Capitalism was the answer. The pronouncements of the Australian
Council of the WCC were at this time largely in accord with Moyes' own Social Gospel ideals.

In February 1950, with the inspiration of Amsterdam still firing its delegates, it stated that:

The supreme fact is not property, but man, who is a child of God. The only
worthy social order is that which allows full expression to human personality in
freedom and responsibility... We believe that neither Capitalism, Socialism, nor
Communism is sufficient.⁷

The above statement elicited a stern editorial from the *Sydney Morning Herald* titled:

'The Real Enemy of Christianity,' in which it intimated that the Council was naïve and remiss in
not identifying the real enemy of Christianity, which in its opinion was Communism.⁸ Moyes
responded on behalf of the Council with one of his most cogently formulated expositions of
Social Gospelism, which was published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* four days later, on 21
February, 1950. He denied that the Council had equated Capitalism, Socialism and Communism
or that it had contended that Communism was just another economic system. He reiterated that

⁵ *Armidale Express*, 10 May 1940, p. 4.
⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 February 1950, p. 2.
⁸ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 February 1950, p. 2.
the Council had stated that neither Capitalism, Socialism, nor Communism was sufficient for the true expression of human life, adding that he believed it was superficial to speak of the real enemy being plainly identified and unequivocally denounced. To undergird this point, he paraphrased the words of Reinhold Niebuhr, who had played a leading role at Amsterdam: "In such manner we focus attention elsewhere and save ourselves the self-examination needed to find where the enemy is within ourselves." Moyes continued in that vein: "We do not slay the devil by destroying the system in which for the time he appears to be incarnate. Behind any system lies human selfishness capable of making it evil." He stated that the Council had tried to go behind the systems to ascertain what had caused the corruption afflicting contemporary society:

We find it in all three systems, the idea that 'power through property' is the basis of social order, whether the property be held for power by individuals or by the State. We held that a true democracy recognising men as greater in value than goods, seeing they are God's children, would want to go beyond this basis, and we urged that Australians should see each other in relation to God so that a responsible society might be evolved... The Christian faith doesn't need us to defend it, but to live it, and that is a far more difficult task than to denounce (possibly quite correctly) evil in other people.

In this statement Moyes was echoing what he had argued in the Moorhouse Lectures nine years earlier. In his view neither Capitalism nor any of the totalitarian models of government treated

9 Sydney Morning Herald, 21 February 1950, p. 2.
11 Sydney Morning Herald, 21 February 1950, p. 2. Moyes' reply to the Sydney Morning Herald editorial was also printed in full alongside the original press release of the Australian Council of the WCC, titled 'Message to the Churches and People of Australia,' in Southern Churchman (March 1950, p. 7) the newsletter of Bishop Burgmann's diocese of Canberra and Goulburn.
human beings as the supreme value, and they all rested their authority on the basis of ‘property power.’ In unrestricted and unregulated Capitalism the power resided with the property owning individuals whereas, in this case, Communism, the power of control was simply transferred to the State. For Moyes, good government was not a case of determining in what way each individual could be of greatest use to the State, but to nurture and value the uniqueness of every human being. The final sentence was also highly characteristic. He used the same argument, as shall be discussed in chapter 4, in his protest at Australia’s military involvement in Vietnam. Identifying one’s one motives and conduct was more important than pointing out the faults of others. Only then could Christians demonstrate the true nature of their faith and lead by example. This has always been a complex theological issue for Christianity since any faith, philosophy or system claiming to be the repository of truth, as opposed to one repository of truth, is compelled to pass judgement on others. Many Christian churches do their utmost to avoid the issue in the present era but in 1950 the hardline position was common, as it was with communists. Neither John Moyes nor anyone else has ever solved this problem but his vision for Christianity was more inclusive and compassionate than most of his contemporaries.

During the autumn of 1950, the Federal Government prepared to honour its pledge from the 1949 election campaign to introduce legislation proscribing the Communist Party of Australia (CPA). Early attention to the Bill can be found in the *Church Standard*. In its editorial of April 28 1950, it was cautiously sceptical when discussing the forthcoming CPA legislation. It expressed concern over whether the glamour of illegality might actually increase the membership of the CPA as was claimed to have been the case when the party was banned some years previously. Concerning whether Communism would thrive if it were made illegal, Menzies conceded in Parliament that the CPA’s membership had risen during its period of proscription

12 *Church Standard*, 28 April 1950, p. 3.
from 7,200 in May 1942 to 16,000 in December 1942. The CPA had been banned while Menzies was Prime Minister, on 17 June 1940. The ban was then lifted by Prime Minister John Curtin on 18 December 1942, after the Soviet Union had become allied with Britain and the USA. There is nothing to suggest that the publication of the CPA newspaper, Tribune, ceased during its period of illegality, between June 1940 and December 1942, to which the extant archival copies attest. The Sydney Morning Herald listed Communists standing as candidates at the federal elections in September 1940 under the banner of ‘Independent’ and ‘Socialist.’

The CPA was, as expected, already mounting a spirited campaign against the legislation at this time. The Tribune, headlined its 29 April 1950 issue with: “Smash This Rotten Bill – Gross Abuse of Human Rights – Don’t Let Menzies Become Dictator.” It continued the next week with: “Communist Party Will Fight For Legal Rights – Unity Can Beat Fascist Bill.” The press organ of the CPA in Victoria, Guardian, was even less inhibited in its charges. It adorned its front page with a large cartoon of Robert Menzies with Hitler moustache, giving the Nazi salute. The accompanying headline read: “Menzies’ Fascist Bill Aroused Nation.”

Sir Robert Madgwick, former Chancellor of the University of New England, an institution whose establishment was due in no small measure to the initiative taken by Moyes as Bishop of Armidale, recalled in 1975 his conversations with Moyes at the time of the attempt to ban the CPA. According to Madgwick, Moyes’ opinion was simply that: “The proposal is

---

13 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, vol. 214, p. 121. Menzies had presumably sourced his figures from the communist publication, Forward, which listed the same numbers.
15 Copies of the Tribune from the period of illegality are not rare. Those studied by the author are held at the State Library, NSW.
16 Sydney Morning Herald, 7 September 1940, p. 15, and 9 September 1940, p. 9.
18 Guardian (Melbourne), 5 May 1950, p. 1.
wicked and as a bishop I have a duty to oppose what is wicked.\textsuperscript{19} In opening the clerical opposition to the Act on 12 May, Moyes made his case to the \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} with the following:

Sir – It is obvious that Communists are doing what they can do to disrupt Australian industry and they cannot be allowed to do this as a first step to further disruption. But it is essential that in seeking to defeat them we should not deny the principles of our way of life and thus give them a victory. For the Australian Government to develop an order that has even faint resemblance to the Police State of totalitarian countries, with its hunting for victims, is to give Communism its first victory. For we shall be adopting its methods and using Satan to cast out Satan. That could only mean that Communism had debauched our way of life.

It may be replied that in order to break up this subversive group it is expedient to make people accused of being Communist prove their innocence. Expediency is a treacherous guide. It may bring short-term success, it always brings long-term disaster: and the violation of an accepted axiom of British law, that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty, for the sake of the immediate safe-guarding of our security, may lead to untold trouble, in the future. The history of Europe in the last twenty years is sufficient evidence of the danger of expediency as a guide; the story of Caiaphas in the New Testament is more than sufficient.\textsuperscript{20}

Doris LeRoy, in her treatment of this issue, did not note that Moyes opened the clerical opposition to the Bill in an unequivocal manner. She also argued that his position was

\textsuperscript{19} Sir Robert Madgwick, \textit{John Stoward Moyes: an Appreciation}, p. 124
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 12 May 1950, p. 2.
“unexpected” and that he and Stuart Babbage “crossed denominational and state lines” in publishing a statement in the *Sydney Morning Herald*.\(^1\) Moyes’ statement was not issued on behalf of a group, and neither was it issued together with that of Babbage. There is nothing in Moyes’ career until this point that in any way suggests that his intervention was unexpected. The opposite is in fact the case.

It is possible that Australians possessed a higher level of biblical literacy in 1950 than at the beginning of the third millennium but whatever the case may be in that regard, by citing Caiaphas, Moyes was alluding to the misguided policy, in his view, of eliminating a minority without sufficient evidence in an attempt to save the nation. In the case of Caiaphas the minority was one man, Jesus of Nazareth. Moyes’ point was that Jewish insistence for the execution of Jesus did not eliminate emerging Christianity. On the contrary, the policy of Caiaphas resulted in a failure, from the Jewish point of view, which was beyond all imagination.\(^2\) According to Moyes’ archdeacon at the time, C.R. Rothero, the Diocesan Council in Armidale attempted to criticise Moyes’ very public contribution to the debate on Communism. Moyes threatened to resign and walked out of the meeting. Only after the withdrawal by the Council did he agree to return.\(^3\)

Objections to the Bill focused primarily on the proposed right of the Government to ‘declare’ individuals as Communists. In this it was accused of inverting the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. Many opponents argued that although the Bill allowed for declared persons to appeal decisions in the High Court, inestimable damage would already have been done to their lives and careers even if the Court found in their favour. In short, the

---
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Government was accused by opponents of the Bill of infringing the democratic rights of the public by employing Communist methods to eliminate a perceived Communist threat. The Bill was attacked in Parliament by the Leader of the Labor Party and former Prime Minister, Ben Chifley, on 9 May 1950. On 12 May, John Moyes launched his campaign in the *Sydney Morning Herald* against the legislation. He was followed on 19 May in the same newspaper by ten professors and twenty three readers and lecturers from the University of Sydney, including the Challis Professor of Jurisprudence and International Law, Julius Stone. On 22 May, the *Sydney Morning Herald* published two more letters concerning the same issue. One was from another twenty-six academics from the University of Sydney that included philosopher John L. Mackie. The second was a seriatim rebuttal of the letter of 19 May from King’s Counsel, Richard Windeyer. The 19 May letter, in which the signatories underlined their abhorrence of Communism and that none in their ranks had any connection with the CPA, expressed concern over the legal weaknesses and dangers inherent in the Bill. The argument presented on 22 May went further, constituting a wholesale rejection of the proposed legislation. At this stage, in May 1950, one who was to become a leading figure in the debate, the Anglican Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn, Ernest Burgmann,25 was not prepared to go further than to say that the proposed legislation may be necessary but that it “needed more scrutiny.”26

For the remainder of 1950 the Communism debate continued to be fought out in the Parliament until it was challenged in the High Court on the day it became law on 19 October, 1950. In a case in which the future Labor Party leader, Herbert Evatt, represented the Waterside Workers’ Federation the Act was declared unconstitutional by the High Court on 9 March 1951.

---

25 Burgmann was elected Bishop of Goulburn in 1934. In 1950 the name of the diocese was changed to ‘Canberra and Goulburn.’ From 1950 he was thus the Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn.
26 *Church Standard*, 26 May 1950, p. 2.
Following the decision Robert Menzies successfully petitioned the Governor-General for a
double dissolution of Parliament. The Government prevailed at the ensuing election, ending
Labor’s Senate majority in the process. A referendum was announced for 22 September and the
debate entered its most intense and decisive stage.

Burgmann joined the debate again in October 1950. It was here that the controversial
nature of his views concerning the Catholic Church began to emerge. In this, his monthly epistle
to his diocese, he attempted to awaken Anglicans to the possibility of the Anglican vote
becoming marginalized in Australian politics. He was very forthright in his assessment of alleged
Catholic ambitions:

The Roman Catholics make no secret of the fact that they are out to make
Australia a Roman Catholic country. That aim is in accordance with their
beliefs, and they are perfectly justified, from their point of view, in
pursuing it. 27

Burgmann’s views on the alleged influence of Catholics in Australian politics caused
considerable unrest when he became more provocative upon entering the referendum debate in
September 1951. Controversy erupted when a summary of his diocesan letter of September 1951
was published in the Sydney Morning Herald on 1 September. In his denunciation of the
referendum proposal Burgmann stated clearly that he intended to vote ‘No’. He did not, as was
claimed by some, advise Anglicans to do the same, only expressing his belief that they would
“vote as they think best.” 28 He made a useful suggestion concerning the idea of a Constitution
Convention to deal with the issue of constitutional amendments. However, it was the
considerable amount of space devoted to divisive and negative assessments of the alleged aims

27 Southern Churchman, 1 October 1950, p. 3.
28 Southern Churchman, 1 September 1951, p. 3.
of the Catholic Church that sparked controversy. This was not surprising given that Burgmann asserted that:

The Roman Catholics are behind the present Government in this proposed legislation...the Labor Party also has an unduly large number of Roman Catholic members in the Federal Parliament.....Rome has got both political parties on the spot, and unless the Anglicans and others awake in time and come to the rescue of our traditional British freedoms, Rome is likely to win a victory in this referendum that she will know how to use in the future.29

The use of the word, unduly, in connection with the number of Catholics in the Labor Party could only be described as regrettable. The bishop then contended that it was not difficult to imagine a Federal Government dominated by Catholics “accepting guidance from their Church. That Church is authoritarian in principle and by conviction, and tireless in pursuit of its aims.”30

His remarks on the Catholic Church concluded with perhaps the most unfortunate claim of all, that: “In seeking to escape one totalitarianism we shall find ourselves in the grip of another.”31

Despite such reckless allegations, it would be unjust to label Burgmann as an inveterate anti-Catholic. Views such as those expressed by Burgmann were widely held in some quarters at the time. Moyes had been accused of anti-Catholic prejudice by the Catholic media seven years previously.32 In 1956 Burgmann attracted criticism from many of his colleagues when he joined the Catholic archbishop, Eris O’Brien, in accepting Commonwealth funding for church schools in Canberra. The CPA debate was however not his most constructive contribution to public life in Australia and he exaggerated or perhaps completely misunderstood the developments taking

29 Southern Churchman, 1 September 1951 (my own italics) p. 3.
30 Southern Churchman, 1 September 1951, p. 3.
31 Southern Churchman, 1 September 1951, p. 3.
32 Series of articles by Rev. Dr Rumble, ‘The Catholic Church and Bishop Moyes,’ in Catholic Weekly, 8, 15, 22, and 29 June 1944, p. 10 of each issue.
place in the Catholic Church. The Catholic anti-Communist crusade was characterised by a profound level of religious, as well as, political fervour, but Burgmann appeared to read it as being purely political, monolithic and operating in strict obedience to an unbending authoritarian hierarchy.33 His biographer, Peter Hempenstall, has discussed the issue in considerable depth, arguing that “if Burgmann had looked more closely he would have noticed that there was no simple Catholic line on the referendum.”34 The Anglican bishop and historian, Tom Frame, has assessed Burgmann as having at times spoken “politically more than theologically” in his writings on the social order.35 This would indeed appear to be the case on this occasion. It was not good enough for a senior figure in the Anglican Church to deflect attention from the issue by inflaming the sectarian divide. The vital element that was missing was a forthright and lucid statement of the Christian position, something for which he, as an Anglican bishop, was eminently qualified to make.

Angry responses to Burgmann’s diocesan letter began in the Sydney Morning Herald on 3 September. Catholic readers complained of Burgmann inflaming sectarianism and making unfounded accusations against the Catholic Church. Several Liberal politicians pointed accusing fingers at Burgmann for stirring up sectarianism and pursuing a soft line on Communism. W.C. (Billy) Wentworth, M.P., informed the public that Burgmann and Canon E. J. Davidson, of St James’ Church, Sydney, had previously been President and Chairman, respectively, of the

---

33 The lines concerning to what extent B. A. Santamaria’s anti-Communist ‘Movement,’ which was largely unknown to the general public at the time, operated as a lay organization, independent of the Catholic episcopal bench, were heavily blurred from its inception. Investigation of the level of cooperation and intertwining of the Labor Party Industrial Groups and the Movement is also a labyrinthine pursuit. On top of this, disagreement and rivalry within the Movement between Sydney and Melbourne created an even greater obstacle to unity amongst Catholics. For the most detailed treatment of the above, see Bruce Duncan, Crusade or Conspiracy? Catholics and the Anti-Communist Struggle in Australia, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2001. Also, Michael Hogan, The Sectarian Strand, Penguin Books, 1987; Paul Ormonde, The Movement, Melbourne: Thomas Nelson, 1972; Gerard Henderson, Mr Santamaria and the Bishops, Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1983.
35 Tom Frame, A Church for a Nation, Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 2000, p. 204.
Australian-Russian Society, an organization of which their patronage had been shared by the ‘Red’ Dean of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson. 36 The Sydney Morning Herald editorial of 7 September, while appealing for an end to partisan politics on what it regarded as such an important issue, dismissed Burgmann’s views concerning the Catholic Church as “irrelevant” and “fantasies.” On the same day the Anglican newspaper, Church Standard, noted Burgmann’s intention to vote ‘No’ and claimed that although he did not state as such, he indicated “his conviction that all good Anglicans should do likewise.”37

The above mentioned Canon Davidson had joined the debate in the Sydney Morning Herald on the previous day with a declaration of support for Burgmann. Davidson maintained the anti-Catholic nature of the argument, implying that the Catholic Church was also driving the so-called witch hunts in the USA. 38 John A. McCallum, M. P., accused Davidson of sliding into a “world of phantasy” when arguing that Rome was behind a conspiracy of “ever active enemies constantly seeking to destroy our liberties.” 39 The Australian Church Record, an Anglican publication representing a more Protestant and Evangelical brand of Anglicanism than the Church Standard, attacked Burgmann’s diocesan letter, linking the bishop with two societies suspected of being ‘front’ organisations for Communists and arguing that the bishop’s concern with the Catholic Church is: “...but a red, and very red, herring, to divert our attention from the main and important issues.” 40 Davidson exacerbated matters when he replied to criticism with an even more pronounced attack on the Catholic Church, stating that: “…this pressure group

36 Sydney Morning Herald, 7 September 1951, p. 2. Hewlett Johnson visited Australia in 1950 on the invitation of the Australian Peace Council for the Australian Peace Conference of that year. The conference was also attended by the American Episcopalian social activist, Joseph T. Fletcher. There appears to be little doubt that this conference was actively supported by the CPA. For a detailed discussion of this event and its principal characters, see LeRoy, Anglicanism, Anti-communism and Cold War Australia, pp. 32-72.
37 Church Standard, 7 September 1951, p. 3.
38 Sydney Morning Herald, 6 September 1951, p. 2.
39 Sydney Morning Herald, 7 September 1951, p. 2.
40 Australian Church Record, 6 September 1951, pp. 4-5.
exhibits all the marks of its totalitarian counterpart and could easily use the proposed alterations to the Constitution for its own ends." 41 A more measured clerical intervention was made by the Anglican Dean of Sydney, Stuart Babbage. He avoided sectarianism entirely and cautiously stated that while he agreed with some of the views expressed by Burgmann and Davidson, he felt that the Church should not say that: "...a certain line is the necessary action or Christian action." 42 Babbage may have been intending to 'cool' the debate and his case, which tended towards the 'No' side was argued with considerably less passion that those of Burgmann and Davidson. The Catholic Archbishop of Melbourne, Daniel Mannix, who remained on the sidelines for much of the referendum debate, made a statement to the press warning against sectarianism and stating that he had given no instructions whatsoever to Catholics on how they should vote. 43 At no point did Mannix reveal to which side his support would fall. 44 In fact, the only senior Catholic clergyman to commit one way or the other was Archbishop Duhig, of Brisbane, who made a statement very late in the referendum campaign to the effect that he would vote 'Yes,' 45 asserting that it was a choice between "Stalin and Christ." 46 Duhig’s biographer, T. P. Boland, suggested that Burgmann’s anti-Catholic approach contributed to Duhig’s late decision to publicly declare his hand. 47 In a letter to Mannix on 1 November 1951, Duhig claimed to have influenced the referendum result in Queensland. 48

By the last week of the campaign the newspapers were overflowing with comment and criticism from all sides. In NSW the entry of former Premier, Jack Lang, who on 16 September

41 Sydney Morning Herald, 8 September 1951, p. 2.
42 Sydney Morning Herald, 10 September 1951, p. 4.
43 Sydney Morning Herald, 11 September 1951, p. 5.
44 Mannix is dealt with extensively in the following; Duncan, Crusade or Conspiracy; Michael Gilchrist, Daniel Mannix: Priest & Patriot, Blackburn: Dove Communications, 1982; B. A. Santamaria, Against the Tide, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1981.
45 Age, 19 September 1951, p. 4.
46 Courier-Mail, 21 September 1951, p. 2.
48 Boland, James Duhig, p. 351.
was given headline coverage for his support of the ‘No’ case, should not be underestimated.

Although Lang had suffered the indignity of being dismissed by Governor Game in 1932, he was still a revered figure by many in his home state.49 The Minister for External Affairs, and later Governor-General of Australia, Richard Casey, bluntly stated that he “regretted the introduction of religious leaders into the referendum discussions.”50 He was also quoted as having regretted Burgmann’s use of sectarianism.51 Another future Governor-General, Zelman Cowen, Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Melbourne, also warned against a ‘Yes’ vote during the latter stages of the campaign.52 In a letter to the Advertiser, the future Premier of South Australia, Don Dunstan, then a young Adelaide lawyer, examined the definition of a Communist under the Communist Party Dissolution Act. He quoted the Act, in reply to the letter of A. J. Hannan, that someone who “supports and advocates the objectives, policies, teachings, principles or practices of Communism” could be ‘declared’ under the Act. This would mean that someone who had supported Objective 16 in the Communist Party Manifesto, which advocated free public education and the abolition of child labour in factories, could be ‘declared’ a Communist.

Dunstan concluded with: “I deplore the actions of the communists but I see no virtue in adding to the imminent danger of a dictatorship of the Right in order to avoid the much more remote possibility of a dictatorship of the Left.”53 The onus of proof was interpreted differently by the Deputy Prime Minister, Arthur Fadden, who left no-one in doubt as to where he considered it to be residing. Fadden stated clearly that if a person was ‘declared’ a Communist he could take his

49 Sunday Herald, (Sydney) 16 September 1951, p. 1.
50 Advertiser, 14 September 1951, p. 3.
51 Advertiser, 14 September 1951, p. 3.
52 Argus, 14 September 1951, p. 2.
53 Advertiser, 6 September 1951, p. 4.
appeal to the High Court where he "must state a case in support of his contention that he was not a Communist." 54

Moyes' diocesan letter of September 1951 was, like Burgmann's, made public in the press. 55 The *Church Standard* made it the front page article on 14 September 1951 with the heading: "An Effective Answer to Subversive Workings." The phrase that caught the eye of the *Sydney Morning Herald* and *Age* editors was Moyes' contention that Australia had "all the means we need at our disposal in the Commonwealth Crimes Act." 56 Moyes wrote that he doubted the wisdom of the nation's leaders who believed that they could eliminate the dangers of Communism, which he referred to as a faith, by force:

Our leaders are getting rid of the disease or trying so to do, but not clearing away the conditions that allow the disease to flourish...Moreover, the use of force against a faith has never succeeded in history, except for a time. The faith has won in the end. And because I dread Communism as a faith that is an enemy to personality and to nationhood, I dread the methods that will give it greater life and mightier power as the years go by. 57

The first sentence in the above was a direct link with the most fundamental tenet of the Social Gospel position. Palliative measures, such as those implemented by the charitable wings of the churches on a daily basis, while necessary and admirable, would never be sufficient to build God's Kingdom on earth. The churches must attack the root causes of all that precluded the realisation of the Kingdom. Employment of Communist methods to extirpate Communism was thus a suicidal course upon which the churches should never embark.

54 *Adviser*, 11 September 1951, p. 3.
56 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 September 1951, p. 5.
Unlike some of his clerical colleagues, Moyes attempted to provide positive suggestions for a way out of the “time of urgency.” In conceding that many would find his ideas “unpractical,” he nevertheless argued the Social Gospel view that human selfishness was at the root of the problem:

I am sure Australia’s deepest problem lies in that majority who selfishly are withholding their best service and taking all they can get. Even if we exiled all the Communists this major problem would still be with us.

Moyes made three suggestions. He urged:

1. Let each one of us give our best in every day’s work, giving more than we take out......2. Let each one of us consider every question, concerning work, money, taxation, from the point of view of others as well as ourselves......3. Let each of us look to see how real is his own Christian faith, and impress on ourselves and on others what is certainly true, that only in Christianity can we have peace and happiness in God’s World.

Asking rhetorically how Communist subversives could be dealt with in answer to the charge of being unpractical, he stated his belief that Australia had all the means it needed in the Commonwealth Crimes Act. He went on to suggest that the trade unions be challenged to cleanse their own ranks and if they refused to accept that responsibility all the power of the nation should be harnessed to get the work done despite them. He also warned the unions quite perceptively that they risked losing all of the gains that they had made in the previous fifty years. Moyes

concluded by stating his belief that securing cooperation from the unions was possible.  

He had defended the rights of trade unions many times throughout his career. In 1949 he argued their case in a synod charge in which he eloquently urged reflection and the avoidance of condemnation:

> It is easy to denounce such action, so easy that the rest of us may miss seeing our own faults and the past sins which created this attitude to life. We should remember that the working class in Australia, who today are in the saddle, and riding the rest of us with spurs, in the end of last century passed through decades of intolerable treatment. They remember this and the unemployment and depression that happened not so long ago. Their behaviour today is often foolish and selfish, but the rest of us have no right to cast stones until we count them as important as ourselves and seek for them the security and the level of life to which we have been accustomed. Then with real justice we can ask them to think of the community as much as they do of their own interests. Our first community act is one of common penitence, for none of us can rise above the selfishness that marks our daily story till our motives are not inspired by material interests but by a common loyalty to God.  

Once more, it was Christianity by example, not a negative and arrogant assessment of the shortcomings of others, that would lead to a more equitable and harmonious community.

It was not long before Moyes was under attack in the press, both from the general public and officialdom. The Minister for Supply, Howard Beale, accused Moyes and Babbage of being
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62 Something approaching this aspiration was not achieved in Australia until the 1980s under the Government led by a former President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, R. J. L. Hawke.

63 J. S. Moyes, *Revival or Revolution*, a Charge delivered to the second session of the Twenty-Sixth Synod of the Diocese of Armidale, 2 May 1949, no pagination, but found on eighth page.
"utterly wrong," and Burgmann of advocating a ‘No’ vote simply because Catholics were supporting the ‘Yes’ case.\textsuperscript{64} Moyes wrote in his unpublished memoirs that:

I, with Bishop Burgmann and others, ruthlessly fought the Government and urged a ‘no’ vote. We were quite certain that if the Government gained the right and sought to compel the Unions to cast out all Communists, the Unions would close in on their members and protect them... The fight was a bitter one and in my diocese there was a surge of feeling against me.\textsuperscript{65}

It was as a response to the challenge from parishioners to spell out his way of dealing with Communists that he delivered the three lectures that later were published in 1952 as The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer. The book was re-issued in 1965. In this book Moyes expounded his views on Communism \textit{vis-à-vis} Christianity. “It is not enough to think of Communism as a disturbing bogey and leave it so. We must understand it, and appreciate what in it is true if we are to overcome what in it is false.”\textsuperscript{66} In his exposition of Communism as a system of earthly salvation for modern man, Moyes reiterated his observations concerning the imperfections of humanity:

For we’ve left out the human element, man himself, with his selfishness, pride and lust for power. Our world is a world in rebellion, not only at the level of conscious human purposes, but at a deep unconscious level involving all nature and even the economic processes which affect man’s life. It is impossible to

\textsuperscript{64} Sun, 14 September 1951, p. 7. \textit{Newcastle Morning Herald}, 14 September 1951, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{65} J. S. Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 153.
\textsuperscript{66} Moyes, \textit{The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer}, p. 1.
give any realist account of history if one refuses to acknowledge the fact of
sin.67

After accusing Communism of a Manichean world view in which it saw itself as the Kingdom of
Light and that all others were living in varying shades of darkness, he asserted that: “The most
significant line to be drawn in life is not between ourselves and those who disagree with us, but
rather right down through our own souls.”68 Christianity did not escape Moyes’ scrutiny
however, and its chequered history of persecuting its opponents was examined, including the
behaviour of the Christian Churches in wartime at the middle of the twentieth century:

Even men of integrity defended night bombing which meant the death of
women and children, and the atom bomb upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki –
because, as was believed, such action would end the war quickly and save more
lives than they destroyed.69

He was guilty of attributing Christian moral aspirations to many more Christians than actually
practised them and of attributing the shortcomings of Communism to all Communists, for
example:

Communism knows no such teaching as we have in the stories of the lost sheep
or the prodigal son. What we know of the history of Soviet trials reveals that the
opponent becomes an ‘outcast’, ‘reactionary’, ‘war monger’ – and is liquidated.
There is no salvation nor reclamation for him. He is a lost soul outside
redemption.70

69 Moyes, The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer, p. 15.
70 Moyes, The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer, p. 17.
Moyes’ expansive and universal morality was, however, impressive. When most arms of the mainstream Australian media were presenting a highly partisan view, as can be seen from the colourful headlines and quoted examples from the press, Moyes deprecated completely the prevailing tribalism and was a confrontingly logical influence:

It was as an individual person, not as a nation, nor group, nor class in whom God became man. In the light of this, it is natural that Christians believe strongly that any doctrine of the State or any way of organizing Society in which a person becomes a mere creature of the State or the group, is wrong.  

