THE PRINCIPLES OF ROMAN CATHOLIC EDUCATION AS STATED IN THE ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PAUL VI, THE DECLARATION ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION (GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS) AND THE APPLICATION OF THESE PRINCIPLES IN CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

EDWARD P. RODGERS

THE PRINCIPLES OF ROMAN CATHOLIC EDUCATION AS STATED IN THE ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PAUL VI, THE DECLARATION ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION (GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS) AND THE APPLICATION OF THESE PRINCIPLES IN CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

by

Edward P. Rodgers

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Department of Educational Foundations

Memorial University of Newfoundland

July 1989

St. John's Newfoundland

ISBN 0-315-65311-6

Abstract

In the light of the current controversy concerning our denominational system of education it is becoming commonplace for critics to derogate the whole system because of its financial and administrative difficulties, as well as to attribute the so-called "hanging-on" stance of the churches to a grasping for power that they are unwilling to relinquish. It appears that the churches are engaged in the retention of a corporation-style monopoly, for from time to time we hear charges of discrimination, disregard for the freedom of conscience and religious rights [with particular reference to non-adherents of representative faiths] enshrined in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the dismissal of teachers for behaviour inconsistent with church teaching. In the face of such charges we are reminded that the right of the churches to retain such power in our educational system stems from the entrenchment of such rights in the Constitution of our country under the Terms of Union of 1949. Perhaps we are led to believe that if such entrenchment were not the case the denominational system and its accoutrements would be relegated to the history books. The question then is quite straightforward: Why are the churches retaining such a large share of responsibility in education? Surely the answer must be more profound than the simple manipulation of power.

The purpose of this study is to research and thus to clarify the particular position of the Roman Catholic Church on education. Although it is inevitable that some evaluation will enter into the treatment of the topic, this is by no means an attempt to justify or abrogate the Roman Catholic position, but to offer some elucidation which would serve as a foundation for rational discussion of an educational system which is, and apparently will continue to be, a controversial issue.

Our study is an analysis of the principles of Catholic education as found in The Declaration on Christian Education of Pope Paul VI (1965); The Catholic School (1977) and Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith (1982), both published by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, Rome; and Catechesi Tradendae, (an Apostolic Exhortation of John Paul II, 1979). These documents were chosen primarily for the impact they have on Catholic Education. Paul VI's Declaration on Christian Education may be considered the most recent definitive statement of the principles of Catholic education. The two post-Vatican II documents formulated by the Sacred Congregation for Christian Education, The Catholic School (1977) and Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith (1982) were included because they offer specific interpretation of the Declaration's presentation of the role of the Catholic School and of the lay teacher in the educational field. The Apostolic

Exhortation, Catechesi Tradendae, of John Paul II underlines the importance of education in the faith and therefore affirms one of the most fundamental principles of Catholic education, that is, the unity of faith and knowledge. Specifically our study endeavours to ascertain whether the ideals presented in Catholic teaching are faithfully reflected in local Catholic denominational policy statements and documents. Following the introductory chapter we will consider the principles of autonomy, freedom, and conscience as they are presented in the Declaration in chapter II. In chapter III the relationship between faith and education is explored, for this aspect of educational thought is crucial to any understanding of the Catholic position on schooling. The fourth chapter concerns the Catholic church's teaching on parental rights and education. Chapter V will be an attempt to navigate the difficult waters of the Catholic teacher's role, while the final chapter will consider some of the issues arising out of our local denominational system.

It is our hope that the elucidation of the principles in this thesis demonstrates that Catholic education does not bear within itself any essential incompatibility with the objectives of those who are seeking a more efficient educational system in Newfoundland and Labrador. Undoubtedly our denominational system is beset by difficulties but to subscribe to the thinking that these difficulties are the

direct result of the present system, and will disappear with its dismantling, is an oversimplification. Local Catholic education authorities, in particular, the Catholic Education Council, have demonstrated a willingness both in policy statements and in the practical implementation of these policies to find solutions to the problems that beset education provincially.

Acknowledgements

I wish to take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to Dr. Romulo Magsino, formerly of the Department of Educational Foundations at Memorial University of Newfoundland. His guidance, insights and high academic standards have been invaluable. I offer my sincere appreciation to Dr. John Netten, Head of the Department of Educational Foundations at Memorial, for assuming the unenviable role of thesis advisor on the departure of Dr. Magsino. I would also like to thank Miss Maureen Kent for the many cheerful receptions and helpful tidbits of information passed along during numerous visits and calls at the Foundations Office. Words cannot adequately convey my appreciation to my Aunt Grace who so willingly accepted the tedious task of typing and retyping numerous drafts and revisions. Her patience and endurance are indeed Olympian. Finally to my wife Gail and my children Lynn, David and Beth Ann a heartfelt thank you for much loving support made tangible in an atmosphere of tranquillty and countless cups of tea.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

Introduction

If one were to poll a cross-section of the Newfoundland public and ask that cross-section to identify the single greatest drawback of our education system, it is reasonable to assume that many of those polled would implicate the denominational system. The precise details of the villainy would perhaps be a little more nebulous, but for those who cast sidelong glances of disfavour on our educational system, perhaps we could look to the example of verbal fencing carried on in the December, 1987, issue of the NTA Bulletin. This exchange between a local lawyer and a provincial MHA was noteworthy because it brought into focus the criticism levelled against the denominational system but at the same time displayed what appears to be a grave misunderstanding of the principles which are, in fact, the infrastructure of this system. It appears to be common practice on the part of critics to derogate the whole system because of its administrative and financial difficulties as well as to attribute the so-called "hanging-on" stance of the churches to a grasping for power that they are unwilling to relinquish. As an example of this attitude, let us take a look at the exchange alluded to above.

In a response to the lawyer for comments made on a local radio show, the former provincial NDP leader, stated in a letter appearing in the NTA Bulletin, December 1987.

> There is duplication in the denominational education system and we are long overdue in looking at the system to see where duplication can be eliminated, but pointing to the system as another major reason for our problems is simplistic.[1]

The lawyer, in a rejoinder appearing in the same issue of the NTA Bulletin, stated emphatically: "The major problem with our educational system is that it is a denominational system."[2]

A little further along, she states: "... the denominational system is the reason that our basic academic skills are falling further and further between (behind) the rest of Canada."[3]

Lastly, and this point, I believe, is pivotal to the problem, she writes: "The churches with their millions of dollars worth of property and their power influence over the system will never voluntarily give way to a system which is more efficient and effective."[4]

It appears, if one accepts a superficial rationale, that the churches are engaged in the retention of a corpora-

tion-style monopoly, for from time to time we hear charges of discrimination, disregard for freedom of conscience and religious rights (with particular reference to non-adherents of representative faiths) enshrined in our Charter of Rights, and the dismissal of teachers for behaviour inconsistent with church teaching.

In the face of all of this debate and controversy we are reminded that the right of the churches to retain such power in our educational system stems from the entrenchment of such rights in the Constitution of our country under the Terms of Union of 1949.

The question is really quite straightforward, but the answer must be more profound than the simple manipulation of power. Why are the churches retaining such a large share of the responsibility in education?

The purpose of this study is to research and clarify the particular position of the Roman Catholic Church on education, and the ways we believe this position has been interpreted and applied in the policies set out by those having decision-making power in our Newfoundland Catholic System. Although there is always the possibility of some evaluation entering into the treatment of this topic, this is by no means an attempt to either justify or abrogate the Catholic stand, but to offer some elucidation which could serve as a foundation for rational discussion of an educa-

tional system which is, and apparently will continue to be, a controversial issue.

It is important to note the necessity of such elucidation for, as with any human enterprise, moments of folly can be uncovered as well as justification for criticism. The question must remain, however, if it is justifiable to leap from criticism to outright derision and thence to the dissolution of an educational system that grew out of the Churches' response to the genuine needs of a people. The danger here is that duplication and denomination will become synonymous with failure and, not appreciating the educational principles at work, we will become like the people described by the America writer, Annie Dillard: "... people whose areas of ignorance are perhaps different, who dismantled their mangers when they moved to town and threw out the baby with the straw."[5]

Dillard does not mention the word "secular", but there does appear to be a subtle reference from time to time in her work that, with necessary technological and scientific advancement, we are drifting irrevocably away from a sense of religion. Perhaps such a secular trend in thought is leading us unwittingly to abandon our denominational system on the yet unsubstantiated premise that religion has nothing to do with education.

As well there are critics who hold fast to the opinion

that religion and education are a potentially dangerous partnership poised to do away with the development of autonomous judgement on the part of students. T.H. McLaughlin in a rejoinder to Eamonn Callan appearing in the Journal of Philosophy of Education in 1985, had to say:

> We know very little about how, as a matter of fact, personal and moral autonomy is developed in children, or for that matter, in adults. In particular, we know little about the significance for this development of an involvement with particular substantive traditions of thought, practice and value, or about the role of virtues and other practical dispositions in the process.[6]

McLaughlin goes on to recommend that extensive research be carried out on the circumstances and conditions which favour the development of personal autonomy particularly in the area of religion. It is worthwhile noting that McLaughlin states the possibility of risks to autonomy arising from sources other than a religious upbringing. As a matter of fact, he indicates that an absence of a religious perspective could have a detrimental effect on the achievement of personhood. In alluding to the obstacles that children face during their growing to adulthood, McLaughlin writes:

> These features may well include the predominance of attitudes and views indifferent or hostile to religious perspectives, and a relentless manipulation of human appetites, predilections and wants in such a way that it is very difficult for the child to arrive at a position of genuine "open-mindedness" enabling judgement enabling judgement about religion to be achieved.[7]

Considering the charges of indoctrination that are frequently heard, it is quite understandable that such charges can be an important aspect of any drive to remove religious influence from education. The fact is, and McLaughlin makes this point, that indoctrination does not have to be religion-based. Just as the zealously religious can indoctrinate, the fanatically secular can do likewise. Many errors have been made in the name of religion, some of these errors have been grievous, and some tragic, but to claim that one's sense of justice would be appeased and a far more efficient educational system would result if the churches would only depart and bequeath the education of our children to the state, is an example of the kind of generalized thinking that creates rather than solves problems. If we permit our thinking to become polarized in this area we are resigning ourselves to an extremism which would effect-

ively perpetuate injustice and reduce the possibility of exercising choice in schooling.

The kind of exclusive point of view that ascribes all our educational ills to denominationalism creates a brand of tunnel vision which literally destroys the positive value of human error. In a lighter but nevertheless appropriate comment Lewis Thomas, in a delightful little book of essays entitled, The Medusa and the Snail, offers an enlightening thought on the human propensity for making mistakes.

> Mistakes are at the very base of human thought, embedded there, feeding the structure like root nodules. If we were not provided with the knack of being wrong, we could never get anything useful done. We think our way along by choosing between right and wrong alternatives, and the wrong choices have to be made as frequently as the right ones. We get along in life this way. We are built to make mistakes, coded for error.[8]

Whatever one may think of Lewis Thomas's reflections, the message to the well-meaning but single-minded is quite clear. We need to be discerning enough not to obliterate the whole enterprise because there may be flaws, inconsistencies, and shortcomings, however glaring these shortcomings

may be.

In this regard it would prove beneficial to consider some of the reflections formulated by Romulo Magsino in his paper, "Teacher and Students Rights within the Denominational Schoolhouse Gate." Having discussed some of the controversial issues arising out of clashes over rights, Magsino goes very practically to the crux of the problem and asks what can be done. He immediately offers three reasons why the abolition of the denominational system in favour of a secular one would not be either feasible or recommended at this particular time. Firstly, there does not seem to be hard evidence that a secular system is superior to a denominational one. Magsino suggests that the reverse is probably true.

Secondly, the denominational system is entrenched in the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada in 1949. Considering that a constitutional amendment would be necessary to alter this, such a decision right now would be a highly volatile one. The third reason is this: both the Graesser and Warren studies on the public opinions and attitudes toward denominational education have revealed substantial support for it.[9]

However, if these reasons did not exist, advocates of complete secularization would have to work a way around the most compelling reason of all for the non-abolition of the

present system. Magsino writes:

> The main problem in any proposal involving the complete secularization of schools in the province is that, in seeking justice for the non-religious and non-christians, it is bound to offend justice itself. In a completely secular educational arrangement, a reverse injustice will be inflicted on religious groups and individuals whose religious freedom and liberty rights will surely be violated. Needless to say, a moral wrong is not made right by another moral wrong.[10]

We are admonished that changes in our system effected on the basis of purely ideological, economic, or legalistic considerations may overlook the human rights perspective based on the notion that every person and, in fact every group, possesses human rights and dignity.

The philosophy of education has a unique foundational role to play in this debate. By definition it is mandated to probe beneath the surface of the present educational set-up to ascertain whether injustice, duplication and educational inefficiency are essential outgrowths, or merely obsolete appendages that can be removed as denominationalism strives to become more consistent with human rights and

improved educational practice. The sort of thinking that would lead us into an either-or situation appears tainted with a rank consumerism that is all too willing to discard rather than commit itself to pursuing a critical perspective.

In an article on teacher education and the necessity of critical thought appearing in Educational Foundations Fall, 1986, Edward H. Berman is concerned that we, in the educational field, are too production-oriented to the detriment of the value of what we are doing. One of his pivotal criticisms is the often blind acceptance given to what he calls "quick-fix" solutions, educational reports, and the roles played by various corporate agencies who are committed to advancing their own stated or unstated aims. Berman's contention is that those who work in education have generally fostered an apathetic stand that is far removed from critical thinking and worse again, this apathy is often defended as a commonsensical, realistic approach to the world around us. It is certainly within the scope of the philosophy of education to engage both educators and the public-at-large in a consciousness raising that would make us aware of the broader obligations, sometimes obscured by economic and legal considerations, that we have toward those we are seeking to educate.

It is interesting to note that those involved in values education are frequently required to remind students that their moral behaviour must be viewed within the framework of the wider society, yet Berman is of the opinion that teachers in their professional practice exhibit a somewhat narrow vision. He writes:

> The nature of the school's organization, its hidden norms and agendas, its larger functions in the society are unknown to many teachers. For them the school exists in a vacuum, detached from the larger society. It is an institution on its own, apart from the others. To put this another way: many teachers and prospective teachers lack a framework that enables them to understand the socioeconomic and political basis of contemporary schooling.[11]

In the context of our provincial educational system, there is a need for a deeper understanding as well as a questioning attitude that is simply not prepared to accept and promulgate what are often billed as utopian solutions. In a public forum on denominational education sponsored by the Division of Continuing Studies at Memorial University in 1987, one lady suggested that we abolish the present system for a secular one where provision would be made for

the Catholics to receive their bit of religion and the Protestants theirs. She concluded by saying that such an arrangement would make everybody happy. This is indeed a daring piece of prophecy. It is very glib, quite smooth, all the problems are apparently solved, and the religious groups are satisfied. The reality is that there are simply too many facets of education that demand more scrutiny, and oftentimes that scrutiny is not forthcoming because, as educators, we feel our duty is to remain stoically steadfast to the goings-on in the classroom, while the general public is awaiting our leadership in this area. The issue is undoubtedly very complex and perhaps our first impulse is to shy away and seek respite in the "quick-fix" solution. However, as Magsino so rightly points out, in response to justice for all, we are obliged to seek, in a penetrating fashion, the separation of wheat from chaff. This process will often leave us with a bewildering sense of groping in a labyrinthine darkness, but as one essayist aptly said: "You do not have to sit outside in the dark. If, however, you want to look at the stars, you will find that darkness is necessary."[12]

With this preamble behind us, our study will be an analysis of the principles of Catholic education as found in current official documents of the Roman Catholic Church (e.g. The Declaration on Christian Education of Pope Paul

VI (1965); The Catholic School (1977) and Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith (1982), both published by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, Rome; Catechesi Tradendae, an Apostolic Exhortation of John Paul II (1979). These documents were chosen primarily for the impact they have on Catholic Education. Paul VI's Declaration on Christian Education may be considered the most recent definitive statement of the principles of Catholic education. The two post-Vatican II documents formulated by the Sacred Congregation for Christian Education. The Catholic School (1977) and Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith (1982) were included because they offer specific interpretation of the Declaration's presentation of the role of the Catholic School and of the lay teacher in the educational field. The Apostolic Exhortation, Catechesi Tradendae, of John Paul II underlines the importance of education in the faith and therefore affirms one of the most fundamental principles of Catholic education, that is, the unity of faith and knowledge. Specifically our study will endeavour to ascertain whether the ideals presented in Catholic teaching are faithfully reflected in local Catholic denominational policy statements and documents. Following this brief introduction we will consider the principles of autonomy, freedom, and conscience as they are presented in the Declaration. In chapter III the relationship between

faith and education is explored, for this aspect of educational thought is crucial to any understanding of the Catholic position on schooling. The fourth chapter concerns the Catholic church's teaching on parental rights and education. Chapter V will be an attempt to navigate the difficult waters of the Catholic teacher's role, while the final chapter will consider some of the issues arising out of our local denominational system.

Finally, reference must be made to the turmoil currently being experienced in the Roman Catholic community here in Newfoundland. Although the impact on Catholic Denominational Education as well as on the Catholic Church in our province is certainly shattering, there are several reasons why this thesis does not attempt to analyze or evaluate the effects of this tragic situation.

First of all, although the physical and sexual abuse of children by priests and teaching brothers is indeed relevant to a discussion of the principles of autonomy, freedom, and conscience, and will undoubtedly enter hotly into the denominational vs secular debate, it is not specifically an educational issue. The present situation has much broader implications such as the perceived power structure of the Roman Catholic Church in Newfoundland; the screening, training and on-going evaluation of candidates for the priesthood; and the social position which has been enjoyed

by clergy, particularly Roman Catholic clergy, in our province.

Second, the very complexity of this issue with its sociological and psychological implications makes it a topic in its own right of not one thesis, but several. As well we are not yet in a position to stand back and rationally scrutinize these contentious issues as they are still being dealt with in the legal system. Perhaps when the dust settles, we will be better able, in the clear light of day, to penetrate, analyze, and evaluate the implication these events have had for our educational system.

CHAPTER II

The Principles of Autonomy, Freedom and Conscience as Outlined in Section I of the Encyclical of Pope VI, The Declaration on Christian Education (Gravissimum Educationis)

This encyclical letter on principles of autonomy, freedom and conscience begins with the open admission that it is a compilation of principles fundamental to education. It not only encourages development of these principles, but advises church authorities to apply them in their own particular localities. Educational principles are not left to be discussed in theoretical circles, but to be acted upon once local circumstances and conditions have been assessed.

It is noteworthy that from the outset the letter recognizes the necessity of the universal availability of this basic human right in the practical striving towards it. Although the Church recognizes that education is more easily accessible today, there still exists an urgency to offer educational opportunities not only to children, but to adults. Some of the reasons offered for expanding the commitment to education are given as follows:

> Men are more aware of their own dignity and position; more and more they want to take an active

> part in social and especially in economic and political life. Enjoying more leisure, as they sometimes do, men find that the remarkable development of technology and scientific investigation and the new means of communication, offer them an opportunity of attaining more easily their cultural and spiritual inheritance and of fulfilling one another in the closer ties between groups and even between peoples.[13]

Autonomy

It is doubtful whether either the secular humanist or the Christian educator would find fault with the above statements. The rationale offered has, as an underlying unifying thought, the most acceptable of education's aims, namely, the attainment of rational autonomy. A process, or better still, a journey, is described through which the individual becomes an active participant in his own personal fulfillment. One would risk going so far as to suggest that such strong advocates of the secular power in education as Joseph Tussman and Cornell Hamm would acknowledge the appropriateness of the encyclical's opening comments. It may prove useful at this point to offer the essential views of each of these thinkers. Our purpose in doing so would be to ascertain whether there appears to be any fundamental

disagreement in position.

In Chapter 3 of Government and the Mind, Joseph Tussman analyses the teaching power of government. In his view the crux of the government control in education lies in ensuring its own continuity.[14] Tussman is certainly very much aware of the potential for too much control and a little later on in this chapter he writes: "The scope of the teaching power is so formidable that the problem may appear, in the end, to be less how to protect it than how to limit it."[15]

In his discussion of teaching as the unique function of the teaching authority Tussman describes it as a pervasive activity so sensitive that at the teacher is actually in a position of grave trust. The possibility of breach of trust is ever present and "frightening to the extent that stringent screening should take place". The desire to teach, and the technical competence to do so, are only part of the picture, for there are other "considerations having to do with the ethos of the role,"[16] which Tussman finds too nebulous to be admitted into the administrative criteria against which a teacher is to be measured. Nevertheless, in front of a "captive audience of minors" teachers reveal themselves, perhaps inadvertently. The question remains - what do teachers teach through such revelation? To put it bluntly, teachers cannot do whatever they please even in the name of academic freedom. Tussman views education as

"development in a context of initiation"[17] which, in reality, translates into a socialization process but with an eye to the particular aptitude and giftedness of the student. Tussman's basic message is that the educator's role as an agent of the teaching power is to continue culture rather than merely transmit it.[18] Although he accepts the mandate of the teaching power, Tussman's view of the child reveals a vulnerability. When coupled with his comments on the propensity for abuse already built into the educational structure, this vulnerability leads one to believe that he is laying the groundwork for lay intrusion as a means of monitoring the process. This is not to say that abuse is not dealt with by teachers themselves as part of their professional responsibility, but the number of variables in education is so great that the obstacles would be insurmountable.

In a sense, Cornell Hamm follows Tussman's line of reasoning in selecting the wider community as a more fitting authority in education. Although he does agree that prerational children have rights which are "expressions of deep-seated natural human urges,"[19] and that parental rights are, in fact, a reflection of their duties toward their children, he does hold the line that the state offers the best opportunity for fulfilling the overall goal of education. Evidently, he feels that the socialization process

can best be carried out in a public school system, for the only reason parents would have for removing their children from this system would be "to make room for religious indoctrination."[20] Hamm is indeed a secular humanist and displays his willingness to see religious education and indoctrination as one and the same thing. In Hamm's view, religious education does not enhance rational autonomy, and therefore does not offer any sound basis for inclusion in the educational process. Hamm neglects to demonstrate this position. He does say, however, that knowledge and truth are public in character. Drawing on J.S. Mill's argument that truth will flourish better in "a free marketplace of ideas," he concludes that the right to decide on the content of education rests with the state for only the wider community has the competence necessary to make such decisions.[21]

Cornell Hamm, I believe, parts company with Joseph Tussman over the question of parental rights. Hamm leaves the impression that parental rights and state rights are incompatible, for he contends that there is nothing wrong with the value system presented in a state-run school, because, occurring as it does, in "a free marketplace of ideas," it fosters rationality. Parents would only object to state-sponsored education if they disagreed with the values presented in such a system. Hamm questions why they

would disagree when all views are presented in a fair, impartial way, without coercion, bias or approval. Such an open-ended presentation of values does have credibility as a teaching method used to stimulate debate, but whether such an approach can be sustained is quite doubtful. Teachers form relationships with students. Their values pervade what they say, do, and do not do. Joseph Tussman writes: "The office is a sensitive one and involves, as do medicine and law, close and confidential relations.[22]

When one considers, as does Joseph Tussman, the broad range of potential misdirection, then one must also agree with him that government involvement in education must take the "weak" rather than the "strong" form. These terms may be misleading although in Tussman's usage they have no bearing on competence or content but deal specifically with the way educational authority is allocated. The strong form sees government control in the pure sense, with other agencies acting out of state permission or tolerance. The weak form spreads the authority further. Government does have a major say, but there are other bodies who hold their own unique responsibilities. These could be various institutions, e.g., those run by religious orders. Certain standards could be set such as a minimum education level, certain standardized programs, etc. In any effort to balance the conflict of rights between parents and state,

Tussman says:

> But it may well be the weak version which is implied in our theory and practice. In any case, that is a version more likely to be hospitably received: is compatible, if it should prove necessary in the end, with the strong form; and is sufficient to establish government's legitimate involvement with the mind.[23]

In the weak form of government involvement in education, as Joseph Tussman describes it, there is really no inherent incompatibility between state and parental rights. There are areas of disagreement certainly, but this is necessary as one claimant checks the other. To allow the government authority to become boundless in scope would be just as disastrous as giving individual parents free rein in the exercise of whatever they perceive to be their rights. The tension created is a creative tension and a necessary element, in a process that is vital to society's self-preservation but exceedingly dangerous in its implementation if not constantly and consistently challenged.

