

The Theory and History of Education Monograph Series Volume 2



Vatican II and Catholic Religious Secondary Education in Ontario: Changes within a North American Context

Joseph Stafford



Vatican II and Catholic Religious Secondary Education in Ontario: Changes within a North American Context

by

Joseph Stafford

The Theory and History of Education International Research Group (THEIRG)
2019

THEORY AND HISTORY OF EDUCATION MONOGRAPH SERIES

Volumes in this series are attached to *Encounters in Theory and History of Education*.

Rosa Bruno-Jofré, founding senior editor

Jon Igelmo Zaldívar and Carlos Martínez Valle, associate editors

- 1 *New Directions in Research on Education*
Reconstruction in Challenging Circumstances
Edited by Tom O'Donoghue and Simon Clarke

Vatican II and Catholic Religious Secondary Education in Ontario: Changes within a North American Context

© 2019 Joseph Stafford

This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. This means that everyone is free to use, redistribute, or adapt this book for noncommercial purposes providing they properly cite the book as follows:

Vatican II and Catholic Religious Secondary Education in Ontario: Changes within a North American Context by Joseph Stafford is used under a CC-BY NC 4.0 License.

For questions regarding this license or third-party reuse of this text, please contact: Professor Rosa Bruno-Jofré (Senior Editor), Faculty of Education, Queen's University, 511 Union Street, Kingston, ON (K7M 5R7), Canada, brunojo@queensu.ca. To learn more about the Theory and History of Education Monograph Series, visit: <https://queens.scholarsportal.info/omp/index.php/qulp/about>

ISSN 2562-5594

ISBN-13: 978-1-55339-624-6

Date of Publication: November 11, 2019

The Theory and History of Education Monograph Series is produced by The Theory and History of Education International Research Group and hosted by the Queen's Library. This monograph series is attached to *Encounters in Theory and History of Education*. Rosa Bruno-Jofré is founding senior editor of the Series; associate editors are Jon Igelmo Zaldívar and Carlos Martínez Valle. We would like to thank the team from the Queen's Library, Scholars Portal, the editorial team, and Advisory Council. We thank the Faculty of Education at Queen's University for their financial support.

Managing editor and copy editor: Angela Pietrobon

Indexer: Nancy Wills

Cover designer: Ana Jofre

Layout designers: Ana Jofre and Robert Pietrobon

Cover image: Photo by Daniel Kainz (https://unsplash.com/@_arkyn) on Unsplash (<https://unsplash.com/>)

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Title: Vatican II and Catholic religious secondary education in Ontario : changes within a North American context / by Joseph Stafford.

Names: Stafford, Joseph, 1958- author.

Description: Series statement: Theory and History of Education International Research Group monograph series, ISSN 2562-5594 ; vol. 2 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: Canadiana 20190217561 | ISBN 9781553396246 (PDF)

Subjects: LCSH: Catholic Church—Education—Ontario. | LCSH: Education, Secondary—Ontario.

Classification: LCC LC504.2.O5 S73 2019 | DDC 371.071/2713—dc23

Acknowledgements

In completing this book, I have relied on the help of several people. First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Rosa Bruno-Jofré for her friendship, support and guidance throughout the entire process of producing this work. I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Attridge for his advice and suggestions for improvement, particularly with the chapters dealing with theology. Thank you to Dr. Jeffrey Brison for his overall support and his guidance concerning my research on the history of the long sixties in Canada. Brenda Reed, the Head Librarian at the Faculty of Education, Queen's University, and her colleague Peter Lewis provided indispensable assistance, especially in the early stages of my research. I also relied on assistance from several archivists whom I would like to thank: Gillian Hearn, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto; Debra J. Majer and Liz Birchall, the Diocese of London; Michelle Anitra Pariag, Loretta Abbey, Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Canadian Province; Michelle Sawyers, General Archives of the Basilian Fathers; Linda Wicks, Sisters of St. Joseph of Toronto; Mary Kosta, Sisters of St. Joseph of London; Bruce Henry, the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops; M.C. Havey, Edmonton-Toronto Redemptorists; Father Brian J. Price, the Archdiocese of Kingston; and Veronica Stienburg, the Sisters of Providence of St Vincent de Paul, Kingston.

I would also like to thank my children, Clare, Paul, and Anna, for their constant support and encouragement. Their high school experience, and their subsequent desire to learn more about their own religion at a deeper intellectual level, motivated me to research secondary religious education, and to propose a new approach that I believe is necessary if Catholic high schools are to graduate well-informed and committed Catholics. Most of all, I would like to thank my wife and best friend, Theresa. Without her love and support, this book would never have been completed.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
About the Author	vi
Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Papacy and Neo-Thomism.....	5
Chapter Two: Strict Neo-Thomism, Pluralism, and Education in North America.....	15
Chapter Three: Catholic Secondary Religious Educational Reform in North America on the Eve of Vatican II: Implications for the Future	31
Chapter Four: The Second Vatican Council and the Declaration on Christian Education	41
Chapter Five: The Conditions of Reception for the Reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Christian Education.....	51
Chapter Six: The Fundamental Shift in Religious Secondary Education in the Catholic Schools of Ontario	67
Chapter Seven: A Proposal for a New Curricular Framework for Secondary Religious Education in the Post-Vatican II Era	87
Conclusion	102
Notes	105
Archival Sources and Bibliography	170
Index	179

About the Author

Joseph Stafford is a retired high school teacher who completed his PhD on the history of Catholic religious education at the secondary level at Queen's University in 2018. With 29 years of teaching experience, he was also a department head for 17 years. In 2008, he received the national Governor General's Award for Teaching Excellence in the Teaching of Canadian History, and he is a past president of the Ontario Historical Society after serving on its board of directors. His publications include: "The Educationalization Process and the Roman Catholic Church in North America during the Long Nineteenth Century," in *Educationalization and Its Complexities: Religion, Politics, and Technology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019), and, "The Conditions of Reception for the Declaration on Christian Education: Secularization and the Educational State of Ontario," in *Catholic Education in the Wake of Vatican II* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017); "An Analysis of the Fundamental Shift in Catholic Secondary Religious Education in North America During the Long Sixties, 1955-1973," *Encounters in Theory and History of Education*, vol. 18, 2017; "Strict Neo-Thomism in the Catholic High Schools of the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1940-1960," *Historical Studies*, vol. 83, 2017; "Looking to the Past and Moving to the Future: A Catholic High School Curriculum for the 21st Century," *Historia de la Educacion*, vol. 35, winter 2016, Universidad de Salamanca; and "The Importance of Educational Research in the Teaching of History," *The Canadian Journal of Social Studies*, spring issue, 2006. He has also published articles on Canadian history and the teaching of history, including in Canada's major history magazine, *Canada's History*. He can be reached at josephstafford7@gmail.com.

Introduction

In 1959, Pope John XXIII surprised the Catholic world by announcing that the Church planned to convene the Second Vatican Council, the first such council since the First Vatican Council was disrupted by the Franco-Prussian war in 1870, and the most important council since the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. Lasting from 1962 to 1965, Vatican II ushered in a new era for the Church, the effects of which are still being felt today. Scholars are still analysing the extent to which the Council impacted the Church. Its impact on Catholic secondary religious education in North America, however, has not been studied in any depth. This is intriguing since the major document on education, the Declaration on Christian Education, was a source of controversy because of the tensions between the conservative and progressive forces within the Church, and the overall uncertainty as to how to adapt to a rapidly changing modern world. For example, one of the most significant Canadians at Vatican II was Bishop Emmett Carter, a leading expert in Catholic education, yet his role in secondary religious education immediately after the Council has not been the subject of much scrutiny. This lack of in-depth analysis is also intriguing given the importance of adolescence, a time when young people often decide to accept or reject the faith of their parents—for the Church is in serious difficulty if the faith is not transmitted to future generations.¹

In order to understand the impact of Vatican II, pre-Vatican II Catholic secondary religious education needs to be examined in the larger historical-societal context of the long nineteenth century (1800 to 1959), which was characterized by an increasingly centralized Church with power vested in the papacy. Rome had an enormous influence on Catholic education, particularly after the publication of Pope Leo XIII's 1879 encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, advocating that the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas be adopted in Catholic schools. As a result, a strict form of Neo-Thomism dominated Catholic education in Ontario and much of North America, a dominance that lasted until the reforms of Vatican II.² Church doctrine and teachings were considered

immutable, grasped by the intellect and interpreted by the Church. Not all Catholic scholars, however, accepted this strict Neo-Thomism, resulting in an increasing pluralism within the Neo-Thomist movement and in a growing criticism of Neo-Thomism itself.

Prior to Vatican II, Catholics in North America also shared a set of values and a world perception that some scholars have called the “Catholic mind,” reflecting the dominant classicist culture, with its roots imbedded in the classical culture of Greece and Rome, that Christianity adopted and assimilated. In this classicist culture, the larger community determined meaning and value, not the individuals themselves. One fundamental change after Vatican II was the shattering of this Catholic classicist culture that sustained the Catholic mind, undermining the sense of certainty that most Catholics possessed about their religion: that the fundamental precepts of the faith were the “truth.” This culture was replaced by an empiricist culture—the dominant culture in the non-Catholic world that had gradually developed since the beginning of the seventeenth century, and one in which individuals determined meaning and value for themselves. At the Council, Neo-Thomism was abandoned as the official philosophy of the Church, and replaced by the new theology that emerged from the pluralism of Neo-Thomism and from different intellectual movements. This new theology emphasized the importance of the inner transformation of the individual, the role of the individual conscience, and the historical development of theology and Church teachings. Church traditions were no longer understood as unchanging, but as part of a living tradition inspired by the Holy Spirit. Although Vatican II also envisioned a more active role for the laity, the Church remained essentially a hierarchical and patriarchal institution, even though the decision-making process was reformed somewhat, giving more authority to the bishops and emphasizing a more pastoral, less authoritarian style of governance—a style reflected in the Declaration on Christian Education.

One unforeseen result of these fundamental changes, especially in terms of culture, was confusion and lack of certainty in Catholic education, reflecting the confusion and lack of certainty that enveloped the entire Church in the years immediately after Vatican II. Influenced by the new theology, Catholic educators now emphasized the importance of individual inner transformation and the establishment of an authentic Christian community within the school, but were uncertain in terms of what Church doctrines and teachings should be emphasized now that Neo-Thomism was abandoned. Much of this confusion and uncertainty resulted from the principle of subsidiarity adopted at Vatican II, which stated that whenever an appropriate authority was dealing with a particular issue in its jurisdiction, a higher authority should not interfere. As a result of this principle, the bishops provided little leadership in secondary religious education, allowing individual schools to develop their own programs at a time when Catholic secondary religious education was also being challenged by the complex cultural changes of the long sixties (1955–1975).

One of the most challenging changes involved the increasingly secular nature of society and the emerging new cultural hegemony based on individual rights in a democratic context. Secularization was a gradual process, but it was during the long sixties that this process had a major impact on the Catholic Church, on Catholic classicism, and on Catholic education, culminating in a “secularization of consciousness” whereby Catholic teachers and students unconsciously adopted secular values.³ Another consequence of secularization was the dramatic decrease in church attendance, with serious consequences for the transmission of the faith from parent to child. After Vatican II, the societal context of Catholic education was challenging since the traditional classicist culture had been shattered during a period of rapid cultural change.