Years later Moyes interestingly contended that Menzies was relieved when the ‘No’ vote was successful: “The referendum was defeated – personally I am sure the Prime Minister was glad.” This view was certainly not contradicted by the actions of the Government immediately after the referendum’s defeat. Despite predictions that attempts would be made to declare the CPA an unlawful organisation under the Crimes Act and that suspected Communists would be expelled from the public service, no Government action was taken. Harold Holt, the Minister for Labour and National Service, had warned his colleagues in his Cabinet Submission in March 1950 of the more extreme measures being sought and perhaps felt vindicated when he stated that the struggle against Communism would now be fought in the trade unions. This had been the policy of the Labor Party during the entire campaign. Two leading Communists had in fact been jailed under the existing Crimes Act during the final year of the Chifley Government. Lawrence ‘Lance’ Sharkey, Chairman of the CPA from 1930-1948 and Secretary General from
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1948-1965, and Gilbert Burns, a member of the state committee of the CPA in Queensland, were found guilty in 1949 of sedition under the existing Crimes Act and sentenced to prison terms. On appeal the High Court found in favour of the Crown in both cases. Burns had stated that in a war between the Soviet Union and British and American imperialism, Communists would fight alongside Soviet Russia. Sharkey’s statement was similar: “If Soviet forces in pursuit of aggressors entered Australia, Australian workers would welcome them.”

On 13 September, Burgmann re-entered the referendum debate, attempting to explain himself and to answer the criticism of his diocesan letter. It was another unhelpful contribution, asserting that Rome, with its highly centralised, infallible authority of the Pope, was being permitted to pursue universal dominion while Anglicans were accused of sectarianism as soon as they raised their voices. Burgmann ignored the simple fact that neither Mannix nor Sydney’s Catholic archbishop, Cardinal Gilroy, had offered any voting advice to Catholics, and Duhig, the only senior Catholic to declare his intentions either way, had not made his statement at the time of Burgmann’s letter. Mannix’s non-committal position has already been noted. Gilroy stated five days after Burgmann’s letter that although Communism had to be dealt with, “citizens should vote in the referendum according to their consciences...it was not within his province to tell people how to vote.” There may have been some in Australia who, not understanding the ex cathedra decree, were convinced that an ‘infallible’ instruction had been issued by the Pope advising Australian Catholics to vote ‘Yes’ in the referendum, but conspiracy theories were not

75 Webb, Communism and Democracy in Australia, p. 21.
76 Sydney Morning Herald, 13 September 1951, p. 2.
77 Sydney Morning Herald, 18 September 1951, p. 2.
supported by the actions of the two most senior Catholics in the nation since Mannix and Gilroy had demonstrably not heeded such putative advice.78

On 15 September, ten clergymen, from all parts of Australia, Anglicans and Protestants, including Methodist minister, Alan Walker, who was to become a leading spokesperson on social justice issues for the ensuing four decades, issued a carefully measured statement warning of the dangers to individual liberty if the referendum was carried. “We believe that even the admitted threat of the Communist Party to our country’s security and order will not justify such a departure from the ancient practice of constitutional democracy.”79 On the same day, the Anglican Coadjutor Bishop of Sydney, C.V. Pilcher, informed the Sydney Morning Herald that due to the very public support for the ‘No’ case of several high ranking Anglican clerics, many people were wondering whether the Anglican Church had advised its members to vote ‘No.’ He assured his readers that no such advice had been issued and that he would be voting ‘Yes.’80

Despite the unanimous nationwide press support for the ‘Yes’ case,81 with the exception of the Argus (Melbourne),82 and the Newcastle Morning Herald,83 the Australian electorate rejected the referendum proposals both by the required number of states and in the nationwide
popular vote. Three states, NSW, Victoria and South Australia voted ‘No’ and the ‘Yes’ case was defeated by 52,082 out of 4,687,936 formal votes cast. The margin of victory in the popular vote was 50.5 percent to 49.5 percent.

3.3. The Influence of Church Leaders Assessed

The general consensus in the press at the time was that church and academic leaders had played a role in the defeat of the referendum. To cite but a few examples: The Courier-Mail sought to explain why the ‘Yes’ case, which had appeared to be a ‘walkover’ at the beginning of the campaign, had ended in failure. Apart from Evatt’s astute and ‘cunning’ campaign, it listed the involvement of some Protestant clergy as “a most potent factor in perplexing many electors who had had implicit faith in Menzies.” It also lauded Archbishop Duhig, whom it contended must have “swung many Labour (sic) supporters to ‘Yes’.” The Sydney Morning Herald attributed some of the success of the ‘No’ campaign to the involvement of “a number of Anglican and Non-Conformist church leaders.” Evatt, the principal figure and leader of the ‘No’ case, also acknowledged his gratitude to the important assistance provided by church leaders and academics.

It is noteworthy that in surveys of voting intentions taken by Australian Public Opinion Polls prior to the 1946, 1949 and 1951 federal elections and the 1951 referendum, the only major church to record a substantial change between the three federal elections and the referendum was

84 Leicester Webb, in his *Communism and Democracy in Australia*, listed the Argus as the only major metropolitan or provincial newspaper to oppose the ‘Yes’ case. This was not so. The Newcastle Morning Herald supported the ‘No’ campaign on 21 September 1951, with what was arguably the most well balanced editorial from any newspaper in the nation.
85 Webb, *Communism and Democracy in Australia*, p. 145.
88 Sydney Morning Herald, 24 September 1951, p. 2.
89 Courier-Mail, 24 September 1951, p. 1.
the Catholic Church. At the 1951 election the predicted Catholic vote was 68 percent for the Labor Party. This was hardly a substantial change from the predicted voting intentions of Catholics at the 1946 and 1949 elections, which were 72 percent and 73 percent respectively. The poll taken one week in advance of the referendum revealed that the predicted Catholic vote was 46 percent ‘Yes’ and 46 percent ‘No’ with the remainder undecided. This poll was taken well after Burgmann ignited the sectarian issue on September 1. The same poll predicted that members of all other major churches intended to vote ‘Yes’ by substantial margins and that atheists would vote ‘No’ by 71 percent to 24 percent. The predicted ‘Yes’ vote for the other major churches at the referendum was very similar to their predicted non-Labor vote at the 1946, 1949 and 1951 federal elections.

Contrary to the general perception that Burgmann’s widely reported entry into the debate may have been influential for the ‘No’ case, it would appear that until the last week of the campaign the Catholic vote had been affected in the opposite direction. Although it could not seriously be asserted that Burgmann’s statements alone could have reduced the Catholic vote from 68 percent to 46 percent for the Labor Party’s position, it is even more unrealistic to suggest that the bishop’s warnings concerning the dangers of Catholic ambitions would have won many Catholic votes for the ‘No’ case. As noted above, statistics pertaining to Anglicans collected at the same time as those concerning Catholics revealed that predicted Anglican support for the ‘No’ case was similar to its predicted percentage of support for the Labor Party at the 1951 federal election. Given that the poll predicting that Anglicans would vote according to
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their usual allegiances was taken after Burgmann’s statements had caused so much interest in the press, it is therefore by no means certain that Burgmann’s contribution was a positive factor in the ‘No’ campaign at all, as argued by the *Sydney Morning Herald*.95 On the other hand, Alan Reid, writing in the *Sun* (Sydney) on 21 September 1951, noted that religious leaders had involved themselves in the campaign to a greater extent than had been witnessed for many years and that the religious aspects of the debate could have been crucial in Victoria. In terms of the Catholic vote in Victoria, Reid may well have been correct given the influence of the Movement and the decision of the Victorian Executive of the Labor Party to support the ‘Yes’ case.96 The decision by Mannix and Gilroy to avoid any partisan statements can possibly be viewed in light of their desire to avoid inflaming the potentially damaging rifts appearing amongst Catholics vis-à-vis the Labor Party, especially in Victoria. The disenchantment eventually proved to be impossible to contain, exploding in 1955 with devastating results for the Labor Party. There may have been a nexus between Mannix’s non-committal statements and a higher ‘No’ vote amongst Catholics in Victoria than would otherwise have been the case but it is also important to reiterate that Catholic voting patterns were not the result of blind allegiance to hierarchic authority as has sometimes been alleged.97 This is evidenced by the disagreements between Duhig and Mannix, at the referendum under discussion here and at the 1949 election, where they expressed diametrically opposed opinions over the issue of bank nationalization.98 Duhig’s support of a ‘Yes’ vote cannot be said to have been particularly relevant given that Queensland was widely predicted to, and did, return a ‘Yes’ majority in any case. The ‘No’ vote did record an increase in

97 Apart from the positions taken by Gilroy, Mannix and Duhig, two of the most influential Catholic papers also differed. The *Catholic Weekly* (Sydney) 6 September 1951, p. 4, supported the ‘Yes’ case. The *Catholic Worker* (Melbourne) September 1951, p. 1, did not advise one way or the other, but presented the ‘no’ case sympathetically.
Victoria when compared to the Labor vote at the 1951 federal election but not as large an increase as was the case in NSW.99 The final referendum results also revealed that the ‘No’ vote represented a continued upward trend in the same three states, NSW, Victoria, and South Australia, that the Labor Party had won at the 1951 federal election.100 From the 1949 election to the 1951 election the nationwide Labor vote increased by 0.52 percent and the ‘No’ vote at the referendum represented a further gain of 1.41 percent.

It needs to be underlined that Catholic voting patterns at the 1951 referendum did not represent the beginning of the shift away from the Labor Party that began in 1955. The 1954 federal election returned a victory for the Labor Party in the popular vote, polling 50.70 percent on a two party preferred basis.101 Although it failed to win a majority of seats, thus losing the election, it achieved a first preference vote of 50.10 percent, the only time more than 50 percent has been won by any party in the post-World War II period.102 This result would have been highly unlikely at that time if its share of Catholic votes had been severely diminished. The voting intentions of Catholics for the 1946, 1949 and 1951 federal elections have already been noted as having been at circa 70 percent for the Labor Party. This was also the case at the 1954 election, despite the probable drop at the 1951 referendum.103

99 Table of statistics prepared by the Economics Department, Australian National University, in: Webb, *Communism and Democracy in Australia*, pp. 152-156.
100 Table of statistics prepared by the Economics Department, Australian National University, in: Webb, *Communism and Democracy in Australia*, pp. 152-156.
At this point it is necessary to discuss the relevant scholarly opinion. It is surprising that such an issue has produced so little in the way of research since the 1950s. One meets only occasional and fleeting references to the contributions of church leaders and academics in the secondary literature of recent decades. One can agree with Judith Brett in her assertion that the referendum debate was Bert Evatt’s finest hour but according to Brett, Evatt singlehandedly transformed a 73 percent majority for the banning one month before the vote into a narrow victory for the ‘No’ case. Robert Murray, in a brief account, also failed to name anyone other than Evatt and his “energetic campaign” in the success of the ‘No’ case. Jenny Hocking, in a concerted attack on Robert Menzies, attributed all the credit for the referendum’s defeat to Bert Evatt while ignoring other contributors. One recent study on Australian referenda mentioned Moyes and Burgmann but did not examine what was occurring with the religio-political allegiances of Catholics, Anglicans and Protestants. It was also regrettable that the authors, George Williams and David Hume, referred to Bishop Moyes as Alban Moyes. Alban “Johnny” Moyes was the bishop’s younger brother, a well known cricket broadcaster and author in mid-century Australia. The explanation offered by Williams and Hume for the general lack of success for referenda in Australia was that Australians would not vote ‘Yes’ to a proposal “they do not feel ownership of, or do not understand.” This is only partially sufficient when applied to 1951. It can reasonably be argued that by the end of the 1951 campaign, a slim majority of
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voters did indeed understand that there were dangers inherent in the powers being sought by the Government. Whatever the case, the advocates for a ‘No’ vote succeeded in creating sufficient concern in the minds of a majority of voters, both nationally and in three states.

After nearly six decades, there are still only two authors who have discussed the influence of church leaders in any depth. They were both contemporaneous voices: Arthur Burns and the previously cited Leicester Webb. Firstly, Arthur Burns, in his *The Churches in the Anti-Communist Referendum*, argued that the referendum was decided by a small group of voters belonging to an area he referred to as secular democratic liberalism. He suggested that although they were guided by non-theological philosophy and not stereotypically aligned to any particular strand of Christianity, these voters were not necessarily anti-clerical or anti-ecclesiastical. They were, according to Burns, more often than not university educated, and included atheists and agnostics:

> In striking contrast with the Communist Party all clergymen who spoke for ‘Yes’ or for ‘No’ employed, naturally rather than of set purpose, the language and the political philosophy of the groups most likely to change their minds...It is not too simple to put it that clerics who wanted ‘Yes’ appealed to nationalism, and clerics who wanted ‘No’ to secular liberal principles and sentiments.\[111\]

While it is difficult to prove or disprove Burns’ argument concerning the decisive nature of the vote for secular democratic liberalism, one can take issue with his assessment of the arguments employed by the church leaders. Burgmann may have hoped to convince Anglicans by warning them of his fear of Catholic domination, but it was drawing a long bow on Burns’ part to argue that Burgmann was employing “the language and the political philosophy of the groups most

likely to change their minds.” It is in fact a real possibility that Burgmann’s views may have been sufficiently disturbing for Catholics to have ensured a larger Catholic ‘Yes’ vote than would otherwise have occurred. In Moyes’ case, his arguments were only secular in so far as his Christian, Social Gospel rationale happened to be in accordance with “secular liberal principles and sentiments” in this particular case. Burns may not have studied Moyes’ public statements that were issued before the immediate lead up to the referendum. In each of those statements, which have been discussed in the previous section, Moyes underlined that his opposition to the anti-communist legislation and referendum was based on the application of his Christian, Social Gospel principles.

In Leicester Webb’s case, he argued that the church leaders who were speaking for the ‘No’ case seemed to be:

speaking against the weight of opinion in their denominations, and it may be suspected that their main influence was not among their active church members but among those whose attitude towards Christianity amounts to nothing more substantial than a vague respect.\(^1\)\(^\text{112}\)

This, according to Webb, was enough to sway a substantial percentage of the electorate from previous allegiances. Webb’s analysis was however incomplete. It seems clear from the statistical evidence, given the closeness of the result, that a meaningful percentage of Catholics must have changed their minds in the last week of the campaign and that a number of Anglicans, Protestants and non-aligned must have done likewise. Without such a change in the last week, the ‘No’ campaign would have ended in failure. Although some Catholic priests may have made their views known to their congregations at parish level, Catholics appear to have voted

\(^{112}\) Webb, *Communism and Democracy in Australia*, p. 97.
according to their consciences, as Mannix and Gilroy said they would. As mentioned earlier, it is almost impossible to imagine the stances taken by Burgmann and Davidson winning the allegiance of Catholics. It is however probable that Moyes presented a case that not only convinced some of his own Anglican flock to support the ‘No’ case but that some Catholics and others also found his arguments compelling and reassuring.

In regard to the influence of Bishop Moyes, it is critical to consider the following. In Australian constitutional referenda the Commonwealth Electoral Office issues a pamphlet to all households containing an argument for both the ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ cases. Each argument must be authorised by a majority of members from both Houses of Parliament who had voted in favour, in the case of ‘Yes,’ and against, in the case of ‘No.’ In 1951 the pamphlets were distributed within fourteen days of the writ being issued. An excerpt from Bishop Moyes’ argument from 12 May, 1950, was featured prominently on the front page of the ‘No’ case, with only quotes from President Harry Truman and former Prime Minister, Ben Chifley, listed above it. The quote from Moyes read as follows:

For the Australian Government to develop an order that has even a faint resemblance to the police state of totalitarian countries, with its hunting for victims, is to give Communism its first victory. For we shall be adopting its methods and using Satan to cast out Satan.\(^{114}\)

The majority of ‘No’ supporters in both Houses of Parliament thus voted for Moyes’ argument to be included on the front page of the ‘No’ case together with that of Truman, Chifley and King’s Counsel, Eric Miller. On the last page was more from Chifley and a quote from Rev. Alan

\(^{112}\) The usefulness and limitations of such an adversarial approach have recently been discussed by Williams and Hume, *People Power*, pp. 261-263.

\(^{114}\) *The Case For and Against*, Referendum Pamphlet issued by the Commonwealth Electoral Office, 1951.
Walker.\textsuperscript{115} Nothing from Burgmann or other clergymen was included. Webb argued that the pamphlet was visually unattractive and spread "more confusion than enlightenment."\textsuperscript{116} Webb did not, and could not, provide any useful evidence for his opinion on this particular matter. One must bear in mind that the early opinion polling suggested a landslide victory for the 'Yes' case\textsuperscript{117} and polls were still pointing to a clear 'Yes' victory until one week before the vote.\textsuperscript{118} Menzies' actions indicated that he was very confident of the result. He only scheduled two public appearances in the final four days of the campaign.\textsuperscript{119} This reversal was undoubtedly due to many factors, not least Evatt's tireless nationwide crusade. It is however also true that the overwhelming majority of voters did not personally attend Evatt's meetings. There was good radio and newspaper coverage of Menzies' and Evatt's speeches but there was no television in Australia at the time. The Electoral Office pamphlet was something that could be kept in the household and regularly referred to for more than a month before polling day. The inclusion by the 'No' case of serious warnings given by an Anglican bishop, the respected Chifley, who had recently passed away, the President of the United States, and a King's Counsel, quite possibly had considerable effect on many voters who, as Webb quite correctly states, would have had trouble understanding the 'legalese' of the Communist Party Dissolution Act or the extra powers included in the referendum proposals. The 'Yes' case included no citations whatsoever from respected authorities such as King's Counsels and bishops. One must also be mindful of the fact that the Anglican Church was the largest church in Australia in 1951 and leading churchmen were accorded a higher level of respect than they are in the twenty-first century. It is reasonable to assume that with the majority of voters unsure of or confused by the powers being sought, the
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inclusion of a bishop from the nation’s largest religious institution warning against a ‘Yes’ vote was a very effective tactic. Whereas any positive effects for the ‘No’ case emanating from Burgmann’s stance were probably counterbalanced by the alienating effect it must have had on Catholics, Moyes provided a well argued and important contribution towards getting the ‘No’ case over the line.

3.4. Conclusion

John Moyes’ suggested solution to Communism and the ‘time of urgency’ in which he argued that Australia found itself can certainly be dismissed as naïve. He saw the overarching problem as selfishness, the recurring theme in his views on all social issues. Moyes, as opposed to Burgmann and Davidson, refused to broach the sectarian issue, preferring to offer the public what he, in his role as bishop, was qualified to do. He offered his Christian interpretation of what was plaguing the nation, and the Social Gospel reading of Christ’s message was that in order to realise the Kingdom of God on earth, human beings must practise the fundamental precepts of Christianity no matter what the circumstances or the colour of the Government at the time. For Moyes, it was not a question of whether Catholics were plotting a national conspiracy to take over Australia or whether they were unduly represented in the Labor Party. He urged Australians to look beyond themselves, to see a greater whole, which in his view was represented by God; to forsake material gain as the centre of their existence. By seeking to understand and love others they could not only find God but build greater harmony in their own lives. As noted earlier, he had told the editor of the Sydney Morning Herald the previous year that: “The Christian faith doesn’t need us to defend it, but to live it, and that is a far more difficult task than to denounce (possibly quite correctly) evil in other people”\textsuperscript{120} This lofty vision was obviously not achieved in

\textsuperscript{120} Sydney Morning Herald, 21 February 1950, p. 2.
Moyes’ lifetime and it is arguable as to whether it is any nearer fruition today than it has ever been hitherto. Contemporary human beings do not appear to exhibit a lesser tendency towards the inveterate need of enemies and scapegoats when compared to previous ages. On the other hand, it is difficult to argue that voices such as that of John Moyes have been an impediment to the elimination of the above. For the Christian, in Moyes’ view, every policy had to be assessed in terms of its compatibility with God’s law and to what extent it respected and protected the value and worth of all human beings. Due to the controversy surrounding his participation in the referendum debate, Moyes sought to explain his actions in his report on the state of the diocese in June 1952. He wrote:

We were, I believed, tackling a desperate evil by utterly wrong methods. As your Bishop it was my duty to say so. I know I disturbed many of you, my correspondence revealed that. I merely want to-day to say two things. Our nation has always believed that the Church through its bishops should safeguard Christian principles in every area of life. Hence Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, led the way in forcing King John to sign Magna Carta. Likewise 24 bishops sit in the House of Lords to ensure that in any political action of any Party the Christian principles of truth, freedom and morality may not be disregarded nor violated. I acted in this tradition of the Church of England. I hope and pray I may always have the courage to do so as long as I remain your Bishop.

Non-Anglicans could reasonably raise an eyebrow over the invocation of Stephen Langton in the same example as the modern episcopal representation in the House of Lords, given that he was made a Cardinal-Priest by Pope Innocent III in 1206 and elected to the See of Canterbury in the

presence of the same Pope, at Viterbo, in 1207. In Langton’s case the tradition could more aptly be described as that of the Church in England rather than the Church of England, but Moyes’ argument is nevertheless a consistent one in the context of his own involvement in the fight against the proscription of the CPA, which he saw as a dangerous infringement of fundamental human rights and therefore unchristian.

John Moyes was a bishop of the largest church in Australia at the time. In a fractious debate that raged for nearly two years, his Christian protest, based on the ideals of the Social Gospel, against the drive to outlaw the Communist Party of Australia and to ‘declare’ individual communists, was the most intellectually balanced, eloquent and compassionate of any church leader. If it was naïve, it was naïve in the sense that the message of Christianity itself is naïve when challenged by the sordid exigencies of political debate. On this issue he played a significant role in preventing a change to the Constitution of Australia that could have set a dangerous precedent pertaining to human rights and legal protection. Such a precedent could also have created a temptation for future governments and caused serious repercussions for Australian democracy. His actions constituted a powerful example of Christian social engagement.
CHAPTER 4
MOYES, MENZIES AND VIETNAM

4.1. Introduction

In March 1965 a group of Anglican bishops signed an open letter to the Prime Minister of Australia, Sir Robert Menzies, expressing its concerns about the rapid deterioration of the situation in Vietnam. Menzies was approaching the end of his second incarnation as Australia’s Prime Minister, having been in office since 1949. The letter of protest was composed by John Moyes who had recently retired as the Anglican Bishop of Armidale and, by this time, was generally recognised as one of the elder statesmen of the Anglican Church in Australia. Moyes had sent the letter with a request for support to the diocesan bishops and to some who had, like himself, retired. Twelve recipients, including three archbishops, agreed to sign. The bishops urged Menzies to use his influence with the United States Government in order to ensure that the possibility of a negotiated settlement of the conflict could be explored to the full. The letter, and the Prime Minister’s public response, thrust John Moyes and his episcopal co-signatories into the centre of a national debate on Vietnam including headline coverage in the nation’s leading broadsheet newspapers and electronic media. Unsatisfied and stung by the Prime Minister’s brusque reply, Moyes then composed a second open letter to Menzies, this time with the support of ten Anglican bishops. The Prime Minister then issued to the press a more detailed response one week before he committed Australian combat troops to the Vietnam War. The initiative taken by John Moyes constituted the first major instance of public debate in Australia concerning the wisdom and morality of the nation’s military commitment in Vietnam. Information found in
the personal papers of John Stoward Moyes, the Federal Government Cabinet Minutes, and Prime Minister’s Department File, has shed new light on this issue.

This chapter shall argue that John Moyes launched the first public protest against the Australian Government’s policy towards the rapidly developing conflict in Vietnam. He did this by applying his Social Gospel vision to Australia’s impending military involvement in a foreign war, whereas in the case presented in the previous chapter, the issue was one of the preservation of human rights within Australia. Although he was unsuccessful in the short term, he placed the question of the morality and wisdom of the Government’s policy on the national agenda. His argument for a greater depth of understanding of the situation in Vietnam, and, in particular, his plea to the Government to value all of the Vietnamese people, not only those allied with the West, as human beings, brothers and sisters, was the most humane reading of the situation. In light of the subsequent development of the Vietnam protest movements, his action constituted a major contribution to the history of Australia.

This chapter is divided into eight sections:

1. Background. It is necessary to outline the situation in which the Australian Government found itself in 1964 and 1965 in order to understand its reasons for deciding upon direct military action in Vietnam. Although this information does not involve John Moyes, it is critical to understanding the responses of Robert Menzies to the Moyes led protests.

2. Moyes’ First Letter.

3. Menzies’ First Reply

4. Moyes’ Second Letter - First Draft. This included a far greater Social Gospel emphasis than the final version. Information discovered in the Moyes Papers and the Prime Minister’s
Department File revealed that Menzies saw this draft. Other pieces of new information contained in the above corrected inaccuracies in the historiography of this episode.

5. Moyes Second Letter - Final Version

6. The Composition of Menzies’ Second Reply. Information found in the Prime Minister’s Department File sheds new light on this issue.

7. The Content of Menzies’ Second Reply.

8. Aftermath and Conclusion.

4.2. Background

Australia had begun its direct military involvement in Vietnam in 1962 when a group of thirty Australian military advisors, Australian Army Training Team Vietnam (AATTV), arrived in South Vietnam in August of that year. The Menzies Government re-introduced compulsory military service by way of the National Service Act in 1964. This involved two years of full-time service for twenty-year-old men chosen by way of a lottery based on date of birth. It was a considerable increase in terms of the duration of the ‘call-up’ when compared to the National Service Act of 1951-59, which had conscripted eighteen-year-old men for a six month full-time commitment. During the time-span of this Act conscripted men were not sent to fight overseas.

The first ballot in the re-introduced National Service was drawn on March 10, 1965. On 29 April of the same year, Menzies officially announced that Australian combat troops would be sent to South Vietnam. In May 1965 the Menzies Government amended the Defence Act in
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order to make it possible for National Servicemen to be sent overseas. In March 1966 the Holt Government announced that National Servicemen would be sent to Vietnam.