At the beginning of the digression on the views of Tussman and Hamm, our intention was to seek some common ground. Certainly, Paul VI and Joseph Tussman can claim

agreement in certain areas but what of Cornel Hamm? If one considers his view on religious education, parental rights, and free and open presentation of values without fostering any in particular, the best one could hope for, considering the views presented in Gravissimum Educationis, would be an uneasy truce between Hamm and the Vatican. However, if one looks a little more closely, some interesting points emerge. The encyclical speaks of an awareness of our dignity; Tussman views the role of teacher as a very sensitive one considering the vulnerability of the student; Hamm is somewhat relentless in his condemnation of anything that smacks of indoctrination, presumably because it undermines the dignity of the learner and his right to a front row centre seat in "the free marketplace of ideas." Tussman and Hamm both view education as a socialization process whereas the encyclical accepts responsibility of preserving our society, of improving it, and of continuing our culture. Hamm is so strong on this point that he is afraid parents may interfere if granted too much of what they perceive to be parental rights over their children's education. Tussman, on the other hand, is worried that the teaching authority will overstep its bounds and hinder individual freedom, consequently depriving the state of the sort of health-giving cultural renewal that he deems necessary. Thus he stresses the "weak" form of government control

because it does provide a kind of internal system of checks and balances. In short, he sees a solution in a shared educational authority. Paul VI sees the socialization process reach its desired end not only in self-fulfillment but in the cooperation that gives rise to the fulfillment of others, both in our own society and beyond. The educational process, according to the encyclical, must afford all individuals "the opportunity of attaining more easily their cultural and spiritual inheritance."[24] Evidently, the idea of cultural inheritance would sound a familiar note with both Tussman and Hamm, but one must be careful, particularly at this point, not to overemphasize the similarities. There is, I believe, agreement that a principal objective of education should be the attainment of rational autonomy. However, the significance of this term will certainly vary as we pass from Tussman to Hamm and to the papal encyclical. Whatever the difference in definition of autonomy, one point is quite clear: that if the educational process is to be successful, individuals must be free and capable of pursuing their desire to become active and discriminating participants in social, economic and political life. Furthermore, this participation must not be that of the conformist, but rather the result of the individual's considered judgement.

Lewis Thomas inadvertently sums up the principal grounds for agreement as far as these three points of view

are concerned. He does this in an essay rather aptly entitled, "On Committees."

> The individual is the real human treasure, and only when he has been cultivated to full expression of his selfness can he become of full value to society. (.....). Integrity is the most personal of qualities; groups and societies cannot possess it until single mortals have it in hand. It is hard work for civilization.[25]

Having considered the raison d'etre behind a society's striving for educational excellence, and having done this in a comparative fashion to emphasize the unifying trends present, let us now take a closer look at what the Church perceives the universal right to an education to be. As this is one of the areas crucial to the understanding of the Catholic position on education and as faithfulness to the text is essential, we shall present this excerpt in its entirety.

> All men of every race, condition and age,since they enjoy the dignity of a human being, have an inalienable right to an education that is in keeping with their ultimate goal, their ability,

their sex, and the culture and tradition of their country, and also in harmony with their fraternal association with other peoples in the fostering of true unity and peace on earth. For a true education aims at the formation of the human person in the pursuit of his ultimate end and of the good of the societies of which, as man, he is a member, and in whose obligations, as an adult, he will share.

Therefore, children and young people must be helped, with the aid of the latest advances in psychology and the arts and science of teaching, to develop harmoniously their physical, moral and intellectual endowments so that they may gradually acquire a mature sense of responsibility in striving endlessly to form their own lives properly and in pursuing true freedom as they surmount the vicissitudes of life with courage and constancy.

Let them be given also, as they advance in years, a positive and prudent sexual education. Moreover, they should be so trained to take their part in social life that properly instructed in the necessary and opportune skills they can become actively involved in various community organizations, open to discourse with others and willing to do their best to promote the common good.

> This sacred synod likewise declares that children and young people have a right to be motivated to appraise moral values with a right conscience, to embrace them with a personal adherence, together with a deeper knowledge and love of God. Consequently it earnestly entreats all those who hold a position of public authority or who are in charge of education to see to it that youth is never deprived of this sacred right. It further exhorts the sons of the Church to give their attention with generosity to the entire field of education, having especially in mind the need of extending soon the benefits of a suitable education and training to everyone in all parts of the world.[26]

Let us now look more closely at this crucial passage in order to determine its significance. As they reflect educational principles previously stated in the Declaration on the Rights of Man adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, and also in the Declaration of the Rights of Children and the Convention Safeguarding the Rights of Men and Fundamental Liberties, the first two paragraphs of the above quotation would be deemed generally acceptable from a secular as well as a Christian point of view. However

there is a need to clarify certain key terms, for this passage is fundamental to the Church's overall position. For instance, the references to the instrumental value of education as achieving one's ultimate goal, and to the final end of "true education" being "the formation of the human person in the pursuit of his ultimate end" would inevitably lead us into a discussion of the significance of "ultimate". This would lead to consideration of those lived values which would assure the attainment of this goal. Not only are the latest developments in psychology and pedagogy called upon to further enhance educational practice, but it is interesting to note, as well, that this educational practice is to be balanced in order to promote harmoniously the various attributes of students, the physical, moral and the intellectual. One is struck throughout by the evident weighing of words which must have taken place prior to any commitment to print. For example, there is the distinction between education and training, a distinction that could open a discussion on the merits of preparing students to fit into a pattern in our economic system as opposed to preparing them "to form their own lives properly" in the pursuit of "true freedom". Training, as such, is mentioned only once in reference to developing the necessary social skills to become active, cooperative members of community groups dedicated to the building up of society in the sense of

fostering the common good. On a very practical note, as the encyclical was prepared during the onset of the so-called "sexual revolution",concern is shown that students be educated in the proper use of their sexuality so that this aspect of their lives becomes an integrated part of their personhood. Approximately twenty-three years have elapsed since "a positive and prudent sexual education" appropriate to the students' ages was called for. In the light of current developments such an education appears even more necessary than ever before.

Freedom

Before moving on to the third paragraph which deals with the appraisal of moral values and the development of right conscience, as well as the formation of a personal relationship with God, it may prove worthwhile to look at some of the ideas expressed by Paul Hirst in chapter four of Moral Education in a Secular Society. There are two principal reasons for doing this. First of all, it may be that Hirst's discussion of freedom can offer some insights into the Church's approach to this very relevant educational concept. Secondly, the emphasis the encyclical places on the fostering of an integrated and harmonious growth of personhood appears to have much in common with Hirst's concept of rational autonomy. As well, Hirst's reflections

on freedom and autonomy in an educational context constitute the basis for a strong refutation of Cornell Hamm's accusation that any recourse to teaching religious values is tantamount to indoctrination. This is not to downgrade in any way the academic freedom implied in the "free marketplace of ideas", thinking of J.S. Mill. Hamm apparently uses Mill's thinking to justify a totally unbiased presentation of values with the objective being that students remain free to choose those values they deem suitable. Tussman found such an idea untenable, for the teacher must in some way reflect those values and principles which he has made an integral part of his life. The Church speaks of "the formation of the human person", not the manufacture of an automaton. That guidance is offered with the aim of facilitating enlightened judgement, and for this to be referred to as an obstacle to self-determination in moral behaviour appears to be a blatant contradiction. In other words morality cannot be taught through the suspension of what it takes to make a moral decision. Paul Hirst writes in response to how morality works in an individual's life.

> F rst, almost obviously, it is to be expected that his actions will be seen to conform to the rules and principles concerned. But having said that, it must be added immediately that the moral life is of

> its essence not merely a matter of observable movements fitting in with certain rules. An automaton cannot be a moral being, nor can a trained pigeon, parrot or rat. For there to be the possibility of moral action, what occurs must be intended by the agent. It must be done by a being who knows what he is doing and, further, it must be done of his own volition.[27]

Evidently those who perceive the threat of indoctrination see it in the presentation of a morality viewed and accepted as objectively true which of course would necessitate the labeling of actions outside this morality as objectively wrong. If this presentation of a fundamental option between what is morally right and what is morally wrong is viewed as an obstacle to one's freedom, or as a hindrance to the development of a rational autonomy, then perhaps the problem lies in ones definition of true freedom. Morality has to be grounded in freedom, but by freedom we certainly do not mean total independence of any kind of constraint. Hirst is very careful to point out that freedom from constraint is really a matter of degree and can never be absolute.[28] We are caught in time and space, and we have developed a state of mind along with certain principles and criteria which reflect our character and upbringing. These

do not destroy our freedom but we are to make our choices within such a context. Just as total freedom and absolute autonomy have no real value as educational concepts, we would similarly have to refute authenticity, understood to mean being true to one's self or doing one's own thing, as a basis for morality for, as Hirst points out, the self who is trying to be authentic may not necessarily be moral.

> The moral life is not be lived by each person exercising his autonomy in being true to himself. It is lived by exercising one's autonomy in the interests of, and within the limits of, reason. Overstressing the place of autonomy in the moral life comes from forgetting what the precise character of morality as a whole is.[29]

There may indeed have been times when an overemphasis on the fear of punishment, either temporal or eternal, coupled with strong injections of guilt stemming no doubt from the incessant repetition of "God is watching you", have led to the mere observance of rules. As a means of developing moral consciousness such methods leave a lot to be desired. In the first place they are self-defeating, for a sense of morality is replaced by a conditioned response which certainly appears contrary to the church's stated aim

of fostering a "mature sense of responsibility".

The point is that the Catholic Church in her Declaration on Christian Education is fostering not a rigid adherence to doctrine, but an investigative stance that must of necessity contribute to the development of personhood. Undoubtedly the case of Catholic truth remains the same, but as each student progresses toward adulthood, the embracing of this truth is one side of a fundamental option we all have to make. To expect an adult to adhere unquestioningly to a set of beliefs, moral dictates and values and to do so with conviction is both impractical and contrary to good educational sense. The Church would not benefit in any way by enlarging its ranks with mindless members. With the multiplicity of values, creeds, and cults that are floating free in our pluralized society, the Catholic educator must surely realize that inquiry must be fostered if the Church is to offer to students a formation that leads to a true freedom. It has often been said that those converted to a faith or a cause make the strongest advocates. This does seem to make sense for conversion would make cause personal and not reduce it to observing a set of exhortations in a text. Such personal commitment must be achieved in a spirit of true freedom. In assessing the Church's approach to the teaching of values and how this is often interpreted as a form of indoctrination, one must admit that, although there

is indeed a difficulty when one tries to formulate a methodology of
ethics that takes into consideration the growth of the person, the teaching authority of the Church not only visualizes the spectre of arbitrariness creeping into ethical decisions, but is aware as well that perhaps we are leaving behind the security of a legal code which, despite its conflicts and problematic areas, offered a more or less consistent guideline. One Catholic moral thinker put the issue this way: "One of the more persistent features of Catholic moral teaching has been its insistence that morality has an objectivity to it and so moral judgments must be made according to objective norms.[30]

Conscience

Before concluding this chapter we must consider the important concept of conscience and its role in the development of moral values. The third paragraph in section one of the Declaration on Christian Education speaks of "the right to be motivated to appraise moral values with a right conscience, to embrace them with a personal adherence, together with a deeper knowledge and love of God.[31]

Conscience could be interpreted as the faculty of telling right from wrong, but such a definition leaves some questions unanswered. In the above quotation, conscience

aids in the appraisal of right from wrong. This implies the use of rational deliberation. There is a motivating factor present as well which would also indicate the kind of rational autonomy we have been speaking about in the earlier portion of this chapter. As well moral values are not to be superficial, but result from a deep personal commitment that is based on a real understanding. Conscience is a way of weighing our adherence to moral norms. It is based on rational deliberation, not simply on a little inner voice that somehow knows all there is about good and evil.

In his Moral Education in a Secular Society Paul Hirst takes issue with the traditional Christian understanding of mind, of which conscience is one "psychological entity", the others being reason, natural wants and desires, and will. Such crude breaking down of the mind into "a number of distinct naturally-given mental organs" lays the foundation for the typically Christian attitude that we can only overcome our weaknesses by appealing to the supernatural. He presents his arguments very forcefully and it is not our purpose to discuss whether he does so accurately. His presentation is very brief and simple. We will take a closer look at what he says about conscience particularly.

Because conscience was seen as a distinct mental organ, then according to Hirst's understanding of the traditional Christian view, it possessed an inbuilt moral voice, a sort

of filtering of the supernatural through the natural with the evident aim of helping us control those wants and desires which stem from our natural corruption. This inner voice, according to Hirst, has more to do with the intuitive form of cognitive judgment, rather than the result of deliberation. Hirst is justly critical of the accuracy of such a mode of distinguishing right from wrong, for he feels that the development of such an intuitive response could stem from a number of cultural, educational, and regional factors. The acting against such intuition "that was thought to be the voice of conscience in indicating moral truth,"[32] is in Hirst's estimation the reason behind the guilt feelings which we normally associate with going against our better judgement. Hirst does not question the existence of a conscience, merely the way that Christians have, in his view, interpreted its function and its source. Just as we can learn to judge in a morally principled way so we can also, according to Hirst, learn to develop strength of will and morally appropriate wants and desires. These conclusions would certainly have a tremendous effect on the organization of a moral education programme. Hirst has a word of caution for those who still adhere to the traditional Christian view as he interprets it.

> Christians must, I think, reconcile themselves

> fully to the truth that men can naturally do morally good actions, and that they can live the moral life without the injection into that life of divine, supernatural force, as something over and above the natural operations of the mind that I have sought to characterize.[33]

Hirst is establishing a principle here that effectively says we can live, directly and under our own human power, a good moral life. This may appear on the surface as if Hirst is taking a very strong anti-Christian stance. As a matter of fact one may get the impression that Hirst is denying that Christianity has anything of value to offer to the development of one's moral response. Of course, such is not the case, for moral actions are actions that can be rationally justified and to overlook the effectiveness of reason and its role in determining moral response is, in essence, to overlook the value of a gift freely bestowed by the Creator. As Hirst writes:

> The moral life does not presuppose the Christian life, it is rather that the Christian life presupposes the moral. It is time that metaphysically the moral life is underpinned by the realities of which the religious understanding of life speaks,

> but our way into the religious life in thought and deliberate action can only be through the natural moral life.[34]

Whatever course the concept of conscience has taken in its development as an essential part of the Church's moral teaching, it does appear that Hirst's thinking is being echoed within theological circles. Granted that the story of the concept of conscience would need to be properly analyzed by one well-versed in the history of moral theology, it can still be maintained that, apart from an overly simplistic treatment of the traditional Christian viewpoint, Hirst does reflect some current Catholic thinking. Father Richard A. McCormick S.J., in his essay, "Does Religious Faith Add to Ethical Perception?", offers a very brief look at some of the thinking that he says has been traditional at least since the time of Thomas Aquinas. His conclusion is that "Jesus Christ did not add any single moral prescription of a positive kind to the natural moral law."[35]

This is an extremely important conclusion for two reasons. First of all it does not negate the mysterious quality of faith, yet it upholds the dignity of human reason in matters where rational deliberation is crucial, by asserting that there should not be any ethical norms which are opaque to human reason. "Christian morality is, in its

concreteness and materiality, human morality. The theological study of morality accepts the human in all its fullness as its starting point.[36]

The point that McCormick appears to stress, as does Hirst, is that one can be moral without being Christian, but if one is Christian without being moral then his Christianity is severely lacking. Faith does add a further dimension to ethical behaviour and this we will deal with in the next chapter, but the essential point to bear in mind is that conscience is a faculty for moral judgment. This faculty is developed; it s informed by faith certainly, but not replaced by it, and most importantly it is not innate and therefore its development is seen as an extremely important foundation to living a moral life.

CHAPTER III

Christian Education and Sensus Fidei

> I know that the explanation of all things,the origin of all things, must remain hidden in infinity. But I do want to understand that I might be brought to the inevitably incomprehensible; I want all that is incomprehensible to be such not because the demands of the intellect are not sound (they are sound, and apart from them I understand nothing) but because I perceive the limits of the intellect. I want to understand so that any instance of the incomprehensible occurs as a necessity of reason and not as an obligation to believe.[37] (Leo Tolstoy, Confession)

These words from Tolstoy's little work Confession are particularly appropriate as an introduction to this chapter on the role of faith in Christian education. This is so for a number of reasons. He is extolling faith as a logical necessity in coming to terms with the limitations of our finitude. He is not doing so for purely epistemological reasons, but within the context of a soul-wrenching search for life's meaning. Nor is he presenting an exalted picture of faith to the detriment of reason. Reason is sound,

Tolstoy says, but faith permits us to deal with the incomprehensible. Faith does not deny reason, it upholds it, glorifies it and urges it on. If we deny faith, we fail to acknowledge the presence of mystery, and oddly enough by doing so we curtail to a very great extent our ability to know.

Faith and Reason

It is, in a sense, somewhat paradoxical that when we deify our human intellect, we set up barriers that prevent its full actualization. We do have a tendency to label every era as a new Age of Reason in which we reduce all the wonder and grandeur of our existence to what can be probed, analyzed and enveloped by our reason. We tend to dismiss what we cannot deal with in quantitative terms as superstitious, archaic, or merely hocus-pocus. In his essay, "Humanities and Science", Lewis Thomas had some enlightening things to say in this regard:

> We have a wilderness of mystery to make our way through in the centuries ahead, and we will need science for this, but not science alone. Science will, in its own time, produce the data and some of the meaning in the data, never the full meaning. For getting a full grasp, for perceiving real

> significance when significance is at hand, we shall need minds at work from all sorts of brains outside the fields of science, most of all the brains of poets, of course, but also those of artists, musicians, philosophers, historians and writers in general.[38]

Just as Lewis Thomas is stressing that there should not be any dichotomy between science and the humanities; that they should in fact complement each other, so The Declaration on Christian Education emphasizes the unity of reason and faith in the pursuit of our ultimate goal. Faith is in fact the sine qua non of Christian education, and this is stated quite forcefully in Section 2 of the encyclical letter. In the introduction to this thesis we stated that one of our objectives was to ascertain whether the denominational and secular systems of education were, in any way, essentially different. Up to this point, arguing from the principles of autonomy and freedom, we could say they are not different; in terms of the development of human potential, the good of society, the fullness of human maturation, both approaches are quite similar. The charges of indoctrination that are often levelled against denominational education as a result of its insistence on objective morality are undoubtedly worthy of a more challenging

response than what we have offered, but the answer to these charges must be found within the context of a Church which is publicly and painstakingly searching for the truth of its own mission in the world. Indoctrination must have at its source a sense of self-sufficiency that signals the search is over; the questions are answered; the mysteries are no more. Such a stance, if intentional, would be degrading for the gift of reason and the gift of faith. Catholic theology teaches that faith is a gift from God, not the result of a man-made obligation.

Christian Education

It may prove useful at this point to take a closer look at the encyclical's teaching on Christian education as it is formulated in Section II. One is immediately struck by a certain logical consistency that the ideas expressed here have with those principles outlined in Section I which dealt with the meaning of the universal right to an education. The difference lies in perspective. Section II looks at the fundamental aims and objectives of education from the viewpoint of reason enlightened by faith. We are reminded here of Paul Hirst's comment that the acceptance of Christian teaching leads to a mode of living that is specifically religious in character to the extent that the overall lifestyle of the person is affected.[39] Richard

McCormick, in his article on the influence of faith on ethical perception already cited in Chapter II of this paper, writes:

> Faith in these events [the incarnation of Jesus Christ, and the coming to reality of the kingdon of God], love of and loyalty to this central figure, yields a decisive way of viewing and intending the world, of interpreting its meaning, of hierarchizing its values. In this sense the Christian tradition only illumines human values, supports them, provides a context for their reading at points in history. It aids us in staying human by underlying the truly human against all cultural attempts to distort the human.[40]

Faith does not deny or supplant reason and may even be a stabilizing factor amidst the many diverse influences that are brought to bear on us in the very rapidly moving cultural context in which we find ourselves.

Let us consider the salient points addressed in this very important segment of the papal document. First that Christians have a right to a Christian education is asserted on the grounds that rebirth by water and the Holy Spirit have added a more profound meaning to life and that this new

dimension must be fostered. In addition to committing themselves to the full actualization of each student from the human perspective, Christian educators must make it a principal objective that students be made ever more acutely aware of the gift of faith that they have received and in the developing awareness of this gift, they derive a lasting appreciation of the mystery of man's salvation. In concrete terms, the deepening of faith and the concurrent sense that this gift brings with it the unique experience of personal salvation are expressed in liturgical action and in a personal life committed to justice and truth. The reference to the growth of the Mystical Body of Christ and the Christian formation of the world are in Christian terms the renewal of the human obligation to work for the good of society so that all men may partake of the great mystery of salvation. The importance of the following part of the Declaration requires its full inclusion in these considerations.

> Since all Christians have become by rebirth of water and the Holy Spirit a new creature so that they should be called and should be children of God, they have a right to a Christian education. A Christian education does not merely strive for the maturing of a human person as just now des-

cribed, but has as its principal purpose this goal: that the baptized, while they are gradually introduced to the knowledge of the mystery of the salvation, become even more aware of the gift of Faith they have received, and that they learn in addition how to worship God the Father in spirit and truth (cF. John 4:23) especially in liturgical action, and be conformed in their personal lives according to the new man created in justice and holiness of truth (Eph. 4:22-24); also that they develop into perfect manhood, to the mature measure of the fullness of Christ (cF.EpL. 4:13) and strive for the growth of the Mystical Body; moreover, that aware of their calling, they learn not only how to bear witness to the hope that is in them (cF. Peter 3:15) but also how to help in the Christian formation of the world that takes place when natural powers viewed in the full consideration of man redeemed by Christ contribute to the good of the whole society. Wherefore this sacred synod recalls to pastors of souls their most serious obligation to see to it that all the faithful, but especially the youth who are the hope of the Church enjoy this Christian education.[41]

Faith and Christian Education

The importance of faith in the Christian life and in Christian education as a means of living fully that life cannot be overestimated. From the earliest days of Christianity the life-giving quality of faith was attested to. In his treatise, Against Heresies, the early Christian bishop Irenaeus (circa 200 A.D.) wrote:

> The glory of God gives life, those who see God receive life. For this reason God, who cannot be grasped, comprehended or seen, allows himself to be seen, comprehended and grasped by men, that he may give life to those who see and receive him.[42]

Josef Pieper and Heinz Raskop traced the etymological development of the word "virtue" as they presented the same conclusion. Both the Latin root meaning manliness, meaning to be fit, "virtuous", and the German source "Tugend", indicate something more profound than good, acceptable surface behaviour carried out with the intention of making oneself pleasing to others or in fulfillment of an obligation. The virtuous person is engaged in actualizing the potential for good that is in him. Faith is the cornerstone of all the other virtues. It is the first theological virtue because it not only relates directly to God, but

because the Christian is a person of faith above all else. The Christian is first and foremost a believer and in his belief he recognizes that he can become fully human and fully alive. God is a reality for the Christian and his ultimate goal is no longer just full human maturity, but the destiny for which God has created him. "The Christian has fully realized the reality and answers God's revelation and gift of Himself with an unqualified and completely confident acceptance.[43]

We must return to a point made earlier, namely that faith enhances reason. The assumption is often made that because the articles of faith cannot be proven in a scientific sense, then they must be irrational. Faith and reason are distinct certainly, but that is not to say they are separate. Reason can add to faith through a sense of questioning, reflecting our need to penetrate the truth and to stabilize our lives with wisdom. Faith on the other hand can elevate reason by allowing us through revelation to glance at realities that our reason alone cannot attain. To the person of faith there is a compelling logic here that often leaves him somewhat bewildered, if not bemused, when the secular humanist informs him that the faithful have been victimized by propaganda and are behaving in ways which are divisive as far as the wider society is concerned. Jacques Maritain in discussing the term "Christian philosophy",

upholds the reciprocal and beneficial relationship that exists between faith and reason. A Christian can philosophize and does not, according to Maritain, have to put his faith in a strongbox in order to do so. Such strongboxes, he says, have very weak locks. Such activity is pretentious, for the Christian can and must question his beliefs, but he certainly is not expected to deny his faith merely because he cannot grasp it intellectually. It was the essayist Montaigne who wrote that "it is a dangerous and serious presumption, and argues an absurd temerity, to condemn what we do not understand."[44] Maritain asks if we can philosophize in faith. The answer depends very much on the viewpoint we take. If we detect an irrevocable separation between faith and reason, then such philosophizing is impossible because the former is an obstacle to the latter. If it can be shown that faith leads irreversibly to an intentional program of propaganda and indoctrination in order to preserve itself, then we had better band together and take definite measures against any system that permits such an educational travesty. On the other hand if we perceive faith in God as the sole condition which allows us to achieve our highest good and to become truly what we can become, then faith should be at the heart of our educational enterprise.