Another critical part of this societal change involved the educational state of Ontario. Historically, the Catholic separate school system was tolerated as a political necessity, and Catholic leadership, especially the bishops, had limited power to defend and promote Catholic education in a province noted for its virulent anti-Catholicism.⁴ Even though the Catholic school system enjoyed a certain degree of independence, its inferior position within the educational state hindered the ability of Catholic educational leadership to develop an effective religious secondary curriculum, since the Ontario government did not consider religion to be a serious academic subject. During the 1960s, the government also initiated several reforms that improved the educational system, most notably by adopting a more child-centred pedagogy. These reforms nonetheless led to a gradual erosion of the academic standards, particularly for religious education.⁵ The combined effects of the inferior position of Catholic schools in the educational state of Ontario and the educational reforms of the 1960s, as well as the overall impact of secularization resulted in a religious secondary education curriculum that was inadequate for meeting the challenges of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

After the long sixties, these challenges became even more daunting given the continuing secularization of society, and the pervasive influence of neo-liberal ideology, which emphasized the productive capacity of individuals in the marketplace and the role of education as an “investment” in this capacity.⁶ Society also became more “fractured” as the importance of individual choice became the priority, greatly weakening the sense of belonging to a larger community.⁷ The concept of the common good likewise lost much of its appeal. At the same time, the transmission of the faith within the family continued to diminish as fewer baptized Catholics practiced their faith.⁸ Even more disturbing for Catholic educators was the growing doubt about the historical Jesus, whose very existence was questioned,⁹ despite the considerable scholarly evidence supporting not only his existence, but also his message and mission.¹⁰

A new approach to secondary religious education is now needed that is appropriate for the secular culture in which young Catholics are immersed—an approach that

respects their right to determine their own meaning and values. This book will examine such an approach, based on the curricular theories of John Dewey, Paulo Freire, and William Pinar, who, despite some significant differences in their philosophy, agreed on certain essentials—essentials that are embedded in the curricular framework that is proposed here: inquiry and discussion; the development of critical thinking skills; student-centred pedagogy; and the discovery of self in the context of the dominant culture or ideology. One of the leading Catholic scholars of the twentieth century, Bernard Lonergan, also argued that such essential components are fundamental to a viable curriculum. Working within the tradition of transcendental Thomism, Lonergan contended that inquiry leads to increased self-understanding, which in turn, leads to the possibility of religious conversion through a process of self-transcendence.¹¹ The proposed curricular framework therefore provides students with the opportunity to study their own religion objectively—to ponder, to inquire, and to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to practice their faith by exploring the evidence behind the historical Jesus, and like the new theologians of Vatican II, by examining the formative period of the Church, when much of Catholic theology and doctrine was first articulated. Students may be intrigued by what they discover and begin to question the values of contemporary society. They may discover that they wish to participate in the living tradition of the Church, a tradition in which Catholic theological and social teachings continue to evolve as new insights and understandings develop. They may enter into a process of self-discovery and self-transcendence by exploring their faith further, not only for themselves, but for the common good.

Chapter One: The Papacy and Neo-Thomism

The Papacy and the Centralization of Power

One of the most important documents on Catholic education is Pope Leo XIII's 1879 encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*. Historical context is of critical importance in understanding why Pope Leo XIII issued this encyclical, why he believed it was his responsibility to assume a leadership role in education, and why he expected obedience from Catholic educators and scholars. An essential aspect of this historical context was the gradual centralization of power in the papacy, beginning with the Gregorian reforms of the eleventh century.¹ This process of centralization lagged somewhat in the late Middle Ages, but accelerated during the 1800–1950 period.² Gradually, papal authority increased at the expense of the various ecumenical councils convened over the centuries, the first being the Council of Nicaea. At these councils, major church decisions were made, with the bishops playing a major role. The laity was also involved, particularly political leaders such as Emperor Constantine, who presided over the Nicaean Council. Twenty ecumenical councils were convened, yet at the first eight, the pope was not even present.³ By the First Vatican Council in 1870, however, the pope had assumed a position of authority over the bishops and no member of the laity participated.⁴ The power had gradually shifted from the bishops to the pope in an increasingly “monarchized” papacy.⁵

A major contributing factor to this centralization of power was the improvement in communications, particularly with the telegraph and the telephone in the nineteenth century, which enabled the pope not only to transmit his directives quickly, but also ensure that they were obeyed by insisting on evidence to indicate compliance. Improved communications also resulted in an increased use of papal circular letters, the encyclicals, as both a teaching tool and an instrument of papal authority. For example, Pius VI (1775–1799) issued two encyclicals, Pius IX (1846–1878) thirty-eight, and Leo XIII (1878–1903) seventy-five.⁶ In these encyclicals, the popes acted as

teachers, explaining at great length theological and doctrinal issues. The encyclicals had also become “authoritative doctrinal pronouncements.”⁷ Improved communications facilitated the authority of the pope, but also that of the papal bureaucracy, the Roman Curia, particularly the different Congregations. During the nineteenth century, the Curia became more powerful, especially the Suprema Congregatio—the Holy Office. The decisions of the various Congregations had to be approved by the Holy Office, whose presiding cardinal was second only to the pope in terms of authority.⁸ Increasingly, the pope encouraged the Congregations to announce their own judgements on a variety of issues.⁹ By the end of the nineteenth century, the pope and the Congregations of the Curia made all of the important decisions.

The power of the papacy was also reflected in the style of discourse adopted in the encyclicals, in the congregational statements, and in canon law, a style dominated by words of authority, and of intimidation, threat, condemnation, and punishment.¹⁰ These “power-words” indicated how the Church operated, particularly in the latter half of the nineteenth century and afterwards.¹¹ By then, Catholics had become accustomed to the dominant role of the papacy in almost every aspect of their religious life, looking to Rome “for answers to all questions.”¹² The centralization of power in the papacy was also evident in the lack of ecumenical councils, since Vatican I was the first council in three hundred years. As well, provincial or regional councils, once a common occurrence with hundreds held over the centuries to deal with specific local concerns and issues, were convened far less often. In the United States, these councils had been a “vital, normal and ongoing part of church life” until 1884, after which none were convened.¹³ Thus, when the First Vatican Council was called, the papacy had assumed a position of dominance, a position it believed necessary to defend the Church in a modern world that was growing increasingly hostile to its theology and its role in society. Dealing with the modern world, with modernity, was one of the major justifications for the concentration of power in the papacy during the nineteenth century.

The First Vatican Council

It is critical to examine the Church’s response to the modern world prior to Leo XIII’s pontificate in order to understand his intentions in issuing his encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*, On the Restoration of Christian Philosophy. Central to this response was the First Vatican Council.¹⁴ With over eight hundred participants, including cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, abbots, and religious superiors, it was the first general council in which bishops from across the world participated.¹⁵ One of the major reasons why the First Vatican Council was convened was to respond to the cultural and intellectual developments that the Church considered to be dangerous threats to Christian values and belief—a response to the revolutions of nineteenth-century Europe.¹⁶ This

historical context is critical in order to understand the intentionality behind the First Vatican Council. In the eyes of the Church, Europe had erred. Thus, the Church's 1864 Syllabus of Errors, a list of prevailing errors, was the original agenda for the Council.¹⁷ One of the major errors involved the relationship between faith and reason. By the time of the Council, many European intellectuals accepted the Enlightenment concept of reason as an "independent, self-grounding, disembodied form of thought—systematically divorced from Christian revelation in its operations."¹⁸ This concept of reason—this rationalism—dominated the thought and culture of the liberal ruling class of Europe.¹⁹ Thus, before revealed religion could be accepted, "it must first submit its teachings to the critical judgment of philosophical reason,"²⁰ at a time when one of the prevailing dominant philosophies, Kantianism, claimed that it was beyond human reason to determine objective religious truth, and that truth was subjective in nature.²¹ Catholic theologians had also begun to adopt the ideas of Descartes and Kant into their philosophy.²² Furthermore, the Council had to respond to fideism, the extreme reaction against rationalism among some Catholics, which held that knowledge of God derived from faith alone and that natural reason played no role whatsoever.²³ At the Council, the Church rejected both rationalism and fideism, arguing that both faith and reason played important roles in religious understanding. Yet, the Church had a specific understanding of human reason. Fundamental to the Church's understanding was the belief that first principles were God's revelation, which were objective in that they existed "outside of the self."²⁴ In *Dei Filius*, the Apostolic Constitution on Faith, the Church articulated this position. Faith was an "operative habit inhering in the intellect," and thus natural reason could prove the existence of God and the "reasonableness of the act of faith."²⁵ Furthermore, in Chapter Two, "On Revelation," it states, "God, the source and end of all things, may be known...with certainty from consideration of created things, by the natural power of human reason."²⁶ God can also be known by faith through God's revelation because the "divine mysteries" are by their very nature beyond complete understanding and are accepted on faith.²⁷ *Dei Filius* argues, then, that natural reason and revelation can co-exist in harmony, since God is the source of both.²⁸ What is critical here is not whether the Church was correct in its understanding of human reason, but that the Church was convinced that it was correct, that objective truth could be discovered within the context of the Church's interpretation and authority.²⁹ The Church insisted that the Magisterium would determine this objective truth, and thus rejected a subjective understanding of this truth.

Another key Vatican I document that had serious implications for Catholic education was *Pastor Aeternus*, which proclaimed the Pope's infallibility in matters of faith and morality.³⁰ This encyclical represented a further step in the centralization of power in the papacy, which accelerated even more after the Rebellions of 1848. A new theological anthropology also emerged that emphasized the sinful nature of humanity, as evident in Pope Pius IX's 1854 definition of the Immaculate Conception, which, according to James Hennessy, was also a "political statement of the first order" that

justified increased papal authority. Only Mary was exempt from Original Sin, whereas the rest of humanity was “born in sin, their intellects darkened, their wills weakened, their passions dominant.”³¹ Humanity was not even capable of self-government. Thus, the Syllabus of Errors was required to highlight the sins resulting from humanity’s “fallen state” and its refusal to listen to the “authoritative voice” of the Church.³² Both intellectuals and universities became suspect.³³ Therefore, even before *Pastor Aeternus*, power had been centralized in the papacy and papal decrees had become authoritative statements of certitude concerning religious truth.³⁴ With the declaration of papal infallibility, the power and prestige of the papacy was further enhanced to the extent that Pius IX once declared that “I am the Church! I am the tradition.”³⁵ It is not surprising, then, that in this centralized and authoritative Church, Catholic education became a major focus during the reign of Pius IX’s successor, Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci, Leo XIII.

Pope Leo XIII’s Encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*

Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*, is directly related to the First Vatican Council. First of all, Leo benefitted from the “enhanced authority and mystique” bestowed upon the papacy during the council.³⁶ He was also prepared to assert papal authority whenever necessary in doctrinal and organizational matters.³⁷ In *Aeterni Patris*, Leo articulated Vatican I’s response to rationalism.³⁸ He believed that in Thomism he had found a philosophy that revealed that human reason was capable of determining religious truth, and that would protect Catholics from the “vagaries of secular philosophy” as well as from fideism.³⁹ Considerable debate ensued, however, concerning the extent to which Leo was open to serious engagement with modernity. This debate had serious implications for Catholic education, since Catholics who were opposed to engaging with modernity and those in favour could both point to *Aeterni Patris* for support, which only intensified the debate itself.

