

Dunedin Methodist Parish

Finding Good in everyone Finding God in everyone

www.dunedinmethodist.org.nz

Presbyter:	Rev. Siosifa Pole 455 2923	
Parish Stewards:	Dr George Davis	453 6540
	Dr Richard Cannon	477 5030
	Mrs Fay Richardson	489 5485
Tongan Steward:	Mr Palanite Taungapeau	456 3144
Parish Office:	Siosifa: parish@dmm.org.nz Sarah: sarahc@dmm.org.nz	466 4600

PARISH BULLETIN 4th September 2011

WORSHIP FOR SUNDAY 11 th SEPTEMBER 2011			
9.30am	Mornington	S Pole	
9.30 am	Mosgiel	K Russell	
11.00 am	Glenaven	S Pole	
11.00 am	Wesley	K Russell	
1.00pm	St Kilda	TBA	
4.00pm	Broad Bay	No Service	

MOSGIEL METHODIST WOMEN'S FELLOWSHIP Tuesday 6th September 1:30pm in the Lounge Mr Bill Feather will be speaking to us "Life as the Community Board Chairman."

MORNINGTON WOMEN'S FELLOWSHIP

The next Meeting for Women's Fellowship will take place on the 12th September at 2p.m., in the Church Lounge. The Speaker will be Mary Thompson - The subject - " New Zealand Birds". Please bring along ideas for the Spring Outing & End-of -year Party. See you there.

CUPCAKES FOR CHAPLAINCY

Wednesday 21 September, Dunedin Hospital Foyer. **Baking needed!** Contact Anna on 474 0999 ext 8130 anna.barham@southerndhb.govt.nz

THANK YOU

To those who were attended the training seminar at the weekend and also for the two tutors from Trinity Theological College who came and led the seminar.

BABY SITTER?

The Parish website has had an enquiry from someone looking for a baby sitter for Rugby World Cup Match England v's Argentina on the 10th. Please contact Will – <u>will@meribelskichalets.co.uk</u>

HAPPY MEALS are not the sole prerogative of McDonalds. The monthly meal at Mornington, preceding the Open Education programme, has become a happy monthly appointment for those who regularly share the good nourishing meal provided. Pictures show some of the happy diners at a recent meal.





LETTER OF THE WEEK - Chosen as Letter of the Week in the NZ Herald last Saturday, this letter from the Rev Michael Dymond of Te Puke hits the mark pretty well. amd is a poignant pointer to a key election issue

New Zealand has been likened to Norway in areas of tolerance, human rights, near absence of corruption and so on. There is, however, one glaring difference, and that is income equality. Comparing the income of the richest 20 per cent with the poorest 20 per cent, the ratio is 3.9 in Norway and 4 in Sweden. In New Zealand it is 6.8, in Australia 7, and in the United States 8.5.

Inequality of incomes has a major influence on rates of social disease such as infant mortality, imprisonment rates, teenage pregnancy, drug abuse and so on. Norway has a low index of health and social problems, while New

2

Zealand is among the highest. Now, we are focusing on our embarrassing child abuse record.

New Zealand has failed for too many years to live up to the ideal of a good place to bring up children. We only try to tinker with the symptoms. It is time to address the underlying factor, inequality of income. Everything else flows from there.



Abraham Maslow formulated his now famous Hierarchy of Needs in 1943. Many of you will be familiar with it:

Level 1: Physiological needs Level 3: Belonging needs Level 5: Self actualisation needs Level 2: Safety needs Level 4: Esteem needs

The two things that were distinctive about the Hierarchy were firstly that someone had managed to differentiate these needs, and secondly that the needs always flowed one from the other: Maslow said that people would solve their Physiological need set before trying to meet the Safety needs and so on.

Much social policy and social work practice has now been built on Maslow's work. It was an idea whose time had come, that was simply so much "common sense" that it was never questioned.

However, there is a problem with Maslow's Hierarchy and it is this: people do not leave their self-actualisation needs until last. The search for selfactualisation and esteem actually permeates every need and every situation that people find themselves in.

Unfortunately, following Maslow, most social practice assumes that these things will be a by-product of the work: let's get your damp cold housing sorted and then you will feel better about your life. Get your spending under control and stop drinking / doing drugs and you'll be right.

The belief that esteem and self-actualisation can wait until the end is what causes us to stand over those who need our assistance, not stand alongside them. It allows us to be controlling, to say the ends justify the means, because we are assured that we know better, and that hope and dignity will result regardless.

But people do not leave their hope and dignity needs until last. These are constant needs, needs that are essential to being a person, indivisible from having or being a "self".

How might a person conceive of themselves without a sense of integrity of being?

How could any assistance to that person be meaningful if it did not also acknowledge their integrity of being?

Yet much of what is provided, and certainly politically pontificated upon (it is, tiresomely, election year *again!*), assumes this is not necessary.

If you have ever been sneered at by a shop assistant, talked over by a medical professional, talked down to by a helper of any stripe, or had your needs (and better knowledge of yourself) ignored; you will understand exactly what I am referring to.

Rob Kilpatrick is the Theological Director for World Vision Australia, and early last year he spoke at a seminar hosted by the Howard Paterson School of Public Theology, on whether faith-based agencies make a particular difference.

Rob believes, and has the evidence to prove it, that faith-based agencies, by their nature, do bring a something to the mix that secular agencies do not: building hope and dignity as a <u>first</u> priority.

In doing this, I believe Rob's work echoes John Wesley's sermons on the Catholic Spirit and a Warm Heart.

The call of the Catholic Spirit is to see others, despite their differences, as integral as we ourselves are.

The challenge of the Warm Heart is that of personal, transcendent experience. Any acknowledgement of this experience in us is inescapably an acknowledgement of it in others.

Maslow was wrong: doing unto others as we would never put up with for ourselves, is not the way forward. Wesley, 200 years earlier, was right: seeing ourselves in each other, is the first step in bringing each of us into the light. *Laura Black*