The re-introduction of National Service was a result of the decision taken by the Menzies Government to enlarge the nation’s defence forces. This was due to several factors and it is vital to bear in mind that Australia was, during the 1950s and 1960s, a member of three organizations with a mutual defence component:

1. The British Commonwealth, which at that time still considered itself a strategic entity, especially in areas of the globe where Britain had a military presence, as it did in South-East Asia.

2. Australia’s realization during World War II that the United States was its most likely source of protection, especially following the British military debacle in Singapore in 1942, led to a continuation of close co-operation after the War. In 1951, the ANZUS Treaty, a tripartite mutual defence agreement between the USA, Australia and New Zealand, was signed in San Francisco. (The USA withdrew its commitment to New Zealand in 1985 after the New Zealand Government refused docking rights to all nuclear armed vessels)

3. Australia was a founding member of SEATO (South-East Asia Treaty Organisation) in 1954.

In regard to point 1 in the above, the most pressing defence issue on the minds of the Australian Government in 1963-64 was the situation in Malaysia and Indonesia. President Sukarno had embarked on a policy of ‘Konfrontasi’ (1963-66) in response to the formation of Malaysia from the Federation of Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak, and Singapore in 1963. Although the
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2 See the letter from the Bishop of Gippsland, signed by bishops of Wangaratta and Ballarat, in protest over the decision to send National Servicemen to Vietnam, March 28 1966, and : Prime Minister Holt’s reply, May 28 1966, in Prime Minister’s Department file; Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965, Series No. A1209, Control Symbol 1965/6365, National Archives, Canberra.
conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia remained a limited one, Australian troops already
stationed in Malaysia, as part of the Commonwealth forces known as ‘The Far East Strategic
Reserve’, became involved in the fighting against Indonesian infiltrators in Malaya after a
request from the Malaysian Government in April 1964. After initially refusing requests from the
British Government to allow its troops to be sent to Borneo, the Australian Government agreed,
upon a request from the Malaysian Government in January 1965, to allow the 3rd Battalion,
Royal Australian Regiment, (3RAR) to defend the Sarawak/Indonesian border in western
Borneo. The 3RAR thus saw action against Indonesian forces in Borneo between March and
July 1965 as part of their assigned duties to defend the border. An escalation of the war could
conceivably have resulted in Indonesia threatening Papua New Guinea, which was still an
Australian Territory. The border of Papua New Guinea and West Irian, later Irian Jaya, which
had passed to Indonesian control on 1 May, 1963, would have been extremely difficult for
Australian forces to defend. Australia would thus have found itself in a dangerous and invidious
position since the defence of its own territory would quite naturally have been an obligation it
had to meet. The Pacific Island Regiment (PIR), an Australian Army regiment of native New
Guineans led by Australian officers was already patrolling the border with West Irian at this
time. It had been increased from one to two battalions in 1963 but it is unlikely that it would
have been of sufficient strength or quality in the event of a serious threat by Indonesian forces.

6 Report by the Defence Committee, including the request from the Malaysian Minister for Defence 8 April 1964,
Series Number A4940, Control Symbol C1473 Part 1, National Archives, Canberra.
7 Cabinet Minute, 14 April, 1964, Decision No.147(FAD) Series Number A4940, Control Symbol C1473 Part 1,
National Archives, Canberra.
8 Edwards, Crises and Commitments, p. 343.
9 The Malaysian conflict was a constant front page newspaper story in Australia during 1964 and early 1965. On 13
September 1964, p. 1, the Sydney Sun-Herald ran a banner headline; “Australia Could Be Bombed.” This was a
report of a New York Times article in which the possibility of Indonesia bombing Australia was discussed.
According to the New York Times, this could occur if British forces attacked Indonesian territory.
In regard to point 2, the Australian Government's announcement of 29 April, 1965 to support the USA by dispatching the 151st Battalion (1 RAR) to Vietnam can be seen, at least partly, as a means of ensuring the active observance of the ANZUS treaty on the part of the USA in the event of a possible future conflict between Indonesia and Australia. The Cabinet decision taken by the Menzies Government on 7 April, 1965, soon after the Honolulu meeting at which American plans for increased military support for South Vietnam were discussed, and at which Australia was represented by the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff Committee, expressed it thus:

Assessing the issues, the Committee agreed that the necessary course is to accede to what amounts to a request from the Government of the United States.

To provide a battalion would have military value in itself, but in addition would be of great importance in present and future Australian/United States defence relationships.

The Cabinet went on to state that it should be explained to the United States that:

...this decision, which would disperse our forces still further would place new limitations on our military capacity in other parts of South-East Asia, including New Guinea, and that Australia must look for support from both the United States and British Governments in dealing with any special difficulties which might arise elsewhere in the area, particularly during the period of Army reorganization which was directed towards the establishment of more battalions.
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10 Cabinet Minute, Foreign Affairs & Defence Committee, Canberra, 7 April 1965, Decision No.859 (FAD), Series No. A5827, Control Symbol Vol.22/Agendum 719, National Archives, Canberra.
11 Cabinet Minute, Foreign Affairs & Defence Committee, Canberra, 7 April 1965, Decision No.859 (FAD).
12 Cabinet Minute, Foreign Affairs & Defence Committee, Canberra, 7 April 1965, Decision No.859 (FAD).
It was thus clear from the policy of the Australian Government that it continued to view its alliance with the USA as critical to its security needs. By naming New Guinea in its response to the American request, Australia made it clear that it was extremely concerned about any possible escalation of the Malaysian/Indonesian conflict into West Irian, which bordered the Australian territory of Papua New Guinea. An eruption of fighting on that border would have required still greater military commitment from Australia, whose forces were already stretched. However, it is also clear from the response of the Australian Government to the American request that the likelihood of American defence assistance in a possible future crisis was greatest if it supported the United States as an active and reliable ally.

In regard to point 3, Australia was also a member of the South-East Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO), which had been formed in September, 1954. The Manila Treaty, which gave birth to SEATO, was signed very soon after the Geneva Agreements, which had been concluded in July of the same year. The partition of Vietnam and the accompanying fear of further Communist gains in South-East Asia was an integral part of the rationale for SEATO’s existence. The organization comprised the USA, France, Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan. It therefore had only two member states from South-East Asia. Despite the fact that the Vietnam War hastened SEATO’s slide into irrelevancy and eventual dissolution in 1977 and that South Vietnam was not a member, attempts were made by both the USA and Australia to view the defence of South Vietnam as being within SEATO’s sphere of interest. It was however a complex and difficult argument to defend given that two major members, France and Britain, refused to become involved in military action on behalf of South Vietnam. Of the remaining SEATO member states, Thailand, the Philippines and New Zealand offered varying degrees of military assistance. Thailand, in terms of logistics, was
extremely important. Australia was therefore honouring its, albeit unclear, treaty obligations and at the same time maintaining its perceived necessary commitment to the USA as discussed in point 2.

President Johnson's envoy, Henry Cabot Lodge Jnr, arrived in Canberra on 17 April to discuss Vietnam with the Australian Government. Lodge had previously been US Ambassador to South Vietnam under President Kennedy and would again assume that position later in 1965 for President Johnson. The visit of Lodge to Australia was part of a tour of South-East Asian countries and Australia and New Zealand. In light of the information provided by the Cabinet Minutes, it would appear to have been more of a visit to confirm Australia's offer to send troops rather than to discuss the possibility of it. The Foreign Affairs and Defence committee had already decided at its meeting on 7 April that "the United States should be informed that Australia would be willing to assist the American build up of forces in South Vietnam by the provision of one battalion if and when formally requested." Before the end of April the Australian Government had announced that it was to commit Australian combat troops to the conflict. Menzies announced in Parliament on 29 April 1965, that an Australian infantry battalion would be sent to Vietnam, stating that a request for 'further military assistance' by the Government of South Vietnam had been received. The Cabinet documents have shown that this was a controversial statement and it shall be discussed in the relevant section.

By the autumn of 1965 the major Australian broadsheets were replacing their headline stories on the Malaysian conflict with dramatic reports of American bombing raids in Vietnam, including encounters with Russian built MiG fighter planes and Chinese military personnel. The
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13 Australian, 21 April 1965, p. 1
14 Cabinet Minute, Decision No.860 (FAD), CRS A5828, National Archives, Canberra.
15 Cabinet Minute, Decision No.859 (FAD), CRS A5828, National Archives, Canberra.
following examples of front page headlines were typical: "More Red Invaders - U.S. may send in marines," "Deepest Raids Yet - Jets smash Viet radar," "US Raid wrecks Red Jet Base." It was against this background that in March and April of 1965 John Moyes led a group of Anglican bishops and archbishops in an attempt to influence the policy of the Australian Government towards the situation in Vietnam.

4.3. Moyes' First Letter

Moyes' first letter to Robert Menzies was published in the national press between 12 March and 16 March 1965. This was six weeks before the Australian Government announced that it was sending combat troops to Vietnam. There were thirteen signatories to the first letter, including Moyes himself. They were: Archbishop of Perth, George Appleton; Bishop of Kalgoorlie, Cecil Muschamp; Bishop of Newcastle, James Housden; Bishop of Ballarat, William Hardie; Bishop of Wangaratta, Theodore McCall; Bishop of Gippsland, David Garnsey; Bishop of Grafton - Robert Arthur, Bishop of Carpentaria - John Matthews, Former Archbishop of Melbourne, Joseph Booth; Former Bishop of Bendigo, Donald Baker; Former Bishop of Tasmania, Geoffrey Cranswick; Former Bishop of Armidale, John Moyes. The Archbishop of Melbourne, Frank Woods, signed and sent his copy separately.

Several authors have attributed substantial influence concerning the composition of the bishops' letters to Francis James, manager of the Sydney Anglican newspaper, the Anglican. David Hilliard went so far as to write that in March 1965 twelve bishops led by John Moyes
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20 Age, 15 March 1965, p. 7; Sydney Morning Herald, 16 March 1965, p. 11; Australian, 15 March 1965, p. 1; Canberra Times, 15 March 1965, p. 3.
21 Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 5, p. 97.
wrote to the Prime Minister "on the initiative of Francis James." Peter Edwards, in his official history of the period with Gregory Pemberton, states on two occasions without supporting evidence that James was actually one of the principal authors alongside Moyes. As noted earlier, there were thirteen signatories, including Moyes himself, to the March letter, and there is no evidence to suggest that anyone other than Moyes contributed to its composition. While it is well known that Moyes and James corresponded regularly and that James probably provided supporting evidence for the second letter, the impetus for the letters came from a different source. Moyes revealed this in his unpublished memoirs. Early in 1965, Dr A. G. H. Lawes, President of the Association for International Cooperation and Disarmament asked Moyes to be a part of an appeal to the Prime Minister for negotiations in the war in South-East Asia. Moyes declined on the grounds that the Government distrusted the movement but he volunteered to approach his episcopal colleagues "who were mostly in the eyes of the Government above suspicion and see whether we could do something." Moyes had kept James informed of what was happening since on 11 March 1965, the day before Menzies received Moyes' first letter, the Anglican published an editorial mentioning the likelihood of a letter on Vietnam from "some bishops." James' own statements do not support the claim that he was the inspiration for the protest. He claimed in a personal interview in 1975 that the timing of the first letter to Menzies was probably due to the fact that Moyes knew in advance of the impending decision to send Australian troops to South Vietnam. This, according to James, was a result of Moyes' many

25 Moyes later used the Anglican to promote the anti-war cause and visited Hanoi twice during the war. He was also involved in raising funds in Australia that were being sent to North Vietnam and, during an enigmatic journey to China in 1969, was arrested and imprisoned for spying. The details of this expedition are not relevant here but his release was secured in 1973 by his school friend, Edward Gough Whitlam, who by that time had become the Prime Minister of Australia. The charge of spying was revoked by the Chinese Government in 1986.
contacts on both the 'right' and 'left' sides of Australian politics, which he "used mercilessly." Moyes did not however leave any evidence in that regard. An article in the *National Times*, also in 1975, intimated that Moyes was either in possession of knowledge to which very few outside the Cabinet would have had access, or that he accurately predicted the course of action Menzies would take, given that Moyes had always regarded Menzies as having a "fixation on communism." *The Words between the Bishops and Menzies,* *National Times*, 12-17 May 1975, pp. 26-27.

The text of Moyes’ first letter is included below in full since it was the shortest of the four pieces of correspondence:

Dear Sir Robert,

There are a number of us deeply concerned that our Government should be seen to be taking positive steps, with others, towards an honourable and peaceful settlement of the fighting in Vietnam.

Already His Holiness the Pope, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, and the governments of Canada, India and France have urged through both private and formal diplomatic channels their earnest desire for negotiations leading to peace.

We are not concerned here to canvass the merits of the respective attitudes of the North and South Vietnamese Governments, or of the Governments of the United States and China.

We have in mind, however, the attitude of Her Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom at the time of the Geneva Agreements in 1954, and since.

We also realise that liberal opinion in the USA, as reflected by sober commentators like Mr Walter Lippmann, by no means agrees with their

---

government’s policy. Although the USA was not a signatory to the 1954 Geneva Agreements, yet in a statement made on 21st July that year they undertook to refrain from the threat of the use of force in the matter of Vietnam. It seems to us that our Government, because we owe so much to our Ally, (sic) the United States of America, is morally bound to help our Ally, (sic) in the friendliest and most loyal spirit, to avoid a policy that can lead to an extension of hostilities. We would hope that our nation, living as we do in the Asian world, should join with the Pope, U Thant and the distinguished leaders of the other Western nations mentioned above, in bringing to a close a war that is costing so many lives and reducing the economy of Vietnam to chaos.28

What was noteworthy about the above letter was not so much its contents - many members of the Labor Party or those in academia could have made such a plea, and it contained very little religious content – but that it was made by a Christian bishop and signed by twelve others. This is central to the argument being presented here. Moyes saw the role of the Church as being one through which the Church should exercise its influence on all aspects of life. In this case, a Christian bishop led the way, demonstrating that when other sections of the community are not agitating for a detailed and informed debate on major issues the Church can still play an important role in holding the Government to account for what it is doing, or planning to do, in the name of the people it represents. The protest of John Moyes at this early stage of what was to become a human tragedy that eventually took the lives of millions of people is an excellent example of Christian social engagement.

28 Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 97. All of the major Australian broadsheets ran the story and some published the text of the letter in full. These included the Age, the Australian, and the Canberra Times, all on 15 March 1965. The Sydney Morning Herald included excerpts from the letter and a brief interview with Moyes, on 16 March 1965. The Church Times of London published a front page article on Moyes’ first letter on 26 March 1965.
Menzies' reply to Moyes was surprisingly severe in tone. Vietnam was by this stage becoming a front page story in the Australian press and this gentle piece of clerical meddling just weeks before the Prime Minister's decision to send Australian troops to Vietnam was announced may have precipitated his angry response simply by its timing and publication. It could also have been the fact that John Moyes was the author of the letter. As discussed in chapter 3, Moyes had been one of the most prominent churchmen, along with Burgmann and others, involved in the successful bid to prevent Menzies from banning the Communist Party in 1950 and 1951. It can also be confirmed that Moyes' activities had been noted by the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation. The head of that organisation, Sir Charles Spry, in a letter to Sir John Bunting, Secretary of the Prime Minister's Department, on 15 July, 1965, listed Bishop Moyes as being involved in various "Communist dominated" activities. The following is one example: "Bishop Moyes is recorded as having been a sponsor for the Communist-inspired Australian Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament, October 1964." Moyes had thus been a public opponent of Menzies for many years and the sight of his name appearing again as a respected and learned foe interfering in Government policy may have riled the Prime Minister more than usual.

4.4. Menzies' First Reply

Menzies’ reply; “P.M. Distressed by Bishops’ Letter,” was published in the press on 26 March. In the Age it shared the front page with the account of the first exchange of fire between Australian troops and Indonesian guerrillas since the Australians had taken up forward positions
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29 Letter from Sir Charles Spry to Sir John Bunting, 15 July 1965, Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965, Prime Minister's Department file, Series Number A1209, Control Symbol 1965/6365, National Archives, Canberra.
in Sarawak. The Sydney Morning Herald's coverage of the bishops' letter was also in the form of a front page article detailing Menzies' responses seriatim. The Australian ran its story inside the paper as: "The Prime Minister Replies to Bishops – We Can't Co-exist with Red Aggression." Menzies' reply stated that he was "surprised and distressed" by one paragraph in particular. He quoted the paragraph in question: "We are not concerned to canvass the merits of the respective attitudes of the North and South Vietnamese Governments, or the Governments of the United States and China." Moyes had employed the same argument during the Second World War, in 1940. Several of the bishops complained that Menzies had misunderstood the phrase that had distressed him. His counter attack was characteristic:

Well, all I can say is that the Government is and must be concerned. Indeed, it seems elementary to me that unless we have some idea on the merits of these matters, our actions will be those of expediency and not those of principle.

He went on to expound the views that had characterised his political career, at least as far as the Cold War period was concerned, emphasising the responsibility that North Vietnam and China must bear for the war and thus offering his flank to attack on grounds of demagoguery and ignorance, (which was exploited in the bishops' second letter) arguing that: "The political views of Hanoi are not to be distinguished from those of Peking." Menzies also asked rhetorically:
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33 Age, 26 March 1965, p. 3.  
34 Age, 26 March 1965, p. 1.  
35 Moyes, The Church and the Hour, pp. 6-7. See Chapter 2 of this thesis, pp. 79-80.  
36 Age, 26 March 1965, p. 3.  
37 Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 5, p. 103. Note; The names, Peking and Saigon, for Beijing and Ho Chi Minh City, are used here in accordance with the usage in the primary sources drawn upon.
"How could they (the USA) negotiate with Communist China, the home of aggression?..There can be no true composition between atheistic and materialistic Communism and countries with deep religious beliefs." He concluded with: "Sir, the change of heart that is needed to lay a good foundation for a fruitful negotiation and a lasting peace must occur in the Communist bodies." Menzies sent copies to his ambassador in Washington with instructions to show it to the United States Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and President Johnson, as well as a copy to the British Government.

Peter Edwards, who has given more attention to the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the bishops than all other historians to date, described Menzies' reply as "a ferocious display of his debating skill," and "formidable rhetoric." It was certainly a ferocious display of Menzies' debating technique and it was definitely rhetorical but it is arguable as to how formidable it was. History has not been kind to Sir Robert's Vietnam policy and the arguments he employed in the correspondence with the bishops have not aged well. It is not only through hindsight that they lack nuance and seem to be predicated on a Manichean world view in which the Western parliamentary democracies had all the right on their side. There was nothing formidable about arbitrarily and publicly asserting that the political views of Hanoi were indistinguishable from those of Peking and that China was the home of aggression. Such statements from the nation's Prime Minister, made at a time when Australia had no official representation in either Hanoi or Peking and when alternative views that later became very widely held were known to him, did very little to illuminate the issue for the Australian public and did nothing towards increasing the level of understanding of Australia in China or North

38 Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 5, p. 107.
40 Edwards, Crises and Commitments, p. 356.
41 Edwards, Crises and Commitments, p. 355.
42 Edwards, Crises and Commitments, p. 366.
Vietnam. Arguments contending that Menzies was simply expressing himself in the cant of the age are also difficult to defend. Not only had various highly respected individuals and foreign governments, including the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Canadian Government, urged negotiations, but even the British Government, Australia’s ally in the Indonesia/Malaysia conflict in which it was involved at the time, was doing everything it could do defuse the situation in Vietnam.

It became even more apparent in his second reply, which was also sent to Washington and London, that Menzies’ chief concern was to make perfectly clear to the Australian public and to the United States Australia’s support for the American effort and to underline for the British Government his support for the USA in its armed struggle to preserve South Vietnam as a non-Communist nation. Edwards is probably correct in contending that in different circumstances the bishops’ letter would have received no more than “a disparaging remark in Parliament,” but the situation in Vietnam was becoming urgent and Menzies obviously felt that his policy had to be broadcast widely. He was assisted by the *Sydney Morning Herald* when on 27 March it lent as forcefully as possible its support to the Prime Minister in a lengthy editorial titled: “The Prime Minister and the Bishops.” The newspaper asserted that it was right and proper that churchmen should publicly express their views about peace and war provided they fulfilled one condition. The condition being that “the signatories of the letter should acquaint themselves with the facts.”

Two major international developments occurred between Menzies’ reply and Moyes’ second letter. The *Australian* reported on 3 April; “Johnson turns down Vietnam peace plea.”
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43 For more information on this issue, see: *Cabinet Minute*, 14 April 1964, Decision No. 147 (FAD) Series Number A4940, Control Symbol C1473 Part 1, National Archives, Canberra; and Edwards, *Crises and Commitments*.
This was an article on the US rejection of the plea from seventeen non-aligned nations to start peace negotiations. Johnson countered six days later with his own peace offer. He proposed unconditional negotiations with no strings attached and promised a billion dollars in aid to South-East Asia if the US terms were accepted.\textsuperscript{47} This unconditional offer did not include the withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam, which was a constant demand of Hanoi. It was not surprising that the offer was rejected.

On the home front the Anglican launched a broadside at Menzies in its editorial of 8 April. Titled: “How to aid Communism,” it was a blistering attack on the Prime Minister’s policy towards Vietnam, accusing him of predicating his statements on sheer prejudice and rhetoric.

The press received the same treatment with the exception of the Australian and the Age. The editorial opined that:

> The majority of South Vietnamese support the “insurgent” Viet Cong which, made up of Buddhists, Roman Catholics, straightforward nationalists and Communists (who undoubtedly predominate), effectively controls and governs four-fifths of the entire area. (italics and punctuation original)

It concluded by arguing that American policy may force the North Vietnamese to call on Chinese ground troops, which ironically would help spread Chinese influence southward.

\textbf{4.5. Moves’ Second Letter – First Draft}

Moyes’ reply to Menzies was published in the national press on 12 April, having reached Menzies with a covering letter, on 10 April.\textsuperscript{48} The primary sources reveal a wealth of confusion concerning the provenance of, and the signatories to, this letter. There were ten signatories when

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Australian}, 9 April 1965, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{48} Letter from Moyes to Menzies, received by Prime Minister’s Department on 10 April 1965, \textit{Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965}. 
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the letter was released to the press. Eight of them had signed the first letter. Those who had signed the first letter but not the second were the former Archbishop of Melbourne, Joseph Booth, and the bishops of Carpentaria, Newcastle and Wangaratta. The new signatories were the Bishop of Bunbury, R.G. Hawkins, and the Bishop of Rockhampton, D. Shearman. Bishop McCall of Wangaratta sent Moyes a note in which he explained that the second letter entered into the field of the well informed expert and that this was outside the bishops’ area of competence.

Material found in Moyes’ private papers reveals a first draft that has not been discussed in previous scholarship. It included a section with far greater emphasis on the application of the Social Gospel to the situation in Vietnam than the revised version published in the press. Moyes’ papers also reveal that some, perhaps all, of the other signatories received this draft before the revised version. There is evidence of this in a letter from the Bishop of Rockhampton who, on 12 April 1965, wrote to Moyes informing him that he had signed the first draft and returned it to Moyes before the second and “better letter” was received. He informed Moyes that he had signed and sent the second letter directly to the Prime Minister. If one had only studied the published version of the letter one would naturally assume that this bold exposition of Social Gospelism had remained unsent. In a serendipitous discovery the Prime Minister’s Department file pertaining to this issue reveals that the Prime Minister saw this letter, signed by the Bishop of Kalgoorlie. Cecil Muschamp of Kalgoorlie had signed and sent this draft to the Prime Minister apparently before he had received the revised version that was released to the press. As a result he was not listed as a signatory in the press but was listed by the Prime Minister’s Department as
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51 Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 49.
52 Letter from Bishop of Kalgoorlie to Prime Minister, received by Prime Minister’s Department, 12 April 1965, Vietnam - Correspondece with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965.
a signatory to both letters. This first draft, sent to Menzies by the Bishop of Kalgoorlie, urged Menzies to be mindful of the fact that Communists were also God’s children. Moyes was responding to a quote from Menzies’ reply to his first letter in which Menzies contended that there could be no true composition between atheistic and materialistic Communism and countries with deep religious beliefs. Moyes, evidently stung by the tone of Menzies’ reply, could not resist the touch of sarcasm present in the first sentence when he felt in possession of home ground advantage:

As bishops, with a passing knowledge of theology, we do not quite discern what atheism and materialism have to do with the present issue. We are not clear on the countries to which you attribute deep religious beliefs. On one thing all Christians are unanimous: God is the father of ALL (sic) mankind; not merely Western democrats. Our Lord Jesus Christ came into this world to save, and died for ALL (sic) men, including Marxists and materialists, black men and white, Russians and Americans and Australians alike. It seems to us preferable in this war, as with all wars, carefully to keep references to “deep religious belief” above the evil it may help to resolve, and not to misuse it to bolster one side of the case or the other. The Viet Cong and the U.S. Marines are alike God’s children, our brothers. We should be bound to remember this even were the right patently all on one side in Vietnam.

This draft, which found its way to the Prime Minister’s office by way of a delayed postal delivery in Kalgoorlie, also included a list of supporting footnotes in which it was underlined that they were nearly all from Western sources and therefore not from North Vietnamese, Chinese or

---

53 Undated internal communication titled: ‘Both Letters,’ Prime Minister’s Department file, Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965.
Russian authorities. These were expurgated from the final version. The first draft was a pure exposition of the Social Gospel as applied to international relations; the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. In this case, when Australia’s sovereignty and territorial integrity were not directly threatened, the Jesus-paradigm of non-violence could be applied without conditions. For John Moyes, in this situation, the dignity and indeed the lives of human beings were far more important than national boundaries or political ideologies. In advising Menzies to refrain from enlisting the support of ‘religious beliefs’ for his argument, Moyes was stating very clearly that religion was not to be employed in order to cause, in effect, a situation where the life of one person was deemed to be worth more than the life of another. His God was the God of all humanity, not only of those who spoke his language, lived in his country or attended his church.

The date of this first draft was 7 April.54


The revised and final version was sent to Menzies on 9 April 1965 and published in the press on 12 April.55 This was three days after President Johnson’s offer of peace talks.56 A letter, dated 7 April, from Francis James to Moyes suggests that some editing had taken place. The first sentence from James reads: “Herewith the missive for the P.M. I think it’s all right; but you should read it through of course.”57 This does not necessarily indicate that James had edited the letter since there is incontrovertible evidence that the Archbishop of Melbourne revised the final

54 Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 41.
55 In Brisbane it was published in connection with Archbishops Strong’s refusal to sign it. See: Courier Mail, 12 April 1965, p. 8. See also, Advertiser 13 April 1965, p. 2. (editorial).
56 Australian 9 April 1965, p. 1. One can only speculate as to whether the President seriously expected a positive reaction from either Hanoi or Peking given that it was announced on the very next day that three thousand extra American marines and more aircraft were on their way to Vietnam. Indeed two American battalions arrived in Vietnam on 11 April, two days after his peace offer. This was reported in the Australian, 12 April 1965, p. 5.
57 Letter from Francis James to Moyes, 7 April 1965, Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 27.
version that was released to the press. This was confirmed by Moyes\textsuperscript{58} and the bishops of Gippsland and Wangaratta. The Bishop of Gippsland wrote to Moyes on 13 April stating that he had received material from Moyes that morning and also the previous Monday. He informed Moyes that he had just replied to the Archbishop of Melbourne who had asked him (Gippsland) for comments on his (Melbourne’s) revision, which must have arrived before Moyes’ last dispatch, which had arrived that morning. Gippsland’s uneasiness with the sections on deep religious beliefs and the Australian desire for peace being axiomatic indicate that he was referring to the first draft.\textsuperscript{59} The Bishop of Wangaratta had declined to sign the second letter in a reply to Moyes dated 9 April. He mentions having received two letters and two telegrams. He states that he could not sign “your letter or the revised version of the Archbishop of Melbourne.”\textsuperscript{60} Archbishop Woods, of Melbourne, may have sent his revised version to James for checking and James could have sent it on to Moyes. James’ comment: “I think it’s alright” can be interpreted to mean that he had contributed but it can also be interpreted as a comment on the work of someone else, in this case, the Archbishop of Melbourne, since James was handling the distribution to the media, naming in his letter to Moyes the timing of the letter’s release and that copies would be sent to the \textit{Australian} and overseas press.\textsuperscript{61} It is however most probable, in light of their friendship and collaboration, that James had assisted with supporting evidence, given his interest and knowledge of the situation in Vietnam and South-East Asia.\textsuperscript{62} This is also supported by a letter from the Bishop of Gippsland to Moyes in which he warned that although he

\textsuperscript{58} Moyes, interviewed in \textit{Anglican}, 20 May 1965, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{59} Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{60} Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{61} Letter from Francis James to Moyes, 7 April 1965, Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{62} For information on James’ interest in South-East Asia and especially Vietnam, see ‘Francis James Collection,’ uncatalogued at the time of writing, Penrith City Library, Penrith, NSW.
respected Francis James’ knowledge of the issue, the bishops “must not give the impression that we are firing somebody else’s bullets for him.”