Historical context is critical here in order to understand Leo’s intentions. Unlike Pius IX, who declared in his Syllabus of Errors that it was “madness” to believe that “the Pontiff could come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization,”⁴⁰ Leo was much more open to the modern world, largely because of his experiences before his papacy. As an archbishop, Pecci had been appointed the Papal Nuncio to Belgium, introducing him to life in industrial northern Europe and to dealing with a democratically elected prime minister. Unlike Pius IX, Leo therefore had a more positive attitude towards humanity’s capacity for self-government, evident in his approach to Republican France when he insisted that the Church did not favour any form of government.⁴¹ At the same time, Leo permitted Catholics to join political movements that were inspired by other doctrines aside from Thomism.⁴² His openness to the modern world was also expressed in his Lenten pastoral letter of 1877, *The Church*

and Civilization: “Society, then, being composed of men essentially capable of improvement, cannot stand still: it advances and perfects itself.”⁴³ Such openness led Cardinal Giacomo Antonelli, Pius IX’s secretary of state, to be suspicious of Pecci, keeping him away from Rome as much as possible.⁴⁴ Furthermore, one of the major reasons he was elected pope was because of the many pastoral letters that he issued in his diocese of Perugia from 1874 to 1877, which emphasized the need to overcome “the alienation between the church and the world and to promote a greater harmony.”⁴⁵ Robert Royal, in *A Deeper Vision: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition in the Twentieth Century*, further argues that *Aeterni Patris* must be understood in terms of Leo’s other encyclicals and teachings, contending that *Aeterni Patris* was an integral component of Leo’s overall effort at social renewal. During his papacy, he issued 110 encyclicals and other teaching letters—more than any pope before him—and St. Thomas was almost always discussed or referenced in the context of socio-political problems.⁴⁶ James Hennesey agrees with this assessment, contending that *Aeterni Patris* charted the “grand design of philosophical renewal” that Leo hoped would lead to social and political renewal.⁴⁷

In order to understand this “grand design,” *Aeterni Patris* must be considered in relation to Leo’s most famous encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, On Capital and Labor, published in 1891, which according to Gerald McCool, “stands in the tradition of St. Thomas’ social ethics.”⁴⁸ Examined together, *Aeterni Patris* and *Rerum Novarum* embodied Leo’s effort to educationalize, or to begin a process in which education becomes “the focal point for addressing or solving larger human problems.”⁴⁹ *Aeterni Patris* represented the first stage in this process. Leo contended that before Catholics could engage successfully in solving human problems, their intellect and will must be properly formed and they must adhere to the objective truth as instructed by the Church, so that they can lead a virtuous life. Such a life was central to the social ethics of Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas identified seven virtues that became central to Catholic moral tradition: the four natural virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance; and the three supernatural virtues that exceeded human natural capacities and thus could only be obtained through the sacraments of the Church: faith, hope, and charity.⁵⁰ Aquinas defined a virtue as a “quality or habit of the soul” that was an integral part of human nature. Virtue ethics was “a learned and applied life of virtue,” a moral lifestyle that involved a daily effort at practising virtue.⁵¹ In his encyclical, Leo therefore emphasized that every citizen must contribute to the common good, and since the goal of society was “to make men better, the chief good that society can possess is virtue.”⁵² For this goal to be achieved, workers needed to share in “the benefits which they create” through their labour. It would be impossible for them to engage in “virtuous action” if their goal remained only obtaining the essential necessities of life.⁵³ It was therefore a matter of natural justice that workers received a fair wage; if not, they were “made victim of force and injustice.”⁵⁴ It was also the role of the Church to influence “the mind and the heart so that all may willingly yield themselves to be

formed and guided by the commandments of God.”⁵⁵ Leo insisted that “human society” could only be saved by a “return to Christian life and Christian institutions,” arguing that society was “perishing” because it had strayed from its foundational Christian principles.⁵⁶ Conversion was needed, and “all those who are concerned in the matter should be of one mind and according to their ability act together.”⁵⁷ He also called upon Catholics to form associations for the common good, in particular to promote “concerted action, and for practical work.” In these associations, religious instruction needed to be given the “foremost place,” so that their members could be warned and strengthened with special care against wrong principles and false teaching.⁵⁸ Thus, these practical associations would play an “incalculable service” by inviting “the returning wanderers” back to the Church, “a haven where they may securely find repose.”⁵⁹ Leo’s two encyclicals, *Aeterni Patris* and *Rerum Novarum*, thus laid the foundation for the Church’s educationalization process, which lasted until Vatican II. Catholics educated in Neo-Thomism were called upon to renew society in the face of the “errors” of modernism, to return it to its Christian principles through their participation in various Catholic associations striving for the common good.

With this process of educationalization, Leo indicated his willingness to be open to the modern world, to engage with modernism, and yet it was on his own terms. Leo remained fundamentally conservative, and his openness had serious limitations. He supported Pius’ Syllabus of Errors, having introduced his own version in his own diocese when he was a cardinal.⁶⁰ In his first encyclical letter, *Inscrutabili Dei Consilio*, On the Evils of Society, published in April 1878, only a year before *Aeterni Patris*, Leo lamented the decline in Church authority and denounced the “modern liberty” of a civilization “steeped in immorality and atheism.”⁶¹ During his papacy, he condemned socialism and Italian nationalism among other ideologies such as communism.⁶² According to James Hennesey, Leo, in charting a “grand design of philosophical renewal,” did not wish to adopt modern values, but to offer the modern world a philosophy, Thomism, which would lead to a restoration of an “objective and immutable order” in the modern world.⁶³ Thus, in the final analysis, Leo was indeed open to engaging with the modern world, and he entered into dialogue with it in his many encyclicals and teaching letters, yet he was not prepared to adapt Church teachings to what he considered the mistaken beliefs and values of modernism. In terms of education, what is critical here is Leo’s insistence that Thomism be promoted in Catholic schools—a philosophy that he believed was based on the immutable doctrine of the Church—a belief that would have serious implications for Catholic education.

***Aeterni Patris* and Imposition**

A major reason why Leo XIII believed that Thomism embodied the immutable doctrine of the Church was because at that time little historical research had been completed on the Middle Ages, the era in which Thomas Aquinas had lived. This lack of research led to what Quentin Skinner calls the “mythology of doctrine,” a process in which certain concepts and beliefs became absolutes immune from historical change.⁶⁴ Most Catholic intellectuals assumed that there had only been one Thomistic philosophy that had endured for centuries, and that the theologians of the first Thomistic revival, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, had faithfully adopted the philosophy of Thomas himself. This was a belief that Leo XIII articulated in *Aeterni Patris* when he claimed that the Greek philosophers and the Fathers of the Church had conceived “sound doctrines” of genius. The Scholastics then collected “the fertile and copious harvest of doctrines, scattered in the large volumes of the holy fathers.”⁶⁵ Thomas, who in the words of Cajetan, had “inherited the intellect of them all,” organized this “harvest” into a coherent philosophy.⁶⁶ In other words, there were no significant differences between the philosophy of Thomas and the revivalists who examined his theological works, his philosophical monographs, and commentaries on Aristotle to organize an “autonomous philosophical system”—known as Classical Thomism.⁶⁷ According to Jose Pereira, this system was the “brilliant achievement of Renaissance and Baroque thinkers, especially Cajetan and John of St. Thomas.” It was then codified by the Dominicans of Salamanca, the Salmanticenses.⁶⁸ It was this Classical Thomism that Leo had in mind when he called for the restoration of Thomistic philosophy in *Aeterni Patris*. When Leo encouraged Catholic intellectuals to engage in historical research with the establishment of the Leonine Commission in 1880, he anticipated that they would discover the one coherent and convincing philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas. This was his intended purpose. In order that no one be led astray by false ideas, Leo insisted in *Aeterni Patris* that Catholics “take precautions that the wisdom of Thomas be derived from his very own fountains, or at least from those streams which, drawn from the fountain itself, yet in the secure and agreed opinion of learned men, flow pure and clear.”⁶⁹ With this statement, Leo articulated a key principle of Thomism—a return to Thomas himself—that would, to Leo’s own surprise, open an intellectual door leading to considerable debate over the nature of Thomistic philosophy.

Initially, Leo XIII did not impose Classical Thomism on Catholic schools. In *Aeterni Patris*, Leo instead stated: “We exhort you strenuously for the protection and adornment of the Catholic faith...that you restore the golden wisdom of Thomas, and spread it as widely as possible.”⁷⁰ Gradually, however, as more debate ensued concerning the very nature of Thomism, Leo changed his approach. Fifteen years after *Aeterni Patris* was issued, Leo revealed an “iron fist,” imposing Classical Thomism upon the Jesuits in his Apostolic Letter, *Gravissime Nos*, of 1892: “It will not happen

that anyone will reasonably depart from St. Thomas's teachings except in one or another conclusion of no great moment."⁷¹ Six years later, in 1898, he demanded that the Franciscans, who adhered to different philosophies, Bonaventurism and Scotism, adopt Thomism.⁷² Jose Pereira, in his excellent paper, pinpoints the fundamental antinomy of *Aeterni Patris* that was incapable of resolution: Leo's attempt to legislate a philosophy and protect freedom of investigation at the same time. He enforced by decree a "mode of thought based not on authority but on the free exercise of reason."⁷³ Pereira continues by emphasizing that "authority, the basis of legislation" is a norm in theology, but that in philosophy the norm is "reason controlled only by its own exigencies and not by any external principle."⁷⁴ In order to resolve this antinomy of a "philosophy imposed by decree" and the "freedom of philosophical discourse," two strategies were adopted with major ramifications for the future. The first strategy involved distinguishing between the "method of Thomism," a scholastic discipline, and the content of Thomist thought. Thomism's method was insisted upon, but as for the content, including its principles and doctrines, "greater leeway" was granted. The other strategy involved distinguishing between public documents in which Thomism was imposed, and the "relaxing of the imposition," allowing for some freedom of thought in more "private statements."⁷⁵ These public documents included the teaching manuals used in the seminaries, leading Gabriel Daly to conclude that priests were Thomists "by conscription rather than by conviction."⁷⁶ Yet, in 1888, when the Jesuit General Pierre Beckx, whose Order did not accept Thomas' distinction between essence and existence,⁷⁷ requested clarification from Leo concerning the extent to which Thomism had to be accepted, Leo responded by stating that "in philosophical matters and in debatable questions, it was not his intention to prohibit free discussion or to impose one opinion or other."⁷⁸ Thus, even though Leo wanted to impose Thomism, it appears that he was aware of the antinomy and that he had opened an intellectual door that he could not close. He therefore permitted a certain degree of freedom of thought.⁷⁹ In doing so, "a spirit of intellectual inquiry was awakened in the heart of the Catholic Church."⁸⁰ Yet, Leo himself had hoped that Thomism was not so much "the starting point of theological reflection as the end of it."⁸¹ It was this hope, as well as the emerging modernist crisis within the Church, which led to his contradictory actions as he allowed some intellectual freedom and historical research, but tried to control it at the same time.⁸² Thus, Leo's effort at control, combined with his limited openness to the modern world and his insistence that public documents adhere to Neo-Thomism in the short term, facilitated his successor's draconian approach to modernity.⁸³

The Modernist Crisis and the Reaction of the Church

The modernist crisis began in the 1890s and continued into the 1920s as the Church continued to struggle with modernity. The modernists within the Church raised serious

questions about the Neo-Thomist understanding of Thomas and the nature of doctrine and tradition. The modernists—an “inescapably imprecise” term according to G. Daly, who contends that the term applied to anyone who criticized the beliefs and methods of Neo-Thomism⁸⁴—shared one common approach to increasing their knowledge of God: the historical-critical method.⁸⁵ It was the use of this method that led the modernists to criticize some of the fundamental positions of Neo-Thomism.⁸⁶ Neo-Thomists contended that no significant change had occurred in Christian theology and philosophy since the days of the Church Fathers. Thus, religious truths were immutable and had “crystallized into assertions in Scripture and in doctrines of tradition”⁸⁷ that theologians then supported through deductive reasoning. The modernists, on the other hand, contended that revelation did not end with the death of the last apostle, but continues throughout history. It was presupposed that doctrine is not immutable, but is open to change as new content and new interpretations emerge as a result of historical study.⁸⁸ Critical of the Neo-Thomist overly intellectual-rational philosophy, the modernists argued that Neo-Thomism neglected the personal, subjective component of religious experience.⁸⁹ Maurice Blondel, for example, concluded that the “inner drives” of the human being and the dynamics of the mind resulted in human beings who could only be content with God.⁹⁰ The modernists also argued that the Neo-Thomist non-historical understanding of doctrine and tradition led to serious error in the interpretation of Saint Thomas’ thought. According to McCool, the “radical uniqueness” of his “metaphysics of existence” was ignored.⁹¹ What was also neglected was the importance of Thomas’ personal religious experience to his thought. The Church, however, insisted that his philosophy was a “highly rationalistic system” whose arguments moved “deductively to their conclusions from conceptual first principles,” and that personal religious experience did not play a “vital role” in terms of gaining religious knowledge of God.⁹² Any “philosophies of intuition” were suspect in the eyes of the Church. This understanding of Saint Thomas’s thought, and the overall role of doctrine and tradition within the Church, were central to the modernist crisis.