> When one becomes aware of it, then one is forced to admit that there is a "Christian Philosophy". It is philosophy, and its work is a Work of reason; but it is in a better position to perform its work of reason. Not only does faith place in our path certain signals ("Danger: Winding Roads," etc.), thanks to which our saloon-car runs less risks. But, above all, faith can help us from within to overcome allurements and irrational dreams to which, without assistance coming from a source superior to reason, we would be disposed to yield.[45]

Denominational Viewpoints

It is worthy of note that F.W. Rowe in a chapter on denominational viewpoints on education from his book, The Development of Education in Newfoundland, presents similar views on the role of faith in Christian education. These views emanate from spokesmen for the various religious groups active in the denominational systems in the mid 1960's; the time of the book's publication. Archbishop Skinner praised the "harmonious and happy relationship" that has developed between the various denominations and the governments. Such a relationship has made it possible "for Catholic children to receive their education in public schools which are Catholic, staffed by Catholic teachers and

administered by school boards made up of Catholic members with full financial support from the state on a non-discriminatory basis."[46] The Anglican Bishop of Newfoundland, the Right Reverend P.C. Abraham, stated that "the Synod stands firmly against any movement towards "common" or "state" schools when the motives for such are merely for financial savings or for centralized control. For we believe that the mere attainment of knowledge and skills is definitely harmful to the child and the community when divorced from a high standard of public opinion and the true purpose of man as revealed in Our Lord Jesus Christ."[47] This is evidently a very relevant statement for it touches on the problem of duplication, a problem which has fed the controversy over denominationalism for quite a while. Efficiency per se cannot be the sole objective of any educational system. "The true purpose of man" is a far more important consideration, and this should not be relegated to a position somewhere behind fiscal considerations when outlining educational priorities.

Rowe also offers an extract from a statement by Lieutenant - Colonel W.C. Brown who served as Salvation Army Superintendent of Education at the time of the book's publication. The extract refers to the willingness of the Salvation Army's educational authority to keep an open mind as far as streamlining the system was concerned, particu-

larly with regard to finances and the amalgamation of schools where denominations saw fit. However, Superintendent Brown is quick to point out the "danger to any land or community where a secularized education system is introduced in which the churches would have little or no voice. We hold that this would be a backward step."[48]

Eugene Vaters, speaking for the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, gave very definite expression to his denomination's philosophy of education by stating that:

> The Pentecostal religious philosophy is based upon the Biblical revelation of God, which enjoins upon parents (and not upon the state, or any other external authority) the duty and privilege of leading their children into full commitment to Christ and His purpose for their lives. It follows that the school - its teaching staff, curriculum, atmosphere - ought to be in harmony with this idea.[49]

The only major denominational group in Newfoundland who have, traditionally and in principle, objected to the present system is the United Church. Rowe cites a special meeting of Methodist clergymen at Carbonear in 1850 during which a statement of that church's policy was drawn up. One

must bear in mind that there was a strong possibility of a further division in the overall financial grant given to the general Protestant population. Such a move was felt by the Methodist Church to be not only unnecessary but also seriously detrimental to education in general. The following summary of their reasons has been accepted according to Rowe as the traditional stand of the Methodist Church (later the United Church) on denominationalism in Newfoundland.

> ... and as in the event of such a division, each Protestant Denomination would feel bound to do all in their power to impart religious and secular instruction to the children of their own people, there would be created a number of petty and rival schools; several of which would necessarily be of an inferior character, these so greatly to be deplored would probably be the most rife, when the people have been the least instructed, and where social harmony is essential to social programs and prosperity.[50]

The document goes on to ask government for an increase in available funds, which are to be given to the respective Boards of Education for purposes of school construction and

teacher salaries.

Rowe includes in his work a more current appraisal of the denominational system from the then Superintendent of United Church Schools, Charles L. Roberts,. Mr. Roberts says:

> The United Church of Canada has traditionally favoured a Newfoundland public school system of education established on a non-denominational basis. The United Church would support legislation bringing such a school system into being, and, would cooperate in any necessary transfer of school property now held in the name of the United Church, or, its school boards, to public school boards. It would be willing to withdraw from the public education field completely, providing government took full responsibility for the management and financing of Newfoundland education.[51]

We use these various views not to demonstrate the polarity of opinion on the denominational system but to offer some insight on why these views are such. It seems evident that those who favour retention of this system do so for reasons of faith, while those who favour its demise offer reasons of practicality and efficiency which are not

without validity. Denominationalism is seen by the latter as a divisive force, when in reality the faith element which is foundational to the system ought to be anything but divisive. In the 1929 encyclical letter of Pius XI, Divini Illius Magistri, as well as in the Declaration on Christian Education, reference is made to this unifying quality of faith.

> There let it be loudly proclaimed and generally understood when the faithful demand Catholic schools for their children, they are not raising a question of party politics but simply performing a religious duty which their conscience rigidly imposes upon them. Nor have they any desire to divorce their children from the national spirit and way of life.
>
> On the contrary, they want to mould them in accordance with it in the best sense and in the way most advantageous to the nation.[52]
>
> Consequently, the public power, which has the obligation to protect and defend the rights of citizens, must see to it, in its concern for distributive justice, that public subsidies are paid out in such a way that parents are truly free to choose according to their conscience the schools

they want for their children.[53]

A little further on, again in reference to state responsibility in education, the Declaration states:

> But it [the state] must always keep in mind the principle of subsidiarity so that there is no kind of school monopoly, for this is opposed to the natural rights of the human person, to the development and spread of culture, to the peaceful association of citizens and to the pluralism that exists today in ever so many societies.[54]

It would appear from the above extracts that the denominational system, representing as it does the various religious beliefs of its citizens, reflects more accurately the pluralized society in which we live. As well such a system offers a choice of schooling which would not otherwise be available if the state exercised a monopoly on education. The word, "divisive", used as it often is in a derogatory fashion, leaves the impression of sectarianism, but in fact it seems to be misused, for in any nation where freedom of choice can be exercised without infringing on another's basic human rights, such divisions are not only to be expected but also encouraged as a sign of national

health. The word "divisive" can be accepted as a negative reaction only after it has been carefully defined for unless it can be shown to foster bigotry, discrimination or feelings of religious supremacy, then perhaps it is not a criticism of the social effects of denominationalism at all, but a synonym for duplication. In this case we are back to the traditional criticism of the system which may not entail the dismantling of the whole structure. It is interesting to note, as Rowe points out, that many of the "evils" alluded to by Levi Curtis in 1905 have been either removed completely or effectively reduced. Curtis criticised the absurdity of a "denominationalism run to weeds" as a result of divisions in educational funding which saw the gross inefficiency of two or three schools in certain small outports operating for portions of the year when with unified funding one school could operate throughout the school year. He also decried the lack of attention paid to the Act for Amalgamated Schools which allowed denominations to work together for the common good of any given community.[55] Many of the changes which Curtis did not foresee when he penned his criticisms were given in Rowe's book as fait accompli. These changes include "the regional and central high school policy, greater centralization of the population, and the increasing tendency of denominations to work together in such things as common curriculum, the

training and licensing of teachers, and the establishment of common or amalgamated schools."[56] The point, of course, in all of this is that we have numerous indications that the system can be streamlined in its practical day-to-day operations while retaining its essential faith character, and safeguarding the element of choice which we would not otherwise have.

The Life of Faith

As we have pointed out earlier, faith is viewed as a life-giving force. This point is made very well in John Hick's Philosophy of Religion where he attempts to offer some philosophical insights into the major conceptual cornerstones of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. In his first chapter which deals with the idea of God as Creator who is creating "ex nihilo" Hick derives two corollaries. One is that there is an absolute distinction between God and his creation. The second corollary is significant for our discussion of faith. Hick writes:

> A second corollary is that the created realm is absolutely dependent upon God as its Maker and as the source of its continued existence. Hence we find that this radical notion of creation "ex nihilo" expresses itself in prayer and liturgy as

> a sense of dependence upon God for man's being from moment to moment. We have a part in the universe not by some natural right, but by the grace of God, and each day is a gift to be received in thankfulness and responsibility toward the divine Giver.[57]

Similar thoughts are expressed in a publication released by the Canadian Catholic Trustees' Association entitled Catholic Education: From Principle to Practice in Catholic Schools. Commenting on the Declaration on Christian Education, and in a general sense the impact of Vatican II, the Trustees' document emphasized the twofold purpose of Catholic education as the harmonious development of physical, moral and intellectual endowments, but as well the growth of a sense of responsibility "within youth is stressed so that they will be willing later on to act energetically on behalf of the common good."[58] In response to charges of segregation and the preservation of a siege mentality by Catholics, Bishop G. Emmett Carter said of the Declaration:

> The Church here states with utmost clarity that it has no desire to remain away from the world in a form of isolation but that Christian education is in the world, since man must work out his salvation

> in the concrete situation in which God has placed him and must achieve this not by protection but by contributing to the whole human community of which he is an integral and inseparable part.[59]

It is important to remember that the above quotation is not merely the opinion of one Bishop, but a statement of fundamental Catholic belief corresponding to the two great commandments of Jesus Himself. Every Catholic is called upon to deepen his relationship with God through individual prayer and the spiritual growth emanating from a life of quiet reflection. This life of faith is also nourished by community worship and this aspect of Catholic life is quite significant for it places each and every Catholic within a community with responsibility for its continued well-being. When the concept of community is logically pursued it cannot be confined to parish or diocesan community, but must be enlarged to world community, to the human family. One who professes to be Catholic must also commit himself to the growth of the human community in cooperation with all men so that a world of justice, peace, and mercy is not merely a platitude, but a becoming reality. The Catholic Church cannot be a closed society jealously guarding its members, and assiduously scrutinizing the credentials of all who express the desire to enter. If the Church is such, it is

no church at all, for as Christians we have been exhorted by Our Founder: "My commandment is this: love one another, just as I love you." (John 15:12)

In our introduction we quoted one critic of the denominational system who felt that the churches were endeavouring to retain a stranglehold on education because not to do so would mean the relinquishing of an influential and powerful social position as well as the jeopardizing of sizeable financial holdings. One of our purposes has been to demonstrate that the Catholic Church's concern in this area goes beyond prestige, be it financial or social, and has to do with bringing principles of education in line with the Christian view of mankind as it is expressed in the Gospel. That view of man is founded on the Judaeo-Christian concept of God who reveals Himself in time and space and who asks that we respond in faith. Those who advocate the secularization of education in our province perhaps do so because they view religion and education as antithetical, not thinking that secularism can also be given the status of a religion when the object of our faith shifts from God to man. It is not at all difficult to understand the very human reasons for this response, for we all have the knack of focusing on the practical aspects of everyday affairs, before we consider the intentions or motives behind them. The response to Catholic education, particularly in the

denominational form, is no different. To write about education and Catholicism demands that we come to terms with the contingencies of time and place while simultaneously we attempt to deal with the timelessness of our faith response to God. It has been the way of the Church to express the message of Jesus Christ through the medium of the culture, language and customs of the various peoples in whose society she finds herself. Quite often the trappings that the Church has picked up over the centuries have been mistaken for the Church herself.

The result of such misinterpretation has been a view of a Church which is more interested in conservation than innovation. As we have attempted to point out in the previous chapter by the reference to the direction taken by theological thought, the Catholic Church is not fortifying herself by the insistence that the truth in its entirety is already in her possession. The very documents that have come forth from Vatican II have indicated challenging new ways of presenting the Christian message. There is the very strong emphasis that has been placed on the role of the laity in the Church. The Declaration on Christian Education calls for the application of innovative yet effective methods of teaching founded on the latest advances in psychology and sociology. In a very well-written and thoughtful work, Catholicism and Education, John W. Donahue

discussed John Henry Newman's image of the Church as a river flowing through history, picking up as it goes along telltale signs of the cultures and civilizations through which it passes, but discarding them and washing them ashore as well. Donahue very nicely makes the point that some well-intentioned Catholics, clergy and lay, tried to turn the Church into a lake where many practices and convictions were held in check by a dam. However, the Church being what it truly is, broke through the dam and startled many of us as it went by revealing the flotsam of the past borne along on the current.

This has been the story since the second Vatican Council. Many Catholics are astounded by the changes that have taken place so much so that there are not a few believers left wondering whether these changes are a foreshadowing of the Church's demise. Donahue is quite reassuring to those who have unwittingly attached essential importance to what is, in fact, historical veneer.

> Yet if we only think of it, we shall judge it fortunate that the Church has resumed its appropriate character of a river moving in and with the story of the human race. Now the Church more easily understands that although it is a true society, a community of persons united in common

> faith and shared action, still it is not the kind of society whose survival requires preserving intact all its historically developed structures, however admirable and ancient these may be. On the contrary, it has often changed these forms, albeit very gradually at times, and it is doing that very thing today. It is precisely this fluidity which makes the river metaphor appropriate.[60]

Apart from trying to dislodge the concept of revealed truth from its historical and cultural setting, there is the perennial problem of the separation of the Gospel ideal from the way individual Catholics attempt to put these ideals into practice. Quite often we are faced with the outright betrayal of the ideals which we hold in such high esteem. It is a relatively simple matter to misjudge the relevance of the message because of what we assume to be its effects. Such thinking can almost call upon the Gospel itself as reinforcement: "A healthy tree does not bear bad fruit, nor does a poor tree bear good fruit." (Luke 6:43). However, upon closer inspection the reference is to the one who acts not the ideal. To relinquish an ideal because those we have trusted have failed in their attainment of that ideal really only attests more strongly to the need for such ideals. There are many fine general statements about education's

role in the development of personal autonomy, but there are times in the everyday classroom experience when autonomy seems far away as a particularly grueling mathematics problem demands attention or one's creative ability appears at low ebb when faced with the writing of an lengthy essay. The birthing of an ideal is indeed an intricate process as it must pass through fumbling human imperfection. The result does not necessarily determine the validity of the concept, but can usually highlight the aplomb, astuteness or finesse of the human agents just as easily as it can point to their shortcomings. In terms of the ideals presented to us by Christ, the quest for faith is ongoing and lifelong. To demand proof that our faith has reached a passing grade does not appear to be a realistic expectation. Pushed to its logical extreme such thinking would require a periodic headcount of those possessed of saintliness in order to justify the system. On the one hand, there is the accusation of indoctrination which effectively takes away or severely reduces the faculty of critical judgement and, on the other, the charge that such indoctrination does not work, so therefore the system is not a viable one. In each case insufficient attention is paid to the ideal of faith and what that ideal can achieve, and indeed has achieved, in those individuals who have wholeheartedly accepted it.

We have been concentrating on faith as a form of knowing, but it is essential to bear in mind that faith is also a teaching and a way of life. As John W. Donahue points out the way of life concept is itself threefold, although the three threads of interpretation are interconnected. First of all, there is the moral ideal which each Christian must make uniquely personal and on which one's life must be consistently modelled. Second, there is the experience of familiarity with God through personal encounter with Jesus in individual prayer and shared community worship. Last, (and perhaps this should be stressed not because it is of greater importance than the other two strands which make up this concept of faith as a way of life, but because it is frequently overlooked by those who view Catholicism from the outside), there is the close bond of interpersonal communion with and service of others in the human family.[61] This interpretation of faith as both a teaching and a way of life is essential for an understanding of the Church's position on the Catholic school, for the criticism is often voiced that suitable time allotment could be made for religious education within a secular framework, thus satisfying both sides in the denominational debate. From the Catholic view, such thinking misses the point, for it is not merely the imparting of knowledge which fosters the development of

faith, but the witnessing of the entire school community to a personal relationship with Jesus as expressed in moral life, community liturgy, and the service of others both within the immediate community and in the wider society. However the importance of faith considered in this threefold light and its foundational relevance to education is presented in a very forthright manner in the apostolic exhortation of John Paul II written in 1979 and entitled Catechesi Tradendae. This letter deals specifically with the Church's response to the final command of Jesus:

> Go, then, to all peoples everywhere and make them my disciples; baptize them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and teach them to obey everything I have commanded you. And I will be with you always, to the end of the age.[62]

The title of John Paul's letter has to do with the traditional role which the Church has accepted to bring all people to Jesus Christ. The term given to this work is catechises, which of course has the same root as catechism, but is not to be mistaken for the question and answer routine used at one time for religious instruction. Granted that "catechises" has its origin in the verb, to teach, this does not adequately do justice to the sense of journeying

implied in a faith response to Divine revelation. This journeying takes place not in a closed materialistic worldview but in an open infinity where all will find ultimate fulfillment. The faith response then cannot be the mere intellectual assent given to certain dogmas, followed by the issue of a membership card signifying acceptance into the Catholic Church. Aiden Kavanaugh offered an interesting insight on the nature of the catechumenate - that stage of formation of the mind and heart in preparation for full communion with the Catholic Church. It is important to bear in mind that Kavanaugh makes this comment within the context of adult conversion. He says:

> Catechumens are to be formed by living closely with others who know well the cost and advantages of a Christian way of life. The exemplary role of sponsors, godparents, and the whole local community of faith is paramount in this mode of formation. One learns how to fast, repent, celebrate, and serve the good of one's neighbor less by being lectured on these matters than by close association with people who do these things with regular flair and ease.[63]

Conclusion

In concluding this chapter on the relevance of faith to the Catholic Church's teaching on education we will take a further look at Catechesi Tradendae and what it says about "The Joy of Faith in a Troubled World". That we are living in a troubled world is beyond question. A cursory glance at any television newscast or daily newspaper will indicate a planet we seem to be intent on making uninhabitable through the scattering of pollutants and a general romping through nature as if we owned the entire place. We may also consider the sense of indignity we are bestowing on each other through the mass production of weaponry that has been pointedly compared to two men staging a stand off waist-deep in gasoline, and holding a box of matches each. Still, the secular humanist insists on the wonderful world man will create when his intelligence is given free rein. Evil will no doubt be done away with. There will be no more nervous breakdowns, car accidents, premature deaths, heartbreak, not to mention floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes and the human tragedy and heroism these necessarily bring in their wake. When Christians are accused by the secular humanist of extreme gullibility for placing trust in a benevolent God, can we not remind him of his own naivete as he engages in his re-enactment of the myth of Sisyphus? Pascal's "wager" leaves a lot to be desired in terms of motivation, but the

man-of-the-world who is interested in the odds could do well to begin at least with this voluntarist form of faith. "Let us weigh the gain and the loss in wagering that God is. Let us estimate these two chances. If you gain, you gain all; if you lose, you lose nothing. Wager, then, without hesitation that He is."[64]

Chapter VIII of Catechesi Tradendae speaks of the solace that faith offers in a world plagued by indifference, where human destiny is somewhere at the end of a materialistic progression in which there is no place for the absoluteness of God. We are admonished about placing all our trust in scientific and technological achievement only to discover our own skepticism when the promise of human success remains unfulfilled and, in our skepticism, to become self-enclosed to the point of losing respect for the dignity of others.

> ... we need a catechises which trains the young people and adults of our communities to remain clear and consistent in their faith, to affirm serenely their Christian and Catholic identity, 'to see him who is invisible' and to adhere so firmly to the absoluteness of God that they can be witnesses to him in a materialistic civilization that denies him.[65]

John Paul goes on to emphasize the importance of the art of pedagogy in the service of catechises. It is worthy of note that he stresses the contributions that other fields [notably biology, psychology and sociology] have made to the effectiveness of teaching and which is as it should be, for the core of the faith must be preserved but the means of conveying that faith are forever subject to change as new and more efficient methodologies are developed. "The science of education and the art of teaching are continually being subjected to review, with a view to making them better adapted or more effective with varying degrees of success.[66]

However, John Paul is careful to point out that a psychology suitable to educating in the faith must be founded on the understanding that educating is not simply a question of transmitting human knowledge, but a "question of communicating God's Revelation in its entirety."[67] This statement echoes the remarks made by John Donahue when he spoke about faith as a teaching and a way-of-life as well as a form of knowledge. A similar admonition is offered regarding the language used to present the truths of the Catholic faith. Although language should be suited to today's young people and to the many other groups receptive to the faith, yet it should never compromise or distort the content of faith in order to make it more appealing.

In closing perhaps we could consider the comment of

Douglas J. Simpson and Michael J.B. Jackson in The Teacher as Philosopher, that philosophy can be understood "as the critical pursuit of rationality in human thought, emotions, actions and traditions."[68] We have seen that faith cuts across the broad spectrum of human activity, and that it is not contrary to rationality, although the two are distinct. It is crucial, then, in our appraisal of Catholic education and the way in which it developed locally through denominationalism that we not overlook the reality of faith, for this is the heart and soul of the whole enterprise.

CHAPTER IV

The Catholic Church's Teaching on Parental Rights and the Education of Their Children

In the Declaration on Christian Education, Section 3 entitled "The Authors of Education", the Church presents a very strong endorsement of the right of parents to educate their children.

> Since parents have given children their life, they are bound by the most serious obligation to educate their offspring and therefore must be recognized as the primary and principal educators. The role in education is so important that only with difficulty can it be supplied where it is lacking. Parents are the ones who must create a family atmosphere animated by love and respect for God and man, in which the well-rounded personal and social education of children is fostered. Hence the family is the first school of the social virtues that every society needs.[69]

It is crucial to remember that the parental rights to educate is not an unqualified one, but is, in reality, a response to an obligation derived from the fact that

parenting does not end with the biological begetting of children. The Church names parents as the first authors of education not only because of the physical relationship, for this would indeed be a flimsy argument, but rather because of the nurturing role the family plays in the life of the developing child. Based on the bonds of love that exist between parents and their children the Church feels that the family context is the most beneficial foundation any individual can have as his initiation into the wider society.

Magsino, in paraphrasing John Locke's thoughts on the role of parents as contained in Of Civil Government, offers some interesting thoughts on the rights of parents to choose the kind of schooling they want for their children. "The duty of parents is to make their children most useful to themselves and others. Parental power does not encompass all of children's lives or property; it simply remedies the weakness and imperfection of their nonage."[70] Within this short quotation an obligation is simultaneously assigned, limited, and specified. Some highly operative terms are utilized. For example, "useful" could include all the negative ramifications incumbent on that particular brand of thinking. In this regard, then, is the parental duty one of molding children so that they "fit into" society, do not upset the apple cart, and perform their role in a highly

efficient, pragmatic way? We may also consider the idea of "nonage" and the vulnerability that goes hand in hand with it and in this light ask what responsibilities parents have, not only to develop and foster their children's abilities, but to protect their offspring while such development takes place. Locke's thinking also imposes wide and necessary conditions on the power that parents can exercise over their children. The duty, and by implication the right of parents stops short of absolute mastery not only of the child's life, but also of his property.

Educational Rights: A Shared Enterprise

Essentially Locke's statement goes straight to the heart of the conflict of rights issue as it relates to education. Of necessity, we must deal with such conflicts, for the process of education must continually take into consideration the child who is to be educated, the parents who select the kind of schooling their child will have, and the society in which that child will play his part.

It is essential to note that the encyclical from which we are drawing the Catholic principles of education stresses that parents are "the primary and principal educators" of their children, but certainly not the only educators. This position was also made abundantly clear in an earlier encyclical, Divine Illius Magistri [--of that Divine Master]

written in 1929 by Pope Pius XI, as well as in the post-Vatican document Familiaris Consortis [The Christian Family in the Modern World]. It is also evident in the Code of Canon Law which states explicitly in Title III on Catholic education. Canon 793, paragraph 1.