The *Australian* published the letter on 12 April: “Bishops Hit Menzies – Telling less than the whole truth.” Moyes did indeed accuse Menzies of not telling the whole truth of the matter with regard to the Prime Minister’s claim that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 had been “consistently violated by the Communists.” Moyes pointed out that North and South Vietnam, China and the United States, had all violated the Agreements. The letter included two main points in which it detailed the breaches committed by South Vietnam, with American support. 1. The continued refusal to hold free elections, and 2. The grant of military bases to a foreign power. Regarding point 1., Moyes argued that it had been agreed in Geneva on 21 July 1954, that general elections should be held in July 1956 under the supervision of an international commission. He went on to say that these elections never took place and that “no authority known to us disagrees that any fair and free election since 1954 would have resulted in a victory for the supporters of Ho Chi Minh. If people want to be communists, guns won’t stop them.”

In regard to point 2., Moyes pointed out that the Final Declaration of the Geneva Agreement of 21 July 1954, states that “…no military base at the disposition of a foreign State may be established in the regrouping zones of the two parties…” (Menzies’ second reply stated that Moyes’ claim was inaccurate and this will be discussed in the relevant section) Moyes answered the Prime Minister’s contention that the policy of Hanoi was indistinguishable from that of Peking, stating: “We doubt the validity of your identification. Is it not like identifying Moscow
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63 Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 57.
65 Moyes, ‘Papers,’ vol. 5, p. 111.
with Belgrade and Warsaw and Peking?" Moyes then took issue with the central thrust of Menzies' first reply:

The main contention of your letter is that we are indifferent to the moral and religious elements in the situation, whereas you and your government are deeply concerned with both. You think of the war as a crusade being carried out by the Christian forces of the "deeply religious" people of South Vietnam, the United States and, presumably, Australia, against the "atheistic and materialistic" forces of North Vietnam and China. We find ourselves unable to make this clear moral and religious distinction and, moreover, regard the making of such a distinction as in itself open to grave moral question. The government of South Vietnam rests on no basis of popular or democratic support. It was from its beginning, until last year, a dictatorship of the late Mr Ngo Dinh Diem. In these circumstances, it seems to us to be idealising the situation to write of U.S. support of "local freedom and self government." As for your observation that "there can be no true composition between atheistic and materialistic communism and countries with deep religious beliefs," we can only say that there are millions of Christians in Russia and China who are compelled to do just this. We have no right to criticise them, since we have not been put to this test.

Moyes closed by reminding Menzies that the bishops' concerns and admonitions were shared by the Pope, U Thant, and the governments of France, India, Britain and Canada.

When one compares the content of Moyes' second letter with what Moyes had been preaching since the 1930s it is clear that the grounds upon which he based his opposition to the
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Government’s Vietnam policy had been present in his thinking for decades. As discussed in chapter 2, he was arguing in 1940 that the Church could not throw its weight behind the Government’s call to war:

The Church’s commission, it has been said, is to show life as God meant it to be — and its danger is always that it should modify that commission with some sort of compromise in the hope that the nation may listen to it the more.

Moyes was well aware that this left him open to accusations of naivety and lack of patriotism but he was unrepentant. His view was that the Church had to remain above the actions of individual nations: “Whatever the nation may do, it is the Church’s business to bring eternal life into everyday affairs, the life of God into the doings of men.” When asked in a television interview in September 1965 to comment on the statement of the Primate, Archbishop Gough, of Sydney, at the recent provincial synod in which clerical meddling in politics was deprecated, Moyes disagreed with Gough’s view. For Moyes, it was the business of the Church to keep moral issues before the public at all times and that it “should be an irritant” to help the public and those in authority to apply Christian principles to the issues at hand.

On the day after the publication of Moyes’ second letter, 13 April, the Australian ran another related story titled: “Menzies Hits Back – More Churches and Teachers Support Bishops on Vietnam.” This was an article on Menzies’ defence of his policy after the Victorian Council of Churches and the NSW Teachers’ Federation came out in support of the bishops. The article stated:

69 Moyes, The Church and the Hour, pp. 6-7.
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The mounting public support for the bishops is creating an embarrassing position for some members of the Government. A number of ministers were surprised at Sir Robert’s brusque tone in reply to the first letter from the churchmen. They believed he stung them unnecessarily into stronger retaliation, hitting at some of the weakest points of the Government’s case.

4.7. The Composition of Menzies’ Second Reply

The Prime Minister’s second and final reply was published on 22 April. The front page of the Age read; “P.M. Sends Stern Rebuke to Bishops – One Sided View.” The Advertiser published it as; “New Menzies Letter to Bishops – No Back-Downs If War Grows.” The Australian ran it as; “Menzies Attacks the Bishops Once More.” The Age’s article focused on Menzies’ accusation that the bishops were blaming South Vietnam for the conflict and ignoring the transgressions of the Vietcong and North Vietnam. The view expressed by the Australian on 13 April and quoted in the previous paragraph, that Menzies’ reply had unnecessarily provoked the bishops into firing a response that was creating a surge of public support, proved to be highly perceptive. The Government, or at least, the Prime Minister’s Department and the Department of External Affairs, were indeed feeling the “embarrassing position” referred to by the Australian.

The papers and cables exchanged within the two departments in the days following the receipt of the bishops’ second letter shed new light on matters and reveal considerable concern at the highest level. The heads of the Prime Minister’s Department and External Affairs, respectively, Sir John Bunting and Sir James Plimsoll, moved quickly and decisively, drawing upon all the resources of the Government, for example, detailed information from External
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Affairs and the Australian Embassies in Saigon and Washington, in order to mount a powerful refutation of the points made in the bishops’ letter. They were quite naturally hampered by the fact that the Australian Government had no representatives in Hanoi or Peking, a point John Moyes continued to make for the rest of his life. The files from the Prime Minister’s Department and the Department of External Affairs also reveal that Sir Robert Menzies did not write the second reply that bore his name. In Nation, three weeks after the event, on 15 May 1965, Maxwell Newton wrote the following:

In his second letter to the bishops, for example, (the one written in External Affairs and not the first one which he wrote himself and which led him into trouble with the clerics) Sir Robert had inserted in ink in the original draft the phrase: “We have no desire for hostilities to spread or grow more intense, though, if this is forced upon us, we will face the resulting situation and not seek to avoid it.”

Maxwell Newton, himself a controversial journalist and the founding editor of the Australian, probably had a source in the Public Service and his first claim, that Menzies was not the author, can be confirmed from the Prime Minister’s Department file but there is no evidence of the quoted insertion being from Menzies’ hand. There are some hand written changes to the draft written by the Department of External Affairs but the phrase referred to by Newton was not one of them. The corrections in ink were minor, such as the changing of a word here and there and

76 Various documents found in the Prime Minister’s Department file, Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965.
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brief insertions and expurgations but they altered nothing substantial as far as the major points of the letter were concerned.\textsuperscript{80} 

The development of the letter was as follows. On 13 April, a draft was sent to Bunting, presumably at Bunting’s request, from A. T. Griffith, of his own department. This draft included a preface in which Griffith openly suggested that “we should have as an objective to close the correspondence.”\textsuperscript{81} He proposed a two-pronged reply. This was to include a letter from the Prime Minister’s Department, the draft of which followed the preface, and a section from External Affairs, in which the two major points in the bishops’ letter were addressed. Bunting then moved with great speed, sending two written pieces of advice to Menzies on the same day as the above draft from Griffith, that being 13 April. In one of his notes to Menzies on that day Bunting told him that he was concerned that some aspects of the Vietnam situation were so “hazy that anything written, no matter how carefully, can be open to rebuttal.”\textsuperscript{82} He added, however, that the bishops “would be less likely to continue their barrage if you bring External Affairs into play against them.”\textsuperscript{83} In the other piece of written advice sent by Bunting to Menzies on 13 April he explained to Menzies how he could exploit the final point made by the bishops in their letter. They had lined up alongside President Johnson whose peace offer had been issued several days before their letter had been sent. Bunting pointed out that Johnson never suggested peace at all costs and that he constantly referred to “attacks” from North Vietnam, something Bunting noted had been studiously avoided by the bishops. A clarification of the content of President Johnson’s recent speech at John Hopkins University underlining the above sent by the American Charge

\textsuperscript{80} Typed manuscript with hand written corrections, \textit{Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965}.
\textsuperscript{81} Typed manuscript on Prime Minister’s Department letterhead from Griffith to The Secretary, 13 April, \textit{Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965}.
\textsuperscript{82} Reply to the Bishops, Sir John Bunting to The Prime Minister, 13 April 1965, \textit{Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965}.
\textsuperscript{83} Reply to the Bishops, Sir John Bunting to The Prime Minister, 13 April 1965, \textit{Vietnam - Correspondence with Anglican Bishops in Australia - March/April 1965}.
d’Affairs in Canberra to the Minister for External Affairs, Paul Hasluck, was also sent to Menzies. In this clarification it was made quite clear that the United States Government had “no thought of a ceasefire or cessation of our present activity which would come only after our receiving concrete evidence that North Vietnam was in fact halting its aggression,” thus providing supporting evidence for the Prime Minister’s case.

The Prime Minister’s Department also received at around this time, although undated, three pages of information defending US policy from the United States Embassy concerning the bishops’ letter. Titled “South Vietnam – Bishop’s Letter,” it opened with: “The following has been provided by the United States Embassy on Bishop Moyes’ propositions on South Vietnam.” Bunting concluded his advice of 13 April by saying that he was leaning towards an unbelligerent reply limiting itself to short simple propositions expressing the desire for a speedy end to the conflict. He added, in an attempt to protect his Prime Minister from further inflaming the bishops and prolonging the issue, that: “If you feel the need for a reply, as it were, point by point to the bishops, I feel you ought to consider putting the reply on the External Affairs level rather than your own.” This was an excellent example of Bunting’s many years of experience and Menzies acted upon this advice. External Affairs drafted the letter and Menzies approved it.

The Prime Minister’s Department file confirms that it came from the Department of External Affairs and that what amounted to the final draft was cabled to the Minister for External Affairs, Paul Hasluck, who was at home in Perth at the time, Menzies, who was at Kirribilli House, and Bunting. The heading of the cable read: “For comment, suggestions or approval by Monday
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afternoon." 87 20 April 1965, the day on which the final version was dated, was a Tuesday.

Menzies' covering letter, dated Wednesday, 21 April, informing Moyes that his reply of 20 April was to be released to the press that evening, makes it certain that the Monday in question was 19 April. 88 The timing of the letter's publication on Thursday, 22 April, was probably due to the impending announcement of the dispatch of troops to South Vietnam and the fact that the visit of the American envoy, Henry Cabot Lodge, had just concluded. 89 As things transpired, Menzies committed Australian combat troops to the Vietnam War on 29 April. It was thus important for the Government to disseminate what it considered to be a strong argument into the public arena prior to the announcement.

4.8. The Content of Menzies' Second Reply

The published letter was a distillation of the information provided by External Affairs, the Australian Embassy in Saigon, the United States Embassy in Canberra and the Australian Embassy in Washington. It began with Menzies saying that he was: "Fortified again, I may say, with close consultation with the Minister and Department of External Affairs." 90 It answered the two major points of the bishops' letter. With regard to point 1., it argued that since "North Vietnam is under complete Communist control, free elections simply cannot happen." 91 The elections were intended to take place in 1956 and even the Australian Embassy in Saigon had begrudgingly confirmed that Vietnam-wide elections in 1956 would have resulted in victory for

89 President Johnson's envoy, Henry Cabot Lodge Jnr, arrived in Canberra on 17 April to discuss Vietnam with the Australian Government. Lodge had previously been the US Ambassador to South Vietnam under President Kennedy. He later took on the same position for President Johnson.
90 Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 5, p. 117.
91 Moyes, 'Papers,' vol. 5, p. 119.
the Communists.\textsuperscript{92} It must also be conceded that South Vietnam had no record of holding free elections either.\textsuperscript{93} With regard to point 2., Menzies' letter stated controversially that the bishops' claim was simply inaccurate: "No military bases have been granted to the United States."\textsuperscript{94} Despite the advice received by the Government, both arguments were half-truths and the second was quite mischievously misleading. The American wording of the relevant passage, found in Article 19 of the Geneva Agreements, stated: "...no military base \textit{under the control of a foreign State} may be established in the regrouping zones of the two parties..."\textsuperscript{95} It was merely playing with words to deny that, for all intents and purposes, the United States was actively utilising bases in South Vietnam and violating the spirit of the Geneva Agreements. The evidence for the above has been presented by many historians and further discussion is not required here.\textsuperscript{96} The letter quoted President Johnson at length, closing with:

> It should be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement. Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam – securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others – free from outside interference – tied to no alliance – a military base for no other country.\textsuperscript{97}

It was obviously referring to South Vietnam being a base for North Vietnam by way of the Vietcong but even by April 1965 South Vietnam was rapidly becoming one of the largest

American military bases in the world. The letter told the bishops that Menzies and his colleagues must decline to be cast for the roles of warmongers and supporters of illicit action on the part of the United States or South Vietnam. It concluded by saying that the Prime Minister’s other commitments precluded him from continuing the correspondence but that he thought it had been of value to the public. The *Sydney Morning Herald* again supported the Prime Minister’s case by simply repeating Menzies’ arguments, which it had published the previous day, in its editorial of 23 April.\(^98\) Two months later, Menzies told the *Sydney Morning Herald* that; “There hasn’t been a peace rally in my country for years that wasn’t organised by the communists.”\(^99\)

**4.9. Aftermath and Conclusion**

The impetus created by Moyes and the bishops was firmly illustrated on 24 April, two days after the publication of Menzies’ second reply. The *Australian* ran a story titled “Menzies—New Call—Churches plead for Vietnam peace move.” The article stated:

The Australian Council of Churches….last night called on the Australian Government to strive for a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam. The intervention by the council, the largest church group in Australia, only four days after Sir Robert’s second reply to the Anglican bishops, shows the great concern felt in all Protestant and Orthodox churches about the possibility of a major war developing.\(^100\)

Sir Robert Menzies announced to a half-empty House of Representatives on 29 April, 1965, one week after the release of his second letter, that Australian combat troops would be sent to Vietnam. The nation’s press reported the news the next day, most of them quoting Menzies’
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controversial claim that "... the decision followed a request from the South Vietnamese Government and was made in close consultation with the United States." 101 Whether this was actually the acceptance of an offer rather than a request from South Vietnam has been discussed at length elsewhere. 102 Pemberton confirms the view that the real initiative for sending Australian troops to Vietnam "cannot be said to have come from the Government of South Vietnam." 103

The *Sydney Morning Herald* did not devote an editorial specifically to the sending of troops to Vietnam. In its leader, five days after the announcement, the Australian/American alliance was praised and Vietnam was listed as one of the examples of close co-operation and the "identity of outlook enjoyed by our two countries." 104 The *Age* editorial supported the decision to send Australian troops to Vietnam based on Australia's obligation to contribute to the stability of South-East Asia by resisting aggression. 105 The *Australian* was the only major broadsheet to criticise the decision. Dated 31 April, but (fortunately) 1 May on all other pages, the editorial noted the influence of the bishops' letters on public opinion and was titled: "PM shows contempt for the public." Menzies was accused of not being willing to engage in debate over the sending of troops to Vietnam even though "the unprecedented letters he received from the bishops could have left him in no doubt about the strength of public opinion... The conduct of the Vietnam War has split the nation..." The editorial noted that even politicians were taken by surprise as evidenced by the fact that "only half of them were in the House of Representatives to hear the announcement." It also, quite perceptively, suggested that the agreement was reached long before Cabot Lodge's "enigmatic trip to Canberra, and that this visit was little more than a
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104 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 May 1965, p. 2.
105 *Age*, 5 May 1965, p. 2.
call to say thank you.” It also noted that the Americans and the British were able to “read about it in their newspapers before we had an inkling... it has clearly been on his mind for weeks. And it will not do to say that the Government has just received a request for help from the Government of South Vietnam.”

Archbishop Gough, Archbishop Strong, of Brisbane, and, astonishingly, Archbishop Woods, issued a joint statement that was published in the Anglican on 6 May in which they gave their support to Australia’s decision to send troops to Vietnam. Peter Edwards has recorded that Francis James, in an interview on 1 May 1987, claimed that Archbishop Gough had telephoned every bishop in his province and some in other provinces to dissuade them from signing the Moyes letters. Even if James’ claim was accurate it is debateable as to whether Gough’s effort would have changed many minds. He may have had some success in NSW, but the likes of George Appleton, David Garnsey and Geoffrey Cranswick were highly unlikely to undergo a theological and ideological metamorphosis on the basis of a phone call. Moyes stated that Australian born bishops were more likely to support clerical protests, such as his Vietnam letters, than their English colleagues. He argued that by virtue of the fact that the Anglican Church was not the established church in Australia its bishops had greater freedom to speak out. He underlined however that several English born bishops had supported him on the Vietnam issue. In the case of Archbishop Woods, it was an extraordinary somersault to perform, given that four weeks earlier he had revised and signed the final version of a public protest against the policy he now supported. In their statement Gough and Woods underlined Australia’s obligations under SEATO and Strong maintained that Australia had to accede to the American request.
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otherwise we would only be “giving lip service to our South-East Asian commitments.” The editorial in the same issue stated that could it not support the SEATO argument because it was based upon factual error. The relevant SEATO clause (Article IV) was cited, showing that there must be unanimous agreement over what action needs to be taken. There was nothing approaching unanimity in the SEATO ranks and the Anglican editorial thus exposed the archbishops’ ignorance. Francis James contacted Woods immediately since Woods replied to James in a letter dated 7 May 1965. Woods backtracked, saying that the point of his statement was that he “believed Australia should honour whatever obligations it is committed to under Seato (sic) or any other treaty.” Woods was quite probably, and innocently, unaware, as was Gough, of Article IV but it was a highly injudicious contribution given his involvement in the second Moyes letter. In Brian Porter’s biography of Frank Woods, the episode is briefly mentioned. Porter writes that in 1965 Woods:

lobbed the conservative Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, asking him to seek a peaceful and honourable settlement to the war in Vietnam. However two months later he was able with twelve other bishops to support by letter the Prime Minister’s decision to send Australian troops to Vietnam.

Porter’s footnote, dated 18 March 1965, can only refer to the first of the Moyes letters. In fact, Woods had done much more than lobby the Prime Minister to seek a peaceful and honourable settlement to the war. He had revised the second Moyes letter. Even though his influence toned
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the missive down somewhat and removed some of its Social Gospel features, it was a forceful criticism of the arguments presented by Menzies.

Despite the disavowal of three archbishops, John Moyes was a frequent debater and commentator in the Australian press during the next several months. At the age of eighty he figured in television and radio debates, as well as in the print media, as arguably the first high profile opponent of Australia’s involvement in the Vietnam War “beyond the traditional sources of opposition to the Government’s foreign policy.” This was also underlined by Paul Ham:

“Bishop John Moyes of Armidale was among the first to land a velvet fist on Menzies’ chin.”

Regarding the bishops’ protest in general, Ham asserted that “Never had such high-ranking churchmen publicly opposed a government.” When two American clergymen who had been to Vietnam visited Sydney soon after the exchange of letters they explained to the Anglican Primate’s representative at the airport that it was actually Moyes they had come to see. In March 1966, Moyes again attempted to garner support from the Anglican episcopal bench for a protest to the new Prime Minister, Harold Holt, over the Government’s decision to send conscripted soldiers to Vietnam. By this stage, however, most of those who had signed his protest the previous year had lost their nerve and his effort met with polite refusal. Such a reaction was not for the Archbishop of Perth, George Appleton, who stated that “the horrors of the Vietnam War had made him a full-blooded pacifist.” The ensuing growth of the anti-Vietnam War movement in the late 1960s is well documented and does not require recapitulation.
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The evidence presented in this chapter clarifies four points in the exchange of correspondence. 1. John Moyes did not write a letter signed by twelve other bishops to the Prime Minister on the initiative of Francis James. It was his own initiative after he declined to put his name to an appeal from the President of the Association for International Cooperation and Disarmament. 2. Moyes’ first draft of his second letter, in which Social Gospel principles were more clearly expounded, reached the Prime Minister. 3. Archbishop Frank Woods revised the second Moyes letter. 4. The Prime Minister’s second reply was written by the Department of External Affairs.

John Moyes has been described by some as the ‘Conscience of the Church’ but his own view was that the Church must be the conscience of society, always attempting to hold it morally to account. He can lay a genuine claim to being hailed as the first ‘independent’ protester in the public arena in Australia against the Vietnam War. He was not a member of a political party or a trade union. Neither was he an academic residing in what were perceived by some to be ivory towers. He was, in fact, as an Anglican bishop, a representative of one of the most conservative institutions in the nation, or at the least, an institution perceived to be part of the Australian Establishment. In his campaign against the proscription of the Communist Party in 1950-51 he refused to join the naked anti-Catholicism into which the “No” case descended, simply arguing that the banning of political parties was unchristian, undemocratic, and an infringement of human rights. It was “using Satan to cast out Satan.”\textsuperscript{118} In regard to war in general, he had argued passionately during the 1930s that responding in kind to violence was never the answer. In World War II, however, he struggled to maintain a consistent position on the rejection of violence, albeit in a far more perilous situation from the point of view of national sovereignty than was presented by Vietnam. In 1965 he succeeded in placing the morality of the Vietnam

\textsuperscript{118} The Case For and Against, Commonwealth Electoral Office Pamphlet, 1951.
issue on the national agenda. While there is no evidence to suggest that by this stage Moyes had embraced a position of unconditional non-violence, he argued that one had to think beyond patriotism, nationalism and ideological tribalism. For him this was not sufficient. His God was the God of all humanity, not just Christians, not just Anglo-Saxons, not just those living in the so-called democratic West. His vision of Christianity embraced all of the Vietnamese people, whether they be Christians, Buddhists or Communists. For him the central aim of the Social Gospel, the realisation of the Kingdom of God on earth, would not be hastened by military action that destroyed their nation, their livelihoods and indeed, their lives. In this case he seemed to be saying that if God’s greatest gift was the gift of life, then it far outweighed any political ideology or religious allegiance that demanded the taking of it.
CHAPTER 5
JOHN MOYES IN CONTEXT

5.1. Introduction

This chapter will examine some of the leading figures in the Social Gospel and Christian social engagement in the twentieth century, comparing them with the work of John Moyes. It was not only chronologically that Moyes was situated in the middle of this period; he also occupied the middle ground on most issues when compared to those who have been selected. Those chosen to bookend this time-frame are Walter Rauschenbusch, who represented the American Protestant Social Gospel tradition with such radicalism and passion in the early twentieth century, and André Trocmé, the French pastor who resisted all attempts by the Vichy and Nazi authorities to compel him to cease harbouring Jewish and other refugees during World War II. Trocmé is not well known outside of France other than amongst writers whose interest lies in the field of pacifism and non-violent resistance. He died eight months before John Moyes.¹ In between these two figures were three Anglican bishops with whom Moyes had personal contact, such as the Englishmen in the Christian Socialist tradition, William Temple and George Bell, and Moyes’ Australian contemporary, Ernest Burgmann. Also of great importance and with whom Moyes had personal contact was Reinhold Niebuhr, who began his career as a ‘liberal’ Protestant but eventually dealt savage blows to the credibility of the Social Gospel. Invoked by many American politicians as their favourite theologian, Niebuhr was, by the time of the Second World War and beyond, in the opinion of others, simply attempting to provide a

¹ Trocmé died on 5 June 1971; Niebuhr, on 1 June 1971; Moyes, on 29 January 1972.
Christian rationale for ‘realism’ and American foreign policy. In far more demanding circumstances than Niebuhr, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the gifted theologian who had argued so passionately for pacifism before the War, eventually saw no other option than to compromise with violence, supporting attempts to assassinate Adolf Hitler. In the latter part of the chosen time-frame we find another figure of crucial importance to the Social Gospel. Martin Luther King Jr, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, became a household name all over the world as the leader of the civil rights movement in the USA.

This chapter places a considerable amount of its focus on the Christian response to violence. This particular issue has been chosen since it was the issue that John Moyes and most of the others were unable to solve. In general, in most Western countries, the social welfare network, although imperfect, provided a far wider safety net at the end of the period under discussion than at its beginning. Many of the measures recommended by John Moyes and others in the 1930s and 1940s have been, in varying degrees, introduced by Western governments. State sanctioned violence, in this case, war, is still however viewed as a policy option by Western governments in the contemporary world as can be seen from the wars waged during the first decade of the twenty-first century in Iraq and Afghanistan. Chapter 2 has laid out Moyes’ vision of a Christian social order. Chapters 3 and 4 have provided case studies of to what extent he was able to implement his views and bring them to bear on Australian society. He, like Burgmann, Temple, Bell, Niebuhr and Bonhoeffer, was unable to find a way forward and excogitate a theologically coherent response to the ideological and moral challenge of violence, as presented by World War II. King, while refusing to countenance violence in his Gandhian campaign against racial discrimination, experienced some incidences of state sanctioned violence. Although it can be contended that the forces aligned against King cannot be compared with the
armies of Nazi Germany or Imperial Japan, there were cases of violence resulting in deaths perpetrated by the American authorities against King’s campaign. He never accepted the validity or the necessity of a violent response even though his own life was constantly under threat and finally taken from him in 1968. Trocmé spent World War II working as a Protestant pastor in France. His parish became known as a safe haven for Jewish and other refugees and as a result he was constantly dealing with, and was imprisoned by, the Vichy Government, and raided by the Gestapo. Although not a systematic theologian, he demonstrated that a theologically and practically consistent Christian response to violence was possible.

By the end of the period covered in this chapter, the movement that had promised so much hope, optimism, liberation and equality through Rauschenbusch and the English Christian Socialists had come crashing to earth in the wake of its apparent inability to provide answers to the unfathomable level of ruthlessness and brutality embarked upon by humanity in the Second World War. But it rose again temporarily in the form of the civil rights campaign in the USA and for a glittering moment in the 1970s it seemed to have secured a leading role for its Catholic manifestation in Latin America, only to be quashed by Vatican authority.