During the pontificate of Pius X, the Church adopted a draconian and reactionary approach to any ideas or actions that it considered affected by modernism. In 1907, Pius X published his encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, On the Doctrine of the Modernists, condemning modernism in the Church.⁹³ In this encyclical, Pius pressured Catholic teachers to comply with Neo-Thomist doctrine, stating, “we will and ordain that Scholastic philosophy be made the basis of the sacred sciences” and “we also warn teachers to duly remember that to abandon Aquinas, especially in questions of metaphysics, is not without grave detriment.”⁹⁴ The overall result of this encyclical was “unbridled carnage” among critics of Neo-Thomism.⁹⁵ Blondel was among the many who were savagely attacked.⁹⁶ Similar to the manner in which the term communist was used in the United States during the 1950s, the term “Kantian” was used to attack any critic of Neo-Thomism.⁹⁷ In order to ensure that priests remained obedient, the anti-modernist oath was inaugurated in September 1910.⁹⁸ In this oath, five truths were

declared: that God's existence could be known by the light of divine reason; that miracles and prophecies were "certain proofs" of Christianity's divine origins; that the Church and the "authority of Peter" were of "divine institution"; that dogmas constituted "the divine deposit of the faith" and were immutable; and that faith was not connected to any sentiment of the heart, but "a genuine assent of the intellect to the truth."⁹⁹ The oath also denied that the historical-critical method could be used to discover religious truth.¹⁰⁰ With such drastic measures, the Church was determined to silence any criticism of Neo-Thomism.

The Implications for Catholic Education

The Church's drastic reaction to modernism had serious implications for Catholic education. This is evident from G. Daly's analysis of the manuals used in seminaries for future priests, many of whom would assume positions in secondary and post-secondary education. Daly contends that the manuals must be examined in order to determine the "character, quality, and limitations" of Catholic theology between the two Vatican Councils. Written in Latin, these manuals were distributed throughout the world and gradually were adopted in most seminaries. What these manuals reveal is that the official Vatican Neo-Thomism, the Thomism of the strict observance or strict Neo-Thomism, permeated the manuals.¹⁰¹ The manuals presented certain assertions as "divine truth," and after 1907, repudiated any "experiential, affective or intuitive mode of thought."¹⁰² Scripture and Magisterium documents were presented as "simple data," the meaning of which was obvious. Interpretation was given a minimal role since it was considered subjective: "the would-be believer had merely to observe, register, and respond with mind and will."¹⁰³ Interpretation was left to the Magisterium. Religious truth was revealed as "eternal, immutable—untouched by the 'flux of history.'"¹⁰⁴ Throughout the Catholic world, priests, sworn to uphold the anti-modernist oath, were educated in strict Neo-Thomism—an education that they transmitted to their students, especially in North America.

Chapter Two: Strict Neo-Thomism, Pluralism, and Education in North America

Strict Neo-Thomism

The period of 1920–1950 has been considered as a “golden age” for Neo-Thomistic philosophy, especially in North America.¹ A key moment was the fiftieth anniversary of *Aeterni Patris*, which stimulated further interest in Neo-Thomism, particularly in strict Neo-Thomism. A number of North American colleges and universities strengthened their departments of philosophy with an increased emphasis on Neo-Thomism. Laval University established its *École Supérieure de Philosophie*,² and in 1929, a leading Neo-Thomist, Etienne Gilson, established the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto, which in its early years focused mainly on philosophy.³ The various religious orders, particularly through their philosophical journals, such as *The Modern Schoolman*, played a critical role in promoting Neo-Thomism, so much so that according to Gerald McCool, the Neo-Thomist movement in North America would not have become “the powerful movement which it became after 1930” without “the expertise, the resources, and support of the religious orders.”⁴ The overall result of this increased emphasis on Neo-Thomism in North America was that Neo-Thomism had “a stronger and more lasting influence on philosophy in general and on Catholic higher education than it had in Europe.”⁵ It is important to note here that not all Neo-Thomists in North America were strict Neo-Thomists. This is especially true of the religious orders. However, the evidence suggests that strict Neo-Thomism was the dominant type of Neo-Thomism in North America. As Bishop Emmett Carter of London, Ontario—who would become a key figure in Catholic education in Ontario—commented in his 1961 study of Catholic education, *The Modern Challenge to Religious Education*, visitors to North America, especially from Europe, were surprised at “our strict adherence and observance of even the minutiae of Church discipline,”

adding that “probably nowhere in the world is the observance of Church customs and laws as strict as in the strongly Catholic areas of North America.”⁶

Neo-Thomism Pluralism

Despite the church’s draconian measures implemented to enforce its strict interpretation of Neo-Thomism, the period of 1920–1950 nonetheless saw the emergence of different forms of Thomism, a natural result of Leo XIII’s invitation in *Aeterni Patris* to Catholic intellectuals to undertake historical research and to return to Thomas.⁷ This pluralism was also a result of the religious orders to which Leo XIII had granted more intellectual freedom. The Dominicans were allowed to profess the Thomism of Cajetan and John of St. Thomas, the Jesuits were free to adhere to the philosophy of Suárez, and the Franciscans remained faithful to the tradition of Scotus.⁸ In the face of growing criticism, the Church continued to relax its imposition of strict Neo-Thomism, beginning with Pius X who, unlike Leo XIII, clearly proclaimed the “freedom of opinion” concerning “disputed matters” among Neo-Thomists.⁹ In *Humani Generis*, Pius XII continued this trend allowing for the “free discussion of experts” on aspects of Thomism, as long as “the things of faith and morals are not directly related.”¹⁰ According to Gerald McCool, the popes’ encouragement of historical research and biblical criticism during this period also contributed to the growing pluralism, especially after the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* was issued in 1943.¹¹ What occurred was a complex convergence of philosophical ideas, including those of intellectuals whom the Church attempted to silence, such as Maurice Blondel and other intellectuals who criticized strict Neo-Thomism.¹² The overall result was the emergence of distinct forms of Neo-Thomism that became identified with specific intellectuals: the strict Neo-Thomism of Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange; the historical Neo-Thomism of Etienne Gilson; the transcendental Neo-Thomism of Joseph Maréchal; and the intuitive Neo-Thomism of Jacques Maritain.¹³ All four types of Neo-Thomism shared common characteristics, but were distinguished by firmly held, different interpretations of Thomas.

Maréchal, for instance, adopted the same point of departure as Kant, asserting that the subject possessed “a dynamic openness to absolute being.”¹⁴ His philosophy of knowledge focused on the subject’s intellectual activity of abstracting and judging, which allowed for a plurality of conceptual frameworks and thus a plurality of metaphysics and theologies.¹⁵ Maritain, whose thought was much influenced by Cajetan and John of St Thomas, had a different point of departure, the extra-mental object’s intentional sign—the “intentional content of the abstracted concept.”¹⁶ Thus, there was one set of “fundamental metaphysical concepts,”¹⁷ which the human intellect was able to grasp through an eidetic intuition.¹⁸ Maritain also promoted a “relativized” Thomism capable of being integrated into contemporary culture.¹⁹ Gilson discovered in

researching the Medieval Era that a common Scholastic philosophy never existed, despite what Pope Leo believed.²⁰ Furthermore, Gilson discovered that his contemporaries were incorrect in assuming that no serious development in philosophy had occurred during the centuries between the Greek-Roman classical period and the beginning of the seventeenth century, that Medieval “philosophy” was essentially Greek philosophy.²¹ Instead, Medieval philosophy was understood in terms of theology, and Medieval scholars had developed a sophisticated “Christian philosophy” —a term that for Gilson did not describe a specific philosophical system, but a “special way of doing philosophy.”²² Gilson’s research had also revealed the profound differences between Thomas’ thought and those of Cajetan and Suárez, such as the nature of the soul.²³ Insisting on a strict historical reconstruction of the meaning of Thomism, Gilson was critical of any efforts to apply Thomism to contemporary cultural and social questions.²⁴ Gilson, in returning to Thomas, also argued that both transcendental and intuitive Thomism did not reflect the original thought of Thomas himself.²⁵ Thus, despite the Church’s official philosophy of strict Neo-Thomism, a considerable degree of pluralism developed within Neo-Thomism that is best exemplified in the works of Gilson, Maritain, and Maréchal.

Gilson, Maritain, and Maréchal: Their Impact on Catholic Education

What is difficult to ascertain, however, is the impact that this pluralism had on Catholic education in North America. According to Gerald McCool, Gilson had the most influence on post-secondary education. By establishing the Medieval Studies Centre in Toronto, and staying there for decades, Gilson “helped to change the direction of the Neo-Thomist movement in North America.” The Medieval Institute became a “mecca” for graduate students.²⁶ Almost all of Gilson’s writings were translated into English and disseminated throughout North America. For example, a popular text, *A Gilson Reader*, provided students with an excellent summary of his thought.²⁷ His pervasive influence helped to ensure that Neo-Thomism remained the dominant philosophy in North America and that Thomas’s philosophy was understood in the context of his theology.

Jacques Maritain also had a major impact on Catholic education despite Gilson’s opposition to his efforts to apply Thomas’ thought to develop solutions to contemporary problems. Although he did not have an opportunity to influence a generation of scholars as Gilson did, his writings were translated into English and had considerable impact, particularly at the University of Notre Dame, which established one of the most prestigious philosophy departments in North America.²⁸ Where Maritain had the greatest impact on Catholic education was in his development of a distinct Catholic educational philosophy that advocated a vibrant liberal arts education focused on specific educational aims that reflected a hierarchy of values, in which

intellectual virtues of contemplation and wisdom superseded those of a more pragmatic and progressive nature.²⁹

Joseph Maréchal, on the other hand, had less impact on education in North America than Gilson and Maritain. His influence was generally limited to his own religious order, the Society of Jesus, but not even all Jesuits accepted his philosophy. In the United States, Jesuit philosophical allegiance was “a matter of local option,” with the Jesuits of the mid-west being more inclined to follow Gilson, whereas Maritain had less appeal among Jesuits, especially those in the eastern states. Here, Joseph Donceel, a Jesuit and a former student of Maréchal, introduced transcendental Thomism by translating his essential texts and compiling a collection of Maréchal’s essential works. His *A Maréchal Reader* was especially influential. The Jesuit university, Fordham, in New York became a centre for transcendental Thomism.³⁰ Maréchal’s ideas also influenced two leading Jesuit intellectuals, Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan, who had more influence after Vatican II. Overall, then, the impact of transcendental Thomism was somewhat limited in North America prior to Vatican II.