> Parents, and those who take their place, have both the obligation and the right to educate their children. Catholic parents have also the duty and the right to choose those means and institutes which, in their local circumstances, can best promote the Catholic education of their children.[71]

It is worthwhile remarking, though, that the second paragraph of Canon 793 goes on to state: "Parents have moreover the right to avail themselves of that assistance from civil society which they need to provide a Catholic education for their children."[72]

What the Church proposes is a shared enterprise as far as education is concerned. Granted, parents are the determiners of the kind of education their children receive, but both civil society and the Church herself have strong supporting roles to play, to the extent that if parents neglect to fulfill their obligation, then the right of children to be educated should be protected by civil

society. This last point is emphasized quite forcefully by Pius XI in Divine Illius Magistri when in paragraph 43 he states: "The function therefore of the civil authority residing in the State is twofold to protect and to foster, but by no means to absorb the family and the individual, or to substitute itself for them.[73]

The limits of the civil authority are further specified in paragraph 45 when the encyclical categorically states:

> It also belongs to the State to protect the rights of the child itself when the parents are found wanting either physically or morally in this respect, whether by default, incapacity or misconduct, since, as has been shown, their right to educate is not an absolute and despotic one, but dependent on the natural and divine law, and therefore subject alike to the authority and jurisdiction of the Church, and to the vigilance and administrative care of the State in view of the common good. Besides, the family is not a perfect society, that is, it has not in itself all the means necessary for its full development. In such cases, exceptional no doubt, the State does not put itself in the place of the family, but merely supplies deficiencies, and provides suitable means,

> always in conformity with the natural rights of the child and the supernatural rights of the Church.[74]

If one were to summarize the Catholic Church's position on educational responsibility, we would come up with a stand somewhere between those who favour complete parental control and those who believe that the teaching authority should be solely in the hands of the State. It is the purpose of this chapter to reflect upon the right of parents to select for their children an education which fosters and deepens their life of faith while at the same time prepares them for initiation into society as productive and rationally autonomous members. This is the stated aim of the Catholic Church, and consequently the aim of Catholic denominational education in our province.

> The Church is bound as a mother to give to these children of hers an education by which their whole life can be imbibed with the spirit of Christ and at the same time do all she can to promote for all peoples the complete perfection of the human person, the good of earthly society and the building of a world that is more human.[75]

Let us, first of all, consider the position of those

who hold that it is the parents' right to educate; secondly the rationale of those who place that right primarily in the hands of society; and lastly, to treat the specific purpose of this chapter which is the right that parents have to select an education that aims at both socialization and development of the rationality of the child within an atmosphere of faith.

Parents' Right to Educate

John Locke's leaning toward the parent as the primary agent for the education of the child is typical of pre-industrial revolution thinking. The parents, because they knew their children better than anyone else, were naturally in a better position to foster the education of their offspring. We are reminded here of Montaigne's comment that next to "the care that beasts have for their own preservation, and to avoid what does them harm, the affection which the parent feels for its progeny holds second place."[76]

However, with the onset of mass production and its offshoot, mass education, bringing in its wake accelerated technology, as well as the rapid accumulation of knowledge, the ideal of taking "all knowledge as one's province" could no longer offer itself as a plausible view of reality. Parents were no longer capable, if they ever were, of being the sole educators of their children. That duty had to be

delegated, not entirely, but in part. As Joel Moskowitz writes in "Parental Rights and State Education."

> The right to raise one's own children was considered not only the right of a free individual, but also sound educational policy. Society had not yet reached the state where the virtues spawned by the industrial revolution - efficiency and standardization - had been transposed from their role as a necessity in mass production to a by-product (and sometimes a doctrine) of mass education.[77]

Moskowitz goes on to cite the 1972 Wisconsin vs Yoder case as an interesting example of the kind of seesaw relationship that can develop between parents and state over the question of educational rights. Without getting into the details of the case, it is perhaps sufficient to say that the court's decision was striking for it upheld the parental right to educate even though the compulsory attendance statute was broken. The rationale behind the decision was "the common law right of parents to direct their children's education."[78] There is also a hint of foreshadowing at least as far as this chapter is concerned, for embedded in the Yoder case was the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion. The Amish lifestyle,

interwoven so completely with their teaching on personal salvation, was not only a pertinent aspect of the case, but a vital factor, for the United States Supreme Court agreed that the state had failed to demonstrate that its interest in keeping children in school superseded the right to free exercise of religious belief.

Moskowitz carries the parental rights debate to its logical limit, namely to the right of a parent to educate his children at home. The number and decisions of court cases are indeed intriguing, but perhaps we can limit ourselves to the Illinois Supreme Court decision in People vs Levisen. The little seven year old daughter of the defendants, who were not licensed teachers, was able to demonstrate an ability comparable to her grade level peers who attended school in the regular sense. Consequently, the court ruled that she was indeed being adequately educated. An objection was raised that the cost of supervision of such educational practices would be ludicrously high. However, Moskowitz replies that the cost of supervising a system must in fact be lower than both supervising and educating, evidently bearing in mind that parents who do their own schooling will save the state a considerable sum.

However, there are other considerations with respect to parents doing their own schooling. For example, how streamlined and cost efficient could such a supervision

system become? Would there be a network of resource centres for communities to supply materials in order to reduce the extraordinary amount of duplication that would take place? Of course, there is the area of special needs - children with learning disabilities or physical and mental handicaps. Finally how do we deal with all the attempted home education schemes that fail causing children to be helpless victims of a parent's ill-founded ideal? However, the essential point that Moskowitz is stressing is whether or not under normal circumstances a child can achieve comparable results, academically speaking, to those achieved institutionally. He is drawing a general conclusion from this and stating emphatically that home-schooling is just as good as schooling in the systematic sense, and in some cases, a better reflection of parental rights over children. That parents have such a right in this view is governed by whether or not they can assist their children to achieve in a social as well as in an academic sense what their peers are accomplishing in the school system. Viewed from the Catholi. perspective there is the additional consideration that, in the context of the family, "the mission to educate demands that Christian parents should present to their children all the topics that are necessary for the gradual maturing of their personality from a Christian and ecclesial point of view."[79]

Removing a child from the system completely would create less havoc in the educational structure than demanding that children be excused from taking certain classes. But what does happen when a parent decides that his child is not to follow a particular course of study? This situation is evidently grounds for a prolonged struggle over the conflict of rights issue. The 1927 People ex rel. Vollmar vs. Stanley case is interesting because it upheld a parental decision that a child could be excused from biology on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment Liberty which allows a parent to decide what his child may learn. However, the court did put limits on this liberty.

> The "good citizenship" standard in Stanley assumes that the interest of the state in imposing compulsory education is to provide all citizens with the knowledge essential to function in society. "Non-essential" learning cannot be compelled over parental objection.[80]

One could debate for a long time the question of what constitutes "knowledge essential to function in society." However the point to be considered here is simply that a demarcation line is drawn between state and parental rights in the Stanley case. Moskowitz attempts to extend parental

rights to cover values education. Although, in reality, values are really at the core of the parent-state conflict, they are, at times, obscured by other considerations. For example, parent rights per se may be put forward as a rationale when, in fact, there is another less obvious motive for insisting on those rights. Very likely, if one looked even a little more deeply one would discover, in not a few cases, that parents want to remove their children from exposure to certain values and present them with other values that more closely resemble the parental view of reality. This motive was strikingly brought out by the Yoder case. Moskowitz writes: "Where the state refuses to separate the attempt to mold the child's values from the teaching of facts, the parents clearly have a right to remove their children from the class."[81]

A good example of this situation would be the Valent vs New Jersey State Board of Education case, cited by Moskowitz, in which the question of compulsory sex education arises. The court's questioning in this case brought into focus the state's right to intrude in the home, and to assume the status of a foster parent. The court interpreted such intrusion as the beginnings of an erosion of parental authority with all its inherent dangers, not the least of which would be the state's assuming the responsibility for guiding the young in their personal, familial and religious

behaviour. In the post Vatican Council II document on the Christian family, the Church's position in this regard is quite clear.

> Sex education, which is a basic right and duty of parents, must always be carried out under their attentive guidance, whether at home or in educational centres chosen and controlled by them. In this regard, the Church reaffirms the law of subsidiarity, which the school is bound to observe when it cooperates in sex education, by entering into the same spirit that animates the parents.[82]

The questions of parental rights also comes to the fore when objections are raised concerning the safety of schools. Although Moskowitz generally concerns himself with school violence and its potentially harmful effects, the same question could be raised in reference to the physical characteristics of the school building itself, the supervision schedule of teachers, or the locality of the school. One has but to call to mind the fire hazards posed by older schools, and the proximity of rivers to at least two schools under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Board for St. John's, to appreciate the level of parental concern. When a child's safety is threatened one can readily understand

the need for parents to act decisively. Of course, through all of this the message is clear that to a great extent the state acts in loco parentis, and therefore in areas of conflict the parental right supersedes that of the state.

Moskowitz also raises the issue of the right to privacy under the American context of the fourth and ninth amendments which constitutionally guarantee this right. He offers as a precedent the 1944 Prince vs Massachusetts case in which this right was interpreted to mean that a "school practice cannot invade the private realm of family life." With such a precedent as this, and there are others Moskowitz indicates, the way is open for parental objections and litigation if necessary, whenever parents feel they have a legitimate cause to complain about school practices and programs.

> While most such programs are relatively harmless and are distinguished mainly by the virtuous feeling aroused in their sponsors and by the boredom of the captive audience, jealously guarding the right of parents to object to such programs and to excuse their children will provide a necessary check on the zeal of the program developer.[83]

Moskowitz concludes his stand for parental rights by

asserting that, for the most part, those parents who keep abreast of the educational scene as far as their children are concerned are more than likely quite conscious of their role as guides for their children in both a moral and a personal sense. The sine qua non for such consciousness-raising on the part of parents is their continued close cooperation with the school. The Catholic Church has traditionally urged this close sharing of the educational responsibility. One point emerges very clearly from Moskowitz's article, namely, that "children cannot effectively assert their own rights beyond a certain point without the aid of their parents."[84]

The Role of the State

A more detailed look at the teaching power assumed by government should help to a certain extent to balance the debate, for parents cannot have absolute control over their children. Most, if not, all educational philosophers of repute would adhere to this basic proposition. Peter Hobson, in his essay, "Some Reflections on Parents Rights in the Upbringing of their Children," states:

> The only rights that parents have by virtue of giving birth to a child flow from duties that this gives rise to. They have the right to fulfil their

> duties and obligations to care for the vulnerable and defenseless being they have brought into the world.[85]

Cornell Hamm reiterates this position when discussing the limitations placed on parents' rights. He writes:

> It is because of the duties parents have to their children that certain rights over their children accrue to them. This is quite a different concept from view that children are the property of parents or the state or someone else and that the parent or the state or someone else has some self-evident right to do with them as he pleases.[86]

In his conclusion to "Parental Rights and State Education", Moskowitz alluded to the necessity of cooperation between parents and government. Such a system of checks and balances is evidently a means of eliminating abuses, even those which can creep into a system as a result of the most well-intentioned programs, or motives. It is likewise interesting to note that the state, in many of the cases cited since Yoder, has been inclined to favour parental rights as long as there was no interference with the development of good citizenship. What exactly then is the

state's position in educational matters? In a general sense the Church identifies the role of the state as one subordinate to the parental role and directed to "What is required for the common temporal good."[87] Joseph Tussman, as we have pointed out in Chapter II, believes that government control in education lies in the right of the state to preserve itself. The state has a right to ensure its own continuity. Although as a principle this is quite acceptable, the difficulty arises when one has to discern what contributes or detracts from the state's right to self-preservation. The conflict of rights is bound to surface when these principles are applied and concrete details are worked out. The seeds of such conflict are present in the division of educational responsibility as outlined in the Church's teaching. This is not necessarily a bad thing, for a lot of positive results can be achieved through the mutual attempts at solutions. However as Tussman points out, there is always the danger of abuse in the form of too much control. Pius XI warned of the excesses inherent in the blind acceptance of the parental right to educate.[88] One must be aware as well that the state is in an even stronger position to exert her influence in educational matters. Pius XI wrote Divini Illius Magistri in 1929 during the rise to prominence of Italian fascism and his very strong assertions in favour of both parental and ecclesiastical

rights were meant to counterbalance the state's determined inroads into the educational process particularly in the training of young boys for eventual military service. However, in a reference to the United States Supreme Court decision in the Pierce vs Society of Sisters and Pierce vs Hill Military Academy, Pius stated in his encyclical a firm principle of Catholic education, but one which is quite similar to Tussman's concern over, not how to protect the teaching power of the state, but rather how to limit it.[89]

> Thus, to give one recent example, the Supreme Court of the United States of America, in a decision on an important controversy, declared that it is not in the competence of the State to fix any uniform standard of education by forcing children to receive instruction exclusively, in public schools, and it bases its decision on the natural law: the child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with high duty, to educate him and prepare him for the fulfillment of his obligations.[90]

We will now consider the position put forward by Joseph Tussman and Cornell Hamm as advocates of state authority in

education. Tussman lays the groundwork of his position by insisting that the multi-layered nature of society demands an authority which varies enough to apply to each of society's segments. No single authority is sufficient to cover young and old, fringe groups, those blessed with good health and those who need special care. Nevertheless, it is indeed society's role to offer the principles for the democratic governing of each group. Tussman is emphatic, when speaking about the social structure, about its changing generational nature and the consequent necessity of dealing with children and adults with different principles - "we need both caterpillar principles and butterfly principles."[91] Basically the state has a right to insure its own preservation. For Tussman the teaching power of society is a more fundamental right than the right to engage in a war for defense. Although the purpose of education is, generally speaking, the development of persons, it is also aimed at generating the continuity of the state and seeking the fulfillment of the state's legitimate purposes. "The teaching power is the inherent constitutional authority of the state to establish and direct the teaching activity and institutions needed to ensure its legitimate general and special purposes."[92]

Tussman supports the claim that governments have quite a legitimate say in matters of the mind, for after all it

is their survival which is ultimately in question. In this light it is quite understandable that there are often controversial issues arising from time to time between government interests and other agencies and individuals who feel they have a say in the processes of education. It is in such a context that Tussman considers the question of academic freedom. He outlines why it is that the teaching power must set certain limits in educating its citizens. Outside these limits a violation of "the constitutional structure of the academic branch of government exists."[93] Simply put, a teacher or student cannot do whatever he wishes. "Teachers are not ambassadors from another country enjoying extraterritorial privileges, they are not licensed to steal children."[94] Government is granted such power as hiring and firing of staff, choice of learning materials, setting of requirements and standards for admission, promotion, and so forth. Tussman points out that educational authority of a government can be quite broad in terms of the consequences it has on one's life. What he says about a typical primary school classroom in any given American community can be applied for the most part to classroom in Newfoundland. We have as well the captive audience engaged in involuntary reading, writing reciting and "revelation of guilty ignorance, all backed by the power to classify, grade, promote, fail and expel."[95]

As the basic function of the educational powers of government, teaching receives some interesting comments from Tussman, who classifies it as both an art and a profession. Tussman's views in this regard may be more pertinent in Chapter V where we will look at the role of the Catholic teacher and the Catholic school. Tussman remarks that the teaching power of the state has the profound responsibility of fostering the art of criticism and proper questioning - the hallmarks of the critical mind that ideally is the end result of the due process of education. However he does appear to favour what he terms the "weak" form of government involvement in education as this prevents the concentration of boundless power in the hands of the state. A consistently emerging concern in Tussman's writing is that there will be a monopolizing of authority in educational matters. The potential for abuse of power is too formidable and the area too sensitive not to have built in some form of control.[96]

Cornell Hamm's article on "Constraints on Parents' Rights Concerning the Education of their Children" is provocative in many ways, however, he does appear a little convoluted at the outset. The fundamental question is: Do parents have the right to decide what educational experiences their children should receive? Tussman considered the kind of authority government exercised as a right of self-

preservation in the educational area. To what extent then do parents' rights complement or clash with this teaching authority? Hamm recognizes the ambiguity of the question in its confusion of the moral and legal sense of rights. To determine whether there are legal rights is fairly simple. One has but to consult the statutes, common law, or the constitution. To determine the moral status of parental rights requires some rational discourse to discover whether grounds for such rights exist.

If the moral right exists, do parents have a legal right to make decisions regarding the education of their children? Hamm devotes the first part of this work to the nature and justification of parents' rights over their children and to the question of paternalism in general. His approach is to establish whether children have rights, for parental rights derive from the rights of children. This approach brings us to a point which Hamm states very concisely. As children are growing into rationally autonomous agents, then naturally they have rights, and therefore, by implication their parents have rights with respect to their education. As children grow older and assume more of the burden of their own rights, the parental rights gradually diminish.

Hamm goes on to say that "there seems to be a nearly universal tendency to assert that prerational children have

a right to such an education."[97] He dismisses categorizing this right as an example of either social contract rights or moral rights simply because the prerational child is not in a position to enter contractual relationships or to have the capacity for choice among competing values. The justification for prerational children's rights rests, Hamm says, in our "deep-seated natural human urges."[98]

> Depending on the strength of our commitment we can, and some do, adopt the linguistic convention of referring to this commitment as a duty and ascribing to children the benefit of doing our "duty" as though it is their "right".[99]

Hamm settles on three views but hastens to add that this list is not "exhaustive or exclusive."[100] Firstly, viewing human fulfillment in terms of material success within a like-minded society would tend to see that a child is properly trained and socialized, with the right to do so resting primarily with the state. Secondly, if achievement is seen in terms of what Hamm calls subservience to God, then the parents acting in a sense as agents of God, will see that their children are properly taught in accordance with such teaching. Hamm uses the expression - "committed to the indoctrination of children."[101] He often leaves the

impression that the teaching of religious education is synonymous with indoctrination. Thirdly, there are those who view human achievement as the attainment of rational autonomy and will therefore be committed to whatever forms of education would best bring this about. The rights of prerational children are not determined by the kind of thinking that sees children as chattels of parents or belonging to them by virtue of a biological tie. Children, it is concluded, have a right to rational autonomy and any parental rights over them derive from this consideration.

In Hamm's discussion it follows that, if children have these rights, then parents have a corresponding obligation or duty to see that their children's rights are respected. Therefore, parents in turn have the right or freedom to carry out this obligation, and this obligation can be interpreted as parents having certain rights over their children. Hamm is quick to point out that this is not at all the same as the children-as-property mentality. "No one has a priori right over children,"[102] but because of the obvious impossibility of small children acquiring their own rights, Hamm states that some form of paternalism is necessary. However, the question is who exercises this paternalism. In reference to education the question seems not so much to be who has the right, but rather who is most competent to carry out the task. Of course one must also

ask what is the task to be carried out. Hamm emphatically states that education is more than socialization (defined by Hamm as an understanding of cultural and political heritage along with the skills necessary for effective participation in society). Ideally education is the attainment of personhood characterized by the rational exercise of individual freedom.

There is a very close link between Tussman's idea of initiation and development and Hamm's concepts of socialization and rationality. To quote Hamm in reference to society's limits on education:

> Genuine education can be claimed by every child against the whole world. The quantity of education is locally limited; but the nature and quality of education, by reason of its conceptual link with knowledge and truth, is dependent of a particular society.[103]

On this basis Hamm concludes with Tussman that the wider society can offer more, for knowledge and truth are public in character. Hamm points out, though, that despite its claim to competence the state can easily be accused of being presumptuous in this regard. As a matter of fact, he goes on to say that the strongest case that can be made for

parents' rights is the argument that the state has ceased to function as a competent educational authority. Of course, such a lack of competence can be determined empirically, but how well a system functioned is also open to much subjective criticism. In dealing with arguments favoring a choice in schooling other than a state-operated standardized system for all, Hamm appears to sum up most of these as attempts to cover up the goal of making room for religious indoctrination. He uses religious education and indoctrination interchangeably and does, in fact, have a tendency to lump things together without adequate definition. For example, in speaking of moral values he questions whether parents in any alternative model will indeed be teaching these values or whether the approach would be to present moral values as inextricably bound to adherence to a religious ideal. The treatment Hamm gives to the choice of schooling argument is basically a response to the point of view developed by Coons and Sugarman in Education by Choice: The Care for Family Control. Evidently Hamm is at odds with their principal thesis because he feels such alternative methods would be at odds with the development of rational autonomy. This of course brings us back to the main thrust of this chapter. It is a firm principle of Catholic education that parents not only have a right to arrange a religiously-oriented education for their children,

but that they have an obligation to do so if they adhere to the Catholic faith. The question remains whether such an education is at variance with the essentials of good citizenship insofar as it is accused of being predominantly a form of indoctrination which detracts from the rationality which may be considered the generally accepted aim of the whole process?

Parental Rights and Autonomy

In the Sacred Congregation's treatment of Lay Catholics in Schools there is a remarkable similarity to Tussman's ideal of development in the context of initiation and, oddly enough, to Hamm's ideas of socialization and rationality. Although it is made quite clear throughout the document that the school works as an extension of parents' rights, the values presented as the ultimate objective of education must indeed be the values that any democratic society would foster.

> In virtue of its mission, then, the school must give constant and careful attention to cultivating in students the intellectual, creative, and aesthetic faculties of the human person; to develop in them sound judgement and the correct application of will and affectivity; to promote in them a sense

> of values; to encourage just attitudes and prudent behaviour; to introduce them to the cultural patrimony handed down from previous generations; to prepare them for professional life, and to encourage the friendly interchange among students who differ in character and social background that will lead to mutual understanding. For all of these reasons, the school enters into the specific mission of the Church.[104]

Of course, the questioning begins after we brush aside the vocabulary of idealism and attempt to unravel the underlying substance. In the case of the above rather lengthy quotation, the last statement declares that, in the fulfillment of the stated ideals, the school would enter into the specific mission of the Church. The point really is not whether the school is promoting the church, but whether, in so doing, it is undermining in any way the essentials of good citizenship. We must also bear in mind that the objective defense of any given religion does not justify its inclusion as an authority in the educational system.

T.H. McLaughlin in his article, "Parental Rights and the Religious Upbringing of Children," looks at parental rights in this area, but first lays down a set of conditions that would affect this right in a liberal state. These

conditions are:

1. that the development of personal and moral autonomy is a fundamental value and parents should have this as a major objective in the upbringing of their children;

2. that the most justifiable form of society is an open, pluralised, democratic one where there is a maximum toleration of diversity and a commitment to free critical debate as the most rational means of advancing the pursuit of truth; and

3. that no one set of religious beliefs can be shown to be objectively true.[105]

McLaughlin evidently wants his thesis to be operative in such a liberal framework, for if it can work in such a situation, then it can withstand countless, critical assaults. The point around which he weaves his argument is whether or not the parental right to foster a religious upbringing interferes with the child's right to become autonomous. Is there in a religious upbringing a degree of interference in another's self-determination that predisposes one to select the position presented as if it were the only objectively correct choice? The point has to be made here that religious upbringing is the issue and indoctrination is the charge. It must be stated emphatically that it is quite difficult to dodge such a charge from a religious point of view. Parents respond to what they consider best

for their children and in terms of a particular religion, they have accepted a profound view of life and death that overflows into and pervades every facet of one's existence. Presumably this is the view they accept as objectively true and, consequently, in adhering to this view they feel that their children will flourish and blossom into happy fulfilled adults. McLaughlin makes an interesting remark here forestalling any argument arising from the one true faith idea and the consequent legitimacy of transmitting this faith no matter what. He writes that "this infringes the liberal principle that nobody can claim a power by asserting a privileged insight into the good of man".[106]

McLaughlin appreciates the very high risk that religious education entails as far as indoctrination is concerned, but he does hasten to add that this is not always the necessary upshot of a faith-based upbringing. In categorizing religion as part and parcel of a "primary culture" that everyone needs as a backdrop to develop not only into a contributing member of society but also into a rationally autonomous person, there is a sense in which religion is not detrimental to one's human growth, and is, in fact, quite acceptable as a fundamental part of one's overall educational development. The whole notion of "primary culture" stems from the necessity of presenting a child with the means to grow from physical and cultural

dependence to independence. The basic recognition of children as "not born fully-fledged and autonomous participants in a liberal form of life" necessitates the parental right to bestow stable and coherent 'primary cultures'".[107] The stability factor is very significant in McLaughlin's view, for it offers a coherent network of ideas against which one can rationally look at other options, be they cultural, religious, ethical or whatever. To suspend teaching a determined viewpoint has not been shown to be any more conducive to rationality than its opposite. In other words there is a need for security in the growing child and this security is often signified by "a substantive set of practices, beliefs and values."[108]

Eamonn Callan, in his response to McLaughlin, criticizes the latter's insistence that one can raise a child with a definite set of religious beliefs while, at the same time, demonstrating a deep-seated respect for the child's freedom of self-determination. However, by distinguishing between the long-term and short-term aims of parents, McLaughlin responds very effectively to this criticism.