Of the personalities listed above, Moyes never met Walter Rauschenbusch, the latter having died in 1918, but Rauschenbusch’s work was well known in English and German theological circles. Burgmann and Moyes were bishops in the same church in the same Australian state at the same time. Moyes’ episcopate began five years earlier than Burgmann’s and continued for four more years, but for twenty-six years they had regular contact as members of the episcopal bench in NSW, and prior to Burgmann’s election to the See of Goulburn, he was well known in Anglican circles as the Warden of St John’s College, Morpeth, and the force behind the *Morpeth Review*, to which Moyes also contributed. Moyes met Temple in 1930, when
Moyes attended his first Lambeth Conference. As previously discussed, Temple placed Moyes on the committee dealing with marriage and sex. Temple was widely admired by the social gospellers and the Malvern Conference, convened by him in 1941, was the inspiration for the Christian Social Order Movement, of whose council Moyes was chairman. Niebuhr was known to Moyes through his involvement in the establishment of the World Council of Churches. They were both in attendance in Amsterdam in 1948 and in Evanston, Illinois, in 1954. He summarised Niebuhr’s Evanston address in *America Revisited*.² Niebuhr has been dealt with at length in this chapter due to his importance as such an intellectually gifted opponent of Christian liberalism and the Social Gospel. Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s English curacy did not begin until 1933 so there was no chance of Moyes having met him in London in 1930. By the time of Moyes’ next visit to England Bonhoeffer had perished at the hands of his own countrymen on a Nazi gallows. Moyes lived long enough to experience the civil rights movement but there is no evidence of him ever having met Martin Luther King Jr. King is best known and admired throughout the world as the great advocate for racial equality in the USA but the public awareness of King as a Christian, and as a Baptist minister, has been lost to a certain extent. It is true that his movement was supported by non-Christians and Christians alike and that he modelled his non-violent response on that of Gandhi, but he found his inspiration in Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel; a Christianity in which for him discrimination of any kind, racial or otherwise, had no place.³

André Trocmé may have been completely unknown to Moyes, since Trocmé’s *chef-d’oeuvre*, *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution*, although published in France in 1961, was not translated into English until 1971, shortly before Moyes’ death.
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Christianity has always had difficulty in explaining what Christian morality actually means and this is highlighted in the multifarious responses to violence held by professing Christians. It will be argued here that by examining the above listed figures King and Trocmé emerge as the most credible representatives of the Social Gospel tradition with respect to the Christian response to violence, but that John Moyes came desperately close to their achievements.

5.2. Walter Rauschenbusch

Rauschenbusch, born in 1861 to German parents in Rochester, New York, grew to maturity in the formative years of the Social Gospel in the United States and became its pre-eminent spokesman and author in the two decades before his death in 1918. He defined the Kingdom of God as “humanity organised according to the will of God.” He drew support for his argument from the Old Testament Hebrew prophets such as Isaiah, Micah, Hosea and Amos, contending that their message was one of national and public, not private, morality. An integral part of this was the concern for justice and the improvement of the conditions of the poor and oppressed. As the Northern, and finally the Southern, Kingdom disintegrated in the wake of foreign invasion, the trend towards individual piety began with Jeremiah but Rauschenbusch argued that it was merely a means to an end. As the nation had been destroyed, personal piety was necessary until the nation and its social order could be restored. This argument was also expounded by Moyes, most expansively on the eve of World War II, in The Church, the Jew and

Paganism. Rauschenbusch believed, or hoped, that the Kingdom of God would not come through an eschatological event but through a gradual process expedited by the people of God who were inspired by the ethical and social vision of Jesus. ...the essential purpose of Christianity was to transform human society into the kingdom of God by regenerating all human relations and reconstituting them in accordance with the will of God. In contradistinction to the contemporary literature on the historical Jesus such as that of Wrede and, especially Schweitzer, who stressed the futility of all attempts to ‘reinvent’ Jesus by applying his message to the current state of society, Rauschenbusch contended that Jesus “was not a Greek philosopher or Hindu pundit teaching the individual the way of emancipation from the world and its passions, but a Hebrew prophet preparing men for the righteous social order.” It is, in fact, doubtful that Rauschenbusch believed in an afterlife. In his A Theology for the Social Gospel, he argued that belief in a future life was not essential to religious faith and expressed solidarity with those religious men and women who “find their satisfaction in serving God now, but expect their personal existence to end at death.” His grandson, the secularist Professor of Philosophy at Princeton, Richard Rorty, also expressed doubts that Rauschenbusch held out much hope for life after death. His position was that religion was not soteriological in the sense of securing one’s
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7 John Steward Moyes, The Church, the Jew and Paganism, a Charge delivered to the third session of the twenty-third synod of the Diocese of Armidale, 1 May 1939, pp. 3-9.
8 Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis in the 21st Century, p. xxi.
10 Rauschenbusch, A Theology of the Social Gospel, p. 228.
entry into heaven through a personal saviour, but a matter of building God’s kingdom on earth,
and he argued that this was the true message of Jesus Christ.\(^\text{12}\)

The desperate poverty that Rauschenbusch experienced during his time as Baptist
minister in Hell’s Kitchen, New York, made a great and lasting impression on his thinking, as
was the case with John Moyes in Lewisham. Rauschenbusch became convinced that whereas the
chief purpose of the Christian Church in the past had been the salvation of individuals, the most
pressing task in the future was social. In condemning the capitalist system as immoral, he
exhorted the Church to work for the abolition of laws, customs, and philosophies inherited from
what he viewed as an evil and despotic past. It was the Church’s role to create fraternal relations
between the various groups and classes of society and to lay the foundation of a just and
equitable society. “Our inherited Christian faith dealt with individuals; our present task deals
with society.”\(^\text{13}\)

The great weakness of Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel in general, according to
their critics, was that they ignored or glossed over the reality of sin. Niebuhr has been credited
with dragging the social gospellers back down to earth by emphasising the sinful nature of
humanity, something that World War II appeared to confirm quite emphatically. Rauschenbusch,
like John Moyes, defined sin as selfishness.\(^\text{14}\) It was argued by the former that the sinful mind
was one that was unsocial and anti-social. Rauschenbusch believed that sin was imparted from

---

\(^{12}\) Similar ideas were preached in Australia in the late nineteenth century by Charles Strong, whose article on the
Atonement caused uproar in Melbourne in 1880. See C. R. Badger, *The Reverend Charles Strong and the Australian
Church*, Melbourne: Abacada Press, on behalf of the Charles Strong Memorial Trust, 1971, Ch.3. The Presbyterian,
Charles Strong, first came to Australia in 1875 to lead Scots Church in Melbourne. By 1884 his liberal views on
both theology and the socio-economic order had led to his resignation from Scots Church and the establishment of
the Australia Church, in Flinders Street, Melbourne. Many of the city’s intellectuals were attracted to Strong’s non-
denominational church, including thrice elected Prime Minister, Alfred Deakin. Strong was at the forefront of
initiatives for social reform. His wealthy supporters gradually abandoned his Australia Church as Strong’s pastoral
concerns focused on his working class parishioners. Strong died at age 98 in 1942 and his church eventually
succumbed in 1957.

\(^{13}\) Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Rauschenbusch Reader: The Kingdom of God and the Social Gospel*, Compiled by

generation to generation “not only by biological propagation but also by social assimilation.”\textsuperscript{15} He rejected the Augustinian portrayal of Adam being sinless before his fall and sinful after it, arguing that such theological notions “had ante-dated conceptions of human perfection, which we have derived from Jesus Christ, and converted Adam into a perfect Christian.”\textsuperscript{16} He was scathing towards the morality of ‘respectability’ in which consumption of alcohol and bad language were considered greater sins than financial exploitation of the weak by the strong. Sinful behaviour was characterised by seeking to establish a private kingdom of self-service and a disinclination to aid the progress of mankind towards peace, justice and the fraternal organisation of economic life, because that would diminish one’s political privileges, unearned income, and power over the working classes.\textsuperscript{17} He cited examples of sinful behaviour as capitalist exploitation of workers and resources. Therefore, if sin was selfishness, salvation must be a change which transformed a human being from self to God and humanity.\textsuperscript{18} On the collective nature of sin, Rauschenbusch had much in common with Gutiérrez.\textsuperscript{19}

Moyes’ thinking on economic exploitation was in agreement with Rauschenbusch but the latter went further and was more explicit than Moyes on this issue. Rauschenbusch stated clearly that exploitation had no place in the Kingdom and that therefore the redemption of society from private property in the natural resources of the earth, and from any condition in industry which makes monopoly profits possible, was essential.\textsuperscript{20} This was perilously close to endorsing Marxism, something which never escaped his critics. They both believed that Capitalism, as it manifested itself in Rauschenbusch’s time and in Moyes’ early life, was incompatible with the

\textsuperscript{15} Rauschenbusch, \textit{A Theology of the Social Gospel}, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{16} Rauschenbusch, \textit{A Theology of the Social Gospel}, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{17} Rauschenbusch, \textit{A Theology of the Social Gospel}, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{18} Rauschenbusch, \textit{A Theology of the Social Gospel}, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{19} See Gutiérrez, \textit{A Theology of Liberation}, pp. 173-175.
\textsuperscript{20} Rauschenbusch, \textit{A Theology of the Social Gospel}, p. 143.
will of God. However, Rauschenbusch held views that were further to the left of the political spectrum than Moyes. In general, Moyes was simply less radical and managed to hold his prejudices in check more successfully. He did not share Rauschenbusch’s indifference to eschatological concerns and he grappled with the Christian response to violence to a far greater extent, probably due to the moral exigencies of the era in which he lived.

Rauschenbusch did not devote much of his attention to the issue of war and violence but in the limited number of references made by him, it was clear that he interpreted Jesus as being totally opposed to all forms of violence and that this was also his position. He never attempted to expound a theologically developed stance on the issue in the manner of Trocmé, Hauerwas or Yoder, but like Hauerwas and Yoder, his views on violence and war were not in his lifetime faced with the same theological and moral challenges as were most of the others under discussion in this chapter.

Despite his oversimplification of the capital versus labour issue, his naive belief in the inevitability of progress and his indifference to eschatological concerns, which are fundamental to the Christian faith for most of its adherents, Rauschenbusch’s contribution was immensely important. It disturbed many and inspired some who had been content to practise a self centred and self contained Christianity that was quick to apportion blame but slow to accept responsibility for the welfare of others. What Rauschenbusch gave to Protestantism was that the entire rationale for religion is called into question when it is individualised and directs its focus towards personal relationships with God. His message was that neither the authenticity nor the hypocrisy of faith are characterised by how often we pray or how often we attend church but by

---
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how we treat one another. Personal religious experiences may inspire the individual but they count for nought if they do not produce an active commitment to justice, compassion and love for one’s earthly neighbour.

Rauschenbusch’s work is probably best represented by his exegesis on the Lord’s Prayer, which was a masterpiece of Social Gospel theology. In citing the three petitions that begin the prayer; ‘hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,’ he argued that the collective and social nature of the prayer is stated from the outset, and that there is no request to be saved from earthliness and to be accepted into a heavenly afterlife. The prayer simply asks “that heaven may be duplicated on earth.”24 The following petitions are all examples of social consciousness and before we should expect to be forgiven we must forgive our debtors, in other words, those whom we perceive to have wronged us. Contrary to criticism of him for being ambivalent towards the reality of evil, he argued that ‘deliver us from evil,’ interpreted as “the malignant powers of evil in humanity,”25 which may have signified Satan and his host of evil spirits represented by the harsh rule of Rome in first century Palestine, was probably best understood in his time as the “terrible powers of organised covetousness and institutionalised oppression.”26 He concluded that the Lord’s Prayer was:

not the property of those whose chief religious aim is to pass through an evil world in safety, leaving the world’s evil unshaken. Its dominating thought is the moral and religious transformation of mankind in all its social relations.27

In summary; Rauschenbusch was indisputably one of the keenest observers, not only of the anomalies and inequities of industrial capitalism, but also of the damaging nature of the

24 Rauschenbusch, A Rauschenbusch Reader: The Kingdom of God and the Social Gospel, p. 34.
26 Rauschenbusch, A Rauschenbusch Reader: The Kingdom of God and the Social Gospel, p. 36.
Christian theology of sin throughout the ages. By attempting to transmute the conceptual nature of sin from the supernatural to the temporal, thereby underlining the social nature of sin, he provided a way forward for Christian theology to apply itself to social conditions that he believed were unchristian and therefore an offense to God. His most glaring shortcoming was that of the Social Gospel in general; that greed and selfishness would gradually disappear if the collective understanding of sin became embedded in modern consciousness. The subsequent history of the twentieth century revealed that the ways of homo sapiens were far more intractable than he believed, or rather, than he had hoped them to be. John Moyes was his fellow traveller on social and economic issues and his interpretation of those issues in the context of the mission of the Church. There is no question that Rauschenbusch stood to the ‘left’ of Moyes in political terms, especially on issues pertaining to property, both public and private. His indifference to eschatological and afterlife concerns was also more radical than anything attributable to John Moyes.  

5.3. Ernest Burgmann

Burgmann and Moyes, despite the odd disagreement, two of which have been discussed earlier, have rightly been regarded as fellow travellers in the history of the Anglican Church in Australia. Moyes described Burgmann as “a keen socialist,” and his election (to Goulburn) “thrilled many of us who had doubted whether the Church of England could be adventurous

28 J. S. Moyes, ‘What I Have Stood For,’ audio tape recorded by Australian Broadcasting Commission, 6 June, 1950. In this personal reminiscence, Moyes expressed a conventional belief in Jesus’ death and resurrection.

29 For the detailed biography of Burgmann, see the previously cited: Peter Hempenstall, The Meddlesome Priest: A Life of Ernest Burgmann. Although not directly relevant here since it does not deal with the Social Gospel or the Christian response to violence, Ian Tregenza’s article on an ‘idealist tradition’ in Australia focused on Burgmann’s belief in the supreme importance of human personality. The work of A. P. Elkin and Charles Strong, mentioned earlier in connection with Rauschenbusch, are also addressed in this article. See Ian Tregenza, ‘The Idealist Tradition in Australian Religious Thought,’ Journal of Religious History, vol. 34, No. 3, September 2010, pp. 345-353.
enough to choose such a radical.” 30 The admiration was mutual, as expressed by Burgmann in his letter to Moyes upon hearing news of his impending retirement. Addressing Moyes as “My beloved bishop,” Burgmann thanked him for his final Synod Charge:

You have been the great Episcopal evangelist of this generation and many will remember you for what you have meant to them in the rough and perplexing things of life. You have also been a great pastor and you have kept abreast of modern thought. In short, you have served the Church and the Church’s God magnificently. 31

There was broad agreement between the two on the relative strengths and weaknesses of Capitalism and Communism, which in 1930, during the heyday of the Morpeth Review and the beginning of Moyes’ episcopate, dominated the social and economic debates. Moyes and Burgmann saw several of the aims of Communism as compatible with their brand of ‘liberal,’ Social Gospel Christianity, but they always underlined that the spiritual value and sanctity of the human person was missing. The following, penned by Burgmann, could well have been countersigned by the Bishop of Armidale: “They both aim at production of wealth as the end of human endeavour. Neither rises to a conception of man as a personal and spiritual being.” 32 Against Capitalism in particular, Burgmann added that: “Machines were cared for and insured long before any such thought for the human beings who worked them.” 33 This was a highly pertinent reference to the conditions in factories and sweatshops in nineteenth century Europe and the priorities that existed during the rapid process of industrialisation. The potential wealth producing capacity of machines was considered to be of greater importance than the health and
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33 Burgmann, Religion in the Life of the Nation, p. 32.
indeed the lives of the people operating them. Burgmann's sympathies were always clear: "The lust of mere ownership is contrary to the Christian view of man and no person can maintain a moral right to property which he cannot or does not use for the common good." 34

The area in which Burgmann's views vis-à-vis Communism became problematic was his attitude towards the USSR. His assessment of the present and future reality of life there was naive, as evidenced by the often cited passage from October, 1941, when the very existence of the USSR was under threat:

What we need to remember is that the attitude of the Soviet State to the Church has changed, is changing, and can change still more. We now have our opportunity to help forward any change that is desirable. The Anglo-Soviet Alliance means that influence will work both ways. Our real problem is to show the Soviet that the Church exercises a valuable and progressive influence in British communities. Neither Russia nor the outside world will be much influenced by what we say but only by what we do. 35

The Anglo-Soviet alliance deteriorated rapidly after World War II, making Western influence on religion extremely difficult for the ensuing four decades. It required a willful decision to ignore the evidence in order to expect the government of Joseph Stalin to view the Anglican Church, with its huge cathedrals, episcopal palaces and bishops sitting in the unelected House of Lords, full of nobles and aristocrats, as a progressive influence on British society. Burgmann was to publicly criticise his own Metropolitan two years later for being the opposite of progressive. 36 His assessment of the state of religion in the nations that were allied with the USSR was more

34 Burgmann, Religion in the Life of the Nation, p. 33.
35 Ernest Burgmann, 'Russia and Religion,' Sydney Morning Herald, 14 October 1941, p. 2.
36 Sydney Morning Herald, 29 June 1943, p. 4. This was Burgmann's objection to Archbishop Mowll and Archbishop Gilroy's joint statement discussed below.
useful. In this he stated that he was far less afraid of the future of religion in Russia than he was of the inadequacy of the Christian witness of the West in its dealings with Russia: "Can we be seriously regarded as a Christian people?"\textsuperscript{37}

The principal difference between the two men on the Communism versus Capitalism issue was not to be found in ideology but in practice. There is no doubt that they supported the labour movement and regarded exploitation of the weak by the strong, and any system promoting or allowing such exploitation, to be unchristian. They were both accused of being ‘soft’ on Communism at various times. In Moyes’ case, a detailed study of his writings and actions reveals such accusations to be unjustified. Burgmann’s writings reveal, for the most part, the same, but by creating the appearance of aligning himself with the USSR, he occasionally weakened the strength of his argument. One noteworthy example was his response to the joint statement on post-war reconstruction made by the Catholic archbishop, Norman Gilroy,\textsuperscript{38} and the Anglican archbishop, Howard Mowll, in June 1943. In their statement, which attracted a significant public response,\textsuperscript{39} especially from the ‘liberal’ flank of the Anglican Church, Gilroy and Mowll deprecated Fascism, Nazism and Communism as being incompatible with Christianity, and did not propose any particular vision for a more equitable social model other than a continuation of the charitable work of the churches. Moyes did not make his views public on this occasion. Burgmann’s reaction was not only strongly worded but probably an

\textsuperscript{37} Burgmann, ‘Russia and Religion,’ \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 14 October 1941, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{38} Gilroy was not elevated to the College of Cardinals until 1946, the first Australian born priest to be so honoured.

\textsuperscript{39} These included letters to the editor from Arthur Garnsey, Warden of St Paul’s College, University of Sydney, and E. J. Davidson, Rector of St James’, Sydney. Garnsey argued that the statement evinced a “purely static conception of human society.” After contending that Communism, in its regard for human beings, had “done many things which would assuredly receive the commendation of the Lord of all Christians,” he concluded by expressing regret that the two archbishops had run the risk of offending the Soviet Union by grouping it together with Nazism and Fascism, the enemies of the Allies (\textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 2 July, 1943, p. 3). Davidson objected to the section on the Social Order, which he claimed took on the “appearance of a traditional defence of the status quo, with the suggestion of charitable alleviation for those who suffer under its injustices,” (\textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 29 June 1943, p. 4).
exaggeration of the perception in the public arena: “As their statement stands there is the implication of the condemnation of the Soviet Union, and I am sure that will be resented most strongly by many loyal Christians.” There would certainly have been some Christians who, like Burgmann, were able to overlook the Marxist view and the official policy of the USSR towards religion, but it is unlikely to have been “many.” Of all the statements made in response to Gilroy and Mowll, the editorial in the Sydney Morning Herald was the most useful: “Christianity, if it is to be true to its own essence, must cease to function as a conservative religion. It must recapture its incomparable capacity for daring thinking and revolutionary action.”

In Burgmann’s Moorhouse Lectures, given in 1942, he expressed genuine but ultimately unrealistic hopes for the compatibility of Christianity and Communism in the USSR. He argued that there were substantial elements of “Christian inspiration” in the aims of the Soviet state, and that the “leaven” of Christianity, which he contended still existed, could leaven that society as a whole, something that he hoped would be the case in Australia. He was arguing from a very dubious premise in this case, given that the policy of the USSR was to facilitate the decline and eventual extinction of religion. This could not be argued with reference to Australia, despite the perceived apathy towards religion by the populace. While expressing contempt for Fascism and Nazism, Burgmann was fulsome and almost child-like in his praise of the Soviet Union:

The spirit of man is reaching out for fullness of life and is doing it in Russia with remarkable energy and ability. A warm-hearted and sympathetic appreciation and understanding, leading to comradeship and co-operation,

40 Sydney Morning Herald, 29 June 1943, p. 4.
41 Sydney Morning Herald, 3 July 1943, p. 8.
would seem to be the right and the Christian attitude to this brave and enduring people. 43

Moyes, while also recognising elements of the Christian leaven in Communist aims, 44 never went so far as to give what amounted to an endorsement of the Communist experiment in Russia. 45 Both Burgmann and Moyes placed themselves from time to time in situations that provided fuel for their more conservative opponents. Some of their actions can thus be regarded as injudicious. Burgmann, during the 1930s and 1940s, became something of an ‘easy’ target for conservative forces and was seen by some as having compromised himself through his presidency of the Australian-Russian Society. 46 Holding this position associated his name with the most prominent Anglican supporter of the USSR in Britain, the ‘Red’ Dean of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson. Conservative Anglicans viewed Johnson as a notorious embarrassment, and Burgmann’s name was linked with his during the 1951 referendum debate discussed in Chapter 3. His strident anti-Catholic position during that campaign also did nothing to quell suspicion concerning his putative Communist sympathies due to the fact that the Catholic Church was so staunchly anti-Communist.

Accusations of Communist sympathies against Moyes were quite pronounced during the same referendum debate, and later in his life, he was accused of unwisely allowing himself to be associated with the Peace Movement. These accusations culminated in 1964 when the Peace Movement was attacked by the Federal Attorney General, and later Leader of the Federal Opposition, Billy Snedden, of being a front organisation for the Communist Party and an apologist for the policies of the USSR. Moyes never supported the 1959 Congress, which was

43 Burgmann, The Regeneration of Civilization, pp. 113-114.
44 Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 279.
45 See Moyes, The Communist’s Way of Life and the Christian’s Answer, passim.
46 Sydney Morning Herald, 7 September 1951, p. 2.
exposed as having been heavily influenced by the Communist Party, and his defence of his
decision, not supported by the Anglican Church, to become a sponsor of the 1964 Australian
Congress for International Cooperation and Disarmament, reads today like a voice of common
sense amidst an uninformed fracas of name calling, to which the Government, the press and the
public contributed. 47 Moyes’ involvement in the Peace and Disarmament movement in the 1950s
and 60s could have been influenced by Sir Philip Game, whom he greatly respected. Moyes
knew Game from his tenure as Governor of New South Wales from 1930-1935. 48 He visited
Game again in England in 1958. Although Game’s estimation of Britain’s influence at the time
was somewhat disconnected from the contemporary geopolitical reality, Moyes considered his
opinion worth quoting: “If England could act unilaterally in outlawing nuclear weapons, I
believe the moral effect on the world would be tremendous. We still count in the moral
sphere.” 49 Also of interest were his impressions from the Anglican Church Congress in Toronto,
Canada, 1963. Moyes remarked on an address by Canon Warren, Secretary of the Church
Missionary Society. Moyes always maintained that God could speak through all people and all
things and it is not surprising that he noted the following in ‘My Confessions’: “We were
reminded that we owe not a little of our concern for social righteousness under God to Karl
Marx. It was a great address.” 50 Moyes applied inspiration from Abraham Lincoln in his attitude
towards Communism, arguing that one cannot kill an idea by killing men. “The only solution in

47 Sydney Morning Herald, 11 July 1964; Sydney Morning Herald, 5 September 1964 (editorial); Sydney Morning
Herald, 7 September 1964, p. 2., Sydney Morning Herald, 8 September 1964, p. 2., Sydney Morning Herald, 10
September 1964, p. 2. For a report on the conference, see Australian Congress for International Co-operation and
Disarmament, 1964, Sydney.
48 Letter from NSW Governor, Philip Game, to Moyes, 28 February, 1933, expressing concern for Moyes’ son who
had been injured in a motorcycle accident. Game opined that riding them “should be banned until one reaches the
50 Moyes, ‘My Confessions,’ p. 279.
the end is to do what Lincoln did. When asked why he was not defeating his enemies, he replied he was doing his best to defeat them by making them into his friends."

Burgmann’s views on nationalism were very similar to those of Moyes. He argued that national sovereignty was simply tribalism writ larger, and that there could be no war that would end war while national sovereignty remained unchanged. His prediction of the post-World War II geopolitical realities for the victors was also accurate. He shrewdly assessed that there was little, if anything, holding the USA and Britain together with the USSR other than the defeat of Hitler: “Everything depends on finding a motive compelling enough to replace the pressure exerted by Hitler. It will be a supreme test of statesmanship.” The tribalism to which he had referred, not only when manifested as nationalism, but also as adherence to political systems, did indeed prove to be a supreme test of statesmanship. However, as was often the case with Burgmann, his brush became excessively broad when asserting that: “The forces of nationalism will not lead to unity, neither will the forces of capitalism. Neither even profess it as an aim or purpose. Both have war latent in their very nature.” One can travel with Burgmann as far as strident nationalism is concerned, but the accusation of war being latent in the nature of Capitalism is impossible to defend and lurches dangerously towards Marxist ideology and Communist propaganda. The case of Switzerland is the obvious example, but the Scandinavian countries, even though their social democratic edition of Capitalism has had a human face since the 1930s, have exhibited a steadfast will to pursue peaceful solutions in international affairs.

52 Burgmann, The Regeneration of Civilization, p. 28.
54 Burgmann, The Regeneration of Civilization, p. 33.
Whereas both Moyes and Burgmann longed for a society in which all its sections were pervaded by what they saw as the Christian ethic, Burgmann went a little further than Moyes in his desire to see Christianity yoked together with the working class:

The hope of a greater and better society seems to me to depend upon a genuine alliance between the Christian religion and the leadership of the workers of the world ... The Christian faith demands a universal comradeship. The working class movement at its best demands the same. No other political movement holds out as much promise and the trend of history seems to be towards unity.  

This was historically and ideologically naive on Burgmann’s part. Any alliance with pretensions to providing solutions for a divided society has to win the support of at least a majority of society itself, not just one class or section of it. The universal comradeship sought by Burgmann demanded balance. This has proved to be a task beyond the capacity of Christianity to meet. Too close an alliance with any particular group has not led to unity but factionalism. The goal of convincing the community that by assisting the weak and restraining the strong all members of society will benefit has proved elusive, not only for the churches but also in the political arena. The strong are usually sure of what they stand to lose and the weak are often unsure of what they stand to gain.

Burgmann’s vision of a social democratic regeneration of civilisation in terms of measures to be taken was quite similar to that of Moyes’ ideas on education, unemployment insurance and healthcare:

If we are thus given a reasonable sense of security there will be no need for an unholy scramble for the accumulation of large stocks of private wealth. The
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wealth of the community will be our security and our service in the community our real form of insurance. 56

He recommended regular medical examinations from before the birth of each child. These examinations, medical, dental and optical, would continue throughout the life of every person in order to change the health care strategy from one of attempting to cure illness to one of prevention. His admonition that: “Education should begin at birth and never end,” 57 was aligned with Moyes’ vision. William Temple’s ideas on adult education, for which N. F. S. Grundtvig’s system of folkehojskoler in Denmark had been the inspiration, 58 was not lost on either of them.