Neo-Thomism, Catholic Classicism, and the Catholic Mind

The predominance of Neo-Thomism in North America was also a major factor in strengthening the already existing Catholic classicist culture, which embodied a fundamental Catholic educational tradition: the integration of arts and sciences by Christian philosophy, “aided by the light of faith”—a tradition dating to the time of Clement of Alexandria and Origen³¹—and best articulated in the twentieth century by Jacques Maritain. Central to this tradition, according to Gerald McCool, is the conviction that:

based on both faith and reason that the world makes sense, and that the human mind has the power to understand it. That understanding can be brought about if the liberal arts, science and philosophy are unified by a sound and believing mind under the light of faith. Once human knowledge has been integrated by a coherent education, it will enable the believing mind to understand God’s revealed word.³²

In this tradition, Catholic belief also permeates the entire culture—a culture that also inherited and absorbed much of the Greco-Roman classical tradition.³³ Bernard Lonergan refers to this culture as classicist, normative and abstract in nature.³⁴ This culture does not understand itself as one culture among many, but as “the only culture any right-minded and cultivated person would name as culture.”³⁵ Theology is understood in terms of this overall culture that permits an educated individual to “assimilate the substance of the cultural superstructure and to follow intelligently and critically the work of pioneers.”³⁶ This classicist culture, which began to change gradually at the beginning of the seventeenth century into an empiricist culture wherein

the individuals decide for themselves “the set of meanings and values that informs a way of life,” still held sway in the Catholic world until the “massive breakthrough” at the Second Vatican Council.³⁷

During the period of 1920–1960, this classicist culture became identified largely with Neo-Thomism in North America, in particular strict Neo-Thomism.³⁸ Philip Gleason’s *In Search of Unity: American Catholic Thought 1920-1960*, chronicles the influence of Neo-Thomism in Catholic education, the goal of which became “integral wholeness,” with the different academic disciplines infused with Catholic theology and philosophy while remaining distinct disciplines. The major role for educators was a practical one of “bringing home to the faithful the full realization of what this unity meant to them personally.”³⁹ By the late 1920s, Neo-Thomism had succeeded in reaching “the level of a popular ideology among American Catholic educators.”⁴⁰ Even as late as 1960, the “Thomistic establishment reigned” in the vast majority of American Catholic colleges and universities, where an “explicitly Catholic point of view” was evident in the teaching of most secular subjects.⁴¹ Furthermore, in theology classes, students were unlikely to study the works of outstanding European Catholic scholars who were questioning Neo-Thomism.⁴² The leading proponents of strict Neo-Thomism also exuded supreme confidence in their beliefs and remained self-assured in any debate with scholars who questioned Neo-Thomism, since it was obvious that there was only one truth about God—St. Thomas’ philosophy was “not just one theology among others; it was an exposition of the mind of God.”⁴³ Thus, it was with great confidence that the classicist culture was accepted among North American Catholic educators to the point that scholars refer to the “Catholic mind”—the acceptance of Neo-Thomism as a mode of thought that formed an integral part of Catholic self-identity.⁴⁴ Jacques Maritain’s focus on the theoretical integration of knowledge was also very influential and contributed to the formation of the “Catholic mind.”⁴⁵ Jesuit institutions in particular emphasized the “union of classical humanism and scholastic philosophy.”⁴⁶ The extent to which Neo-Thomism permeated post-secondary Catholic education is epitomized by George Bull’s 1933 essay, “The Function of the Catholic Graduate School,” wherein he argues that there is a “distinctive Catholic life of the mind,”⁴⁷ that contemplation is needed, not research, since “wisdom had been achieved,”⁴⁸ and that “the frame within which all man’s thinking is to be done, has been set.”⁴⁹ Neo-Thomism, the inheritor of the immutable truths from the classical, apostolic, and patristic eras, provided this frame, this “communal life of the mind.”⁵⁰ According to Bull, “every Catholic has and must have a sense of a finished Revelation,” which is “part of the furniture of the mind over which we never fall.” This “same assumption” holds true in the “realm of the humanities,” where classical literature mirrors “the permanent and ultimate values of human nature” for Christianity only “purified” them without fundamentally altering them. It is part of the Catholic “heritage” not to expect anyone “greater than Homer.”⁵¹

***Divini Illius Magistri*, On Christian Education of Youth**

Catholic classicism also permeated the most important papal statement on education until Vatican II, Pope Pius XI's encyclical, *Divini Illius Magistri*, On Christian Education of Youth, issued in 1929 in honour of the fiftieth anniversary of *Aeterni Patris*. This encyclical "set the agenda" for Catholic education for the next thirty years.⁵² According to McCool, the "cultivation of the Catholic mind" was the "ideal of Christian Education" proposed by the encyclical.⁵³ Neo-Thomism permeated this encyclical. Yet, Neo-Thomism was situated within the classicist tradition, reflecting its status as the dominant "mode of thought."⁵⁴ Thus, *Aeterni Patris* provided the "philosophical position" underlining the encyclical,⁵⁵ since Pius accepted the Neo-Thomist ahistorical contention that the Scholastics had collected the "harvest of doctrines" from the Greek philosophers and the Fathers of the Church—a harvest that Thomas had organized as a coherent philosophy. In turn, the scholars of the first Thomist revival had inherited this "harvest" that had remained unchanged for centuries. Consequently, Pius was selective in his use of history, careful to choose historical sources that supported Neo-Thomist theological positions. Statements from different historical figures were used as points of departure to provide a "new faith insight," but one that was compatible with traditional theology.⁵⁶ Several of the Church Fathers, including St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. John Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, are cited throughout the encyclical. Reflecting the importance of the Greco-Roman classical tradition, the encyclical also cites significant Roman figures, in particular Tertullian,⁵⁷ highlighting the need to bring "into full conformity with the Catholic faith, what is taught in literature, in the sciences, and above all in philosophy, on which depends in great part the right orientation of the other branches of knowledge."⁵⁸ Considerable attention is also given to the Middle Ages, a special focus for Neo-Thomists, with references naturally to the "Angelic Doctor," St. Thomas.⁵⁹ Pius also praises Cardinal Silvio Antoniano (1540–1603), a major figure in education during the late Renaissance for his "golden" treatise, *The Christian Education of Youth*.⁶⁰ It was therefore within the classicist tradition that Pius placed Neo-Thomism with *Aeterni Patris* providing the philosophical position underlining the encyclical.

The encyclical also reflected the official strict Neo-Thomism that emerged after Leo XIII's papacy. Emphasizing that Christ "conferred infallibility" on the pope and commanded the Church to teach His doctrine, Pius declared that Christ had entrusted the Church to "keep whole and inviolate the deposit confided to her...in accordance with revealed doctrine."⁶¹ This "deposit" was immutable, a theological position emphasized in the strongest terms: "God Himself has made the Church sharer in the divine magisterium and, by a special privilege, granted her immunity from error; hence she is the mistress of men, supreme and absolutely sure, and she has...the inviolable right to freedom in teaching."⁶² The encyclical also reflected the dominant "theological anthropology" articulated in the 1854 definition of the Immaculate Conception that

emphasized the sinful nature of humanity—an anthropology accepted by strict Neo-Thomists. Original sin affected human nature with the two major failings of “weakness of will and disorderly inclinations,” both of which could not be corrected without the Church providing the necessary “supernatural truth” and “grace.” Without the Church, then, it was “impossible to control the evil impulses.”⁶³ All forms of education therefore needed to consider the impact of original sin, and consequently the Church was opposed to any form of progressive education that recognized the “self-government and unrestrained freedom” of the child, and which accordingly diminished the role of the teacher in the educational process.⁶⁴ The teacher assumed an essential role in Catholic education as the moral and intellectual guide to the youth, upholding the ultimate purpose of education: spiritual perfection and salvation.⁶⁵ In the final analysis, the encyclical embraced both the strict Neo-Thomist interpretation of the role of the Church in education, a vital role given the perceived innate weaknesses of human nature, and the concept of the Church as the defender and interpreter of the “deposit” of doctrine and religious truth.

Central to this encyclical was also the refusal to adjust to the modern world—a position held since the papacy of Leo XIII, who, although open to the modern world, presented Thomism as a philosophy able to counter what he considered to be “modern ills.” Yet, by 1929, in its insistence on strict Neo-Thomism, the Church’s position had hardened in its rejection of much of modernity. Indeed, the Church wanted to isolate the youth from “the moral poison which at that inexperienced and changeable age more easily penetrates the mind and more rapidly spreads its baneful effects.”⁶⁶ Thus, the Church emphasized the traditional role of the family in the education of Catholic children, “forbidding” parents to send their children to public schools unless they had no other option, and even then, only with the permission of church authorities.⁶⁷ Contending that the Church was “independent of any sort of earthly power...in the exercise of her mission,”⁶⁸ the encyclical discussed at length the relationship between the Church and the secular state, arguing against any form of state monopoly on education that denied the right of Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools.⁶⁹ Overall, then, the encyclical, in its embodiment of a Neo-Thomist classicism, its rejection of modern values, its insistence on complete Church control of education, its emphasis on the need to isolate Catholic children from secular culture, and its pessimistic view of human nature, revealed a Church unwilling to embrace the modern world and supported a form of Catholic classicism that in reality became what has also been called “ghetto Catholicism.”