> Their long-term, or ultimate, aim is to place their children in a position where they can autonomously choose to accept or reject their religious faith -

> or religious faith in general. Since, however, these parents have decided to approach the development of their child's autonomy in religion through exposing them to their own particular religious faith, their short-term aim is the development of faith; albeit a faith which is not closed off from future revision or rejection.[109]

Callan really does not refute McLaughlin's "autonomy via faith". He declares it impossible, for, like Cornell Hamm, he sees religious upbringing and indoctrination as the same thing. Underlying Callan's criticism is the failure to come to terms with a changing autonomy. There is really no such thing as a pure or "fully autonomous judgement."[110] Autonomy is always a matter of degree. As children grow and direct their rational focus to bear on their own upbringing they have not only the right to revise the beliefs passed on by their parents, but they may reject them if they so desire. Many young adults will alter their personal convictions, viewing those passed on by parents as insufficient in some cases and stifling in others. Callan tends to polarize not only parents and children but also religious upbringing and the lack of it. He does not appear concerned about the continual dialogue that forms over a period of time; a mature faith which is responsive to, and grows out of, the

kind of autonomy he labels as its victim.

Rather than embark upon a discussion of the pros and cons of parental rights, John Donahue offers for consideration three principles which are essential in answering the question, "who should educate?" First of all he states that the learner himself is the primary agent of his own learning. Donahue bases this principle on a distinction made by Thomas Aquinas between "inventus", or learning through discovery by one's own efforts, and "discipline", or learning by being taught by another. Aquinas concluded that "invention" is by far the most efficacious form of learning for it is engendered by the learner's own resources without the middleman agency of a teacher. Donahue points out that most of us know this principle to be true based on our own experience for what we have taught ourselves is generally more meaningful to us, and more vivid as well. Consequently, we retain what we have learned through "invention" more effectively than what we have been taught by others. This phenomenon is also reflected in teaching practices, for whenever a teacher utilizes greater student involvement in the learning process the possibility increases that the learning experience will be a fruitful one. This is, of course, a further application of Thomas Aquinas' observation that "whenever an effect can be produced either by nature or by art, the method of art

should be as much as possible like that of nature."[111] An effective teacher, then, will attempt to model his pedagogy on the methods used naturally by a person who is learning through discovery.

The second principle is itself the recognition of the primacy of parental rights in the education of their children. This is a right which is first both in time and in importance. Donahue points out that this right is an extension and completion of procreation. Parents do not pass the right to educate over to the state or some other teaching authority, thereby forfeiting their rights, as soon as the child is old enough to begin formal schooling. What they do, in fact, is ask the wider society for help in fostering the education of their children for, in the complexity of our civilization, a parent-sponsored "invention" is not possible on economic grounds. Parents simply do not have the resources or the personal and physical qualifications necessary to fulfill the educational needs of their children. They have to resort to "discipline" out of economic and, of course, practical necessity. The state has the obligation to protect by law these parental rights, but at the same time it has the right to expect that the educational process should enhance and aid the development of the common good. However, as Donahue says, "... our constitutional tradition recognizes implicitly that when

political society enters the field of education, it finds the family already there."[112] One must also bear in mind the admonition of Pius XI in his Divini Illius Magistri that the state in its ancillary role has the power not to usurp parental rights but to insure that they are carried out. Hence if parental responsibility is not fulfilled either by neglect or the direct physical abuse of their offspring, the state has the obligation to see to the educational needs of children.[113]

There are a number of practical corollaries arising from the Church's stand on parental rights and, although we will not discuss them in detail, it is interesting to note that these considerations give us a general idea of where respect for parental rights is leading us in our educational planning. Firstly, according to Donahue, the focus on parental rights is compatible with the philosophy of decentralization which would allow parents more control and input as far as the educational progress of their children is concerned. Secondly, there is an argument for public funding for nonpublic schools inherent in the parental rights approach. This is fundamental to respecting parents' rights in choosing the kind of schooling they want for their children. As for those who charge that the availability of funding to nonpublic schools leads to discrimination of various kinds, Donahue refers to the Declaration on the

Relationship of the Church to Non-Catholic Religions which states emphatically that the Catholic Church "rejects as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color. condition of life, or religion.[114]

The third principle, emphasizing as it does the Church's right as a religious community, to educate and conduct schools, acts as a kind of balance on the civil teaching authority. There is a fair amount of practicality in such a principle for the necessity of accepting the state's aid in carrying on the educational enterprise is certainly self-evident considering the enormity and complexity of such an undertaking in our society. The state is of inestimable value in offering its assistance to parents and looks upon this assistance as an obligation and a right in the interests of self-preservation. Donahue writes:

> Civil society has, therefore, a right to educate which includes the maintaining of its own schools and other educational agencies. It is also entitled to make sure that nonpublic schools meet minimum health and safety standards and are academically respectable.[115]

He warns, however, that the great power resident in the state is susceptible to overstepping its bounds and seeking to monopolize education. Although standards are essential if distributive justice is to be satisfied, nevertheless uniformity per se cannot be identified as a virtue in the administration of educational matters in a pluralised society. This is the underlying purpose of the third principle as far as the Church's teaching on education is concerned. She sees herself commissioned to teach, "to show young people how to synthesize the Gospel and the secular culture in their own lives so as to be both fully human and fully Christian. A school that effectively educates in the arts and sciences and at the same time contributes to religious growth would seem to be the best environment and instrument for realizing this synthesis."[116]

In conclusion, those who promote the civil authority as the sole educational agency would, upon examination of these principles, realize that there is no inherent conflict between the aims of the state and the objectives of parents. Nor is there in the Church's vision of herself as an educational agency anything which is essentially incompatible with the good citizenship ideal as promoted by democratic societies. However, in the day-to-day working out of these objectives conflicts arise, but this is, as well, a practical beneficial effect with one agency balancing

another as they seek the most suitable means of fulfilling the educational mandate entrusted to them by the parents of their charges.

CHAPTER V

The Role of the Catholic Teacher

> Perfect schools are the result not so much of good methods as of good teachers ..." (Pius XI in Divini Illius Magistri).

The above thought conveys in a concise and powerful fashion the quintessential importance of the teacher's role, in a general sense as well as in the specific Catholic environment. Such statements are not at all hard to discover in Catholic literature on education, and reflect the Church's teaching that faith is not simply a body of knowledge but a way of life. The role of the teacher is also inextricably bound to the Church's teaching on the role of the layperson in the building up of the Kingdom of God. In the Sacred Congregation's document Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith the "call" of the laity is explored.

> This call to personal holiness and to apostolic mission is common to all believers; but there are many cases in which the life of a lay person takes on specific characteristics which transform this life into a specific "wonderful" vocation within

> the Church. The laity "seeks the Kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God." They live in the midst of the world's activities and professions, and in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life; and there they are called by God so that by exercising their proper function and being led by the spirit of the Gospel they can work for the sanctification of the world from within, in the manner of heaven. In this way they can make Christ known to others, especially by the testimony of a life resplendent in faith, hope, and charity.[117]

The task of the layperson is outlined here, but it is worthy of note that the last statement pinpoints the sensitivity of a role that teaches by doing. This role is especially relevant in the teaching apostolate because of its fundamentally formational character. It is obviously insufficient to mouth the message; it must be demonstrated with a sincerity that is at once convincing, but also appealing.

The power residing in the teaching role is given a very thoughtful treatment by Joseph Tussman. Although he is not concerned, strictly speaking, with the development of religious faith, he is acutely aware that a teacher does much more than transmit knowledge. As professionals,

Tussman says, teachers assume a responsibility over a vitally important social function and although they function as part of the organized political structure, they nevertheless struggle within its confines when that structure appears to represent ideals as goals with which they do not agree. Teachers are, in Tussman's opinion, functionaries, but they do more than merely fill a gap; they foster the survival of the society, albeit sometimes reluctantly. One must agree with Tussman when he explores the complexities involved in deciding who should teach. Technical competence is required certainly, as is a willingness to teach, but underlying these there is "a broader range of considerations having to do with the ethos of the role."[118] One cannot accept the presumption that teachers will only teach what they are trained to teach. Considering the captive audience many issues will be raised: e.g. freedom of religion during history class, the morality of suicide in Shakespeare, genetic engineering in science, minority rights in demographic geography. Even in second languages and language arts, persuasive and expository essays will deal with topics which demand the revelation of teachers' standpoints. As teachers they simply cannot back away from issues that seem to them controversial. It is noteworthy that Tussman defends the right of teachers to become embroiled in any issues, and holds steadfastly that all teachers are within

their rights to do so in the name of freedom of speech and the free marketplace of ideas. Within the area of academic freedom Tussman raises the question of autonomy in the teaching profession. Pertaining to this professional autonomy, who retains the authority to judge qualifications, to make appointments, to disperse discipline and to ostracize if the need arises? The profession may, in a sense, be reluctant to accept outside controls or even intrusion, relying on the assumption that as a profession it can best judge the level of fitness of its members. Whether it can best handle its own disciplinary problems is another matter, for the teacher does not work in a vacuum. The teachers'role is a social one with everwidening responsibilities.

> The teacher may be a member of a profession, but he is also, in the usual case, working in a school - a public agent subject to a measure of political control. The teacher, as a wielder of the teaching power, is ultimately answerable to the polity.[119]

Tussman thereby establishes the accountability of the teacher. If the state is recognized as the teaching authority then the teacher is answerable to the embodiment of that authority. If, as in the so-called "weak" form of

state control, another agency is responsible for education, then the teacher is subject to the recognized authority within that agency. The question remains - and this must be an area of conflict - what are the crucial aspects of accountability? There are of course issues particularly in the area of morality that could lead to debate. These we will reserve for the next chapter on the local application of Catholic principles of education.

Tussman has some very apt observations of this teaching authority dilemma. Education is indeed a powerful tool and the teacher is the one who utilises it for good or ill. Because the particular function of teachers is to prepare individuals for life in a particular society, it is essential to take a look at the kinds of preparation they offer. Teachers, in effect, control the ladder up which individuals must climb to find not only their role in society, but to achieve their measure of self-fulfillment. It is indeed an enormous responsibility, for all must travel up that ladder - or, in Tussman's words, engage in education.[120]

Based as it is then on the primacy of parental rights, Catholic educational authority views itself as an extension of parental responsibility that carries with it the mandate to educate in the milieu of faith. As Tussman suggests, the special type of social milieu in which the teaching power delivers its message is not a free-for-all, "a town hall or

an intellectual fair," but rather "a special intellectual environment within which it may determine the mind's agenda and cultivate its proper manners."[121]

The influences exerted by milieu and teacher are certainly distinct, but in a very strong sense they cannot be called separate, for the teacher stands at centre stage as a principal personage in the milieu of the Catholic school. Thus, in addition to fulfilling the academic and professional requirements essential to their role as communicators of knowledge, within the Catholic school they are called upon to be "witnesses" to the faith. This is the ideal and it is attested to frequently in Catholic writing on educational matters as we have already stated. This ideal must be borne in mind when considering the overall philosophy of the Catholic school, for its relevance is felt particularly in our province in the hiring and dismissal of teachers.

Let us take a somewhat cursory glance at certain key documents and how this teaching ideal is articulated. Going back to December 1929, Pius XI stated in reference to those entrusted with the education of youth:

> Of them also it may be said in the words of the divine master: "The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers few." Let us then pray the Lord of

> the harvest to send more workers into the field of Christian education; and let their formation be one of the principal concerns of the pastors of souls and of the superiors of Religious Orders.[122]

Paul VI in the Declaration on Christian Education leaves no doubt concerning the importance of the teacher's role.

> But let teachers recognize that the Catholic school depends upon them almost entirely for the accomplishment of its goals and programs. They should therefore be very carefully prepared so that both in secular and religious knowledge they are equipped with suitable qualifications and also with a pedagogical skill that is in keeping with the findings of the contemporary world.[123]

Knowledge is synonymous with growth in the life of faith. The encyclical goes on to say: "Intimately linked in charity to one another and to their students and endowed with an apostolic spirit, many teachers by their life as much as by their instruction bear witness to Christ, the unique Teacher.[124]

Canon law states simply: "Formation and education in

a Catholic school must be based on the principles of Catholic doctrine, and the teachers must be outstanding in true doctrine and uprightness of life."[125]

The consistency of the message speaks for itself and is based primarily on the Catholic acceptance of the unity of purpose of faith and education.

The ultimate objective of both faith and knowledge is human fulfillment in union with God achieved through the living out, in daily life, of the message of Jesus Christ. Such a statement could easily be misconstrued as a rationale for a continuous high-powered program of proselytizing. The 1977 document, The Catholic School, published by the Sacred Congregation on Catholic Education, recognizes the objection and responds to it by declaring that such one-sidedness is actually the result of a misinterpretation of "the nature and methods of Christian education," for if education is to be complete it demands a religious dimension. In other words Christian education is structured on the belief that the overall development of the personality is diminished if religion is not an integrated part of one's general education.[126] There is a sense, within Catholic educational thought, of the unity of truth. "The school considers human knowledge as a truth to be discovered. In the measure in which subjects are taught by someone who knowingly and without restraint seeks the truth, they are to that extent

christian."[127] Upon reflection this statement appears to be a very striking one, for what it says essentially is that the Christian weltanschauung is unavoidable to one who, with intellectual honesty, strives for the truth. This point is indeed a reinstatement of the Gospel imperative "Seek and you shall find."[128] "Discovery and awareness of truth leads man to the discovery of truth itself."[129]

Teachers then become guides in the seeking of the truth, acknowledging by their own example that it is praiseworthy and consistent with human nature to question. Ideally the fruit of their own searching will be evident to their pupils providing them with at least a glimpse of the goals they wish to attain. Within such a framework one can readily understand why great emphasis is placed on the importance of the teacher's example.

> The achievement of this specific aim of the Catholic school depends not so much on subject matter or methodology as on the people who work there. The extent to which the Christian message is transmitted through education depends to a very great extent on the teachers. The integration of culture and faith is mediated by the other integration of faith and life in the person of the teacher. The mobility of the task to which

> teachers are called demands that, in imitation of Christ, the only Teacher, they reveal the Christian message not only by word but also by every gesture of their behaviour. This is what makes the difference between a school whose education is permeated by the Christian spirit and one in which religion is only regarded as an academic subject like any other.[130]

Similarly John Paul II, in speaking to Catholic educators in St. John's in September 1984, voiced his thoughts in the importance of teacher example.

> An extremely important aspect of your role is that you are called to lead the young to Christ, to inspire them to follow Him, to show them His boundless love and concern for them, through the example of your own life. Through you, as through a clear window on a sunny day, students must come to see and know the joy of life lived in accordance with His teaching, in response to His challenging demands. To teach means not only to impart what we know, but also to reveal who we are by living what we believe.[131]

One could say that a characteristic, if not the hallmark, of the Church's teaching on the role of the teacher is the union of what appears to be a duality of educational competence, both in terms of knowledge and communication skills, and the rather problematic area of personal conduct.

The aspect of personal conduct in Catholic schooling can provide fertile ground for criticism on the basis that one's personal life is irrelevant to the work one does in the classroom. Viewed from a secular point of view, one can readily understand how such objections come to be, for the overtones of invasion of privacy, freedom of conscience, and religion are quite often detected. However the sensitivity of the role must always occupy our foremost thoughts. As Tussman points out, teachers affect lives; they do not only present material. The personalities that they present to their students are the same personalities that they have in private. A clean separation of the two lives does not seem to be possible. As a matter of fact considering the vast range of material presented to students in our schools, the responsibility of offering a holistic worldview will remain largely unfulfilled unless teachers are capable of presenting one. This unity of educational aims with the objectives of the Christian way of life would seem to be a response to what is, in fact, a contemporary educational dilemma. Under the guise of an ideal, the presentation of

a smorgasbord of values and knowledge without guidance fosters the continuation of what is already quite a fragmented curriculum. With timetables, material to be covered, workshops and extracurricular activities, teachers and students are generally locked into a norm which categorizes subject areas, including Religion, while ignoring the human experience which unites these different areas.

In an interesting, but brief, article entitled "Paradoxes of Catholic Education", Michael McKeown writes:

> We must cater for the norm and the norm is a mileage of uncoordinated cognitive stimuli ranging from the structure of the helix through the causes of the Second World War to the moral dilemma of an anguished Hamlet. If the Catholic school is to fulfill its "specific mission" and offer an appropriate weltanschaaung which is distinctive and unique, it must offer within its curricular provisions some mechanism where those stimuli can be woven into a coherent pattern of experience and perception and through which the pupil can develop a unified sensibility to the human condition as it embraces the secular and the divine, the material and the spiritual, the worldly and the otherworldly.[132]

While McKeown is lamenting the fact that our efforts are dispersed in many directions because of the curriculum demands made upon us in Catholic schools, nevertheless he is pinpointing the necessity of such unified synthesis as part of the essential substructure of Catholic education. Teachers who, in their personal lives as well as in their teaching competence, strive to attain the ideals laid down in the various documents we have quoted would certainly be a response to the need for such a "mechanism".

In a statement by the Canadian Catholic Trustees' Association care is taken to show that, in the application of Church principles insofar as they relate to teachers, due caution is exercised lest the practice of the faith be an avenue to employment.

> In stating that practicing Catholics would be preferable on staff, we must avoid the danger of the teacher practicing the faith in order to be employed. Better to employ a non-Catholic who is honest than a non-practicing Catholic who pretends to be devout. At the minimum, the teacher should subscribe to the objectives and programs of the Catholic schools. At the optimum, the teacher's motivation to be an active part of the community of the Catholic school permeates and enables the educational atmosphere.[133]

This publication attempts to do what the church documents on education have not really attempted, that is to bridge the gap between the principles of education and their practice. One must realize, of course, that such a task remains the specific duty of local and regional educators, for the general principles laid down by the Church cut across many diverse cultures and consequently demand a response which is in keeping with local practices. Thus the question remains unanswered how the concept of school, as it is presented to us by ecclesiastical authorities, can be translated into an operational reality to the extent that it would be readily obvious that a Catholic school is noticeably different from any other. It is a profound observation to say that the multiplicity of tasks which faces the school in our modern society, coupled with the perennial notion that education is the springboard to a successful career and social status, has led to a kind of sidestepping of the role which the Catholic school purports to assume.

It must be remembered that Catholic schools, as do secular schools, place a value on competitiveness, social compliance, application to work, and the overall academic, athletic, creative and social success achieved in their respective institutions. However, as McKeown so astutely observes, Catholic schools and their teachers are suscept-

ible to a distortion of values which permits the absolute value of the Catholic school - to become submerged by the relative values inherent in running any school.[134] The Catholic school is thus presented with a difficulty that is uniquely its own, namely, to harmonize what are often seen as two different views of reality, the secular and the religious. No such dichotomy should exist within the Catholic structure, for the Church teaches that our objective is to educate the whole man. As the Sacred Congregation points out, the role of the Catholic school is a unified one.

> Its task is fundamentally a synthesis of culture and faith, and a synthesis of faith and life: the first is reached by integrating all the different aspects of human knowledge through the subjects taught, in the light of the Gospel; the second in the growth of the virtues characteristic of the Christian.[135]

McKeown argues that, although such a dichotomy is not intrinsic to the Catholic school, it can develop from either an overemphasis on "the utilitarian benefits of academic achievement," or from the manner in which the curriculum is presented.[136] At any rate, it is evident that the teacher's

role is a crucial one, for the staff of the school are really its consciousness, charged with the responsibility of guiding it away from tumbling into a kind of "institutionalization which is antipathetic to the liberating thrust of the valid Catholic education."[137]

Sister Mary Hamilton of the Catholic Office of Religious Education in Toronto notes the great similarity between the goals and objectives set forth in the Ontario Ministry of Education publication, Education in the Primary and Junior Division and those of Catholic educators. She quotes the Ministry document: "The role of the teacher is to provide the context in which a child can develop values that reflect the priorities of a concerned society and at the same time recognizes his or her integrity as an individual."[138]

Toward the end of her article she quotes from an address given by Archbishop Pocock of Toronto in 1971 which is printed in Part I of the Metropolitan Separate School Board Manual. Archbishop Pocock offers what he feels are the educational objectives of the school board in question. Of course these objectives could be adopted by any board which seeks to bring its students to the fullness of life in Jesus Christ.

The manual states:

The basic objectives of the Metropolitan Separate School Board, its staff and each Catholic school shall be to help each student:

a) to develop a deep personal relationship with Christ, so that it manifests itself in his daily life;
b) to develop a love for the Church as the family of God's people;
c) to develop an appreciation and understanding of the personal worth and dignity of every man, as well as of himself;
d) to give and use knowledge in order to make sound judgments;
e) to think independently and analytically;
f) to strive at all times toward academic excellence;
g) to learn to adapt to change intelligently;
h) to value the arts and sciences, and be appreciative of the countless ways in which they can contribute to his expression of the Glory of God;
i) to prepare to make a useful contribution to society and to assume his obligation as a member of society.[139]

Indeed, as Sister Hamilton points out, the similarities are evident. In educational terms there does not appear to be any fundamental incompatibility between the Ministry's assessment of the teacher's role and the goals of the Metropolitan Separate School Board. Certainly this congruence is as it should be if the stated aims of both bodies are educationally sound. Archbishop Pocock goes on to say, however:

> Ideally, the Catholic school is a venture in faith - faith that the Word of God dwells among us. It is a community of Catholic believers that shares the aspirations of all mankind, experiences their needs and sufferings, and ascends with all men to fulfillment in Christ.[140]

When this ideal is put into practice there is the potential for conflict between individual teachers and education authorities. This is a highly sensitive and controversial area and it is not our intention to delve into specific case studies. However, given the philosophy of Catholic education as the fundamental union of the life of faith with educational development, and the principle of freedom of conscience which is a cornerstone of Christian moral teaching, it is readily observed that conflicts are

inevitable. Such conflicts often carry in their wake the cries of injustices done, and witchhunts carried out, which create an atmosphere of medieval persecution, strong enough at times to stir an emotional response.

The seeds of conflict are also embedded in our Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom. As Magsino points out in his paper, "Teacher and Students Rights within the Denominational Schoolhouse Gate,"

> Given that apparent tension exists among some Charter provisions themselves, Canadian jurists will have to exercise delicate balancing of their relative weights in varying contexts. In particular, perhaps no less than Solomonic wisdom will be expected of them when students and teachers, claiming the fundamental right to conscience and religion, clash against school boards claiming an equally fundamental right.[141]

Magsino is referring specifically to a kind of "no man's land" that exists when one attempts to balance Section I of the Charter which "guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society,"[142] with Section 29 of the same charter

which states that "nothing in this Charter abrogates or derogates from any rights or privileges guaranteed by or under the Constitution of Canada in respect of denominational, separate or dissentient."[143]

What is striking about this apparent impasse is the commentary immediately following the statement of Section 29 quoted above. This commentary declares that "the establishment and separation of religious schools are not adversely affected by any other provisions of the Charter."[144] The Commentary goes on to ensure that neither the freedom of conscience and religion clause, nor the equality rights clause is interpreted in such a way as to take away from existing constitutional rights concerning the setting up and state financing of schools operated on a religious basis, <u>where students and teachers are selected according to their adherence to a particular religious faith</u>.[145]

It would appear that the Charter is implying that adherence to a particular religious faith may be considered a qualification for employment as far as certain school boards are concerned. Thus we find ourselves questioning whether employers have the right to demand certain qualifications on the part of their employees, or in fact whether such a demand infringes upon the rights of prospective employees. Undoubtedly in the case of the Catholic School,

if one views religion as an essentially private matter between God and the individual, the solution would be easy enough to determine. However as we have already seen, by its very nature the Catholic school witnesses to faith, and this faith is truly a community pilgrimage.

Ideally when Catholic teachers educate, they not only do so in a scientific, technological, artistic, or humanistic sense, but first they educate in the life of faith. This arrangement is the ideal, and we must not be deluded into thinking that there are but a few Catholic teachers who would not recognize and accept this witnessing to faith as their primary objective. Many perhaps would be genuinely surprised, but it falls within the responsibility of the Catholic School Boards to carry out a more vibrant pastoral program among teachers. Certainly if one were to listen closely to what our teachers have to say, many of them do not, in all sincerity, perceive a great difference between the role of the Catholic School and its counterparts under the direction of the other denominational authorities. If indeed such is the case, then there is little wonder that the fundamental question of whether it is legally permissible to include religious choice under the heading of job qualification has become such a controversial issue.