Although both Burgmann and Moyes advocated dialogue between the Christian churches, Burgmann appeared to go furthest nominating Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism and others to be regarded “somewhat as denominations within or fragments of the Church.” 59 He stressed that this did not make them of equal value, adding that it said nothing about the value of any of them. It did however imply that “there are points of contact and affinity that should be sympathetically explored with a view to possible understanding and co-operation.” 60 He also hinted, like Moyes, that Christianity was not the exclusive guardian of the truth. In a statement lacking internal consistency he suggested that if Christendom had within its keeping “some of the fullest and deepest insights that have come to man then from within Christendom must come the most fruitful leadership in the days ahead.” 61 If Christendom only had some of the fullest and deepest insights that have come to man then from within Christendom must come the most fruitful leadership in the days ahead.”

insights that have come to man within its keeping one could be forgiven for asking why it should assume leadership in a proposed interreligious dialogue.

Burgmann’s understanding and awareness of the God phenomenon was however universal and impressive in its insight. In four lectures given to the Melbourne University Christian Union Conference in 1930, he was at his most eloquent:

So also we look for God in unexpected places and find Him. Our personality grows as we realise our unity with the world of men and things in which we live....We can grow towards feeling one with all creation and this will enhance our reverence for all living things. But our greatest kinship will be found with our fellow human beings. This we will carry in our souls till they become one with us in love.62

In broad agreement with Moyes, he saw the Christian conception of personality making every individual potentially a person of infinite worth,63 and that the task of every nation should be to nurture the growth of its citizens. “It is a garden for growing men and women.”64

Burgmann was also on the same track as Moyes when he argued for the removal of national and cultural boundaries: “We can no longer be content to regard our own kith and kin as alone having claims upon us.” In an exposition of the Social Gospel ideal of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, he urged the Church to encourage its members to more readily perceive the common humanity of all rather than to focus on national, racial and religious differences. On the question of “Where then will man find an ideal big enough and impelling enough to make him translate into action these far reaching universal principles,”65 he conceded

63 Burgmann, Religion in the Life of the Nation, p. 23.
64 Burgmann, Religion in the Life of the Nation, p. 16.
65 Burgmann, Religion in the Life of the Nation, p. 38.
led him to make some leaps of faith concerning the credibility of reports pertaining to the status of religion in the USSR. Moyes, although never as enthusiastic about the USSR as Burgmann, eventually accepted the inevitable and organised the contribution to the war effort in his own diocese.  

In summary; Burgmann and Moyes exhibited the same inherent problems in their attempts to apply their vision. They were both vocal opponents of war during the 1930s, and as long as war was taking place in other parts of the world they could maintain what they considered to be a Christian opposition. It has been shown that Moyes was still castigating the Government for allocating extra funding to the military in November 1939 instead of utilizing such expenditure on housing and slum clearance. However, when the threat of war approached the shores of Australia, Moyes struggled to make sense of the position he had espoused and retreated into a passive, or ‘negative,’ acceptance of the grim reality. After the war, and for the remainder of his life, Moyes campaigned for peace and the abolition of armed conflict, as evidenced by his leadership in the struggle to stop Australia’s military involvement in the Vietnam War and his involvement in the Peace Movement. Burgmann, due to his ideological leanings, was able to turn his previous rejection of war into a more ‘positive’ acceptance of events after the tragic absurdities of World War II dragged the USSR into the centre of the conflict on the side of Britain and the USA. Both positions were untenable in the sense that the two men had, despite all attempts at rationalisation on the part of themselves and others, abandoned their passionate and, at times, moving pre-war statements on the need to break down national barriers and the building of what they saw as a Christian international order. It must be underlined however that no-one would envy them the situation in which they found themselves. Superficial analyses of the moral dilemma presented by World War II for those trapped directly
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72 Paul Lamb, *The Conscience of the Church*, pp. 82-93.
in its path, as opposed to those following it from a distance, have tended to portray the situation as one of a choice between right and wrong. The reality for civilians in occupied Europe and Asia was far more complex in that choices often had to be made between one's family, and one's nation. Those who found themselves compelled to decide in such a situation often discovered that the choices available were between wrong and wrong. Church leaders had to attempt to reconcile the Jesus paradigm with a struggle for national survival. This proved to be an impossible task for the vast majority. Burgmann decided that once the USSR was involved, the allied cause was the 'right' and 'just' one and he gave it his wholehearted support. Moyes remained convinced that war could never be regarded as 'right' and retreated into a state of reluctant acceptance.

Moyes and Burgmann's attempts to steer the Australian community to what they saw as a Christian blueprint for a more humane, just and equitable social order can only be admired. In 1950 and 1951 they both campaigned vigorously against the Australian Government's attempt to alter the nation's constitution in a manner that would have created a dangerous precedent for the future of political democracy. In this case Moyes' argument was free of sectarianism, more consistent with the Social Gospel position and more constructive than that of Burgmann. On their work in general, it remains debatable as to whether their influence on the development of the social order would have been greater if they had openly aligned themselves with Australian Labor Party, which was where their sympathies lay. William Temple, who had provided so much inspiration to social gospellers in Britain and its former colonies, had advised against allowing the Church to be politically aligned, even to a particular policy. One of Temple's
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recent biographers, John Kent, has argued that this was, in the long run, "self-contradictory because the impact of Temple's social ideas fell left of centre." This can also be applied to Moyes and Burgmann but it does not necessarily follow that an open alignment would have had a positive effect. It could have led to greater factionalism within the Anglican Church and objections from the conservative side of politics, thereby pushing the social gospellers further towards the periphery of influence.

5.4. William Temple, George Bell and Dietrich Bonhoeffer

After Moyes' death the incumbent Anglican Primate of Australia, Frank Woods, compared him to William Temple. As far as their vision for a Christian social order and support for the ecumenical movement was concerned, the comparison was valid. Moyes had clearly been inspired by Temple's Malvern Conference and most of the points listed in Temple's recommendations for a Christian social order were shared by Moyes. These included the right of every citizen to be free from the threat of unemployment and to be secure in income as would enable him or her to maintain a home and raise children, all of whom should be guaranteed an education until maturity. Such an education should be designed to allow for the peculiar abilities of each individual and be inspired by faith in God. All workers should be given a voice in the conduct of the industry to which his or her labour contributed. Moyes' views on the Christian response to violence, and in particular the challenge presented by World War II, were however
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more in line with those of the Bishop of Chichester, George Bell.\textsuperscript{78} Also an indefatigable advocate for Christian unity, perhaps even more so then Temple, Bell distanced himself from the Anglican episcopal bench in England by publicly opposing civilian bombing. During the war Bell attempted to convince the British Government to provide greater levels of support to the German resistance movement.\textsuperscript{79} In this he had been inspired by the example of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, whom he had admired since meeting him while Bonhoeffer was working as a Lutheran priest for the German community at Forest Hill, London, from 1933-1935.

The experience of the churches in attempting to deal with a regime such as Nazi Germany had led Bonhoeffer to the point where he urged the churches to donate all of their property to those in need, since their only mission was to exist for the sake of others. The clergy should live solely on the offerings of their congregations, or perhaps function as a lay priesthood, working in secular employment. “The Church must share in the secular problems of ordinary human life, not dominating, but helping and serving. It must tell men of every calling what it means to live in Christ, to exist for others.”\textsuperscript{80} His concept of ‘religionless’ Christianity was an attempt to forge a path for the churches to reconnect with a secular world. Although the influence of Karl Barth on Bonhoeffer was substantial in that they both believed that religion had misused God’s transcendence and made ‘him’ remote and abstract, Moyes’ desire to bring religion back into the secular world, at the centre of life, was very similar to that of Bonhoeffer.

Bonhoeffer was very forthright before World War II in his advocacy of pacifism, going so far as to write that the only way for evil to be overcome was to “let it run itself to a standstill


because it does not find the resistance it is looking for.” 81 Resistance was regarded as futile, only adding fuel to the flames, but by refusing to reply in kind the Christian compels violence to confront itself. “It stands condemned by its failure to evoke counter-violence.”82 This did not imply that one condoned evil but that suffering, willingly endured, was more powerful.

Bonhoeffer intimated in his last writings that his earlier work, The Cost of Discipleship, came at the end of a path on which he thought that he could “acquire faith by trying to lead a holy life.”83 By 1944, having been a member of a resistance group seeking to remove Adolf Hitler, he could see the dangers in The Cost of Discipleship but he underlined that he stood by what he wrote.84 Although he is not recorded as having committed acts of violence himself, his active membership of the group that attempted to assassinate Adolf Hitler is well known. He had stated in 1940 that Hitler was the Anti-Christ and that he had to be eliminated.85 His written position could not be harmonised with that of his chosen course of action, but he made the choice in full knowledge of its inconsistency. The pre-war pacifism of The Cost of Discipleship had become untenable in his mind when assaulted by Hitler’s challenge.

There was never any doubt that Moyes also found the war a far less noble episode than many as can be gleaned from his abhorrence of area bombing of civilians and the use of atomic weapons: “Even men of integrity defended night bombing which meant the death of women and children, and the atom bomb upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki – because, as was believed, such action would end the war quickly and save more lives than they destroyed.”86 One of the men of integrity to which Moyes was referring was probably William Temple who had been the great

82 Bonhoeffer, The Cost of Discipleship, p. 91.
84 Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers from Prison, p. 193.
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inspiration to so many Anglicans during the interwar period. Temple had never supported any variant of pacifism. Prior to World War I he had argued that Christians should not refuse to fight in defence of the state regardless of whether the state was Christian or not, and that if they did so, they may be alienating themselves from far greater issues that demanded human sacrifice because there existed no alternative. It was evidently not the role of Christianity to provide such an alternative. This was a troubling vision from one who was to become the world’s most high ranking Anglican and who never gave any indication that he had altered his opinion on this issue.

The only prominent Anglican cleric in Britain to publicly denounce the indiscriminate bombing of civilians was the Bishop of Chichester, George Bell, in a speech made in the House of Lords. But despite his eloquence and admirable courage, he was, like Moyes, unable to construct a coherent position with regard to World War II. Both rejected war but also rejected pacifism and non-violent resistance. Bell, Moyes and others were trapped by a conflict between war, which they felt to be fundamentally wrong, and what they understood to be the inadequacy of the Christian faith to deal with it. It is unlikely that their untenable position was created by a fear of being labeled as traitors, since in Bell’s case his stance had already attracted such
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epithets, and Moyes' erstwhile attacks on high finance and government policy had precipitated
the branding of him as a Communist.\footnote{Moyes, 'My Confessions,' p. 104.}

Moyes and Bell were also believers in the view that one
could not rid the world of evil by using evil means, but when faced with the greatest challenge to
their faith, they wavered. They rejected a pacifism of non-resistance and could not see that their
own Lord and Master had demonstrated that non-violence is not synonymous with non-
resistance. In this model, evil had to be resisted, but if it was resisted by evil means it would
never be defeated. Bell had stated clearly in 1939 that: "War is destructive, and war not only
wastes life and wastes material resources, but poisons human relationships."\footnote{Chichester Diocesan Gazette, May 1939, cited in Jasper, George Bell: Bishop of Chichester, p. 283.}

What he and Moyes knew, but did not act upon, was that even a 'just war' is all of the above. Bell, like
Moyes, was forced into a dilemma that "did not make for logic and consistency."\footnote{Jasper, George Bell: Bishop of Chichester, p. 283.}

Like Moyes, George Bell outlived William Temple and was faced with a new set of
moral choices for the last decade of his life. Western fear of Soviet Communism and the Cold
War had become the great issue in world affairs. He continued in the House of Lords to preach
the message of peace and greater activism from the churches, appealing to the ‘two great supra-
national agencies – the Vatican and the World Council of Churches’\footnote{George Bell, 'The Church in relation to International Affairs,' in Jasper, George Bell: Bishop of Chichester, p. 339.}

Bell contributed to a
book quite similar to that written by Moyes at approximately the same time in which a Christian
answer to Communism was proposed.\footnote{D. M. MacKinnon, ed., Christian faith and communist faith: A series of studies by members of the Anglican Communion, London: Macmillan, 1953.} Bell stressed on many occasions that Communism was a
religion and that it must be apprehended as such. He and many others were shown by hindsight
in 1989 to have overstated and generalised the "fanatically held"\textsuperscript{95} allegiance to Communism of the peoples of Eastern Europe, mistakenly attributing to them the same fervor as that of the ruling elite.\textsuperscript{96} Bell was however probably the closest of the English Anglican bishops to Moyes in content and style. On the issue of the Christian response to violence they were both morally and theologically immobilised by the reality of World War II.

In summary, John Moyes was greatly influenced by William Temple, as were many Anglicans of his generation. There was very little difference in their application of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the role of the Church in the community in peace time. Temple wholeheartedly supported the British war effort, including the bombing of civilians. He did not appear to agonise over the Christian response to violence as did Moyes. George Bell did indeed agonise over this issue, and courageously raised problems of grave moral concern, but like Moyes, he could provide no coherent Christian solution. Dietrich Bonhoeffer wrote passionately in favour of Christian pacifism before World War II, but eventually came to believe that violent action was necessary to overcome a greater evil. He gave his life in that pursuit.

5.5. Reinhold Niebuhr

Thus wisdom about our destiny is dependent upon a humble recognition of the limits of our knowledge and our power. Our most reliable understanding is the fruit of 'grace' in which faith completes our ignorance without pretending to possess its certainties as knowledge; and in which contrition mitigates our pride without destroying our hope.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{95} Jasper, \textit{George Bell: Bishop of Chichester}, p. 339.

\textsuperscript{96} Jasper, \textit{George Bell: Bishop of Chichester}, p. 339.

This often cited excerpt from *The Nature and Destiny of Man* contains both the strengths and weaknesses of Niebuhr's contribution. His analytical ability was breathtaking at times, but it shall be argued here that despite his argument in the above, he did indeed destroy hope as far as a specifically Christian vision for society was concerned.

The Social Gospel ideal survived reasonably intact the horror of World War I since its advocates could point to the massive arms race and the magnitude of the territorial greed on the part of the European powers that had preceded the conflict. It was held that the behaviour of the great powers had been so explicitly selfish that if they could learn from their ways and abandon dreams of national aggrandisement, turning their attention to the disadvantaged within their midst instead of planning for war, they could live in peace and harmony with each other. When the attempts of Britain and France to defuse the threat of Nazism through negotiation and other peaceful means collapsed in 1939, it appeared as though Niebuhr's critique of the Social Gospel, made during the 1930s, had been proved correct. Niebuhr attacked the idea that human morality could be corrected through social justice, superior education, improved working conditions and greater opportunities for the disadvantaged. He derided as naive the belief so passionately argued by Walter Rauschenbusch, the great proponent of the Social Gospel in Niebuhr's own country, the USA, that 'better' social conditions would produce 'better' people.

Niebuhr was one of the most intellectually cogent, and probably the most influential, critic of the Social Gospel during Moyes' lifetime to make his voice known to the theologically uninitiated. For those who study and work within the walls of theological academia Karl Barth is known as the scholar who first established a compelling case against the school of liberalism that
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had dominated Protestant theology during the latter part of the nineteenth century and until circa World War I. The work of Schleiermacher and later, Ritschl and Harnack, had been central to its development. Reading and understanding Barth’s imposing literary corpus, was, and remains, an intellectually taxing exercise for which most lay people have neither the time nor the expertise. Niebuhr, on the other hand, although his work also demands considerable study, was a frequent public debater, not only in the print media, but also on radio, and later on television, in the world’s most powerful nation during the 1940s and 1950s. His work, and the movement that he is credited with having led, Christian Realism, was a major force opposing the Social Gospel and other forms of Christian liberalism.

Niebuhr has always been open to charges of pragmatism given that he began his career under the influence of ‘liberal’ Protestantism, particularly that of Harnack, and by 1930 was a socialist, forming a favourable impression of Russia after visiting that country with a delegation of Christian ministers in 1930. He accepted the nomination of the Socialist Party for the state Senate from the Nineteenth District of Detroit in the same year and helped form the Fellowship of Socialist Christians in 1931. Perhaps more than any major theologian of the twentieth

99 See Barth’s three decade long, thirteen volume, magnum opus: Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1936-1969, and the work that established Barth as one of the twentieth century’s most influential theologians, Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
century, Niebuhr's thought is intrinsically intertwined with his own time. Richard Wightman Fox, assessed him thus:

While a Tillich, a Barth, or a Richard Niebuhr tried to lift himself out of the passing flux of history to mount sustained theological inquiries, he immersed himself in it...One wonders if he could have achieved such high distinction at any other historic juncture.

One can of course argue that the same could be said of the social gospellers since their position can be attributed to the poverty and despair that they saw as a product of industrial capitalism. Niebuhr's dramatic change of direction, however, from quasi social gospel liberal in the 1920s to realist and supporter of American Cold War foreign policy in the 1940s and 1950s, is evidence of the fact that current events influenced his moral and theological stances more than most of his contemporaries.

By the middle 1930s, his ideas were developing in a different direction. In his influential work, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, Niebuhr stressed the problems associated with the collective implementation of personal morality. He argued that as individuals, human beings can act with due concern for others, but that this concern is rarely practiced by societies or social groups:

In every human group there is less reason to guide and to check impulse, less capacity for self-transcendence, less ability to comprehend the needs of others.
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and therefore more unrestrained egoism than the individuals who compose the group, reveal in their personal relationships.  

Niebuhr directed his attack towards both Christian and secular liberals who imagine that:

the egoism of individuals is being progressively checked by the development of rationality or the growth of a religiously inspired goodwill and that nothing but the continuance of this process is necessary to establish social harmony between all the human societies and collectives.  

These moralists, Niebuhr argued, were unaware of the fact that when collective power, whether state control or class domination, exploited weakness, it never surrendered that power unless force was used against it. Given that he was writing in the middle 1930s, he was compelled to address the contemporaneous protest movement in India led by Mohandas Gandhi. Niebuhr admired the non-violent resistance being pursued by Gandhi at the time, although he considered Gandhi to be confused about the nature of his own resistance movement. Niebuhr contended that although Gandhi’s movement was non-violent, it was a type of coercion, one that “offers the largest opportunities for a harmonious relationship with the moral and rational factors in social life.” In Niebuhr’s mind, non-violent action was still physical coercion, whereas deputations and petitions were not. This was a problematic position for Niebuhr to adopt since a clear dividing line between what constitutes physical coercion and non-physical coercion is elusive as soon as one contends that non-violent action can be classified as physical coercion. 

---

On home soil he rejected the view that equal rights for black Americans would be achieved through moral persuasion, arguing that white Americans would never grant such rights until they were “forced to do so.” In the case of black Americans, a well organized and durable campaign of non-violent resistance led the way from the 1950s onwards. Acts of violence were, however, committed by both sides, especially after the death of the campaign’s leader, Martin Luther King Jr, in April 1968. It is naturally very difficult to ascertain the effects, positive or negative, of acts of violence on the progress of the campaign for racial equality, but it would appear that the sheer force of the non-racist argument combined with the promulgating and implementation of legislation eventually exposed the moral bankruptcy of the segregation case in the minds of the majority of citizens. Niebuhr’s argument that social change, involving the surrendering of privileges by some sections of the community, requires coercion, whether non-violent or violent, has therefore proved to be something of a non-argument in that it depends on a satisfactory definition of coercion, which Niebuhr was unable to make in this context. The gradual transformation of attitudes towards women’s rights and homosexual rights is a workable example. In both cases, the change in attitude has been due to a combination of legislation and largely secular moral persuasion. In the case of homosexual rights, the positions taken by the churches have included total opposition, tardy and grudging acceptance of a fait accompli, creative hermeneutical gymnastics concerning offending verses of scripture, and a few cases of unqualified support.

When attempting to explain the religious nature of non-violent resistance, Niebuhr argued that it was the area in which religious imagination could make its largest contribution. In this context he contended that:

These attitudes of repentance, which recognize that the evil in the foe is also in the self, and these impulses of love, which claim kinship with all men in spite of social conflict, are the peculiar gifts of religion to the human spirit. Secular imagination is not capable of producing them; for they require a sublime madness which disregards immediate appearances and emphasises profound and ultimate unities.

He then cites Gandhi’s religiosity as being proof of the above before adding a highly curious caveat that: “The occident may be incapable of this kind of non-violent social conflict, because the white man is a fiercer beast of prey than the oriental.” If one overlooks the spurious comparison of oriental and occidental aggression levels and takes issue with the negative assessment of secular imagination, one can only conclude that the progress of social change during the second half of the twentieth century proved Niebuhr to be wrong. The above mentioned issues of women’s and homosexual rights, although ongoing, have been achieved in the occidental world with relatively little violence and without meaningful religious input. They have been, in fact, achieved despite the obstructions attempted by many church groups. Of the two largest religious institutions in Australia, the Catholic Church, in the early twenty-first century, still bans women from its priesthood and officially regards homosexuality as a sin, despite lurching from one calamity to the other due to issues of sexuality. While the public perception of sexual impropriety amongst Catholic priests is probably exaggerated, the fact that
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some priests have been charged and found guilty of sexual molestation of children has provided
a scandal-fixated media with devastating material as far as the reputation of the Church is
concerned. The issue of women in the priesthood is still divisive in some sections of the
Anglican Church, and the entire Anglican Communion has been perilously close at the beginning
of the third millennium to renting itself asunder over the issue of homosexuality. In what is a sad
assessment to have to make, the churches are seen by many Australians as either irrelevant or
obstructionist in the development of a tolerant and harmonious community.

Niebuhr, apart from his early flirtation with liberalism and pacifism after World War I,
did not rule out the use of violence if he considered it necessary to remove an injustice. He
argued that social change, which inevitably involves the surrendering of privileges by the
privileged, is not necessarily the result of a developing morality on the part of the privileged, but
the result of a skilful government successfully managing its coercive taxation policies. He
refused to accept that any group, racial, national or economic, could ever progress to the point
where it possessed sufficient reason and sympathy to permit it to accept and understand the
interests of others as fully as its own, or to develop a level of moral goodwill that would allow it
to support the rights of others as vigorously as its own.117 This was, for Niebuhr, “beyond the
capacities of human societies.”118 Based upon this dark assessment of humanity, Niebuhr
suggested that any political methods employed in the struggle for an “ethical social goal for
society”119 must take into account “the limitations of human nature, particularly those which
manifest themselves in man’s collective behaviour.”120
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Niebuhr concluded his discussion of non-violent resistance by arguing that the tragedy of history is that those who have led humanity in the direction of spiritual enlightenment have divorced themselves or misunderstood the problems of collective man, “where the brutal elements are most obvious.” It is notable that in this work, Niebuhr, a Christian theologian and pastor, paid such scant attention to the example set by the founder of his own religion. He drew upon St Augustine’s argument that the peace of the world must be gained by strife. Niebuhr’s assessment of collective human nature is thus fundamentally pessimistic, arguing that coercion, preferably non-violent, but violent when necessary, will always be required to achieve social cohesion, harmony and justice. Stanley Hauerwas took issue with Niebuhr on this critical point, arguing that Niebuhr was mistaken in believing that the tragedy of humanity was the realisation that the limited good human beings could hope to achieve “can only be accomplished ultimately through force and coercion.” In Hauerwas’ view, this was order, not peace. The tragedy of mankind resided rather in the fact that the peace to which Christians witness could make the world more dangerous, “since we do not give up our violent illusions without a struggle.” Niebuhr’s peace, which could only be achieved by the maintenance of a ‘balance of power’ within the community, wherein the corruption, deception and violence of individuals and groups was held in check by threats of greater violence, was in fact not peace at all. It was the imposition of order. Hauerwas was again penetrating in his assessment:

We are peaceable so long as no one challenges our turf. So violence becomes needlessly woven into our lives; it becomes the warp on which the fabric of our
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existence is threaded. The order of our lives is built on our potential for violence.\textsuperscript{125}

The realisation of the above does not cultivate the earth for a Christian peace of immediately perfect harmony, but of a work in progress. A Niebuhrian peace, wherein the corruption and sin of humanity are controlled by the methods that characterise and define its sin, was more akin to a declaration of moral impotence.

In his \textit{An Interpretation of Christian Ethics}, Niebuhr again identified the lack of understanding in modern culture (the 1920s and 1930s) of the tendency for evil impulses in men to be “compounded in collective actions until they reach diabolical proportions.”\textsuperscript{126} However, he refused to accept that his own religion could ameliorate this situation by initiating the Kingdom of God on earth, as argued by the social gospellers. He rejected as sentimental piety Rauschenbusch’s argument that the moral vision of the New Testament was a “simple possibility.”\textsuperscript{127} Niebuhr’s claim that modern culture, in both its Christian and secular forms was guilty of false optimism, assuming that “all the forces which determine each moral and social situation were fully understood, and that the forces of reason had successfully chained all demonic powers,”\textsuperscript{128} was both unfounded and ultimately unproductive. One can indeed be forgiven for wondering what Niebuhr saw as the contribution his religion could make. He addressed the issue of the Kingdom of God in connection with the Old Testament prophetic texts so often cited by the social gospellers, in this case, Deutero-Isaiah, arguing that the moral ideal of love and vicarious suffering achieved such a purity that it could never be realised in history.

Conceding that Christianity was a prophetic religion, he argued that its heights of pure love

\textsuperscript{125} Stanley Hauerwas, \textit{The Peaceable Kingdom}, p. 144.
\textsuperscript{128} Reinhold Niebuhr, \textit{An Interpretation of Christian Ethics}, p. 10.
would always be beyond human achievement: “Men living in nature will never be capable of the sublimation of egoism and the attainment of the sacrificial passion, the complete disinterestedness which the ethics of Jesus demands.” He cited the social justice of Amos as representing a possible ideal for society but that Jesus’ conception of pure love transcended the possible and the historical. In this bleak and mediocre vision for the future the human race had no choice but to stumble from one calamity to the next, meeting violence with more efficient violence, hoping and praying that personal salvation would secure its individual members letters of transit to an ill-defined eternity in which the inequities of this life would be redressed.

On the subject of the economic order, the message was the same. The ethic of Jesus was silent, according to Niebuhr, on what he regarded as the most pressing moral problem of every human life, that being the issue of establishing an armistice between the contending factions and forces. He argued that Jesus said nothing about the “relativities of politics and economics, nor of the necessary balances of power which exist and must exist in even the most intimate social relationships.” For Niebuhr, Jesus’ attitude towards wealth was not founded upon social, economic or moral considerations, but on the conviction that wealth was a source of distraction. He argued that the key to Jesus’ attitude on wealth could be summarised in the following verse from The Gospel According to Matthew: “Where your treasure is there will your heart be also.” The Sermon on the Mount was thus not to be interpreted as a gospel for the removal of oppression and inequity in this life.
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Niebuhr also approached the issue of the Christian response to violence in this work, contending that the ethic of Jesus was impossible for human beings in their immediate situations: "Nowhere is the ethic of Jesus in more obvious conflict with both the impulses and the necessities of ordinary men in typical social situations."\(^{134}\) The injunctions of Jesus to love our enemies, to turn the other cheek and to do good to those who hate us were dismissed as being of purely religious significance, having no social or moral relevance. These interpretations of Niebuhr were in diametric opposition to everything the Social Gospel proclaimed. Are Christians not to follow the example of Christ? Is it not precisely because the ethic of Jesus is in more obvious conflict with both the impulses and the necessities of ordinary men that such an ethic is necessary? Is humanity really nothing more than a rabble of helpless wretches unable to improve themselves even with God's help? Does God not long for it to cooperate with him in order to build his kingdom on earth?