An Example: Secondary Education in the Archdiocese of Toronto

Secondary education in the Archdiocese of Toronto reflected the Neo-Thomist classicism embodied in *Divini Illius Magistri*. Furthermore, despite the increasing

pluralism within Neo-Thomism, particularly at the post-secondary level, strict Neo-Thomism dominated Catholic education, not only in the Toronto archdiocese but across North America. For example, Emmett Carter emphasized that one major effect of the “strict observance” of Church law in North America was “a great reluctance to consider or accept change in methods of teaching religion and to admit the need for re-evaluation of the content of religious education.”⁷⁰ The dominance of strict Neo-Thomism is also reflected in the fact that the catechetical revival movement in Europe, which began in earnest after World War II, left North America largely untouched.⁷¹ In his study, Carter provided an interesting insight that even though Catholic educators were willing to consider new methodologies and new content, and to discuss the needs of the learner when it came to other subject areas, when it came to religious education, innovation was feared and seen as bordering on heresy.⁷²

An examination of the policies of the Archdiocese of Toronto supports Carter’s overall assertion. The archdiocese made a concerted effort to impose strict Neo-Thomism on Catholic high schools in obedience to the Magisterium in Rome. The response of the Archdiocese of Toronto to the Sacred Congregation of the Council’s 1935 Decree on the Better Care and Promotion of Catechetical Education reflected this effort. Expressing serious concern about what it considered as the deplorable state of religious education, the Council cited several canon laws to justify its call for improvement, emphasizing the critical importance of effective teacher-training and of treating religious instruction as the most significant subject offered in Catholic schools.⁷³ The Church demanded complete obedience and emphasized the power of local religious authorities to enforce the decree and to “inflict on the obstinate and the negligent the ecclesiastical penalties prescribed,” including those involving suspension of duties and excommunication.⁷⁴ In order to highlight the importance of religious instruction, the Council called for the institution of a Diocesan Catechetical Office, which would “control the entire catechetical instruction in the diocese.”⁷⁵ One of the major functions of this office was to ensure that in all parishes, schools, and colleges “Christian doctrine [would] be taught by properly prepared teachers according to the traditional form of the Church.”⁷⁶ Bishops were also directed to establish the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in each parish, according to canon law; the Confraternity “should embrace all who are capable of teaching and enkindling love for the catechism, especially teachers in schools.”⁷⁷ The Council also called for the establishment of a Catechetical Day in order to celebrate Christian doctrine, and provided specific instructions as to how to organize the day.⁷⁸ Bishops were also ordered to complete a detailed questionnaire every five years concerning the “state of the diocese entrusted to them.”⁷⁹ In 1941, the Archdiocese of Toronto obediently completed the questionnaire, reporting that a Catechetical Office existed known as the Office of Religious Instruction, and that every year the Catechetical Day was celebrated, following the precise instructions from Rome.⁸⁰ For several years, the Director of Catechetics was Monsignor Vincent Foy who strongly supported the

Magisterium.⁸¹ In every parish, the Confraternity of Christine Doctrine was established, which greatly helped in catechetical efforts since it trained lay teachers who instructed students attending public schools.⁸² It was also decided to have religion exams at the end of each year of high school in order to enhance the importance of religion education at the high school level.⁸³ The grade 12 exam was given a special status.⁸⁴ In 1944, for example, the graduation exercises for all those who passed the Diocesan religion exam were held at St. Michael's Cathedral on Catechetical Day.⁸⁵ The evidence therefore indicates that in the Archdiocese of Toronto, the high school religion curriculum adhered to strict Neo-Thomism.

An analysis of the textbooks provides further evidence of this adherence. For example, the mandated textbook in the 1940s, *Religion: Doctrine and Practise*, emphasized one of the major tenets of strict Neo-Thomism, that there had been no change in the “deposit of faith,” that is the “sum of revealed doctrines,” since the death of the last apostle—a deposit that St. Thomas Aquinas inherited. Furthermore, “no new revelation has been proposed by the Church” and “whenever there is a question of settling or defining a disputed point of faith, the Church always decides according to the teaching of tradition.”⁸⁶ The textbook was organized by a series of questions, which were then immediately answered. One such question dealt with two new, controversial doctrines, papal infallibility and the Immaculate Conception of Mary: “Does not the Church define new doctrines?” An answer was then provided: the Church “does not define new doctrines, but...from time to time it gives more explicit knowledge and exposition of what was revealed to the Apostles.”⁸⁷ Another question was, “Do the doctrines of the Church change?” The answer was, “No, the doctrines of the Church do not change.”⁸⁸ During the 1940s, then, the mandated textbook supported the strict Neo-Thomist perspective.

In the 1950s, this continued to be the case. One of the most popular series of textbooks in North America published in 1951, *Our Quest for Happiness*, was the major textbook series used in the Archdiocese of Toronto. In 1957, Msgr. P.C. Marcinkus, Secretary for the Apostolic Delegation in Rome, requested from the Chancellor of the Archdiocese, Msgr. T.P. Fulton, a list of textbooks used in the Archdiocesan high schools. Fulton replied that the *Quest for Happiness* textbooks were the only ones used, adding that he was quite certain that this series was also used throughout English Canada.⁸⁹ *Our Quest for Happiness* reflected the self-assured, confident Neo-Thomist perspective, and expected students to accept Church teachings and doctrines without question. The first unit of the grade 9 textbook, *Our Goal and Our Guides*, focused on the relationship between faith and reason, adhering to the Neo-Thomistic belief that human reason is a guide in terms of determining religious truth, but that it cannot be “trusted too far” for without faith, the “better guide,” serious errors will be committed. The root cause of such “errors of reasoning” is “original sin, which darkened our understanding and weakened our will.”⁹⁰ In the grade 12 textbook, *The Eternal Commencement*, the authors declared that “the only proof needed by a

Catholic that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from original sin...is the official, infallible definition of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception by Pope Pius IX, on December 8, 1854.”⁹¹ The authors also claimed that the Gospels were “reliable authentic historical documents,” and that historical biblical criticism reflected “outdated” ideas. Near the end of the textbook, the authors warned students not to bother arguing with anyone who still held such ideas, and emphasized the “guaranteed certainty” to be found in Gospels written by eyewitnesses who were willing to die for their faith.⁹² Strict Neo-Thomism is also reflected in another popular textbook used in the 1950s, although it was originally published in 1881 and contains a letter of praise from Pope Leo XIII. *Bible History* adopts a literal interpretation of the Bible and the question-answer method of instruction.⁹³ In the 1956–57 Program of Christian Doctrine Studies of the Archdiocese of Toronto, *Bible History* was the mandatory text for the senior elementary grades, preparing them well for the high school *Quest for Happiness* series.⁹⁴ Both of these textbooks adhered to strict Neo-Thomism, and did not reflect the increasing pluralism that existed in Neo-Thomism. Thus, the transcendental Thomism of Rousselot and Maréchal had little impact at the high school level. None of the textbooks from the 1940s and 1950s referred to any personal assent to revealed truth, but instead reflected the strict Neo-Thomist view that ordinary believers were “incapable of determining the reasonableness of their faith,” and therefore had to accept and obey the authority of the Church on issues of faith.⁹⁵ Students of the archdiocese, then, no doubt shared the experience of Canadian Jesuit Bernard Lonergan, who criticized the secondary education that he had received due to its focus on the acquisition of information in a “regulated and unreflective manner.”⁹⁶

The textbooks in the 1940s and 1950s also adopted the defensive intellectual position evident in strict Neo-Thomism and in Pius XI’s encyclical on Christian education—a position characteristic of ghetto Catholicism. Such a position was clearly assumed when grade 12 graduates were warned not to even bother arguing with people who disagreed with the Church, and to dismiss any notion of biblical historical criticism. In a lengthy section on indulgences in the mandatory 1940s textbook, the author contended that Luther had a “wrong notion concerning indulgences,” commenting further that “enemies of the Church have also accused her of selling indulgences. This is a gross calumny; such an act would be simony. As a matter of fact, the Church excommunicates anyone who makes money by means of indulgences.”⁹⁷ Here, the author denies well-documented historical evidence in order to defend the Church. Nor was this an isolated case. Emmett Carter acknowledged that Church history was often inaccurately taught, particularly when dealing with moments where the Church committed major errors.⁹⁸ It is not surprising then that in 1963, according to a memorandum from the Archdiocese Office of Religious Education, the majority of teachers believed that the *Quest for Happiness* texts “would serve no useful purpose” because the “apologetics, particularly the grade 12 text, is positively harmful, since the defensive is selected as the principle role of this course.”

Furthermore, the use of these texts might encourage students to consider “the unbeliever” as an “enemy, against whom one must defend himself rather than a sincere seeker toward whom kindness and understanding must be shown.”⁹⁹ Given the overall nature of these texts, it is not surprising that after Vatican II, their classroom use was no longer mandated.

Lastly, the impact of strict Neo-Thomism and the strict adherence to the ordinances of Rome was also reflected in professional development for teachers, which fell under the jurisdiction of the Inspector for Catholic Separate Schools, John M. Bennett. His overall responsibility was the “supervision and visitation of all classes” to ensure that the policies of the Ministry of Education and the Archdiocese were upheld.¹⁰⁰ This supervision included ensuring that teachers were properly prepared to teach Church doctrine. In a lengthy paper, “The Teaching of Religion,” distributed to teachers at a catechetical conference on October 12th, 1953, Bennett commented that “many teachers are not satisfied with their results of teaching Christian Doctrine,” and so proceeded to provide the necessary instruction in order to improve their teaching.¹⁰¹ Part of these instructions included explaining the Church’s position on faith and reason, emphasizing that “faith is greater than reason,” and the need to remain on the offensive against “Atheism and Materialism” with the “Sword of the Spirit” by implementing the weapons of “Prayer, Work (teaching), and Sacrifice.”¹⁰² Teachers were also entrusted with the “task of imparting supernatural truth,” so Bennett provided them with suggestions as to how to accomplish this task. For example, teachers were instructed to strengthen the will of the students through “encouragement, reprimands, reminders,” and through “inspiration” to “have children seek the Grace of God” by praying, attending Mass, and using the sacraments.¹⁰³ Quoting Cardinal McGuigan of the Archdiocese of Toronto, Bennett emphasized that “the purpose of education is...stated as the effort to perfect an intellect and will to think correctly and to act rightly.”¹⁰⁴ Anyone who wished to teach in a Catholic school in the Archdiocese of Toronto had to attend religious instruction classes offered at the Ontario Normal School. In these classes, new teachers were instructed on how to use the mandated textbooks effectively in the classroom, to teach strict Neo-Thomism and thus prepare the students properly to succeed in their final religion exams.¹⁰⁵ Bennett also ensured that courses were provided for practising teachers to improve their teaching of religion. For example, in the 1958 Catechetical Instruction Course, teachers were instructed in the “Guiding Principles in Christian Education,” focusing on the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, Etienne Gilson, and Jacques Maritain.¹⁰⁶ This course consisted of ten one-hour sessions in which the teachers also examined the teachings of Pope Pius XI and Pius XII, the reigning pope at the time. Teachers would therefore be studying Pius XI’s encyclical on Christian education.

An analysis of teacher professional development in the archdiocese also reveals that teachers were encouraged to promote Catholic classicism and the concept of the Catholic mind. Reminding teachers in his “Teaching of Religion” paper that they had a

“Catholic culture to impart,” Inspector Bennett highlighted the different academic disciplines that needed to be integrated with Catholic theology and philosophy, for example, poetry, music, and literature.¹⁰⁷ Bennett acknowledged that it was a “difficult task to carry the cross and only definite principles and the Grace of God will help us...as teachers to endeavour to develop a Catholic mind to wish to do this.”¹⁰⁸ He then asked what he considered an urgent question: “Can we work the truths of faith so deeply into the minds and hearts of our youth by means of activities in Christian study in early youth that they will be men and women of Christian principles throughout life?” A list of classroom activities was provided that could help to facilitate the deepening of the “truths of faith” into the minds of the youth.¹⁰⁹

Secondary education in the Archdiocese of Toronto therefore provides an excellent example of the dominance of strict Neo-Thomism. In terms of policies, mandated textbooks, and teacher preparation, the archdiocese strictly followed the ordinances from Rome, and thus it promoted Catholic classicism and the concept of the Catholic mind. Little evidence exists to suggest that the students were exposed to the pluralism that existed in Neo-Thomism. Pius XI’s encyclical on Christian education did indeed “set the agenda.” This analysis of secondary religious education in the Archdiocese of Toronto confirms Carter’s contention that “probably nowhere in the world is the observance of Church customs and laws as strict as in the strongly Catholic areas of North America.”