Dr. Magsino suggests that some extended research may be required to ascertain why teachers prior to 1982 did not

assert their rights within a legal framework. He does, however, isolate some factors which may have contributed to teacher hesitation in this regard.

> The immense discretionary power vested in school authorities, the general and embracing listing grounds for termination of teacher services (e.g. immorality and insubordination), the conservative community ethos, lack of precedents affirming teacher rights and the common law interpretation of school board-teacher relationship as a master-servant relationship, have all mutually reinforced one another in discouraging teacher lawsuits.[146]

Dr. Magsino continues with a specific reference to our provincial situation. "In Newfoundland and Labrador, the nature of denominational education itself, with perceived school board power to fire teachers for denominational reasons, must have contributed to the fear of litigation.[147] Whatever may have been the case, with the advent of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, a new-found courage seems to have been injected into those who previously were either too timid or too wise to challenge the authority of the Catholic educational system.

Certainly to the casual observer it must appear that

the Church, through the Catholic School Boards, is acting out of turn in her insistence that Catholic teachers be held accountable for fulfilling the minimum requirements of Church membership. One cannot expect the general public, subjected as it is to following the ongoing debate between human rights proponents and Catholic educators attempting to elucidate the Church's position, to fully comprehend the philosophy of Catholic education which necessitates what must often appear to be gross injustice. Yet one observer stated that there cannot be Catholic schools without Catholic teachers, for to forego the insistence on the latter would, of necessity, irretrievably undermine the former. Often appearances suggest a lack of respect for freedom of religion and conscience, and it is in fact quite easy to maintain that level of argumentation in the media. One could also attack religious persuasion as a job qualification and classify it as narrow-mindedness or at worst religious bigotry. The fact remains, however, that Catholic schools whether they are in Ontario, Newfoundland, or any other part of the globe are only Catholic schools if they are staffed by Catholic teachers. Perhaps it is essential that teachers who are seeking employment with Catholic School Boards be led to a clear understanding of this requirement before they commit themselves to a contract. One must be cautious not to leave the impression that

Catholicity is the sole requirement for sound educational practice, for it would indeed be backwards if a school board were to overlook academic qualifications in its quest for denominational compliance. Similarly, the importance of Catholic teachers in Catholic Schools does not prohibit school boards from employing a limited number of non-Catholic teachers if they should see fit to do so.

One thing must be clear if we are to make a sincere effort to understand both sides of the debate over teachers' personal and religious rights. We must look below the surface at the real motives of each side. As Covert and Magsino pointed out:

> Whether teachers should have rights to personal and professional autonomy, or whether they should have such autonomy circumscribed by denominational authority, cannot be resolved by arguments about schools. Inevitably we are brought to an examination of competing ideologies in society.[148]

In conclusion, the question of teacher suitability in a Catholic context is a much more complex issue than freedom of religion and conscience. The unity of faith and knowledge which lies at the heart of Catholic education demands adherence to a set of values that must be reflected by both

the word and example of the teacher. To suggest that moral values be subdivided between one's professional and personal lives does not appear to be a realistic expectation in the educational field where curriculum often demands the revelation of more than knowledge.

CHAPTER VI

The Application of the Educational Principles From the Declaration on Christian Education in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador

As a suitable beginning to this chapter perhaps we could draw attention to an address given by Archbishop Penney of St. John's to the Catholic Education Congress held in October 1980 for the express purpose of stimulating thought on the development of Catholic education here in our province.

> Aware of the unique richness and thoroughness of the education being provided by our Denominational School system, a system which is continuing to expand across Canada, we would be unworthy of our heritage if we did not endeavour to measure and re-assess the manner in which our Church schools are serving pupils and parents. As clear cut as it is in its goals and objectives, we know that the way of achieving these goals, like everything else, is perfectible. Indeed it would be unrealistic and very short-sighted on our part if we did not realize that the changes in our society as well as the changes in the Church demand an updating in our

> Catholic schools in order to continue providing a high calibre of catholic education to parents and pupils.[149]

There appears to be two key elements in the above quotation which must be kept in mind when discussing Catholic education in Newfoundland and Labrador. First of all there is a clear, if somewhat understated, acceptance of the goals and objectives of Catholic education. Secondly there is a very evident willingness to have the means, whereby these goals and objectives are to be achieved, left open to scrutiny so that tney are always "perfectible".

In previous chapters we have dealt with the unity of faith and knowledge which lies at the heart of Catholic education. To preserve this unity the Catholic school has as its goal to bring people to integrate into their lives the very person of Jesus Christ with the depth of personal fulfillment and autonomy that such integration entails for each individual. This is the mission that Christ entrusted to his apostles when he commissioned them to go and "make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:18-20).

Archbishop Plourde of Ottawa, who delivered the keynote address at the Congress in question, spoke at length on the conditions necessary for a school to be authentically Catholic. He lists these conditions as follows:

a) The first condition for a school to be authentic is that it create a Christian atmosphere within itself.

b) The second condition, therefore, for Catholic schools to be authentic is that the religion taught in these schools be truly the teaching of the Church.

c) The third condition is an authentic example on the part of teachers.[150]

It would be useful to consider some of the insights which accompanied Archbishop Plourde's listing of these conditions. Pertaining to the atmosphere of the Catholic school, Plourde insists that it is through such an atmosphere and not through coercion that "a sympathy or liking for a life according to God" is developed.[151]

Concerning the school's faithfulness to the teaching of the Church Plourde deplores the tendency of the media to underscore dissent between theologians and the Magisterium while seemingly ignoring the assent that is more often the case. He is careful to point out that "theologians have a right to probe, to suggest, to propose, to deepen, but not to decide what is or is not the authentic teaching of the Church."[152]

Regarding the role of teachers in the Catholic School,

Plourde emphasized that "children learn far more from observing than from listening and are formed more by example and witness than by words."[153]

Consequently he asks if the teachers in a Catholic school can be legitimately required to pursue a lifestyle that is in keeping with Catholic teaching? This is a highly volatile issue as we have already suggested in the previous chapter and, in the light of the present legal climate in Canada, it is an issue that promises to stay with us. In discussing school board by-laws we will attempt to expand our treatment of this area.

School Board By-Laws

It is on the basis of these two points that we will look at the by-laws of the Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's to ascertain whether, in policy, it is faithful to the educational principles of the church set forth in The Declaration on Christian Education. In attempting to ascertain how well local Catholic school authorities reflect the Church's teaching on "true freedom" we will first consider school board by-laws and secondly how these by-laws form a basis for responding to such local areas of debate such as teacher rights; duplication of services; school board structure. Of course we must do this against a background of the demands of justice.

The Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's lists twelve by-laws. These by-laws concern matters significant in the daily running of any school, for example, the internal organization of schools. The use of school facilities for other than school purposes, the expulsion and suspension of students, school discipline and student involvement with police, student pregnancy, unauthorized persons on school premises, and the financial and purchasing aspects of the school operation are looked after. It might appear that there is not anything specifically in these by-laws which would indicate that they are the operational foundation for Roman Catholic schools. Such, however, is not the case. The specifically religious dimension is to be seen in certain of the by-laws.

By-law number 3, section 1 states in so many words that parish priests are to have access to school facilities as long as this does not interfere with the functioning of the school or incur additional expenses, for which the board would not assume responsibility. The spirit of Catholic teaching on education is also evident to some extent in By-law number 2, section (2) which states:

> There shall be in each school a religious education and family life co-ordinator whose duties shall include the proper co-ordination of the religious

> and family life programme of the school and maintain a continuing liaison with the Board's Religious Education and Family Life Consultants.[154]

By-law number 12 deals specifically with the religious education courses offered to students. It states:

> Subject to Section 64 of the Schools Act, all students in the schools under the Board must include as one of the subjects studies the religious education course prescribed by the Catholic Education Committee.
>
> Subject to Section 64 of the Schools Act, all students in Grades X, XI and XII must include a minimum of a one credit course in the Roman Catholic religious education program as prescribed by the Catholic Education Committee.[155]

Although the above by-law seems quite rigid, and one may well ask if such a ruling can be justified in the light of parental objections based on either non-adherence to the Catholic faith or on the possible interference such a ruling could have in terms of graduation for certain students who may need credits in areas other than religious education, school principals are invested with broad discretionary

powers in order to favorably respond to parental concerns. Parents are invited to express their concerns freely to school and school board authorities. This approach has worked well up to the present time and is certainly in keeping with Church teaching on religious liberty while in no way contradicting the second of the stated aims of public education for Newfoundland and Labrador. "We believe that best and fullest development can be achieved only in a Christian democratic society and that the aims of education, both general and specific, must be conceived in harmony with such a belief.[156]

The Catholic nature of the school board in question is expressed most explicitly in by-law number 1 which is comprised of a preamble and six sections. For our purposes it may prove useful to offer the complete text of this by-law, for it reveals the very grave responsibility of the teacher in the Catholic school.

By-Law Number 1

Preamble

> Since the chief aim of this Roman Catholic School Board is to provide an education service, enlightened by faith in which our youth can grow in the knowledge, love and practice of the Roman Catholic faith, our schools must be centers of Catholic life and worship. But since, in the words of Vatican

Council II, teachers must recognize "that the Catholic school depends upon them almost entirely for the accomplishment of its goals and programs," it shall be obligatory for all teachers employed by the Board, in the exercise of their functions and responsibilities, to carry out, perform and respect the following duties:

Community and Functions:

(1) A teacher, whether involved in the actual teaching of Religious Education courses or not, must make a positive contribution to the development of a genuine spirit of Christian Community within the school, and subject to Article 5 of this By-law, must actively participate in the school's religious functions, wherein and whereby both the teacher and the students can grow to the full measure of Christian teachings.

To Teach Religious Education Courses:

(2) Subject to Section 81(c) of the Schools Act, a Roman Catholic teacher in a school operated by this Board must teach the prescribed course in Religious Education, if directed to do so by, or on behalf of, this Board.

Approved by R.C.E.C.:

(3) The courses in Religious Education approved by the Roman Catholic Education Committee must be used by a Roman Catholic teacher in a school operated by this Board, and no courses and no textbooks in Religious Education may be used without prior written authorization by the Roman Catholic Education Committee or by the local Ordinary. (This article does not prevent wide recourse to appropriate reference materials by a teacher).

Teacher Credibility;

(4) The task of Catholic Education is understood to be not merely the discovery of meaning and the sharing of knowledge, but also live evidence of fundamental Christian values, and a teacher employed by this Board must recognize that his or her personal lifestyle has an impact upon his or her credibility with youth.

Teachers who are not Adherents of the Roman Catholic Faith

(5) This Board respects the freedom of conscience of a teacher who is not an adherent of the Roman Catholic faith and who so advises the Board in writing at the time of commencement of

employment with this Board. Such a teacher, while maintaining fidelity to his or her own conscience, is expected at all times to demonstrate a respectful and sympathetic sensitivity to the Catholic beliefs and practices of the students in the schools operated by this Board.

Incompatibility

(6) A Roman Catholic teacher in the schools operated by this Board is expected to abide by the laws and regulations common to all members of the Catholic Church and by word and example to encourage students to do likewise. When such a teacher employed by this Board acts in flagrant and explicit contradiction with fundamental Roman Catholic values or with the official teachings of the Magisterium or with the educational objectives of the Roman Catholic Church, that action is incompatible with the continued exercise of the teacher's function in a school operated by this Board.[157]

It is readily evident that the role of the teacher as outlined in Church documents on education to which we have previously referred is reiterated in these by-laws, with

some concentration of the principles governing the individual teacher's responsibility. It is not at all difficult to understand why certain individuals and groups in our society would find these by-laws unpalatable, for one could read into them a certain triumphalist attitude that is reminiscent of those times when Catholics believed that outside the Church there is no salvation. Worse still one could perceive a position in stark contradiction to the freedom of religious conscience which the Church purports to uphold, not to mention a certain nonchalant casting aside of human rights particularly in the area of freedom of information and job discrimination. However, such charges are often based on a misunderstanding of the principles that we have outlined earlier. This is certainly the case as far as a true understanding of freedom is concerned. A totally unrestricted autonomy is, as we have seen, not only impossible, but also undesirable, for even in a pluralistic society such as ours, it is still justifiable to hold on to one's convictions. This does not necessarily mean that one has to create a hierarchy of beliefs and convictions, but rather it gives us the basis of a tolerant and inquiring society.

One of the foundational convictions is the integration of faith and life which can best be achieved in the atmosphere of a Catholic school. If we look at the development

of Catholic education in Newfoundland we see that a number of factors were at work, each of them having in common the firm belief that education, in its fullest sense, is "Christ-centered." This was made quite clear in an address given by local lawyer and former provincial opposition leader, James J. Greene, Q.C. to the Catholic Education Congress mentioned earlier. Mr. Green cites four factors.

(1) The leadership of the Church authorities who unswervingly recognized that faith and life are best integrated through education;

(2) The determination of the laity, with their strong religious convictions, to provide for their children at all costs the fruits of a Christian system of education and who, over the years, through times of depression and privation, counted no sacrifice too high to make to maintain that system;

(3) The magnificent and continuous contributions from generation to generation, now extending over 150 years, of the religious orders and lay men and women who served as teachers and with whom, beyond all

doubt, the system would long since have faltered and failed;

(4) Late though it came, the acceptance by the Government of the denominational system of education and, over the years, an ever-increasing financial contribution towards the costs of that system without which the system as we know and cherish it today could not have been maintained."[158]

Undoubtedly Catholic education in the past has recognized and accepted the principle of integration of faith and life and has seen in this the way to personal autonomy. The question remains whether or not our Catholic system today reflects that principle. In school board policy as contained in By-law number I we can say that it certainly does, but Catholic education is also an extension of parental rights in the education of their children. The church has consistently upheld the primacy of parental rights in this regard and one would have to inquire whether Catholic education in our province is in keeping with the will of the parents of our students. If such is not the case, then perhaps the charges that the Church is engaged in a power struggle have the ring of truth about them.

The principle of parental primacy is a convoluted and

controversial one in the Newfoundland context. Although one can argue, as does Ishmael Baksh that "the provision of Church-related, public education enables parents to safeguard their religious conscience by permitting them to educate their children in accordance with their conceptions of the religious obligations of parents,"[159] it is still important to remember that in our province we have tended to claim support for our denominational system of education based on the numbers of people affiliated with the various Churches. This may well be considered a logical assumption, but it remains an assumption. Simply because a number of people label themselves Roman Catholic, this does not legitimately mean that each and every one of them supports Catholic education. Romulo Magsino takes issue with this assumption, suggesting that it is contradictory to the principle of the primacy of parental responsibility for the education of their children.

> This strategy clearly makes a mockery of the principle of parental responsibility which the denominationalist professes to uphold. When the denominationalist says, "you are a member of x church and therefore your child ought to go to x school," he effectively pre-empts the right to decision-making on the part of the parent. The

> principle of parental responsibility, in this case, gives way to the denominational creed: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations ... ."[160]

If the Catholic philosophy of education is truly supportive of parental responsibility, then in principle and in practice it must also support the existence of non-denominational schools for those parents who wish to choose such an educational setting for their children. To my knowledge there is no objection implicitly or explicitly present in the documents studied to indicate an inherent stand against such schooling. Within the economic context in our province such an additional "system" may well be a financial strain, but then such is not the topic of our paper. Furthermore Catholic education is not required to dismantle itself because there are sufficient members in our province who seem to indicate a preference for a "non-sectarian" system.

There have been a number of surveys taken on our educational system and it is necessary to consider their findings as part of a general discussion of parental rights. In a 1983 survey conducted by Dr. P.J. Warren, Question 21 dealt with the views of Newfoundlanders on the denominational ystem. For comparison purposes it is to be noted that this study was the second in what is intended to be a series of

five year studies of public attitudes toward education in our province. Participants were questioned as to levels of support for our present system with six levels: no response, strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, strongly agree. For our purposes we will consider only the Roman Catholic response which was second highest to the Pentecostal respondents in declaring its strong agreement with the present system. The figures are informative, however, with 22% of Roman Catholics strongly agreeing and 40% agreeing with our system as it was in 1983. In the undecided category there was 18% while the combined numbers disagreeing and strongly disagreeing amounted to 19%. When compared to the 1978 study Roman Catholics showed stronger overall support in the more recent survey. The percentage of those strongly agreeing and agreeing rose from 51% in 1978 to 62% in 1983, while the undecided fell from 29% in 1978 to 18% in 1983. The disagree and strongly disagree rose by 1% from 18% in 1978 to 19% in 1983.[161]

While Dr. Warren's study was an overall look into public perception of our total educational structure, Mark W. Graesser's 1987 study sought out public opinion specifically on denominational education. In assessing the relationship between religious affiliation and attitudes toward change in our system of education, 15% of the Roman Catholics included in the survey favoured no change what-

soever; 47% felt that some "public" addition should be made to the present system; 38% felt that the entire educational structure should be changed to one public system.[162] If one could assume that the 47% who wanted some public education were at least partially in agreement with the present system, then it would appear that Graesser's findings in terms of strongly agreeing and agreeing with Catholic education match those of Warren's 1983 study. The 62% figure, while not denoting unanimity, is certainly a formidable show of support to which Catholic educational authorities have to respond.

It is worthy of note at this point that Graesser offers several observations by way of summarizing his statistical results with regard to support for change. He writes:

> We may summarize at this point by observing that support for change is strongest among the Protestant denominations other than Pentecostals, and is strongest among younger, more educated and more urbanized people. We may draw the inference that this attitude pattern reflects general secularizing tendencies in the generation which is distinctively a product of the expanded and economic opportunities brought on by confederation.[163]

Upon closer scrutiny one may draw one's own inferences from this summary, namely, that the "secularizing tendencies" deriving as they do from "expanded educational and economic opportunities" are essentially good things aiding younger, better educated and more urbanized people to clarify their thinking as it pertains to "non-secularizing tendencies" which would include perhaps religious aspects of life more influential in the lives of older, not-so-well educated, and less urbanized people.

Ishmael Baksh in his "The Defence of Denominational Schools" makes a number of points which counterbalance the sense that secularism is a panacea for our educational ills. In referring to V.C. Blum's Freedom of Choice in Education (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1958) p. 50 - 52, Baksh writes:

> Blum argues for Church-related, public education on the basis of his conviction that it can serve as a bulwark of individuality. The individual in society encounters various forces which press for conformity: the will of the majority threatens to deprive him of his right to differ and the State, too, may sometimes reveal itself as the enemy of intellectual or of spiritual freedom, penalizing the individual for subscribing to a particular

> belief. Also the development of the Welfare State causes the individual to be caught up increasingly in the uniformity of State control. A system of education directed entirely by the State cannot adequately sustain the diversity of thought - intellectual, spiritual, and other wise - which is a concomitant of individual freedom.[164]

The essential point to be kept in mind is not simply what the majority wants, but whether our educational system is responding out of a sense of distributive justice to the diversity of needs in our province. Up to the present the debate has been structured along an either-or standoff.

Realistically speaking there is a middle ground, as indicated by Dr. Magsino, between a denominational system branded as discriminatory and doctrinaire and a secular system viewed as enlightened. In judging one system against the criteria of the other, it often happens that views become biased, and the tendency to allow our praise of one system to become euphoric and our condemnation of the other to become hysterical often blinds us to the true educational value of each. Magsino writes:

> The correct solution to the problem under consideration will not be achieved by answering the question: denominational schools or secular

> schools? In a democracy where pluralism with respect to deeply-held convictions is recognized and protected by law, the either-or attitude is itself divisive. If we are to take the democratic way of life seriously, then we must respect the right of different groups of people to ensure the continued existence of their values and beliefs. Quite clearly, no reason at all could be found in the democratic creed which would justify discrimination against a group in favour of another; every reason could be given for fostering harmonious co-existence among men of diverse faiths.[165]

Magsino goes on to state that the principle embedded in a pluralised, democratic society would demand not only that denominational schools be retained, but also that a school board(s) be formed to represent the secular viewpoint.[166] Granted that such an arrangement will involve a hard look at our economic resources, the point is less that the established denominations are standing in the way of such an arrangement, or grasping for power, but rather that we are forced to ask ourselves whether or not we can afford it. From the Roman Catholic point of view it is simply inconceivable that a Church dedicated to the brotherhood of man and the universal right to an education will present itself

as a stumbling-block to a segment of our society whose educational requirements are deemed to be outside of our present system, which is intolerable not because it is denominational, but because it denies a significant number of our people a proper expression for their educational needs. Theoretically the secular and denominational can co-exist. In practice the implementation of the ideal will be an extremely challenging one,[167] if for no other reason than the economic situation in which we find ourselves.

As a result of his findings Mark Graesser states:

> It would appear that an educational model which would be more congruent with the pattern of majority and minority opinion registered in the surveys would combine a core "public" or non-sectarian system with publicly supported separate, religious schools where justified by substantial support from within certain denominational groups. Among the established denominations, the surveys show that such support is restricted to Roman Catholics and Pentecostals. To further reflect public preferences, such a reformed system might well provide for religious instruction within the "public" stream for those who desire it.[168]

Whether such will be the end result of the present unrest is not certain, but it is highly likely that Catholic authorities in the educational field, in being faithful to the principles presented in the encyclicals and other Church documents, will continue to insist on a separate Catholic system in response to the wishes of those parents who want to educate their children in the atmosphere of a Catholic school. This atmosphere cannot be achieved in terms of the hours that religious instruction is carried out. The Archbishop of Paris and former chaplain at the University of Paris, Cardinal Jean-Marie Lustiger understood this very well when he stated:

> Christianity cannot be limited to being just a part of life. You cannot strengthen faith by increasing the hours that it is taught in school, as you can with German or math. Christianity concerns the whole of life and young people know that; if faith does not transform the whole of life, young people soon see the contradiction.[169]

In the long run perhaps we ought to bear in mind that the hard facts of economics and budgets may be more easily adjusted than the drive to conceal conformity under the guise of equality. One may well ask which is the more

fertile breeding ground for discrimination; an acceptance of diversity, or the insistence on "sameness".

Interdenominational Cooperation

At the beginning of this chapter we referred to a statement of Archbishop Penney's which reflected a willingness on the part of local Catholic educational authorities to continue in their striving to make our system a better one. As recently as February 1988, with the publication of Educational District Boundaries: A Framework for the Future, this willingness remains evident. The statement made by Archbishop Penny in October of 1980 at the Catholic Educational Congress mentioned earlier, was not mere lip service, but a reiteration of Catholic educational philosophy found throughout the various documents we have studied.