While Niebuhr possessed prodigious analytical ability he left a barren path ahead for Christianity in the modern age. By arguing in Barthian terms that some aspects of Jesus' teaching are not applicable to contemporary society or any conceivable society, and that such fundamental teachings as those listed above are "oriented by only one vertical religious reference, to the will of God,"\(^{135}\) regardless of whether they are applicable or not, he left an insurmountable obstacle in the path of those who had hoped that the example of the life and death of Jesus Christ could raise human beings above their sordid shortcomings and fulfill the Lord's Prayer, that God's will would be done on earth as it is in heaven. It was inconceivable for the social gospellers that it was God's will for the poor to remain poor and the oppressed to remain oppressed.\(^{136}\) In their view, if Christians take the words attributed to Jesus seriously, through which he taught; "...Just

\(^{134}\) Reinhold Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, p. 28.


\(^{136}\) For an exegetical discussion of this subject, see Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation*, pp. 253-268.
as you did not do it to one of the least of these, you did not do it to me,"¹³⁷ then the conditions of the poor and other disadvantaged members of the community must be regarded as an offense against God.

Niebuhr conceded that the first Christians attempted to live communally and to emulate Jesus, but argued that this was possible for them because of the expected parousia. In this interpretation, which was by no means unique to Niebuhr, planning social and economic structures for the future was not necessary since there was not going to be a future as they knew it. They expected Jesus to return sooner rather than later. When this did not occur, Niebuhr argued that the Church was "forced to come to terms with the relativities of politics and economics and the immediate necessities of life."¹³⁸ It then embarked upon two millennia of compromises with the secular world which, in Niebuhr's view, "frequently imperiled the very genius of prophetic religion."¹³⁹ Niebuhr’s analysis was, as usual, perceptive but lacked any credible vision for the future. He had already pronounced the ethic of Jesus as being inapplicable to modern life in many cases and only practised by the first Christians because of the unique situation in which they found themselves. He also lamented the compromises made with the world at large by the Church throughout its long history. It was difficult to discern a hopeful future for Christianity in such an assessment.

Although John Moyes advocated a social gospel position on most issues he was an admirer of Niebuhr and echoed his views on the pivotal issue of forgiveness. Niebuhr articulated this theology of forgiveness in the following:

¹³⁸ Reinhold Niebuhr, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics, p. 36.
¹³⁹ Reinhold Niebuhr, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics, p. 36.
Forgiving love is a possibility only for those who know that they are not good, who feel themselves in need of divine mercy, who live in a dimension deeper and higher than that of moral idealism, feel themselves as well as their fellow men convicted of sin by a holy God and know that the differences between the good man and the bad man are insignificant in his sight.¹⁴⁰

This was the view expressed by Moyes in the case studies presented in chapters 3 and 4. Both Niebuhr and Moyes, quite naturally, held that such a level of humility and self awareness was only possible through the pursuit of a Christian or at least, a religious, life. The evidence for its very essence being correct in terms of the religious aspect or the historical success of its implementation is not particularly compelling, but it does not have to be. Until human beings, both individually and collectively, concede that they are at fault, genuine forgiveness, from their Gods or their neighbours, will always be elusive.

When discussing forgiveness in connection with war Niebuhr’s analysis was characteristically incisive. He identified the glaring anomaly present in the arguments propounded by secularists, that the elimination of religion would eliminate war. This would never occur, according to Niebuhr, since all wars were religious wars, regardless of whether the historic creeds were present or not: “Men do not fight for causes until they are ‘religiously’ devoted to them.”¹⁴¹ The evidence of such barbarous bellicosity in the twentieth century certainly militates in favour of Niebuhr’s argument. He concluded his discussion of this topic by contending that nothing other than knowledge of the true God could rescue human beings from the delusion of assuming the role of God themselves, “and the cruelty of seeing their fellow men

¹⁴⁰ Reinhold Niebuhr, _An Interpretation of Christian Ethics_, p. 139.
¹⁴¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, _An Interpretation of Christian Ethics_, p. 144.
as devils because they are involved in the same pretension.”142 Once more, it was disappointing that a man of such prodigious ability as Niebuhr did not broach the subject of how this was going to happen.

In *Christian Realism and Political Problems*, Niebuhr was writing in 1953 when the threat of nuclear war was very real. He reiterated several themes from his pre-World War II works, namely what he viewed as the dubious presuppositions currently held concerning the perfectibility of humanity and the idea of progress. He argued that both in Christian and secular scientific circles humanity was being examined on the premise that it was one of many objects in nature, and that if the tools of science were sufficiently precise and the scientist sufficiently objective, human beings could be comprehended fully through the scientific method.143 He took aim at the Enlightenment view that if humanity would cease its irrelevant other-worldly hopes and focus its attention on perfecting itself and human society, progress would be inevitable. The world had indeed not ‘progressed’ as the eighteenth century had hoped it would and Niebuhr defined this contradiction between past hopes and present realities as the fact that “the heaven on earth of modern man turned out to be more incredible than the old heaven; and much more dangerous.”144

One can travel a substantial part of the way with Niebuhr in the above. The scale of the internecine barbarity perpetrated by human beings in the first half of the twentieth century must have dented the confidence of even the most optimistic of the social gospellers. It needs to be underlined, however, that by most methods of measuring the state of the ‘heaven on earth of modern man’ to which Niebuhr referred, his argument has been weakened by the course of events in the Western world since the book was published in 1953. The majority of people in the

144 Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christian Realism and Political Problems*, p. 5.
West now live longer than ever before, they have more food and more salubrious housing than ever before, they have considerable political and religious freedom, and their educational opportunities are greater than at any time in the past. On top of this, despite their readiness to employ violence in other parts of the world, the Western nations have, for the most part, managed to cease warring with each other. As far as humanity in general is concerned, there remains ample evidence for dismissing the attempts at 'perfecting' human beings and creating a secular or religious 'heaven on earth,' so frequently derided by Niebuhr, but in the Western world there is evidence for arguing that 'progress' has been made.

Niebuhr identified four critical issues underlining the relationship between the Church and politics. 1. All social evils and injustices, whether under feudalism or capitalism, have been sanctified in some way or other by religious sentiment. 2. The ideal of a neutral church in political issues is an impossibility. The neutral church is usually an ally of the establishment. 3. A section of the Church has been guilty of a useless sentimentality when attempting to deal with political complexities, arguing that problems would cease if only people would love each other. 4. Another section of the Church has been prepared to propose elaborate blueprints for social justice, without, according to Niebuhr, comprehending that all laws can be instruments of sin.\textsuperscript{145}

Niebuhr destroyed however every option open to the Church without offering a solution of his own that could in any way be described as 'Christian.' As always, it is difficult to ascertain what, if anything, he was suggesting. His attempt to do so was no less naive than his own point 3, in which he ridiculed the sentimentality of the 'love each other' approach. Arguing in 1953 that mankind had "made a shipwreck of our common life through the new powers and freedom which a technical civilisation has placed at our disposal,"\textsuperscript{146} he was himself guilty of a sentimental

\textsuperscript{146} Reinhold Niebuhr,\textit{ Christian Realism and Political Problems}, p. 111.
nostalgia for a “common life” in the mist of temps perdu. It is unclear as to which ‘common life’ Niebuhr was referring. In his own country the pre-technical civilisation that he extolled had produced the iniquity of slavery and the bloodletting of the Civil War, the ruthless dispossession and slaughter of the native Indians and the brazenly territorial war against Mexico, to name but three examples. His remedy for modern humanity was no less naive and unrealistic than the remedies his considerable analytical ability had exposed. In simplistic tones reminiscent of the evangelists to whom his disapproving eye had been cast, he averred that mankind’s escape from the angst of the nuclear age was faith:

Faith in the God revealed in One [sic] who died and rose again that death can become the basis of new life, that meaninglessness turns into meaning, that judgement is experienced as grace. Our business is so to mediate the divine judgement and grace that nations, classes, states and cultures, as well as individuals, may discern the divine author of their wounds, that they may know the possibility of a new and whole life...147

How Niebuhr expected this to be regarded as ‘realism’ by the USA’s nuclear opponents in the Kremlin at the time of writing was not explained.

Despite his inability to provide a solution that was coherent and consistent with the premise of his case, Niebuhr’s analytical ability was sharp. He attacked the Church’s tardiness in dealing with racial prejudice and its general complacency, concluding that contemporary religion must have seemed to the cynical observer, and to God, nothing more than “a vast effort to lobby

---

147 Reinhold Niebuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems, p. 112.
in the courts of the Almighty to gain a special advantage for our cause in the divine adjudication.”

As mentioned earlier, part of the reason for Niebuhr’s high public profile was due to the fact that he effectively utilised the mass media. In an interview with a young Mike Wallace on ABC Television in the USA, in 1958, he made some illuminating statements pertaining to the civil rights movement, which was beginning to become more powerful at the time. In his experience the Catholic Church in the USA was much less racist than Protestant churches. His explanation was that the more democratic the Protestant churches were, the more racist they were, contending that due to congregational control, Protestant churches were more prone to being influenced by extremist factions, in this case, extremist white factions.

One of the premises of the interview was that religion was becoming more influential in the USA. Examples were given of rising church attendances and the success of evangelists. Niebuhr was not wholly in support of the current situation, arguing that simple and superficial answers were being given to the most profound questions affecting human life. His explanation was, as always, replete with an attack on liberal Christianity. In his view the religious revival was a case of revivalism appealing to those who had espoused a secular religion, either liberalism or Marxism, in their youth, and now having been left rudderless because of the fact that both liberalism and Marxism had broken down. He contended that it was childish of evangelists to tell their flocks not to worry about summit conferences or reciprocal trade acts, but to put their trust in Christ. Communists were dangerous precisely because they were religious in their worship of Communism and that ordinary atheists were far less dangerous. Man was both creative and destructive. Science was no longer just for human welfare. It had also produced

---

nuclear weapons. He recommended that the USA and USSR should at least recognize that they were living in a common predicament, in other words, he advocated dialogue.

Wallace mentioned that Bertrand Russell, amongst others, had suggested that, faced with nuclear destruction, he would rather live under Communism and work against it from within. Niebuhr rejected this view, arguing that no nation could follow such a course. According to Niebuhr, freedom was necessary because individuals required it and society required it. It was a telling reply that encapsulated the difference between Niebuhr and the liberals and social gospellers. The value of human life was completely absent from Niebuhr’s answer. The nation and the political system ranked higher on the scale of what was most sacred.

In summary; From a superficial glance, Niebuhr would appear to have landed some heavy blows against the Social Gospel and all forms of Christian liberalism as evidenced by the following. He argued that Christian liberalism was like the icing on a cake in which the whole cake comes from the modern temporal world view. The debate had descended to the point where the question was whether the icing was too sweet or whether the cake would be more wholesome with or without the icing; “All the tragic antinomies of history, the inner contradictions of human existence, and the ultimate mysteries of time and eternity are obscured.”¹⁵⁰ This is however one particular reading of Christ’s message that leads to the conclusions drawn in the above.

Niebuhr’s argument can be turned in on itself whereby the whole cake represents modern realpolitik embellished with Christian symbols to supply the icing. The Social Gospel view is that Christ’s message is the whole cake and as a result of that view the questions become: Can one argue that to work for an end to violence is not a Christian aspiration? Did Jesus desire that the poor should remain poor? Did Jesus consider a nation’s territory, pride and political system to be of greater importance than the lives of the people who live in it and the lives of one’s

¹⁵⁰ Reinhold Niebuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems, p. 190.
enemies? Ironically, Niebuhr never confronted these issues in a useful or theologically 'realistic' manner.

John Moyes and Niebuhr were in agreement on many issues. They were both involved, as wholehearted supporters, in the ecumenical drive during the late 1940s and 1950s and were active in the establishment of the World Council of Churches. They both argued for a far greater degree of self criticism within the churches, which they hoped would provide the clergy and the laity with the tools required to lift them out of their complacency and hypocrisy. They also identified the inequities and moral inadequacies of both Capitalism and Communism and they never ceased highlighting the evils of racism. On the question of the Christian response to violence they differed. Moyes came very close to rejecting violence in every circumstance but this was anathema to Niebuhr. Even after the superpowers had acquired the nuclear capability to threaten the existence of the human race he still prioritised national sovereignty and a particular political system over the sanctity of human life. The fundamental difference between Moyes and Niebuhr lay in their general outlook. Moyes possessed a life-long liberal optimism, which contained in its very essence, not only a belief in God, but a belief in humanity. This was the belief that by cooperating with God human beings could become the harbingers of his kingdom, performing his eschatological errand here on earth. For Reinhold Niebuhr, there was too much darkness at the bottom of the human soul for him to place any great trust in such a hope. The best humanity could strive for was to establish an uneasy balance of power at the local and international level in which the evil and corruption of mankind could be held in check by employing the methods of the 'enemy.' The question that begs to be asked after a study of Niebuhr is whether Christianity has anything to offer other than supplying symbols of legitimisation in support of Western geopolitical aims.
King underlined the huge influence of Walter Rauschenbusch’s *Christianity and the Social Crisis* on his thinking. Although he felt that Rauschenbusch had accepted the cult of inevitable progress that had been dominant in the second half of the nineteenth century, and that he had too closely aligned himself with socialist political and economic ideals, King credited Rauschenbusch with making an indelible impression on his ideas and with giving American Protestantism a "sense of social responsibility." He was clear in his interpretation of what he considered the role of Christianity in society to be: “The projection of a social gospel, in my opinion, is the true witness of a Christian life.” The Church was to be a thermostat rather than a thermometer, moulding rather than measuring popular opinion.

It was however not Rauschenbusch, or any Christian theologian that led King to a position of non-violence. This came through his study of Mohandas Gandhi and the resistance to British rule in India. Deeply impressed by the Gandhian concept of *satyagraha*, King revealed that his scepticism concerning the power of love gradually diminished, and he became convinced that “the Christian doctrine of love operating through the Gandhian method of non-violence was one of the most potent weapons available to oppressed people in their struggle for freedom.”

He argued forcefully against the proposition that legislation and judicial decrees only played minor roles in the elimination of inveterate prejudices. In this respect his views were not dissimilar to those of Niebuhr:

> Morality cannot be legislated, but behaviour can be regulated. Judicial decrees may not change the heart, but they can restrain the heartless. The law cannot...

---

153 *Satya* is truth which equals love, and *graha* is force; *satyagraha* thus means truth-force or love-force.
make an employer love an employee, but it can prevent him from refusing to hire me because of the colour of my skin. The habits, if not the hearts, of people have been and are being altered every day by legislative acts, judicial decisions, and executive orders. Let us not be misled by those who argue that segregation cannot be ended by the force of law.  

The difference between Niebuhr’s position and that of the social gospellers was that Niebuhr saw coercion as coercion, regardless of whether it involved violence or non-violence and that the paradigm of Jesus’ temporal life could not be interpreted as the means by which he intended his disciples, ancient and modern, to combat evil.

On the subject of war, one must bear in mind that all of King’s published works were written during the Cold War, at a time of grave concern over the perils of nuclear conflict. It is therefore not particularly revealing that he was opposed to it. He was however also opposed to the concept of limited war, arguing that it “will leave little more than a calamitous legacy of human suffering, political turmoil, and spiritual disillusionment.”  

John Moyes expressed his opposition to the Vietnam War two years earlier than King and it was only after the horror of that conflict began to assume visibility in the American media that King publicised his position. When he did so, in April 1967, his speech could well have been written by John Moyes, so similar was its content. King stated:

I sometimes marvel at those who ask me why I am speaking against the war.

Could it be that they do not know that the good news was meant for all men – for communist and capitalist, for their children and ours, for black and for white, for revolutionary and conservative?.... We are called to speak for the

---

155 Martin Luther King Jr, Strength to Love, Cleveland: Collins + World Publishing Co. 1963, p. 34.
156 King, Strength to Love, p. 41.
weak, for the voiceless, for victims of our nation and for those it calls enemy,
for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our
brothers.\textsuperscript{157}

He also noted in his opposition to the Vietnam War that black and white Americans were serving
side by side in the United States military in Vietnam while at home, in some states, they were not
permitted to sit in the same classroom.\textsuperscript{158}

King, like Moyes, but more so due to his international profile, was regularly accused of
being a communist. King, also like Moyes, saw many admirable features in a communist
economic order, but was a strident opponent of Communism, chiefly because of its atheism,
materialism and statism. He viewed Communism as a Christian heresy.\textsuperscript{159} In terms reminiscent
of Rauschenbusch and Moyes, King argued that Christianity had too often been absorbed in a
future good beyond the grave that it forgot the evils present on earth. No religion worth its salt
could profess to be concerned with the souls of men and be unconcerned with the economic and
social conditions that oppress them. Religion of this kind, he argued, deserved Marx's
condemnation as "the opiate of the people."\textsuperscript{160} In applying the social gospel to race relations he
challenged the Church to recognise that it was the most segregated major institution in American
society, and that the most segregated hour of the week was eleven o'clock on Sunday
morning.\textsuperscript{161} His characterisation of Capitalism was Moyesian to the letter, citing Dives and
Lazarus,\textsuperscript{162} arguing that the profit motive, when it is the sole basis of an economic order,

\textsuperscript{157} Washington, ed., \textit{A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King, Jr.}, p. 234.
\textsuperscript{158} Martin Luther King Jr, 'Why I am opposed to the War in Vietnam,' http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b80BswoUG-U, retrieved 25 September 2011.
\textsuperscript{159} King, \textit{Strength to Love}, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{160} King, \textit{Strength to Love}, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{161} King, \textit{Strength to Love}, pp. 101-102.
\textsuperscript{162} Luke 16:19-31. 'Dives' was not the rich man's name. The parable became known as Dives and Lazarus due to the translation of the Latin, \textit{dives}, to the English, 'rich man.'
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encourages people to be “more concerned about making a living than making a life.” He accused modern Americans of judging success by the size of their salaries and automobiles. “The Kingdom of God is neither the thesis of individual enterprise nor the antithesis of collective enterprise, but a synthesis which reconciles the truth of both.”

King revealed himself as more than an able scholar when presenting his theology of love. He maintained that love was the only force on earth that could be dispensed or received in an extreme manner, without any qualifications, without any harm to the giver or to the receiver. In this regard he went further than the other figures discussed in this chapter in the area of Christian relations with other religions. His stance on ecumenism was that one’s loyalties must transcend race, tribe, class, and nation; “and this means we must develop a world perspective.”

He argued that the “Nietzsches of the world” had dismissed love as a weak and cowardly force but that it had now become an absolute necessity for the survival of man. It was not a sentimental or weak response but a force seen by all the great religions as the supreme unifying principle of life. Love was the key that unlocked the door that led to ultimate reality. For King, this was common to Hindus, Moslems, Christians, Jews, and Buddhists and was encapsulated by the first epistle of St John:

Let us love one another, for love is God and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. If we love one another God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us.”

163 King, Strength to Love, p. 102.
164 King, Strength to Love, p. 103.
In a well informed criticism of Reformation theology, King argued that it had often emphasised a purely otherworldly religion, which had stressed the hopelessness of this world and inculcated in the individual the need to concentrate on preparing his or her soul for the world to come. This theology, by diminishing the necessity of social reform, resulted in a religion that was divorced from the mainstream of human life. “By disregarding the fact that the gospel deals with man’s body as well as with his soul, such a one-sided emphasis creates a tragic dichotomy between the sacred and the secular.”168 King regarded the Renaissance as having been too optimistic and the Reformation as too pessimistic in their views on humanity. He sought a middle way between the position of ‘unconditional grace’ found in some Protestant traditions, where prayer treats God as a “cosmic bellhop,”169 and the exclusive human ingenuity position of humanists. For King, humanity was required to cooperate with God.170 In line with Moyes he held that the social order required a shift from a thing oriented society to a person oriented society.171 It was not sufficient for the churches to play the Good Samaritan. “One day we must come to see that the whole Jericho road must be transformed so that men and women will not be constantly beaten and robbed as they make their journey on life’s highway.”172 In the tradition of the Social Gospel since the nineteenth century he argued that palliative measures were not sufficient. “True compassion is more than flinging a coin to a beggar...A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth.”173

In summary; Martin Luther King Jr was a formidable advocate for the Social Gospel in the USA in the post World War II period. It is doubtful whether The Civil Rights Act of 1964 would have been signed into law at that time without his effective leadership of the non-violent campaign against racial discrimination. It is difficult to find areas of disagreement between Moyes and King. They both espoused the Social Gospel while expressing Christian-based opposition to Communism. Their objections to violence were, in principle, the same. Moyes became morally and theologically paralysed by the threat of invasion and the accompanying issue of national sovereignty. King’s campaign of non-violence was not created in response to a comparable threat. The issue of violence against individuals and the campaign as a corporate body was present, but the issue of national sovereignty was absent. We do not know what King’s response to a threatened invasion of the USA would have been.

Both Moyes and King opposed the Vietnam War, but for subtly different reasons. Moyes protested before the graphic television images of violence had influenced public opinion. His opposition was based on what he regarded as un-Christian policy on the part of the Australian Government. The lives of Vietnamese civilians had to be valued higher than the right of the USA and Australia to use military force in order to ensure the protection of their preferred system of government for South Vietnam. King shared those concerns but by 1967, when he first publicly opposed the War, shocking reports and images of violence were becoming regular occurrences in the American media. He was also, quite naturally, appalled that black men were serving side by side in the United States military while still suffering discrimination at home. King, possibly due to his study of Gandhi as the inspiration for the campaign of non-violent civil disobedience, exuded a greater interest in other, especially far Eastern, religions than Moyes. His concept of God tended therefore towards immanence rather than transcendence.
5.7. André Trocmé

André Trocmé is not as well known amongst English speaking readers as some of the writers upon whom his influence has been substantial. These include John Yoder, Stanley Hauerwas and Walter Wink. Trocmé was a French Reformed Church pastor in the parish of Le Chambon in south-central France during World War II. The story of how he and his wife, Magda, made their parish a haven for Jewish and other refugees does not require recounting here. The purpose of including Trocmé in this chapter is that he succeeded in constructing a theologically coherent Christian response to violence, something that eluded Moyes, Burgmann, Temple, Niebuhr and Bonhoeffer. Martin Luther King Jr implemented a similar practical response to Trocmé but the balance of his well articulated position comprised a universal morality founded on what he regarded as Christian ethics, rather than an exposition of Christian theology with regard to violence. Bonhoeffer, by contrast, attempted to present a theological argument but eventually participated in a movement that espoused violence as a means to achieving what was perceived to be a greater end.

Trocme was not a prolific writer but he presented his entire thesis on non-violence in his pivotal work, *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution*. He argued that the mission of Jesus was stated by Jesus himself in the Gospel According to Luke. This passage, often referred to as Jesus’ Mission Statement, or The Rejection at Nazareth, describes the return of Jesus to Nazareth for

---


175 For more information on André and Magda Trocmé, see Pierre Boismorand, *Magda et André Trocmé: Figures de résistances*, (textes choisis et présentés par Pierre Boismorand) Paris: Cerf, 2007. (Magda and André Trocmé: Figures of resistance, texts chosen and presented by Pierre Boismorand.) This work is a collection of Magda and André’s writings, sermons, letters, testaments, etc. It underlines the importance of Magda Trocmé’s contribution. At the time of writing, an English translation has not been located.


the first time since his childhood. He attended the synagogue on the Sabbath and read from the
prophet Isaiah:

The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring glad
tidings to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim liberty to captives and recovery
of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, and to proclaim a year
acceptable to the Lord.

Jesus then rolled up the scroll and said: “Today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing.” At
first, the reception to such a statement was positive but when the congregation realised that this
man, whom they recognised as the son of Joseph, in other words, one of their own, was assuming
the status of the prophets Elijah and Elisha for himself and laying claim to the central role in the
divine plan, they rapidly turned against him, ultimately attempting to take his life.

All but the clause referring to ‘a year acceptable to the Lord’ in the above is self
explanatory for the theologically uninitiated. The term refers to the Jubilee Year, first
described in the Jewish Torah, contained in the Old Testament, in the book of Leviticus, chapter
25. It requires some elucidation. Trocmé argued that Moses had done nothing less than institute a
“social revolution aimed at preventing the accumulation of capital in the hands of a few.” At
the first Jubilee each tribe repossessed the land it had been given when the Hebrews first settled
in Canaan. The Jubilee occurred every forty nine years but also incorporated measures to be
taken every seven years. These included steps to ensure the agricultural sustainability of the land
by leaving it fallow every seventh year due to God providing a double harvest every sixth year;

178 The phrase, ‘recovery of sight to the blind’ is found in Luke but not in Isaiah 61 from which Jesus was reading.
different version is found in Mark 6:1-6.
180 Luke 4:21, NAB.
181 Luke 4:29, NAB
182 Also often translated as ‘a year favourable to the Lord’.
183 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 16.
all debts were to be cancelled every seventh year; all Hebrew slaves were to be set free every seventh year; every forty ninth (Jubilee) year each family was to regain possession of the land and houses it may have lost since the previous Jubilee. Between Jubilees any property bought was therefore temporary.\textsuperscript{184} What this means in the context of this thesis is that Trocmé viewed Jesus as the social gospeller \textit{par excellence}. The link between the injunctions of the Jubilee and the root causes of violence have been explicated by Stanley Hauerwas and can be summarised in one sentence: “For our possessions are the source of our violence.”\textsuperscript{185} Hauerwas argued that we fear others desiring what we have and that in the depth of our souls we understand that we do not deserve that which we call our own. We then indulge in self deception in order to justify patterns of coercive behaviour to protect our possessions.\textsuperscript{186} The Jubilee can thus be seen as representing an attempt at preventing the root causes of violence.

By reading the passage from Isaiah and stating that it was now fulfilled Jesus was announcing that the Kingdom of God was at hand, not in a distant future, ‘other worldly’ or existentialist, Bultmanesque sense. It was possible on earth, in the lifetimes of the living, and it was his mission to bring it to fruition. Trocmé argued that it was this blasphemous and highly presumptuous message from Jesus, that he, the humble son of Joseph, could be the harbinger of the Kingdom of God, inaugurated by a Jubilee that incurred the wrath of the Jewish authorities and finally necessitated his execution.

Trocmé’s Jesus was thus a greater radical than the Jesus of Moyes, Burgmann, Temple, Bell, Rauschenbusch and the Anglophone social gospel tradition. He became even more so when Trocmé addressed the issue of violence. He conceded that most Christians and non-Christians alike have an image of Jesus as a messenger of peace, but when attempting to implement his

\textsuperscript{184} Trocmé, \textit{Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution}, pp. 22-23.
\textsuperscript{185} Hauerwas, \textit{The Peaceable Kingdom}, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{186} Hauerwas, \textit{The Peaceable Kingdom}, pp. 81-87.
message, they invariably choose what they consider to be the lesser of two evils. In tackling the seminal New Testament text on resistance to evil, that of turning the other cheek, Trocmé argued that a small minority had always taken these words literally, whatever the cost. The majority, however, and especially individual nations, had taken Niebuhr’s view, that such a teaching cannot be applied across the board due to the fact that it is contrary to human instinct and that to do so would actually hinder the progress of God’s plan for humanity.

Trocme set the stage for his case by arguing that the responses of the Jews to Roman occupation at the time of Jesus were varied and included well documented examples of pacifism. These include the ‘sit-in’ demonstration against Pilate’s decision to hang military ensigns bearing the emperor’s effigy in Jerusalem, the protest at Pilate’s decision to use Temple funds to build an aqueduct, and Caligula’s attempt to have a statue of himself installed in the Temple. In the last example, several years after Jesus’ death, the Jews embarked upon a Gandhian campaign in which they stopped sowing their fields and stood outside the legate’s house for fifty days, announcing that they would allow themselves to be killed for their cause. Of the three listed examples, the first achieved a successful outcome for the protesters, the second ended in slaughter at the hands of the Romans, and in the third case, Mediterranean winds prevented Caligula’s orders from arriving before he met his own death.