Strict Neo-Thomist Education and the Dominant Catholic Culture

Some intriguing questions remain unanswered, however. To what extent was this education effective? Did Catholic teachers and students accept this Catholic classicism and possess a Catholic mind, a particular Catholic understanding of the world? It is important here to be cautious in any assessment as to the extent to which the Catholic mind was actually developed despite the efforts of the archdiocese, since such a development is difficult to measure. Nonetheless, most scholars, such as Bernard Lonergan, argue that this classicist culture dominated Catholic life in North America. In his excellent study, *Conscience First, Tradition: A Study of Young American Catholics*, Patrick McNamara contends that in the 1940s and 1950s ordinary Catholics possessed a self-assured confidence, content to belong to the “one true Church.”¹¹⁰ Novelists and essayists also portrayed a “Catholicism of clear and clean definition.”¹¹¹ According to McNamara, most ordinary Catholics did not question the authority of the Church and its representatives, the priests, brothers, and sisters. Questions were not needed, only devotion.¹¹² Scholars tend to agree that North American Catholics were in fact immersed in the dominant classicist culture, accepting Neo-Thomism as a mode of thought that formed an integral part of Catholic self-identity.

This contention is strengthened once the role of elites in forming a sense of identity within a community is considered. Gary R. Miedema contends that in any given society, the elite social class “constructs” identities to serve their own interests, constructions that are not limited to religion, but encompass any public identity, including that of a nation.¹¹³ According to cultural theorist Raymond William, “in any given society, in any period, there is a central system of practices, meanings and values, which can properly be called dominant and effective,” and which are “not merely abstract but which are organized and lived.”¹¹⁴ Public symbols and rituals were important “tools of cultural formation and maintenance”¹¹⁵ that helped “shape personal and collective identities.”¹¹⁶ These “tools” also assumed a “cognitive role, rendering intelligible society and social relationships, serving to organize people’s knowledge of the past and present and their capacity to imagine the future.”¹¹⁷ Understood in these terms, Catholics were subject to these “tools of cultural formation” when they went to church, when they attended a Catholic school, and when they participated in public events like Catechetical Days. All of these “public symbols and rituals” reinforced the dominance of Catholic Neo-Thomistic classicism. Schools, as public institutions, played a key role in establishing this dominance, as recent studies of Ontario education have indicated.

Bruce Curtis, in his study *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871*, argues that an “educational state” was established in the nineteenth century that suited the aims and values of the urban elite, “the governing classes.” Wishing to maintain the British colonial connection and adopt a parliamentary democracy, the colonial governing classes opposed a growing agrarian radical movement that wanted to create an American-style republic. Education became one of the tools of the governing classes to counter this threat—a form of social control. A highly centralized power structure was built into the provincial department of education, with the entire student population following the same curriculum with the same set of morals and values, in order to establish the social order that the governing classes desired. To ensure that the government ordinances were strictly obeyed, a system of school inspectors was created. By 1871, according to Curtis, most of the population had internalized and embodied the moral and social values of the governing classes: social tolerance, respect for legitimate authority, and an overall Protestant “collective morality.”¹¹⁸ A process of “self-making, of subjectification” had been completed.¹¹⁹ Instead of becoming independent and active participants in their own education, students had become “incomplete social subjects” who needed to be educated, to be controlled socially, in order to become respectable citizens in the educational state of Ontario—participants in the dominant culture that the elites, the governing classes, had established.

Granted their own government sponsored school system in the mid-1840s, the Catholic elite established an “educational state” within the educational state of Ontario, and thus considered itself as the “governing class” as far as Catholics were concerned.

As a publicly funded system, Catholic schools were also subject to the authority of the Department of Education and its inspectors, yet in terms of religious education, Catholic schools enjoyed considerable independence. A parallel educational state was established in terms of religion. Catholic rituals and symbols were permitted. A system of inspectors was created for religion classes in order to ensure that Church-sanctioned curriculum was followed. Catholic school boards and the local bishops cooperated to ensure that the Catholicity of their schools was maintained.¹²⁰ It stands to reason, therefore, that the Catholic elite succeeded in developing a similar process of subjectification, resulting in a dominant set of morals and meanings in a distinctly Catholic culture, which by the 1920s was characterized by Neo-Thomistic classicism.¹²¹

The educational efforts of the Catholic elite beyond the classroom further strengthened this dominant culture. Ever since Pope Leo XII issued *Rerum* as part of the process of educationalization, the Church had encouraged Catholics to form associations in order to engage in social reform and in conversion efforts—associations that became known as “Catholic Action”—and maintaining this dominant culture was central to these efforts. Although other popes also concerned themselves with Catholic Action, it was Pius XI who provided the impetus for the proliferation of Catholic Action groups throughout the world, in charity organizations, in the marketplace, and in the establishment of Catholic journals and newspapers.¹²² In order to maintain control of these groups, his successor, Pope Pius XII, established the Central Office of Catholic Action under the supervision of the Secretary of the Cardinals Commission, which communicated with the bishops. Thus, Catholic Action was not an autonomous organization, but an umbrella organization of various groups that were expected to obey their local bishops and to adhere to the official teachings of the Church.

As such, Catholic Action played a critical role in promoting strict Neo-Thomism and the integrated approach to education that promoted the Catholic mind. As leading American scholar John Courtney Murray S.J. emphasized, once individuals possessed the “splendid organic wholeness” of the Catholic faith, they also possessed a “tightly integrated system of motives” to inspire them to moral action under the direction of the Church.¹²³ In North America, the major aim of Catholic Action was to promote this “organic wholeness” first among Catholics, and then to convert the entire society to this Catholic vision.¹²⁴ Catholic Action promoted “practical tasks” that would further the integrated Catholic vision throughout North American society.¹²⁵ To accomplish this significant stage in the educationalization program, Catholic Action became more of an organized movement, following Pius XI’s instructions. The United States and Canada established central offices to supervise and co-ordinate Catholic Action activities. By the mid-1930s, the General Assembly of Bishops of Canada had formed two committees, one for doctrine and the other for social action, that were responsible for keeping the church hierarchy informed of activities in these two areas.¹²⁶ Throughout

Canada, specific days were also declared “parochial days of Catholic Action,” when parishes convened “diocesan congresses” at which selected Catholic Action activities were discussed and studied. In the United States, the National Catholic Welfare Conference was responsible for supervising Catholic Action, and in 1937, the Department of Lay Organizations was established to promote social-welfare initiatives among the laity. It also sponsored a series of conferences to educate priests in Catholic social teachings in order to prepare them to provide the necessary leadership for these initiatives.¹²⁷ Thus, by the late 1930s, Catholic Action emerged as the major instrument of the Church’s educationalization process, initiating a wide range of activities throughout North America that reinforced the dominant Catholic culture of classicism.

Prominent among these activities were various opportunities for lay persons to learn more about both doctrine and social renewal. In May 1939, a three-week “School of Catholic Action” was held in Chicago at which lay Catholics were told that they were members of Christ’s mystical body and therefore called “to socialize souls, so that hearts and minds may unite in the Mystical Body of Christ.”¹²⁸ Catholic Action “Summer School” sessions were offered, such as one in 1951 in Cumberland, Ontario, where any lay individual could register for a three-week course with the purpose of restoring “the world in Christ.” After learning about the spiritual foundations of Catholic Action, participants studied the topic of the “mystical body of Christ in action.”¹²⁹ In October 1951, the World Congress of the Lay Apostolate was held, focusing on various subjects such as doctrinal foundations and on the Christian social order, with the overall aim of organizing a “world plan and the opportunity of common action according to this plan.”¹³⁰ Throughout North America, study groups were established under episcopal direction, adhering to the belief that practical action must be based on Catholic truth and not life experience.¹³¹ In these groups, the social inquiry method of “See, Judge, Act” was used.¹³² Catholic Action was also involved in the international catechetical renewal, biblical study, and liturgical reform movements, serving as a way to reach the ordinary Catholic.¹³³

Several specialized Catholic Action groups were also formed in order to realize Pius XI’s educationalization goal that “workers must be the apostles of the workers, farmers the apostles to farmers, students the apostles of students.”¹³⁴ One of the most significant groups was the Young Christian Workers, which aimed at promoting the workers’ right to live in a just society, and at developing leaders dedicated to reforming society as members of Christ’s mystical body.¹³⁵ Two other groups that developed in the United States were the Young Christian Students and the Christian Family Movement, which was very active among married couples in parishes across North America.¹³⁶ Another group, Pax Romana, was very influential among university students, with a North American Commission established in Toronto in 1951. One of its major goals was for students to “place their intellect at the service of God,” according to a leading Neo-Thomist, Etienne Gilson.¹³⁷ Pax Romana was to give students “a

sound character,” enabling them to make “practical judgments” in terms of improving society.¹³⁸ Such specialized Catholic Action groups played critical roles in the Church’s educationalization process by contributing to the integrated Catholic culture and teaching Neo-Thomist doctrine, and through their apostolic action.

In the final analysis, then, the existing evidence supports the contention that Catholic classicism, with its Neo-Thomistic mode of thought, was the dominant culture of North American Catholics. Under the strict control of the Magisterium, Neo-Thomism was both imposed on the school system and promoted within the umbrella organization of Catholic Action. This is not to suggest that Catholic Action’s ultimate goal of social reform and conversion was achieved.¹³⁹ Nor is it meant to argue that all Catholics in North America participated in this culture or that all Catholic schools adhered without question to the ordinances from Rome. Even with mandated exams, it is reasonable to assume that many teachers had their own educational priorities, and that they strayed from the official curriculum. It is meant to argue, however, that this Neo-Thomistic classicism was dominant and, in the words of Lonergan, “normative.”¹⁴⁰ Socio-economic conditions during the late 1940s and 1950s also facilitated this dominance. After fifteen years of economic depression and war, North Americans sought social and economic stability in a “culturally determined return to normalcy.”¹⁴¹ Beneath this stability, an intense sense of anxiety also existed, a natural result of experiencing the previous tumultuous years of insecurity and of living under the threat of nuclear war during the Cold War.¹⁴² Not only Catholics, but many North Americans, sought comfort in the normal patterns of life, which included the acceptance of existing cultural norms.¹⁴³ For Catholics, these religious norms were defined by classicism and a strict form of Neo-Thomism. During these post-war years, then, it could be well argued that most Catholics did indeed share a “Catholic mind.”

Chapter Three: Catholic Secondary Religious Educational Reform in North America on the Eve of Vatican II: Implications for the Future

Despite the dominance of strict Neo-Thomism in North American education, many Catholic educators and scholars recognized the need for educational reform long before Vatican II. Many were also becoming frustrated with the teaching methods necessitated by this strictness. For example, Professor Lawrence E. Lynch of St. Michael's College, in a 1957 address before the English Catholic Education Association of Ontario, entitled "Intellectual Curiosity in Catholic Schools," strongly criticized contemporary religious education, emphasizing the need for a sense of "wonder," and called upon teachers to instill in their students "a restless sense of intellectual curiosity."¹ Jacques Maritain and Emmett Carter were also prominent among such scholars and educators. In their writings, both Carter and Maritain revealed their Neo-Thomist belief in the capacity of human reason, under the guidance of faith, to discover religious truth. They, however, disagreed with one fundamental tenet of strict Neo-Thomism: the inability of the ordinary believer to accomplish this task. Instead they emphasized the students' ability to reason and to understand complex religious concepts. Catholic scholars and educators were also aware of the process of catechetical renewal evident in Europe, even though it had little impact in North America prior to Vatican II, especially at the secondary level. Furthermore, the Neo-Thomist pluralism opened the door to a new understanding of religious truth within the tradition of St. Thomas, an understanding with serious implications for education after Vatican II. Finally, the development of the "new theology," beginning in the 1930s as one of the intellectual movements opposed to Neo-Thomist dominance, had a major impact on Vatican II and on Catholic education in general. Thus, well before Vatican II, educational reform was discussed as a possibility, and within the

pluralism of Neo-Thomism and the new theology there remained the potential for considerable educational reform after Vatican II.