The three-member committee approved by the Catholic Education Council to conduct a boundaries study was given a framework of four terms of reference. The second of these terms of reference states the purpose of this committee: "To examine recommendations from the recent Integrated Education Council Boundaries Report (School District Boundaries Revisited) which refer to possible future sharing/co-operation among denominational School Boards of the Province.[170]

These efforts to accommodate change do not in any way

detract from what Catholic educators see as their mandate to make the Gospel message of Christ a living reality in the school community. If anything this openness to innovation and, to some degree, rejuvenation is an endorsement of that mandate. Nevertheless in chapter one of their study the members of the committee (Dr. Dennis L. Treslan of the Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Memorial University, Chairman; Dr. J.K. Tracey, former Executive Director of the Catholic Education Council; and Mrs. Regina Warren, M.Ed., a teacher at Regina High School, Corner Brook) stressed that "it is imperative that the Catholic identity in joint arrangements be preserved, that the religious education of pupils be ensured and that guidelines be agreed upon and acceptable procedures maintained.[171]

School Board Structure

In considering how a Catholic philosophy of education is applied to the local educational scene one cannot overlook either the sense of purpose or the structure of the Catholic School Board. Under the heading of the "Aims of Public Education for Newfoundland and Labrador" as contained in the School Board, a booklet prepared by the Denominational Education Councils, we find:

> We believe that those who have achieved their fullest and best development as individuals are those who, to the best of their ability,
>
> (a) are possessed of a religious faith as maintained and taught by the church of their affiliation (Spiritual: Religious Training and Exercises)
>
> (b) are possessed of a sense of moral values, based on a belief in, and an earnest endeavour to practice and exemplify in their daily living, the virtues, both spiritual and moral, affirmed by their religious faith (Moral: Religious Training and general moral precept and example)[172]

It is certainly relevant to our purpose to ascertain what the individual school board members see as their particular role. In a paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association at Corner Brook in June 1982, Dr. John J. Stapleton of the Faculty of Education, Lakehead University, cites the research of Padraig O'Toole who, in fulfilling requirements for his doctoral thesis in education, spent over a year working in a southern Ontario separate school board. According to Stapleton the heart of O'Toole's work was "the

in-depth profile of the histories and value orientations of fifteen trustees."[173] Incidentally none of the trustees in question was a priest. Space will allow only the inclusion of the more salient aspects of O'Toole's findings. Stapleton writes:

> O'Toole found that the concept of commitment dominated the entire system. This surprised him since he had expected to find that concern for the faith played only a minimal role in the perspective of popularly elected trustees. He had further expected that the multiplicity of family life styles would have contributed to this minimal role. Instead he found that a sense of commitment dominated the minds of the trustees who interpreted commitment to mean that individuals connected with the system would give assent to a body of belief (the Catholic faith) and that each one could be expected to pledge himself to a course of action that promoted this belief in others.[174]

O'Toole also learned that school board trustees had strong and determined views on the necessity of religion in the educational process. It was generally felt that the answers to the ultimate questions of human existence are to

be found in "the tenets of the Christian faith and propagating this faith is one of the functions of education in the Christian community."[175]

It is interesting to note as well that this study by O'Toole concluded that elected trustees viewed themselves as representatives of church-going supporters of the separate school system, but at the same time there was a general sense that each of these trustees would vote on relevant issues according to his personal assessment of the situation and not merely as a reflection of their constituents' wishes. In terms of his overall conclusions O'Toole felt that the strength of the convictions evident in this particular board must surely be reassuring to those who feel that Catholic education must certainly be on the decline because of the continually diminishing presence of religious orders. If this board is indeed typical, [demographic characteristics such as average age, sex, length of service etc. revealed no significant differences from the characteristics of other Ontario separate school boards], then O'Toole states that, Catholic trustees are very serious about the continuing implementation of the evangelical mission of the Catholic school. He writes: "In conjunction with the home and the parish, Catholic trustees believe that a prime purpose of the Catholic school is to pass on the major tenets of the Catholic faith to succeeding generations

of Catholic youngsters."[176]

Comparing O'Toole's findings with our local situation, there does not seem to be any reason to assume that school board trustees in Newfoundland and Labrador view their role as substantially different from that of their colleagues in Ontario. During the recently held consultations in preparation for the World Synod of Bishops on The Vocation of the Laity in the Church and the World, there was a presentation given in St. John's concerning the role of the laity in the apostolate of Catholic education by Paul Stapleton, a trustee of the Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's. Mr. Stapleton saw the function of the trustee as twofold. There is what he refers to as the legal function. This has to do with providing the facilities, materials, and staff necessary for the presentation of the curriculum. In this capacity trustees are answerable to the general public and in particular to the parents. Of equal importance is the other aspect of this twofold function, namely, "the conveying to our students of the Christian values which will enable them to live the eucharist in their daily lives".[177] Mr. Stapleton went on to say:

> This is a much more difficult function to fulfill. These are intangibles for which there is no standard testing to determine whether or not we are

> succeeding in our ministry. There can be no doubt that in fulfilling this role the Catholic School Trustee is participating in the ministry of the Church. Again, in this ministry we are responsible for setting the policy which our administrators and teachers are to follow in achieving our objective _____" making the gospel known."[178]

What is significant in this presentation is the recurrent emphasis on the school board trustee as a lay minister of the Church. Mr. Stapleton goes on to say that in addition to apathy and complacency the major obstacle to meeting the challenge of spreading the message of Jesus is a "pre-occupation with bricks and mortar and grade testing."[179]

The presentation of Mr. Stapleton does not mention the almost continual thrust being made by certain groups in our province to have a completely secular system of education. Rather it appears to hold the position that Catholic education will wither from lack of concern on the part of administrators, teachers, parents, much more quickly than from any assault from the outside. As a concerned trustee Mr. Stapleton reminded those present at the preliminary consultation that local clergy must take a keen interest in educational matters, for lay trustees are quite capable of fulfilling the aspect of their role that deals with the

actual policy-setting which administrators and teachers are to follow, but they need the constant input of the church if they are to steep themselves in the philosophy of Catholic education.

> Our Church must be careful however to continue its input and to intensify that input wherever possible. This applies not only to finances, but also to the provision of regular opportunities for trustees to educate themselves in the philosophy of Catholic education and to giving clear, ongoing advice and direction on issues, moral or related, as they arise. The position(s) of our Church on educational matters must be communicated clearly to trustees on a regular basis.[180]

Some of those who favour the dismantling of the denominational system and its replacement by a completely secular system see the strategic importance of getting on the inside of the school board control center. Apparently this objective will be attained in the interests of justice. This was made abundantly clear in two recent letters appearing in the local press. Steven B. Wolinetz in a letter appearing on the editorial page of the Evening Telegram decried the process by which a school board is

formed; process which until quite recently excluded anyone who did not belong to any of the constituent faiths. Wolinetz views this as outright discrimination against those who are non-adherents of major religious denominations. He writes:

> If an individual stands for election or accepts appointment, it is unlikely to be because they wish to undermine the system, but because they are concerned about education. Yet parents or citizens who are neither Catholic, nor members of Protestant faiths making up the Integrated or Consolidated School Boards in this province cannot stand for election to the school boards for which they, because of the absence of a secular school system, must send their children.[181]

Wolinetz went on to state that such shortcomings could be alleviated if denominational authorities at least appointed some non-adherents to their boards. This arrangement however would not be entirely satisfactory in Wolinetz's view for it would go contrary to the spirit behind school board structure, that is, the appointees are meant to represent "the interests of the constituent denominations" and the elective seats are "to represent the public and

particularly the parents of students in the school system."[182]

The same thoughts are expressed by Lynn Byrnes, past President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Association. Writing in a recent edition of Newfoundland Lifestyle, she made some interesting comments.

> Parents themselves are not overlooked in the application of discriminatory policies. Parents who do not ascribe to one of the designated religions have been denied the right to stand for school board elections, although they may have a child attending the particular school.[183]

She goes on to make a somewhat creative but questionable comparison.

> However, the Provincial School Board Tax Authorities make no such exemption in their collection policies for non-adherents. The School Tax is collected equally from all working groups, regardless of religious affiliation or lack of it, despite the refusal to allow these groups to be represented on the school boards. Here lies the potential for a Newfoundland version of the 'Boston

> Tea Party'. Taxation without representation is alive and well in our colonial education system.[184]

British domination of the North American colonies prior to the Revolutionary War appears to be hardly analogus to an educational system which strives to perfect itself and accommodate the changing demands of our population. Ms. Byrmes goes on to quote from the Declaration on Christian Education stating that parents have the "first and inalienable duty and right to educate their children" and that "the church gives high praise to those civil authorities and civil societies that show regard for the pluralistic character of modern society ..."[185]

These quotations are excellent illustrations of the Catholic Church's respect for both parental and minority rights as well as an endorsement of the resources that any society can be said to possess when it respects the diversity that exists among its citizens. However, they do not state either explicitly or implicitly that a Catholic school system should be struck down to make room for a secular system. The Church would certainly favour the formation of another system to serve those who do not belong to designated denominational groups, particularly if numbers warrant such a system. However such a resolution to the denominational controversy is deemed unacceptable because

of its potential strain on the provincial economy. Therefore Ms. Byrnes writes:

> Living within the economic reality of this province, the reasonable alternative is for the operators of our church schools to amend their current discriminatory practices. Those policy amendments would need to include and respect different religious minorities equally with their own faiths.[186]

The argument that apparently results from Ms. Byrnes' article follows the usual pattern. The major denominations are actively involved in promoting discriminatory policies against non-adherent groups, notably non-Christian groups. Included in these discriminatory policies is the exclusion of these non-adherents from school board membership. This is the case because the major denominations want to hold on to power in the educational field. There are two ways of dealing with this situation. A separate system could be established to respond to the needs of non-adherents. This is considered cost-prohibitive in the light of the provincial economy, and therefore simply not feasible. The alternative is to create an entirely secular public school system, by first of all dismantling the present denomina-

tional one. This aim is a very considerable objective and we should, if for no other reason than in the interests of common sense, take a closer look at this discriminatory policy-making that our system fosters.

The enrolment figures for 1988 - 1989 might be used in examining proposals for dismantling this present system. As the purpose of this paper is confined to the Catholic philosophy of education, we shall consider the stand taken by Roman Catholic educational authorities only. In the Roman Catholic system throughout the province we have a total of 51,247 students. Of this number 21 are unaffiliated, 486 are other [included under "other" would be lesser known Christian groups, non-Christians, and non-religious groups], 3,363 are from major Christian denominations other than Roman Catholic, and the remaining 47,884 are Roman Catholic. Provincially there is a total of 252 unaffiliated and 3,767 other out of a total school population of 132,995 students.[187] In terms of percentages the combined unaffiliated and other make up approximately 3% of the overall school population. The figures themselves hardly warrant the radical educational changes suggested by those who favour a completely secular system. However, this 3% deserves not only recognition but in the interests of distributive justice, they deserve and have a right to representation on school boards. In keeping with the spirit

of the Vatican document quoted by Lynn Byrnes, and with the statement of Archbishop Penney given at the beginning of this chapter to the effect that "we would be unworthy of our heritage if we did not endeavour to measure and re-assess the manner in which our Church schools are serving pupils and parents,"[188] the school boards and the Catholic Education Council have initiated changes in school board structure to offer minority groups representation. Considering that the unaffiliated and other make up a little less than 1% of the student population in the Catholic system and that other Christian denominations comprise roughly 7%, the request that Catholic School Boards "amend their constitutions to permit the Bishops of the Diocese to select for appointment to a Catholic Board persons of other denominations where such appointments are deemed appropriate"[189] appears to be more than equitable. This request was made during the Catholic Education Council meeting in May 4, 1988 and the new policy was adopted at the annual meeting of the Council in October 1988. Prior to the adoption of this policy a typical Roman Catholic School District divided into six zones and having a total of eighteen Board Members might be constituted as follows:

a) Six persons, one representing each zone and nominated by the Ordinary of the Diocese for appointment to the Board.

b) Twelve persons elected in accordance with the Regulations, two representing each zone.[190]

The revised policy is stated as follows:

- the two-thirds segment of the membership of each Roman Catholic School Board which is selected by election shall be persons of the same religious denomination as that for which the district was established i.e. Roman Catholic.
- one-third of the members of each Roman Catholic School Board shall be selected for appointment by the Ordinary of the Diocese.
- School Board Constitutions should be amended to remove the 10% restriction on the number of persons of other denominations who are selected by the Ordinary of the Diocese for appointment to a School Board, and
- School Board Constitutions should be amended so that members selected for appointment by the Ordinary of the Diocese be selected at large.[191]

When one considers the Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's with a total enrolment for 1988-89 of 19,649 students, 1,018 of which are non-Catholic and of this number

7 are unaffiliated while 285 are listed as other, the opening up, in principle, of six seats on an eighteen member board must surely leave one wondering in disbelief about charges of discrimination. Characteristics of discriminatory behaviour would be its irrationality, its hard-headed entrenchment, and a very strong element of intentionality. Persons and institutions who discriminate make it their business to do so. People of good will who recognize discriminatory practices resulting from a melding of historical development, contemporary population mobility as well as changing lifestyle and values take positive steps to effect change. Looking at the 1981 Canadian census statistics on religious affiliation in Canada, [the 1986 census did not include religious affiliation in the information sought] we find that less than 1% of the provincial population do not believe in God and that less than 1.2% are non-Christian.[192] The school enrolment figures for 1988-89 seem to indicate that these situations have not changed appreciably since 1981. One would have to conclude that the population of this province is not as pluralistic as some would have us think.

Teacher Rights

Whenever charges of discrimination are aired against the denominational system the most frequently cited context

is that of teacher freedom of conscience. This is evidently a very painful area of confrontation between an individual's right to freedom of conscience and the school board's sense of responsibility in terms of its obligation to parents and students to uphold the Catholic atmosphere of the school system. To those critical of the denominational system the religious and moral choices of a teacher are wholly outside the educational nature of his work. Such however is not the viewpoint of the Church for whom the teacher is at the heart of the school, as we have seen in the previous chapter. Similarly there are others who see clearly the enormous power for good and ill that a teacher possesses,[193] for it is evident that the curriculum presented by a teacher is communicated in a personal interaction where far more than information is conveyed. A teacher who acts in "flagrant and explicit contradiction with fundamental Roman Catholic values or with the official teachings of the Magisterium or with the educational objectives of the Roman Catholic Church"[194] is deemed to be acting in a fashion incompatible with the continued exercise of his function within a Catholic school. It must be observed that whereas religious affiliation in most workplaces may not have a direct bearing on how one carries out one's duties, within the context of a Catholic school where parents send their children not only to be educated in an academic or vocational sense but also

to become knowledgeable in and appreciative of Catholic beliefs and values, such affiliation is of paramount importance. This is not to say that non-Catholic teachers are refused positions on the basis of religion, nor is it to indicate that there is an on-going scrutiny of the personal lives of teachers to ascertain whether they are living within the dictates of Catholic teaching. Furthermore the issue is really not freedom of religious choice, freedom of conscience, but whether or not the choices, once made, are consistent with the teaching ministry in a Catholic school. The Catholic teacher who signs a contract with a Catholic School Board is aware of these responsibilities and the responsibility to learn about and deepen one's faith is a personal one. If a Catholic teacher decides in all sincerity that his relationships with God and others will be nurtured more fully in the community of another denomination, or that his life will be more fulfilled outside the Catholic Church, that is indeed his prerogative. However, such a teacher should extend the onus of his sincerity to question his position in a school system whose fundamental tenets of faith he has rejected.

There has been a lot of talk about honesty as a Christian virtue and how this virtue is seemingly rejected by Catholic School Boards who dismiss teachers who honestly and in a forthright fashion accept the faith expressed by

another denomination. In a letter previously quoted in this chapter Steven Wolinetz wrote in reference to a teacher who was fired by the R.C. Board for St. John's for converting to another Christian faith:

> On the CBC Radio Morning Show a spokesman for the R.C. School Board stated that the Board hires members of other faiths but that Catholic teachers had to be held to another standard. Perhaps, but in that the Roman Catholic Board hires teachers of other faiths, the dismissed teacher was fired for being honest. Had he lied or otherwise concealed his conversion, he could have retained his job. This is a peculiar reward for honesty and truthfulness - values cherished by Christian and non-Christians, atheists and agnostics - and a peculiar message for a school board to convey to its pupils.[195]

Is Mr. Wolinetz proposing as a social principle that any action can be justified if the doer of that action freely admits doing it? Such a principle would have striking ramifications not only for our legal system, but in the area of our interpersonal relations as well. On closer examination of Mr. Wolinetz's statement one may well

ask who is being honest? If the teacher in question were concerned about integrity and honesty perhaps the proper course would be to resign from a system with which he felt he was in fundamental disagreement. The school board itself with its 18,631 Roman Catholic students seems to have honored its responsibility to those students and their parents in its efforts to preserve the faith atmosphere of the system. It must be noted that it is not the choice of religious affiliation that is in question here but whether in converting to another faith, if one retains the necessary occupational qualifications to teach in a Roman Catholic school. Romulo Magsino offers the findings of the Arbitration Board hearing in the case referred to above:

> By joining the Salvation Army and subsequently marrying in that church, he repudiated Roman Catholicism and thereby eliminated this occupational qualification. In our opinion, this occupational qualification is bona fide and the loss of the same constitutes "just cause" for his dismissal.[196]

It is the stated belief of Catholic educational authorities that they have been given a mandate by parents to educate their children, but more precisely to foster through

example and word, their faith development. Teachers, on a daily basis, for approximately 190 days a year interact with many young people. If a teacher remains in a particular school for an extended period he will often see children progressing through primary, elementary and on into Junior High School. Senior High School teachers similarly watch as Junior High graduates move through the years on to post-secondary institutions. The influential position of teachers does not have to be emphasized. To deny that a teacher's conversion from one faith to another does have a definite effect is to turn a blind eye to the fundamental importance of example in faith development. The question must be then first and foremost whether Catholic school boards have the right to expose their students to such example especially during the somewhat turbulent and malleable years of adolescence. Once this question has been satisfactorily answered by parents and educational authorities, then perhaps the individual teacher's right to the retention of his position may be ascertained.

There is, of course, another side to this debate which has been the subject of many documents dealing with an overall view of Catholic education. At the risk of offering some excerpts already cited earlier in this paper let us take a look at some relevant examples. The Declaration on Christian Education states:

> But let teachers realize that to the greatest possible extent they determine whether the Catholic school can bring its goals and undertakings to fruition. They should, therefore, be trained with particular care so that they may be enriched with both secular and religious knowledge, appropriately certified, and may be equipped with an educational skill which reflects modern-day findings. Bound by charity to one another and to their students, and penetrated by an apostolic spirit, let them give witness to Christ, the unique teacher, by their lives as well as by their teachings.[197]

John Paul II in September 1984 addressed Catholic educators at the Basilica of St. John the Baptist in St. John's. The complete text is relevant but the following is particularly appropriate.

> Teachers and parents must strive for a mature spirituality in their own lives; a strength and relevance of faith which can withstand the assault of conflicting values upon the home and school. If the teaching of the Gospel is visible in your daily lives, it will have visible influence upon the young whom you teach.[198]

One would also find in the document on The Catholic School under the heading, "practical directions:"

> By their witness and their behaviour teachers are of the first importance to impart a distinctive character to Catholic schools. It is, therefore, indispensible to ensure their continuing formation through some form of suitable pastoral provision. This must aim to animate them as witnesses of Christ in the classroom and tackle the problems of their particular apostolate, especially regarding a Christian vision of the world and of education, problems also connected with the art of teaching in accordance with the principles of the Gospel.[199]

The supply of similar references is practically endless and one can find a recurrent theme as in the three excerpts quoted above. Such striking phrases as "trained with particular care", strive for a mature spirituality", and "ensure their continuing formation" will all point to the need for an ongoing programme of faith development specifically for teachers. Catholic teachers appear to be caught in the dilemma of having a denominational system which by its very nature provides a unique opportunity to spread the Gospel message, while at the same time teacher training is

carried out in the milieu of a secular university which does not address this particular need. Effectively we often have Catholic teachers with a fair degree of expertise in certain subject areas but whose formal religious training is that of a high school graduate. Yet we expect these teachers to bear the responsibility of guiding our youth. There is no doubt that in most cases they make a conscientious effort to do so, but certainly there is a better way of fostering the faith of both students and teachers. As witnesses to faith our educators must be convinced of the necessity of a deep, relevant spirituality as well as a background in biblical and theological study that would enable them to take their place in the classroom with the same confidence demonstrated in other areas of the curriculum.

In practical terms, the mechanics of such a programme of teacher formation would need considerable study regarding both structure and implementation. It is worthy of note that in response to this need, the Pentecostal, Integrated and Roman Catholic Education Councils presented a joint brief to the Review Committee on Teacher Education, in the Province in 1988 offering a number of recommendations in the area of teacher training in religious education. It will be interesting to see what will develop from that presentation.

It should also be mentioned that during the past two years monies made available through the Sisters of Mercy Sesquicentennial Fund have made possible the holding of institutes for School Board Central Office Staff, School Administrators, and individual school staffs. The principal purposes of these institutes are: to build up faith communities at the school and school district level; to develop leadership within the Catholic School system; and to deepen personal awareness and commitment to the Christian Ministry of Teaching.[200]

Teachers touch many lives of parents, students and each other. If their ministry is to be fruitful, it cannot ring hollow but must be grounded in a deep, personal commitment to the message of Jesus Christ. The question is not whether this is essential to Catholic education but rather, what are the most effective means of carrying it out. This is an area that has perhaps been neglected by local Catholic School Boards but, with the Catholic system protected as it is by law on the outside, it may be time to see that it is also made strong inside.

Conclusion

In the introduction to this thesis, it was our stated purpose to explore the fundamental principles of Catholic education as these principles are presented in the encycli-

cal letter, Declaration on Christian Education. It was our hope that such an elucidation of principles would demonstrate that Catholic education does not bear within itself any essential incompatibility with the objectives of those who are seeking a more efficient educational system in our province. In our discussion of the principles of autonomy, freedom, and conscience we trust that the fundamental respect accorded these principles is as evident in the Catholic system as the secularists claim it is in theirs. Although the ultimate aims of education are radically different when one places the Catholic and secular philosophies side by side, in their practical implementation, the respect for the personhood of the student is very much in evidence as a priority from both viewpoints.

It was crucial to our thesis that we emphasize the essential relevance of faith to any understanding of Catholic education, for its force and energy derive from the wholehearted assent to the Gospel message of humanity's redemption by an omnipotent, yet all-loving God. This faith does not usurp the power of reason, but enhances it and opens for it paths where it would not otherwise go.

One cannot offer a comprehensive overview of Catholic education without taking account of the primacy accorded to parental rights in the education of their children. It is the duty of both Church and State to foster and protect

these rights, thus the Church acknowledges her ancillary position as well as that of the State. The Church retains for herself, however, the task of reminding Catholic parents of the serious responsibility they have to educate their children in the faith. The Church's stand on educational rights is a moderate one of refusing to concede all power to the state yet recognizing keenly the possibility of abuse if parents were the sole determiners of their children's education.

We have also attempted to clarify to some extent the problematic area of teacher rights with the Catholic denominational system. The importance of teacher faith response cannot be overlooked even with a cursory perusal of literature on Catholic education. However, one must concede that the insistence on such faith response arouses the ire of those who, not cognizant of the energizing thrust of faith, visualize a blatant disregard of freedom of conscience and religion. Such a disregard does not exist, for teachers retain the right to religious choice, but it is incumbent upon them, as it is with all of us, to bear the burden of integrity.

The teachers' rights question is, of course, only one of several issues which calls upon the local Catholic educational authorities to defend the Catholic denominational system. In our thesis we have made an effort to

respond to such questions as duplication of service, school board membership, indoctrination, and discrimination, and to demonstrate that the Church is acting in a forthright and tolerant manner. The assumption that the local Catholic Church is engaged in a struggle to retain control in the educational system because of land holdings and financial resources is without foundation. Undoubtedly our denominational system is beset by difficulties but to subscribe to the thinking that these difficulties are the direct result of the present system, and will disappear with its dismantling, is an oversimplification. The local Catholic educational authority, the Catholic Education Council, has demonstrated a willingness both in its statements of philosophy and in the practical implementation of these statements to find solutions to the problems that beset education provincially.

Finally, it would be fitting to offer as a closing for this thesis a excerpt from the mission statement adopted by the Council at its annual meeting in October, 1988.

> In keeping with the authentic character of Catholic education, we seek to respond to the changing circumstances of Church and society and of education in particular. In committing ourselves to the preservation and enrichment of Catholic education,

we welcome our legislated responsibilities, dedicate our efforts to create improved structures and pledge our willingness to work with other responsible educational agencies in planning for the future.[201]

Endnotes

[1]The NTA Bulletin, December 1987, Vo. 31, No. 4, p. 22-23.

[2]Ibid., p. 22-23.

[3]Ibid., p. 22-23.

[4]Ibid.. p. 22-23.

[5]Annie Dillard. Teaching a Stone to Talk: Expeditions and Ecnounters, Harper and Row, New York, 1982, p. 15.

[6]T.M. McLaughlin, "Religion, Upbringing and Liberal Values: A Rejoinder to Eamonn Callan" in Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1985, p. 126.

[7]Idem., p. 126.

[8]Lewis Thomas, The Medusa and the Snail: More Notes of a Biology Watcher, Bantam Books, Toronto, 1980, p. 30.

[9]Dr. Romulo Magsino, "Teacher and Students Rights Within the Denominational Schoolhouse Gate." Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Foundations, Memorial University, St. John's, p. 39.

[10]Idem., p. 39-40.

[11]Edward H. Berman, "Excellence in Teacher Education: The Necessity of a Critical Perspective" in Educational Foundations, 1, Fall 1986, p. 35.

[12]Dillard, Teaching a Stone to Talk, op. cit., p. 31.

[13]Paul VI, Declaration on Christian Education, St. Paul Edutions, Boston, 1965, p. 5.

[14]Joseph Tussman, Government and the Mind, O.U.P. 1977, p. 54.

[15]Ibid., p. 59.

[16]Ibid., p. 61.

[17]Ibid., p. 63.

[18]Ibid., p. 64.

[19]Cornell Hamm, "Constraints on Parents' Rights Concerning the Education of Their Children" in M. Manley Casimer's Family Choice in Schooling, Lexington Brooks, D.C. Heath & Co., Toronto, 1982, p. 3.