---

Matthew 5:38-39, NAB.

Much textual debate has taken place over the translation of the original Greek word, αντιστασις, as ‘resist’ in ‘do not resist evil’ (Matthew 5:39). The word ‘oppose’ has also been preferred by some. The advocates of non-violence argue that the word implies that one should not face up to anyone for a fight. The most accurate reading of the phrase for them is therefore ‘Do not fight evil with the same weapons,’ or ‘Do not reply in kind.’ See Walter Wink, The Powers That Be, New York: Doubleday, 1998, Ch. 5, and: John Howard Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, p. 202fn

Trocme, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 94. It was a fifteen year period, from the beginning of Pontius Pilate’s rule until the end of the proconsular regime in Judea (26-41 CE)


Josephus, p. 730.

Josephus, pp. 592-596.
Trocmé argued that three tendencies concerning the Roman occupation were present among the Jewish factions during Jesus' ministry. Collaboration was favoured by the Herodians, by those who worked for the Romans, and by the Sadducees. Those who chose withdrawal were the Pharisees and Essenes. The Zealots espoused armed rebellion. On purely compositional grounds, Trocmé weakened his argument somewhat by not successfully connecting the above cited examples of pacifism with Jesus' ultimate choice, contending that the two options open to him were withdrawal or violent resistance, but his overarching argument nevertheless survived his literary limitations. Jesus chose the way of non-violent resistance. If he had chosen violence he would have been employing the methods of 'Satan to cast out Satan,' thus recognising and legitimising the evil of his persecutors. If he had abandoned the struggle by withdrawing to the desert he would have undermined and negated the sanctity and morality of his mission. His decision to remain and resist evil by non-violent means is thus crucial.

The example of the whip in the temple has always been considered to be the one incident in the life of Jesus to which an appeal to violence could be made. Such an appeal is problematic on two counts. First, the whip of chords (φραγέλλων) is only mentioned in the Gospel According to John. It is absent from all three of the Synoptic Gospels. There are many reasons pertaining to textual research for giving preference to the synoptics in this case, not only due to the later date of John's Gospel and the considerable inconsistencies in its chronology and geography when compared with Matthew, Mark and Luke, but also due to its greater

197 In the Gospel According to St John, Jesus spent far more time in Jerusalem than in the synoptics. Also in John, Jesus was crucified on Maundy Thursday, not Good Friday. See John 19:14-18, *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament*.
theological dimensions and the more pronounced influence of Greek philosophical themes. Second, in none of the four examples was Jesus reported to have struck another person. He did however drive the money changers out of the temple, but this, Trocmé argued, was evidence of the fact that the temptation to violence followed Jesus all through his life until his death. He did not consider Jesus to be a theorist of non-violence, but one who overcame the temptation through a series of redemptive acts. It was not the course of a mystic refusing to confront the realities of this world. On the contrary, it was a path carved out by Jesus, leading ultimately to the cross; a path that made possible the realisation of the Kingdom of God on earth.

For Trocmé the Jesus paradigm was actually a third way, one of non-violent resistance. The majority was therefore wrong if it assumed that this form of pacifism implied keeping one’s hands clean: “Non-violence engages evil, it does not withdraw from it.” He argued that the heart of Jesus’ non-violent revolution was simply a loving respect for our neighbour, the person right before us. One cannot love God without loving one’s brother since it is through the one that we can see the other. On these points Trocmé was presenting a mainstream Social Gospel view, in agreement with that preached by Moyes, Burgmann, Temple, Bonhoeffer and others. But he expounded it further by emphasizing that anyone who sets a limit for his neighbourly love erects a wall between themselves and God, who sets no limits: “God’s kingdom seeks to overcome barriers.” In this view Christians must not make themselves obstacles in their neighbour’s path to God. The physical wellbeing of one’s neighbour is as important as the spiritual: “The healing of the body and the healing of the soul are joined in a single operation. Christ’s revolution is

---

198 For example, the incorporation into Christian theology of the Greek concept of λόγος. See John 1:1-2. One could argue a case for the Social Gospel being indebted to the synoptics, whereas the individualistic strand of Protestant theology owed more to John and Paul.

199 There are many fine commentaries on the Gospels for further reading, but for more detail on this passage in the context of the argument being presented here, see: John Howard Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, pp. 42-43.


201 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 151.
total, or it is nothing.”202 It followed therefore for Trocmé that killing one’s neighbour, who due to circumstances may have become one’s enemy, for a perceived greater good, was untenable, since his or her physical and spiritual wellbeing were equally important. He argued that the entire issue was quite simple and that one need not be impressed by “great principles quoted to us, or with great historical moments that call for bloodshed.”203 Any effort aimed at serving the needs of others, especially those specifically named by Jesus such as children, the incarcerated, the poor, the infirm, the oppressed and one’s enemies, would advance the Kingdom of God, “even if only minutely.”204 It was for this reason that Christians should object to war or military service. They should be too busy loving and serving their neighbours to contemplate killing them. In an obvious reference to Nazism, he conceded that violent remedies, even so-called ‘just wars,’ may be successful in putting an end to particular forms of evil in certain cases but that they can never eliminate evil.205 For Trocmé the fertilizer of violence was yesterday’s violence, regardless of whence it came. In their theological understanding of the issue, Moyes and Trocmé were in complete agreement. This was precisely what Moyes had argued to the Government in 1950 when its plans to proscribe the Communist Party were made public: “For we shall be adopting its methods and using Satan to cast out Satan.”206 It was the cry of the nation that proved too powerful for Moyes to resist when the reality of war reached the shores of Australia, even though his acquiescence was reluctant.

202 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 151.
203 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 151.
204 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 151.
205 Trocmé was a great admirer of Mohandas Gandhi and his movement of non-violent resistance to British rule in India during the 1930s while Trocmé was already a pastor in France. Although not directly relevant here, Trocmé presented an analysis of the differences between the non-violence of Gandhi and that of Jesus Christ. He argued that Gandhi had demonstrated the practicality of what Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount. See: Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, pp. 157-161.
206 Sydney Morning Herald, 12 May 1950, p. 2.
Trocme employed the ‘Parable of the Persistent Widow’\textsuperscript{207} to illustrate his views on the relationship between church and state. Noting that the constant pleading of the widow eventually produced a result from the Godless and dishonest judge, he argued that the widow represented the Church as the people of God, and the judge, the State. The judge in this little Palestinian town, microcosmically representing the corruption, oppression and exploitation present in the administration of a great nation, eventually responded to the Church, represented by the widow, who was an obstacle to the status quo. She did not employ violence, but by constantly drawing attention to injustice she eventually advanced the Kingdom of God, regardless of how small her contribution may have been. In a telling point, the judge did not accede to the widow’s request because he suddenly experienced \textit{metanoia} and adopted the Sermon on the Mount as his guiding principle, but because her persistence wore down his patience. The realisation of the Kingdom of God on earth was therefore not simply a case of how many individuals could be converted but by the Church advancing God’s will.

Trocme emphasised in the above that the widow was not to be interpreted simply as an individual, but that Jesus’ exhortation to prayer, in the first verse of the parable, was made to humanity as a whole. Thus, the prayer that he had taught; ‘Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven,’ did not simply concern a personal relationship between the individual soul and God. There are, as Rauschenbusch emphasised, no personal pronouns in the Lord’s Prayer.\textsuperscript{208} It is rather a collective prayer for the restoration of God’s justice on earth and for victory over evil. In taking the Social Gospel view that all Christians and non-Christians were responsible for the hunger, injustice, exploitation and war that devastates life for so many, Trocme repudiated the ‘realist’ position in which humanity, despite its capacity for lucid analysis of human weakness,


\textsuperscript{208} For Rauschenbusch’s hermeneutic on the Lord’s Prayer, see Rauschenbusch, \textit{A Rauschenbusch Reader: The Kingdom of God and the Social Gospel}, pp. 24-36.
continued to live by the logic of revenge, ‘just war’ and weapons parity. In contradistinction to Niebuhr, he argued that the Church must “never give allegiance to the state, even if the state protects it, but must constantly call the state to a more perfect justice.”

When he asked rhetorically why contemporary Christians hesitated to put Jesus’ teaching on non-violence into practice, Trocme’s answer was that Christians, and in particular, the Christian churches, have participated in the power structure of relevant governmental authorities for centuries. Their ethic was now “one of realism.” It was a realism of compromise entailing money, power and war. The answer is clearly far more nuanced than Trocmé implied and he ignored the manifold manifestations of Christianity in existence, but it is incontrovertible that the compromises made, especially by the major churches, have constituted at least one important factor in allowing nationalism and patriotism to take precedence over questions of religion, morality and ethics in the life of the nation state.

In summary: Trocmé presented a theological exposition of the Jesus paradigm as one of non-violent resistance to evil. He challenged his readers to take seriously the mission statement of Jesus, which proclaimed a social gospel as the Kingdom of God based on the ancient Hebrew tradition of Jubilee. By following the paradigm of Jesus in the New Testament, the oppression and captivity listed in the mission statement were to be eliminated not by violence, but by refusing to accept the moral legitimacy of violence. To withdraw, thus refusing to engage with evil, one aided its proliferation. Likewise, to resist evil with evil means would simply legitimise and perpetuate the existence of the evil one sought to expunge. Between 1940 and 1944 Trocmé found himself in a moral labyrinth of far greater density than any other under discussion in this chapter. By implementing his interpretation of the Jesus paradigm when his own country was not

---

209 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 167.
210 Trocmé, Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution, p. 159. See also, Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, pp. 193-211.
only threatened by, but actually in the grip of, a foreign and ruthless occupation, Trocmé succeeded in achieving a synthesis between his theological and practical Christian positions.

5.8. Conclusion

Walter Rauschenbusch died in 1918. The adoption of Communism as the system of government in Russia in the previous year, followed by its influence, in varying forms, on Western thought for the ensuing half century, probably ended Christianity's last chance to be the leading agent of social change. There are of course myriad other factors involved in the decline of Christian influence on society at large, but despite the fact that the Social Gospel survived the First World War, the political and social impact of its message was thenceforth forth most effectively presented in secular garb. In the 1960s, the rise to maturity of the post-war generation coupled with issues such as racial discrimination, women's rights, poverty in the midst of rapid technological progress, and the Vietnam War, gave the Social Gospel another opportunity to seize the lead in social reform. For one decade, Martin Luther King's movement appeared, to some extent, to reinvent the Church as an agent of social change, but although he always identified his message as a Social Gospel, the Christian core of the civil rights movement was rapidly consumed by secular forces. With the exception of Liberation Theology in Latin America, no Christian replacement was found after King's assassination in 1968.

Several of the leading figures in the Social Gospel manifestation of Christianity during John Moyes' lifetime have been discussed in this chapter. Death in 1918 saved Rauschenbusch from having to defend his Social Gospel against the attacks launched upon it in the 1930s and the moral questions raised by World War II. William Temple, the towering figure of English Anglicanism between the wars, was also spared by death the tragedy of seeing his dream of a welfare state with the Church at its centre eventually replaced by the crass and secular
materialism that he had warned against. His compatriot, George Bell, struggled to make sense of
his faith in the midst of unspeakable crimes being committed by his nation's enemies and by
itself. He never publicly conceded that there can never be a 'limited' or 'conditional' Christian
condemnation of violence. Ernest Burgmann was a fervent believer in, and an able advocate for,
the Social Gospel in Australia. His credibility among neutral and opposition forces was possibly
diminished by his perceived penchant for elements of Communism and his support for the
USSR. His aversion to violence in the context of Christianity and World War II did not survive
the entry of the Soviet Union into that conflict. Dietrich Bonhoeffer died a martyr in the cause
against Nazism. He abandoned his pre-war pacifism for what he believed to be a greater good.
His death, while clearly an inspiration to many in the ensuing decades, did not hasten the demise
of Adolf Hitler or the Nazi regime. It did however rob the world of a gifted theologian and a
profound and compassionate soul. Reinhold Niebuhr, the nemesis of the social gospellers, has
been assessed here as being in possession of a prodigious analytical ability, but lacking the gift
of vision. His pragmatism appeared to have donated Christian legitimacy to Western, and
particularly American, geopolitical interests. Humanity can look forward to a dark and dismal
future indeed if Niebuhr's assessment of its moral capabilities was accurate. Martin Luther King
Jr, a Baptist minister, preached a Social Gospel of hope. He was influential in effecting landmark
legislative change for black Americans in the 1960s. The passion and brilliance of his oratory on
behalf of the poor, the disadvantaged, and the infirm, made him a figure of world renown. He
also spoke out against his nation's willingness to use violence as an instrument of national or
domestic policy. Like Bonhoeffer, he died a martyr to his cause. André Trocmé, living and
working in circumstances similar to Bonhoeffer, pursued a policy of non-violent Christian
resistance. He later published a theological rationale for his actions. While not minimising the
achievements of King, Trocmé was faced with the additional issue of national sovereignty over and above threats to the personal safety of himself and those who worked with him.

John Moyes outlived all of the figures discussed in this chapter, exceeding Niebuhr, who died in 1971, by seven months. He was not as radical and closely aligned with Socialist measures as was the case with Rauschenbusch. His application of the Social Gospel to the economic order was very much in line with that of Temple, but his profound concern over the Christian response to violence, when put to the ultimate test, was not shared by the wartime Archbishop of Canterbury. Moyes’ concern was however shared by the Bishop of Chichester, George Bell, but both men found themselves trapped in a cul-de-sac when attempting to solve the question of violence. Moyes and Burgmann were powerful representatives of the Social Gospel in Australia, but Moyes, while also accused of communist leanings at times, did not allow himself to be compromised in that regard to the same extent as Burgmann. When addressing political issues, Moyes was able to keep the Christian premise of his contribution at the centre of his argument, a quality that sometimes eluded the Bishop of Canberra and Goulburn. In contrast to Moyes, Burgmann saw his way clear to suspend his reservations pertaining to World War II once the involvement of the USSR had become a reality. Moyes, like Bell, was never comfortable with any aspect of the War. Moyes admired Bonhoeffer’s pacifist exposition of Christian ethics, and it must always be borne in mind that Bonhoeffer’s ultimate choice was made in far more demanding circumstances than those which fate had dealt the Bishop of Armidale. Martin Luther King Jr preached a Social Gospel with very similar aims as John Moyes, allowing for the fact that King himself represented a minority group fighting for equality under the law. It is not at all inconceivable to envision John Moyes marching alongside King if the accident of birth had placed him in the New World. André Trocmé emerges from this group as the example of a
Christian living out his peace time creed when challenged by the reality of what all of the above figures regarded as evil. While Moyes did not achieve the same level of consistency as Trocmé or King, he presented a highly credible Christian witness, refusing to align himself with purely political movements, always striving to keep his religion at the core of his case.
CONCLUSION

Tom Frame, writing at the dawn of the third millennium, argued that the decreasing relevance of Christian churches in Australia was not due to them having been excluded from the public sphere, but due to the fact that "they had virtually abandoned it." It can of course be argued that they no longer had anything to say, but to enter into that debate is beyond the bounds of this study. The research for this thesis has, not surprisingly, revealed many things, but perhaps above all, it has revealed that John Moyes fought to keep his church in the centre of the public sphere. The compartmentalisation of society into secular and sacred was anathema to Moyes. In this sense he was in step with Temple. A church that was not a part of, and not an influence on, society was meaningless. This involved more than grandiloquent appeals to personal salvation and prayer, and more than palliative charitable work without attempting to reform the social structure that permitted the existence of such glaring levels of inequity. Anglican bishops with public profiles such as Burgmann and Moyes had at least a measure of success in reaching the wider citizenry with a Christian message that was not merely a religious echo of the politics, morals and ethics of the Establishment. This was not unusual for the Irish Catholics in Australia since their historical circumstances were of a totally different nature and their case had also been argued by a figure of formidable courage and ability in Archbishop Daniel Mannix. But the Anglican Church, although not the Established Church in Australia, was perceived to be the religious organisation closest to possessing such a status. It was also, during the lifetimes of Moyes and Burgmann, the largest church in Australia.

John Moyes challenged the status quo and the Establishment, both within and without his own church, throughout his career. He was, in essence, a born protester, sans pareille, but as

---

1 Tom Frame, Anglicans in Australia, p. 243.
Anne O’Brien has alluded to, a ‘cultivated’ one. There was nothing of the *enfant terrible* about Moyes. He was a highly educated, articulate, well read and respectful advocate for the causes he chose to espouse. There were however, as is always the case, many others possessing the above qualities, but Moyes demonstrated on repeated occasions an uncanny ability to be in the vanguard of public opinion. He was one of the first voices in Australian public life to be appalled by the ecological molestation of the Australian landscape, and his abhorrence of the White Australia Policy was not simply a more profound understanding and manifestation of the ‘love thy neighbour’ precept than that of some of his contemporaries. He also saw that it was a calamitous element in Australia’s foreign policy, given that all of the nation’s neighbours, with the exception of New Zealand, were non-white, predominantly Asian, and that the Japanese had already expressed their concern over such a policy at the conclusion of World War I. In regard to both of the above issues, he proved to be on the triumphant side of history as far as general acceptance by the majority is concerned.

Moyes’ views on education met with mixed results. His active support and participation in the establishment of Australia’s first regional university was symptomatic of his lifelong commitment to education. He has been fittingly honoured by the University of New England as one of its founding fathers. On the other hand, his vision of an education system from primary to tertiary level pervaded by a Christian influence on all subject areas suffered the same fate as the decline of Christian influence in general. He argued for raising the status of the teaching profession in the eyes of the community and for the removal of the State as a controlling influence in the educational process, preferring this task to be undertaken by an independent commission of suitably qualified experts. His opposition to Government funding for non-Government schools was swept away in, not only the tide, but the torrent of history in that regard.
since the 1960s. The development of non-Government schools in Australia has been dramatic. As of 2010, the number of students attending public schools had declined to 66 percent.² Moyes’ objection to state funding for what were, in his time, almost exclusively church schools, was founded on his fear that they would lose their independence. Ironically, the policy of Australian governments of both political persuasions to continue funding non-Government schools has produced unfortunate results in primary and secondary education. Through no fault of their own, children of lower socio-economic backgrounds are facing a future wherein the quality of their education is becoming more and more dependent on the financial status of their parents.

Moyes consistently sought an education system that fostered broad and holistic growth in the life of the student. The goal of education was not merely to prepare students to be money making cogs in the nation’s economic wheel, but to enrich their lives by broadening their minds through the study of literature, the sciences, history, religion, music and the fine arts. It is often argued that this brand of idealism is detached from reality in that economic growth is necessary for such an education system to exist, and that market Capitalism has proved itself to be far more successful in that regard than all forms of Socialism. The question of whether the continued adoration of economic growth is tenable leads to a subject area beyond the scope of this thesis. However, Moyes’ warnings against rampant materialism relate more to a question of balance and economic and social priorities. His vision of a civilised community was not of the nation as a place of uncommonly large profit, but of how well it valued and nurtured each person as a human being, and in particular, how it treated the disadvantaged. If those at the bottom of the socio-economic scale were to be left to fend for themselves, then humanity had not climbed one rung further up the ladder of civilisation than the animals of the jungle. As a bishop of the

Anglican Church, he naturally believed that belief in the Christian God was essential to the realisation of that goal.

On the question of marriage and sex Moyes was clearly progressive in comparison with the prevailing view within the Anglican Church when he attended his first Lambeth Conference, in 1930. At that time, his church, and most others, were still debating whether the only function of sexual relations was procreation. It has been noted that his contention that sex was a sacramental act between husband and wife was regarded as controversial. He was also progressive regarding divorce. In that regard he was an early advocate of counselling services for couples contemplating the termination of their marriage and he was one of the first Anglican bishops to permit the remarriage of divorcees. His views on the detrimental effects of sexual liberty on the creative energy of civilisations did not transcend the morality of the Victorian age and are best forgotten.

On the questions of money and the economic order, one can only confirm that Moyes' assessment of the extent to which greed and materialism were endemic in Australia, irrespective of whether one views them positively or negatively, has become more accurate since his death. In a concrete example of what Moyes had argued - that money had become a value in itself - money matters now dominate the public arena through the countless tentacles of the media, constantly and shamelessly offering advice to Australians concerning how they can make more and more money simply by transferring their money from one investment to another; in other words, without producing anything. The dream of a welfare state along the lines of those advocated by Temple and Moyes lives on to a certain extent in Scandinavia, without the religious element, but its Anglophone edition was dealt severe blows in the 1980s and has not reappeared on the political agenda.
In the two case studies presented here, Moyes gave his support to what the historical consensus has embraced as the ‘right’ side of history. On both occasions, his ability to perceive and evaluate the issues before the majority was in evidence. These two cases represented major events in Australia’s twentieth century history. The attempt to alter the Constitution in order to ban a political party, thus creating a dangerous legal precedent that would have been extremely difficult to repeal given the history of referenda in Australia, could have had enduring consequences for the nation if it had been successful. Moyes was protesting against the Communist Party legislation before it had been presented for debate in the Parliament, sixteen months before the referendum. His contribution to the final defeat of the drive to proscribe the Communist Party has been undervalued. In the case of the Vietnam War, he publicly protested against what he regarded to be the folly and immorality of the Government’s policy before any other public figure, elevating the issue onto the national agenda in the process. His contribution in this case has also been undervalued.

When placed in context with the list of Christian figures from his lifetime in Chapter 5, Moyes’ achievements were considerable. He avoided falling into the trap of aligning himself too closely with secular Socialism and weakening the case for a Christian social order by removing the soteriological and eschatological elements from Christianity, as can be argued with respect to Rauschenbusch; and neither did he display a naive attachment to the USSR, as can be argued with respect to Burgmann. He travelled in step with Temple in his vision of a Christian social order, but was unable to harmonise the wilful killing of civilians with what he believed to be Christian morality. He agreed with Niebuhr’s criticism of the trivialisation of sin found in some Social Gospel circles, but was greatly troubled by the Cold War policy pursued by the West, to which Niebuhr gave his blessing. Bonhoeffer was a special case. No-one would have desired the
position in which he found himself during World War II. He eventually decided that his pre-war pacifism had to be abandoned in such an extreme state of emergency as that precipitated by Nazism. It was not simply a case of choosing national sovereignty over human life for Bonhoeffer. He came to believe that the elimination of Hitler would save lives. As events unfolded, it is impossible for the historian to assess what might have occurred if the plotters had been successful.

George Bell established a reputation throughout non-Catholic circles in Europe between the two world wars as one of the great voices of ecumenism and the avoidance of war. Like Moyes, his Australian colleague who also remained in a provincial See for his entire episcopal career, World War II presented a problem for which he could not find an answer. Having condemned war in peace time, the two men were unable to stand by such a principle when confronted by a very real challenge to national sovereignty. Moyes’ warning that one could neither embrace the nation’s call to war nor the cry of the pacifists was a muddled attempt to rationalise and justify the abandonment of a principle, just as Bell’s lonely oration in the House of Lords was a poignant confession of moral impotence.

Martin Luther King Jr led a courageous campaign against racial prejudice that was intertwined with Social Gospel ideals such as the eradication of poverty and injustice. He also shared with Moyes a disgust at his nation’s policy towards Vietnam. Both Moyes and King based their protests and their vision on what they believed to be Christian morality. King, although often in personal danger, was never faced with formulating a Christian response to a military threat to the sovereignty of the USA.

This leaves us with André Trocmé. In Barbara Tuchman’s work, The March of Folly, she exposed the prodigious ability of human beings to act in ways not only contrary to the interests
of others, but also contrary to their own. Tuchman demonstrated that in all four of the cases selected to reveal the disadvantageous policies chosen by the relevant authorities, there were always available alternatives, known at the time, although held and put forward by what were often tiny minorities. For Christians struggling with how to respond to the moral and theological challenges presented by Nazi militarism, Trocmé could well have been one of Tuchman's minority voices. His nation was militarily defeated and compelled to surrender its sovereignty. Half of it was occupied by its victorious enemy and the other half permitted to execute the daily business of government provided that this was done in accordance with the will of the conqueror. Trocmé practised what Moyes, Bell, and perhaps King, believed; that reverence for life transcends allegiance to country. His conviction was that this was integral to Christian morality and that this was the example set by Jesus Christ. Life was a gift from God. Nations were created by human beings. In his mind there was no conflict whatsoever. Life was sacred and in his Christian edition of the Hippocratic Oath, no nation, not even his own, could take precedence over God's greatest gift. John Moyes recoiled from taking the final step to implementing what he had preached before the horror of war threatened his nation. He could not see his way clear to take the stand adopted by Trocmé.

Even though it has become increasingly difficult for the Christian churches to continue claiming that they are in possession of an original or unique message, a message does not forfeit whatever importance it may have for that reason. Opponents of Christianity regularly point out that the last one hundred and fifty years of scholarly research into other religions and the Christian texts themselves has undermined Christian claims to uniqueness. However, those who employ such evidence in an attempt to establish the moral bankruptcy, falsity or uselessness of Christianity display either a disturbing level of historical ignorance or a mischievous penchant

for selectivity. The absolute originality of an idea is nearly always impossible to establish, if indeed it ever exists at all. Very few of Shakespeare’s plays, if any, were original ideas of his own. Mozart did not invent the symphony, the concerto, the sonata, opera, the diatonic scale or the chromatic scale, but this does not prevent us from recognising him as one of the most prodigious and profound talents of which the human race can boast. Arguments of originality are not central to the issue at hand. That which is central concerns the positive role that the churches, and, of course, other community organisations, can play in the public debate of major issues and the shaping of the future. Moyes most definitely believed that the values constituting his vision were Christian values. The question of whether they can continue to be regarded as specifically Christian is rapidly losing its relevance. His belief in the Christian God was strong but it was balanced with optimism and an unshakeable faith in human potential. John Moyes was one of the enlargers of life and his contribution to providing a vision for a more humane, equitable and just society for all deserves recognition.
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Moyes, J. S., *Revival or Revolution*, a Charge delivered to the second session of the Twenty-Sixth Synod of the Diocese of Armidale, 2 May 1949.


Moyes, J. S., *Religion and Education*, A Charge delivered to the first session of the Twenty-Seventh Synod of the Diocese of Armidale, 1 May 1950


Moyes, J. S., *Sacramental Living*, A Charge delivered to the third session of the Twenty-Ninth Synod of the Diocese of Armidale, 23 February 1958


**Journals**


*Australian Historical Studies*, Melbourne.


*Australian Quarterly*, Sydney.


*Morpeth Review*, Morpeth.

*St Mark’s Review*, Canberra.

**Newspapers and Newsletters**

*Age*, Melbourne.

*Advertiser*, Adelaide.

*Anglican*, Sydney.

*Argus*, Melbourne.
Armidale Express, Armidale.

Australian, published nationally.

Australian Church Record, Sydney.

Canberra Times, Canberra.

Catholic Weekly, Sydney.

Catholic Worker, Melbourne.

Church of England Messenger, Melbourne.

Church Standard, Sydney.

Church Times for the Church of England in Australia, Sydney.

Church Times, London.

Courier-Mail, Brisbane.

Daily Telegraph, Sydney.

Farmer and Settler, Sydney.

Guardian, Melbourne.

Herald, Melbourne.

Labor Daily, Sydney.

Mercury, Hobart.

Nation, Sydney.

National Times, Sydney.

Newcastle Morning Herald, Newcastle.


News-Weekly, Melbourne.


Northern Magazine, Tamworth.
Some of the most recent editions of the Bible and Strong’s Concordance have been utilised for purposes of cross checking. Due to the fact that in Chapter 5 André Trocmé drew his inspiration from the Gospel According to St Luke, several commentaries on Luke have also been consulted.
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