[20]Ibid., p. 1.

[21]Ibid., p. 8.

[22]Ibid., Tussman, p. 60.

[23]Ibid., Tussman, p. 22.

[24]Declaration on Christian Education, op. cit., p. 5.

[25]Lewis Thomas, The Medusa and the Snail, op. cit., p. 95.

[26]Declaration on Christian Education, op. cit., p. 6-7.

[27]Paul H. Hirst, Moral Education in a Secular Society, University of London Press, Ltd., London, 1974, p. 58.

[28]Ibid., Hirst, p. 61.

[29]Idem.

[30]James P. Hanigan, What Are They Saying About Sexual Morality? Paulist Press, New York, 1982.

[31]Declaration on Christian Education, op. cit., p. 7.

[32]Hirst, Moral Education in a Secular Society, op. cit., p. 71.

[33]Ibid., Hirst, p. 73.

[34]Ibid., Hirst.

[35]Richard A. McCormack, S.J. "Does Religious Faith Add to Ethical Perception? in Readings in Moral Theology No. 2: The Distinctiveness of Christian Ethics. New York, Ramsey, 1980, p. 163.

[36]Ibid, p. 168.

[37]Tolstoy, Confession translated by David Pittman, New York, 1983, p. 90-91.

[38]Lewis Thomas, "Humanities and Science" in Late Night Thoughts on Listening to Mahler's Ninth Symphony, Bantam Books, Toronto, 1983, p. 150.

[39]Ibid., Hirst, p. 74.

[40]Ibid., McCormick, p. 169 ... the parentheses are mine.

[41]Ibid., Declaration on Christian Education, p. 7-8.

[42]Irenaeus, from the treatise Against Heresies printed in The Liturgy of the Hours according to the Roman Rite, Book III, Catholic Book Publishing Co., New York, 1975, p. 1498.

[43]Josef Pieper and Heinz Raskop, What Catholics Believe, Pantheon Books, New York, 1951, p. 65-66.

[44]Michel de Montaigne, Essays, Penguin Classics, Markham, Ontario, 1958, p. 90.

[45]Jacques Maritain, The Peasant of the Garonne: An Old Layman Questions Himself About the Present Time. MacMillan, Toronto, 1968, p. 168.

[46]F.W. Rowe, The Development of Education in Newfoundland, Ryerson Press, Toronto, 1964, p. 96-103.

[47]Ibid., Rowe, p. 96-103.

[48]Ibid., Rowe, p. 96-103.

[49]Ibid., Rowe, p. 96-103.

[50]Ibid., Rowe, p. 83.

[51]Ibid., Rowe, p. 101.

[52]Piux XI, Divini Illius Magisri [also given in some texts under the title Representanti in Terra] in the Papal Encyclicals 1903-1939 compiled by Claudia Carter IHM, A Consortium Book, McGrath Publishing Co., 1981, p. 366.

[53]Ibid., Paul VI, Declaration on Christian Education, p. 10.

[54]Ibid., Paul VI, p. 11.

[55]Ibid., Rowe, p. 100.

[56]Ibid., Rowe, p. 100.

[57]John Hick, Philosophy of Religion, Prentice-Hall, Toronto, 1963, p. 8.

[58]Catholic Education: From Principle to Practice in Catholic Schools, Canadian Catholic Trustees' Association, May 1974, p. 7.

[59]The Documents of Vatican II. Walter M. Abbott, S.J., general editor, New York, Guild Press, American Press, Association press, C. 1966, p. 635.

[60]John W. Donahue, Catholicism and Education, Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1973, p. 12.

[61]Ibid., Donahue, p. 59-60.

[62]Matthew 28 (19-20).

[63]Aiden Kavanaugh, The Shape of Baptism, Pueblo Publishing Co., New York, 1978, p. 131, found in The Catechumate: The Community as Catechist by Richard Ling.

[64]Blaise Pascal, Pensees, Le Livre de Poche, Librarie Generale Francaise, Paris, 1972, No. 233, p. 114 (persons ... sans hesiter).

[65]John Paul II, Catechesi Tradendae, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, Ottawa, 1979, p. 75.

[66]Ibid., John Paul II, p. 75.

[67]Ibid., Catechesi Tradendae, p. 76.

[68]Douglas J. Simpson and Michael J.B. Jackson. The Teacher as Philosopher: A Primer in Philosophy of Education, Methuen, Toronto, 1984, p. 11.

[69]Ibid., Declaration on Christian Education, p. 8.

[70]Romulo F. Magsino, "Students, Parents, Educators: An Approach to Conflict of Rights", p. 3 from Interchange, Volume 13, No. 3, 1982.

[71]Code of Canon Law [in English Translation], Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Canon Law Society Trust, 1983, p. 145.

[72]Ibid., Code of Canon Law, p. 145.

[73]Pius XI, Divini Illius Magistri [also given in some texts under the title Representanti in Terra] in the Papal Encylicals 1903 - 1939 compiled by Claudia Carter IHM, A Consortium Book, McGrath Publishing Co., 1981, p. 359.

[74]Ibid., Divini Illius Magistri, p. 359.

[75]Ibid., Declaration on Christian Education, p. 8.

[76]Ibid., Montaigne, p. 138.

[77]Joel S. Moskowitz, "Parental Rights and State Education" in Washington Law Review, Volume 50, 1975, p. 626.

[78]Ibid., Moskowitz, p. 628.

[79]John Paul II, Familiaris Consortio [The Christian Family in the Modern World], Section II, paragraph 39, in the Vatican Collection Vol. 2, Vatican Council II: More Post-Councillor Documents, Austin Flannery O.P. General Editor, Costello Publishing Company, New York, 1982, p. 848.

[80]Ibid., Moskowitz, p. 640.

[81]Ibid., Moskowitz, p. 642.

[82]Ibid., Familiaris Consortio, Section II, paragraph 37, p. 847.

[83]Ibid., Moskowitz, p. 650.

[84]Ibid., p. 8.

[85]Peter Hobson, "Some Reflections on Parents' Rights in the Upbringing of Their Children" from The Journal of the Philosophy of Education, 18(1), 1984, p. 64.

[86]Cornell Hamm, "Constraints on Parents' Rights Concerning the Education of Their Children" from M. Manley Casimir's Family Choice in Schooling, p. 5.

[87]Ibid., Declaration on Christian Education, p. 8.

[88]Ibid., Divine Illius Magistri, p. 359.

[89]Ibid., Tussman, p. 59.

[90]Ibid., Divini Illius Magistri, p. 358.

[91]Ibid., Tussman, p. 53.

[92]Ibid., Tussman, p. 54.

[93]Ibid., Tussman, p. 58.

[94]Idem., p. 58.

[95]Ibid., Tussman, p. 59.

[96]See Chapter II, p. 7.

[97]Ibid., Hamm, p. 2.

[98]Ibid., Hamm, p. 3.

[99]Ibid., Hamm, p. 4.

[100]Idem.

[101]Ibid., Hamm, p. 4.

[102]Ibid., Hamm, p. 5.

[103]Ibid., Hamm, p. 7.

[104]The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith in Vatican Council, p. 633-4. More Post Councillor Documents, op. cit.

[105]T.H. McLaughlin, op. cit., p. 75-76.

[106]Idem.

[107]Ibid., McLaughlin, p. 78.

[108]Idem.

[109]Ibid., p. 79.

[110]Ibid., p. 81.

[111]John W. Donahue S.J., op. cit. p. 96.

[112]Ibid., Donahue, p. 98.

[113]Divini Illius Magistri, op. cit., p. 359.

[114]Donahue, op. cit., p. 98.

[115]Ibid., Donahue, p. 99.

[116]Idem.

[117]Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith, op. cit., p. 632.

[118]Tussman, op. cit., p. 61.

[119]Ibid., Tussman, p. 62.

[120]Ibid., Tussman, p. 63.

[121]Ibid., p. 64.

[122]Divini Illius Magistri, op. cit., p. 367.

[123]Declaration on Christian Education, op. cit., p. 13.

[124]Idem.

[125]The Code of Canon Law, op. cit., BKIII, Title III, Chap. II, Canon 803, paragraph 2, p. 147.

[126]The Catholic School, op. cit., paragraph 19.

[127]Ibid., Catholic School, paragraph 41.

[128]Matthew: 7:7.

[129]Catholic School, op. cit., paragraph 41.

[130]Ibid., Catholic School, paragraph 43.

[131]Address by John Paul II to Catholic Education at the Basilica of St. John the Baptist, St. John's, Newfoundland, September 12, 1984.

[132]Michael McKeown, "The Paradoxes of Catholic Education" from The Furrow, Vol. 33, No. 11, November 1982, p. 685.

[133]Canadian Catholic Trustees' Association. Catholic Education: From Principle to Practice in Catholic Schools, May, 1974, p. 11.

[134]Ibid., McKeown, p. 683.

[135]The Catholic School, op. cit., paragraph 37.

[136]McKeown, op. cit., p. 684.

[137]Ibid., McKeown, p. 685.

[138]Ontario Ministry of Education, Education in the Primary and Junior Division, 1975, p. 3 quoted by Sister Mary Hamilton in "Religious Education for Children with Special Needs," in the Bosco Journal: Catholic Education in Canada, Vol. 2., No. I, March, 1987, p. 13.

[139]Archbishop P. Pocock, "Schools with a Difference," address of the 27th Annual Convention of the English Catholic Educating Association of Ontario, March 31, 1971 and printed in the Metropolitan Separate School Board Manual, Part I quoted by Sr. M. Hamilton, Ibid., p. 15-16.

[140]Idem.

[141]Romulo Magsino, "Teacher and Student Rights Within the Denominational Schoolhouse Gate." Memorial University of Newfoundland, p. 4-5.

[142]The Charter of Rights and Freedoms: A Guide for Canadians. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, 1982, p. 5.

[143]Ibid., p. 29.

[144]Idem.

[145]Idem. (I have underlined for emphasis here).

[146]Ibid., Magsino, p. 16.

[147]Idem.

[148]Romulo F. Magsino and James R. Covert, Denominational Thrust in Education: Some Issues Affecting Canadian Teachers, from the Canadian Journal of Education, Vol. 9, Number 3, 1984, p. 255.

[149]Archbishop A.L. Penney, Opening Address to the Catholic Education Congress, October, 1980, St. John's, Newfoundland from Supplement to the Monitor, November 1980, p. 9.

[150]Archbishop J.A. Plourde, "Catholic Education: An Integration of Faith and Life" keynote address to the Catholic Education Congress, St. John's, October 1980 from supplement to the Monitor, November 1980, p. 15.

[151]Idem.

[152]Idem.

[153]Idem.

[154]By-law number 2 from R.C. School Board for St. John's: By-Laws, available from the school board office on Bonaventure Avenue, St. John's, Newfoundland.

[155]Ibid., By-law number 12.

[156]The School Board, a publication prepared by the Denominational Education Councils, BFL Building, St. John's, Newfoundland, November 1985, p. 5.

[157]By-law number 1 from Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's: By-Laws, op. cit., p. 12.

[158]James J. Greene, "Catholic Education in Newfoundland: A Living Heritage," an address given to the Catholic Education Congress, October 1980, printed in the Supplement to the Monitor, November 1980, p. 33-35.

[159]Ishmael J. Baksh, "The Defence of the Denominational Schools" from School and Society: Readings, edited by Ishmael Baksh and Romulo Magsino, Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1984, p. 192.

[160]Romulo F. Magsino, "Denominational Education in Newfoundland (or why exorcise a friendly ghost?") from School and Society, p. 195, Footnote 11, chapter 6.

[161]P.J. Warren, Public Attitudes toward Education in Newfoundland and Labrador: a 1983 Study, Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, 1983, p. 36-44.

[162]Mark W. Graesser, Public Opinion on Denominational Education: Does the Majority Rule? Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1987, p. 9.

[163]Graesser, op. cit., p. 11.

[164]Ishmael Baksh, op. cit., p. 192-193.

[165]Romulo Magsino, op. cit., p. 197-198.

[166]Idem.

[167]Magsino, op. cit., p. 199.

[168]Graesser, op. cit., p. 20-21.

[169]Interviews with Cardinal Jean-Marie Lustiger from Dare to live, (c) Editions du Centurion, English translation, Crossroad Publishing Company, New York, 1988, reprinted in Catholic Digest, November 1988, p. 140.

[170]Educational District Boundaries: A Framework for the Future, A Study of Roman Catholic Educational District Boundaries, Catholic Education Council, St. John's, Newfoundland, February 1988, p. 4.

[171]Educational District Boundaries, op. cit., p. 3.

[172]The School Board, op. cit., p. 5-6.

[173]John S. Stapleton, The Catholic Trustee and Educational Leadership. A paper presented to the Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association, Corner Brook, Newfoundland, June 4, 1982, p. 8.

[174]Idem.

[175]Ibid., p. 9.

[176]Ibid., p. 10.

[177]Paul Stapleton, Consultations in Preparation for the World Synod of Bishops on the Vocation of the Laity in the Church and the World, June 1987, St. John's, Catholic Education Council, p. 2.

[178]Idem., p. 3.

[179]Ibid., p. 3.

[180]Idem.

[181]Steven B. Wolinetz, "Quality of Education is the Crucial Question" in The Evening Telegram, Saturday, September 24, 1988, p. 6.

[182]Idem.

[183]Idem.

[184]Ibid., p. 31.

[1852]Idem.

[186]Idem.

[187]Source: Department of Education, Newfoundland and Labrador, November 30, 1988.

[188]Archbishop Penney, op. cit., p. 1., chapter VI.

[189]"Catholic Education Council Holds Annual Meeting" in The Monitor, November 1988, p. 2.

[190]The School Board, op. cit., p. 10.

[191]Policy approved at the annual general meeting of the Catholic Education Council, October 1988, St. John's.

[192]1981 Canadian Census, Poluation by Selected Religions, Canada, Provinces and Territories, p. 17.

[193]See comments on Tussman, Chap. II.

[194]By-laws of the R.C. School Board for St. John's, op. cit., p. 3.

[195]Steven B. Wolinetz, op. cit.

[196]Romulo Magsino, Teacher and Student Rights Within the Denominational Schoolhouse Gate, op. cit., p. 24.

[197]Paul VI, Declaration on Christian Education, op. cit., p. 646-647.

[198]John Paul II - Address to Catholic Educators, St. John's, 1984. Courtesy of the Catholic Education Council.

[199]The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, The Catholic School, op. cit., p 27.

[200]"Catholic Education Council Holds Annual Meeting," in The Monitor, November 1988, p. 2.

[201]"Catholic Education Council Holds Annual Meeting," from The Monitor, November 1988, p. 2.

Bibliography

Abbot, W.M. (Ed.). (1966). The documents of Vatican II. New York: Guild Press, American Press, Association Press.

Baksh, I.J. (1984). The defence of the denominational school. In Ishmael Baksh and Romulo Magsino (Eds.), School and society: Readings. Department of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Berman, E.H. (1986, Fall). Excellence in teacher education: The necessity of a critical perspective. Educational Foundations, 1.

Berry, T. (1980, June). Perspectives on creativity: Openness to a free future. The Riverdale Papers, 8. Written for the Theology Institute, Villanova University.

Brownfield, R. (1973). Those old-time values. Reprinted from The Catechist and included by Howard Kirschenbaum and Sidney B. Simon (Eds.), Readings in values clarification. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.

Buscaglia, L. (1986). Bus 9 to Paradise. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Byrnes, L. (1987, September-October). Newfoundland's exclusive education system. Newfoundland Lifestyle, 5(4).

Cahill, L.S. (1984). Contempoary challenges to exceptionless moral norms. Moral Theology Today. St. Louis: The Pope John Center.

Canada Catholic Trustees' Association. (1974, May). Catholic education: From principle to practice in Catholic schools. A publication of the Canadian Catholic Trustees' Association.

Canadian Census. (1981). Population by selected religions, Canada, provinces and territories, p. 17.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms: A Guide for Canadians. (1982). Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services, Canada.

Catholic Education Council. (1988, February). Educational district boundaries: A framework for the future. A Study of Roman Catholic Educational Boundaries, St. John's.

_____. (1988, November). Catholic education council holds annual meetings. The Monitor.

Code of Canon Law. (1983). [in English translation], Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, The Canon law Society Trust.

Cooper, Dr. G.A. (1967, April). Church schools or state schools. NTA Journal.

Covert, J.R., & Romulo, M. (1984). Denominational thrust in education: Some issues affecting Canadian teachers. The Canadian Journal of Education, 9(3).

Curran, C.E.. (1967, November). The ethical teaching of Jesus. Commonweal.

Denominational Education Councils. (1985, November). The school board. A publication prepared by the Denominational Councils, BFL Building, St ohn's.

The Didache. (1968). Part I in the Penquin Classic edition of Early Christian Writings. Markham, Ontario.

Dillard, A. Teaching a stone to talk: Expeditions and encounters. New York: Harper and Row.

Donohue, J.W. (1973). Catholicism and education. New York: Harper and Row.

Echlin, E.P. (1987, July). Who in Solihull cares about dolphins. America.

Fox, M. (1983). Original blessing: A primer in creation spirituality. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Bear & Co.

Gow, K. (1980). Yes, Virginia, there is right and wrong. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons Canada Ltd.

Graesser, M.W. (1987). Public opinion on denominational education: Does the majority rule? Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Greene, J.W. (1980, November). Catholic education in Newfoundland: A living heritage. An address given to the Catholic Education Congress. The Monitor.

Hamilton, Sister Mary. (1987, March). Religious education for children with special needs. The Bosco Journal: Catholic Education in Canada, 2(1).

Hamm, C. (1982). Constraints on parents' rights concerning the education of their children. In M. Mandey Casimer, Family choice in schooling. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath & Co.

Hanigan, J.P. (1982). What are they saying about sexual morality? New York: Paulist Press.

Hick, J. (1963). Philosophy of religion. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.

Hirst, P.H. (1974). Moral education in a secular society. London: University of London Press Ltd.

Hobson, P. (1984). Some reflections on parents' rights in the upbringing of their children. The Journal of the Philosophy of Education, 18(1).

Irenaeus. (1975). From the treatise. Against heresies. Printed in The Liturgy of the Hours according to the Roman Rite, Book III. New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co.

Jackson, Dr. M.J.B. (1984). Indoctrination and education. In Ishmael Baksh and Romulo Magsino (Eds.), School and society: Readings. Department of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Jackson, Dr. M.J.B., & Simpson, D.J. (1984). The teacher as philosopher: A primer in philosophy of education. Methven, Toronto.

Janes, P. (1984). Requiem for a faith. St. John's, NF: Creative Printers and Publishers.

John Paul II. (1984, September). Address to Catholic Educators at the Basilica of St. John the Baptist, St. John's, Newfoundland.

_____. (1979). Catechesi tradendae. Ottawa: Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops.

_____. (1982). Familiaris Consortis (The Christian Family in the Modern World). In Vatican Council II: More Post-Conciliar Documents, Volume 2 of the Vatican Collection. Austin Flannery, O.P. (Ed.). New York: Costello Publishing Co.

Kavanaugh, A. (1978). The shape of baptism. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co.

Lewis, C.S. (1963). The screwtape letters and screwtape proposes a toast. New York: Time Reading Program Special Edition, Time Inc.

Lustiger, Cardinal Jean-Marie. (1988, November). Interviews with Cardinal Jean-Marie Lustiger from Dare to Live, (c) Editions due Centurion, English Translation. New York: Crossroads Publishing Co., reprinted in Catholic Digest.

Magsino, R.F. (1984). Denominational education in Newfoundland (or, why exorcise a friendly ghost?). In Ishmael Baksh and Romulo Magsino (Eds.), School and society: Readings. Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Magsino, R.F., & Covert, J.R. (1984). Denominational thrust in education: Some issues affecting Canadian teachers. The Canadian Journal of Education, 9(3).

Magsino, R.F. (1982). Students, parents, educators: An approach to conflicts of rights. Interchange, 13(3).

Magsino, R.F. (1988). Teacher and student rights within the denominational schoolhouse gate. Wm. A. McKim (Ed.), The vexed question: Denominational education in a secular age. St. John's: Breakwater Books.

Maritain, J. (1968). The peasant of the Garonne: An old layman questions himself about the present time. Toronto: MacMillan.

McCann, P. (1984). The future of denominational education in Newfoundland. Ishmael Baksh and Romulo Magsino (Eds.), School and society: Readings. Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

McCormack, R.A., S.J. (1980). Does religious faith add to ethical perception? Readings in Moral Theology Nol 2: The Distinctiveness of Christian Ethics. Ramsey, New York.

McKeown, M. (1982, November). The paradoxes of Catholic education. The Furrow, 33(11).

McLaughlin, T.H. (1985). Religion, upbringing and liberal values: A rejoinder of Eamonn Callan. The Journal of Philosophy of Education, 19(1).

Merton, T. (1968). Conjectures of a guilty beystander. Garden City, New York: Image Books, Doubleday.

de Montaigne, M. (1958). Essays BK I, Chapter 27 That it is folly to measure truth and error by our own capacity and BK II, Chapter 8 On the affection of fathers for their children. Markham, Ontario: Penguin Classics.

Montessori, M. (1949). Education and peace. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.

Moskowitz, J.S. (1975). Parental rights and state education. Washington Law Review, 50.

Mulcahy, Sr. M.N. (1988). The philosophical-theological foundations of the denominational system of education. William A. McKim (Ed.), The vexed question: Denominational education in a secular age. St. John's: Breakwater books.

Newfoundland Teachers' Association Bulletin. (1987, December). 31(4). St. John's, Newfoundland.

O'Connell, T. (1982). A theology of sin. Chicago Studies, 21.

Pascal, B. (1972). Pensees, Le Livre de Poche, Librarie Generale Francaise, Paris.

The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. (1966). Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (Ed.), The documents of Vatican II. New York: Guild Press, America Press, Association Press.

Paul VI. (1965). Declaration on Christian education. (Gravissimum Educationis). Boston: St. Paul Editions.

Penney, Archbishop Alphonsus L. (1980, November). Opening address to the Catholic Education Congress. St. John's, Newfoundland. The Monitor.

Pieper, J., & Raskop, H. (1951). What Catholics believe. New York: Pantheon Books.

Pius XI. (1981. Divini Illius Magistri [also given in some texts under the title Rappresentanti in Terral from The Papal Encyclicals 1903 - 1939 compiled by Claudia Carlen, IHM, A Consortium Book. New York: McGrath Publishing Co.

Pocock, Archbishop P. (1971, March). Schools with a difference. Address to the 27th Annual Convention of the English Catholic Education Association of Ontario. Toronto: Metropolitan Separate School Board Manual, Part I.

Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's. By-Laws. Text available from School Board Office, Bonaventure Avenue, St. John's, Newfoundland.

Rowe, Dr. F.W. (1964). The development of education in Newfoundland. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education. (1977). The Catholic school. Ottawa: Publications Service, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops.

_____. (1982). Lay Catholics in schools: Witnesses to faith. In Austin Flannery (Ed.), Vatical council II: More post conciliar documents. Volume 2 of the Vatican Collection. New York: Costello Publishing Co.

Schuller, B., S.J. (1982). Remarks on the authentic teaching of the Magisterium of the Church. In Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormack, S.J. (Eds.), Readings in moral theology number 3, the magisterium and morality. New York: Paulist Press.

Simpson, D.J., & Jackson, M.J.B. (1984). The teacher as philosopher: A primer in philosophy of education. Methven, Toronto.

Stapleton, J.S. (1982, June). The Catholic trustee and educational leadership. A Paper presented to the Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association, Corner Brook, Newfoundland.

Stapleton, P. (1987, June). Consultations in preparation for the world synod of bishops on the vocation of the laity in the church and the world. St. John's: Catholic Education Council of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thomas, L. (1984). The medusa and the snail. Toronto: Bantam Books.

_____. (1984). Late night thoughts of listening to Mahler's ninth symphony. Toronto: Bantam Books.

Tolstoy, Count Leo. (1983). Confession. Translated by David Patterson. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Tussman, J. (1977). Government and the mind. New York: Oxford University Press.

Warren, Dr. P.J. (1983). Public attitudes toward education in Newfoundland and Labrador: A 1983 study. Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland. St. John's, Newfoundland.

Wolinetz, S.B. (1988). Quality of education is the crucial question. The Evening Telegram, Saturday, September 24.