Jacques Maritain

Jacques Maritain's ideas are best expressed in his major work on education, *Education at the Crossroads*. An analysis of this work reveals that Maritain had considerable respect for progressive education that centred upon the needs of the child, even though in terms of educational aims, these needs were secondary to the intellectual virtues of wisdom and contemplation.² Although Maritain rejected the pragmatism characteristic of progressive education,³ he accepted many of its pedagogical suggestions, especially the emphasis on the importance of the "inner resources of the student and the vital spontaneity of the child."⁴ Recognizing the "actual merit of modern conceptions in education since Pestalozzi," Maritain argued that the greatest "rediscovery" was the "fundamental truth that the principle agent and dynamic factor is not the art of the teacher but the inner principle of activity, the inner dynamism of nature and of the mind."⁵ According to Maritain, "any education which considers the teacher as the principal agent perverts the very nature of the educational task."⁶ Yet, he maintained a balanced view, recognizing the important role of the teacher in guiding the students and providing "moral authority."⁷ He was critical of many of the traditional teaching methods that focused on memorization alone: "Nothing should be required of the child without an explanation and without making sure that the child has understood."⁸ Such traditional education Maritain called "education by the rod," a form of education that he strongly criticized.⁹ Maritain also possessed a broad conception of education, one in which schools had the crucial role of developing the intellect and powers of reason.¹⁰ Maritain therefore emphasized the necessity to understand the psychology of the child and the different stages of intellectual development, arguing that at the high school and university levels, more attention should be given to the formation of the student's ability to reason.¹¹ "Common sense and spontaneous pervasiveness of natural insight and reasoning constitute the dynamic unity of the adolescent," according to Maritain.¹² This "natural impulse" towards reasoning needed to be "stimulated and disciplined."¹³ A major goal of education was not to "shape the will and directly develop moral virtues in the youth, but to enlighten and strengthen reason."¹⁴ In doing so, it was critical to respect the individual in the development of personality, which he understood as the "internal selfhood" that "grows in proportion as the life of reason and freedom dominates over the life of instinct."¹⁵ In other words, education did not directly involve the "shaping of the will" and developing of "moral values," but focussed on the development of the powers of reason that would lead the individual to shape his own will, and to understand and therefore adopt the desired

moral values. The student would also understand that the supreme goal of education was the attainment of religious wisdom, truth, and personal salvation.¹⁶

It is important to note here that, throughout his study, Maritain emphasized what he considered to be the critical importance of intuition, essential to his philosophy. As he stated, “What matters most in the life of reason is intellectual insight or intuition.”¹⁷ At the elementary and secondary levels, he believed that the educational process should involve the “freeing of the intuitive power” by “encouraging the spontaneous interest and natural curiosity.”¹⁸ As a result, the teacher must respect and encourage the “path through which” natural intuition is “naturally awakened, the path of sense-perception and sense experience and imagination.”¹⁹ What is also critical, however, is to recognize that the validity of Maritain’s approach to education is not dependent on an acceptance of the important role that he gives to intellectual intuition; it stands on its own merit.²⁰ In *Crossroads*, Maritain presents a thoughtful, well-argued exposition of a sophisticated Catholic philosophy of education that integrates some key aspects of progressive education, places the child at the centre of the educational process, and adheres to fundamental Catholic aims of education. In the wake of the dramatic changes in education following Vatican II, Maritain’s study was soon forgotten, yet it still provides considerable insight into the process of education—insight that is still relevant today and should be revisited.

Emmett Carter

Emmett Carter, one of the most prominent educators in North America, agreed with Maritain that the traditional methods of Catholic education were inadequate to meet the needs of the students, but focused more on practical changes, a natural focus given his position as the principal of Montreal’s St. Joseph Teachers College. In his 1961 study, *The Modern Challenge to Religious Education*, which became a standard text in North America,²¹ he acknowledged that “considerable re-arrangement of content” was required in terms of the traditional catechetical approach, particularly at the high school level.²² Given the secular nature of society, traditional teaching methods relying on rote memory were no longer sufficient. Rather, at the high school level, the focus must be on the “explanation of the Christian religion,”²³ focusing on biblical studies, with the end result that students would be able “to read the Gospels with profit and insight.”²⁴ Much like Maritain, Carter argued that understanding was “not guaranteed by the child’s memorization of a formula.”²⁵ He was also critical of too much reliance on textbooks and teacher manuals, referring to them as “aid books” that “should not be relied upon by the teachers as the final sources from which he himself learns the subject matter.”²⁶ Although recognizing the importance of repetition in terms of pedagogy, he also contended that the “sameness” of repetition was “mentally and spiritually sterilizing.”²⁷ He situated this repetition in the context of the “big idea,” the

nucleus of a unit of study. The lessons of a unit “elucidate, elaborate and draw out” the big idea, “allowing time for it to be driven home together with its co-related ideas.”²⁸ In doing so, “tediousness and dryness” would be avoided as a “thought, a principal, and a moral” were presented in a “variety of ways without the risk of boring repetition.”²⁹

In the development of such units, Carter, much like Maritain, also emphasized the importance of stimulating the students’ interest. He considered “interest” and “understanding” as directly related. Referring to a “law of the mind,” he argued that people “remember most easily those things which we understand best and which interest us most.”³⁰ He also emphasized the importance of “meaningful repetition of ideas, by concentrating attention on the specific matter to be retained and upon the interest which is aroused in that which is to be remembered.”³¹ According to Carter, one method that could be used to increase the students’ interest concerned making the content “meaningful through establishing connections and relations between what is being learned and the student’s own life.”³² Here, Carter is echoing a major criticism of strict Neo-Thomism as is evident in the example he provided: sanctifying grace was a term that had lost some of its “freshness” and was a “technical term.” The doctrine of grace had become as “dry as dust account of a mechanical soul process” from the “lips of our school children.”³³ Carter nonetheless still insisted that there was a place for some rote memory of formulas because they “guide our mental attitudes and our line of conduct must be present to the mind so that they may readily be summoned to meet a given situation.”³⁴ Critical to Carter’s thinking, however, was the context in which such formulas were memorized: the students’ interest had first to be stimulated and they must understand the formulas. Any memory work must involve the repetition of what the students’ “intellect has grasped and understood” and not simply the “unthinking rattling off of words.”³⁵ Understood knowledge was fundamental to his approach to religious education: “the more the child is brought to know and understand his religion, the greater will be his love for it.”³⁶ This must be accomplished without “watering-down” the content.³⁷

Carter was also adamant in his conviction that not all content is of equal significance, and that religious education must focus on the essential and meaningful content. Highlighting a major weakness of the educational process, a weakness still noticeable today, he contended that “too often in the past all questions and answers were given equal weight in the memorization process, and the essential message and these formulas which explain that message were lost in a welter of material.” The focus needed to be on the essential and meaningful content, he said, stating that “scientific experiments demonstrate that meaningful material is forgotten at a far slower rate than is meaningless material.”³⁸ Modern studies on meaning and memory have confirmed this statement.³⁹ Thus, Carter argued that religious curriculum should centre on units of study that emphasized the “big ideas” of meaningful content related to the personal interests of the students.⁴⁰ In this context, Carter considered exams a necessity as long as they measured the students’ comprehension and understanding, not simply their

ability to memorize content. “Open-book” exams could also be effective since the emphasis would not be on memorization.⁴¹ Agreeing with the Sacred Congregation of the Council, he contended that exams were necessary if only to avoid giving the impression that “religion is not a subject of very much importance since it is not sanctioned by an examination.”⁴² On the eve of Vatican II, Carter, one of the leading educators in North America, provided some needed constructive criticism and proposals for improvement.

Neo-Thomist Pluralism

Considerable potential for educational reform emerged from Neo-Thomist pluralism, despite the collapse of the belief in one coherent Thomistic philosophy that had endured for centuries virtually unchanged—a belief that resulted in strict Neo-Thomism. Vatican II resulted in the end of the modern Neo-Thomist movement,⁴³ but this did not mean that Neo-Thomism did not have some impact on post-Vatican II education nor that modern educators could not draw upon the Neo-Thomist tradition. Both Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan, although not Neo-Thomists, drew upon this tradition. Neo-Thomist pluralism also contributed to a gradually emerging consensus that there were different paths to discovering religious truth, a natural consequence of this pluralism since Neo-Thomists themselves no longer followed one path.

Transcendental Neo-Thomism, in particular, was becoming more influential, despite the considerable opposition that it faced, especially in North America. Both Rahner and Lonergan were influenced by transcendental Neo-Thomism—a form of Neo-Thomism that could trace its origins to “the wisdom of Thomas” derived “from his very own fountains”—in the words of Leo XIII.⁴⁴ Transcendental Neo-Thomism combined two powerful ideas with implications for secondary education: the subject’s “inner drives” to desire God, and the ability of the subject’s intellect to grasp “intelligible reality” through its “act of understanding”—an act that Lonergan called “the act of insight.”⁴⁵ Both of these ideas survived the collapse of the Neo-Thomist movement and influenced post-Vatican II education, giving rise to intriguing possibilities for secondary educational reform, especially when considered in the context of the new theology.

The New Theology

What has become known as the “new theology debate,” in the words of Gerald McCool, was “the culmination of the development within Thomism itself which gradually led to its decease as a single organized movement.”⁴⁶ In the period of 1935 to 1960, this debate co-existed with the increasing pluralism within Neo-Thomism. Both were the result of Leo XIII’s insistence on a return to Saint Thomas himself. It was the new theology, despite great opposition from the Church, that had the greatest

impact on Vatican II, that influenced how Catholic education would be understood, and that possessed considerable potential for educational reform at the secondary level. An analysis of the new theology is essential in order to identify which components might be incorporated into a new approach to secondary Catholic education; in other words, which components could be integrated into a challenging, vibrant curriculum.

It is also critical to examine the new theology in the context of the theological developments that occurred between 1920 and 1960 that influenced the new theologians, in order to understand that the new theology was the culmination of these developments. Moreover, it is important to note that these developments were “largely northern European phenomena” that had far less impact in North America prior to Vatican II.⁴⁷ Jürgen Mettepenningen, in his excellent and in-depth study of the new theology, identified nine specific developments. One of them was in ecclesiology. Prior to 1920, the Church was seen more as an institution, focusing on the authority of the pope and the Magisterium, whereas afterwards it was understood more as a community of believers, “the people of God on its way.”⁴⁸ A more Christ-oriented spirituality was also noticeable. The combination of this new ecclesiology and spirituality led to a new vision of the Church as the “mystical body of Christ,” as is evident in Pope Pius XII’s encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, which emphasized the invisible nature of the Church.⁴⁹ This focus on Christ also led to a heightened interest in the historical Jesus; thus, it is no surprise that only three months after *Mystici*, the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* was released. Another major development was the liturgical movement, with its focus on celebrating the mysteries of the Church and on allowing a greater role for the laity in the liturgy. A further trend was the growing popularity of a kerygmatic theology, which focused on spirituality, preaching, and mysticism. There was also an increased interest in the ordinary, everyday life of believers, and in Christian social action. A growing appetite for ecumenism was also noticeable, witnessed by a new dialogue between Catholics and Anglicans during the 1920s. Another important trend occurred in France as the number of conversions in intellectual circles increased dramatically, one of whom was Jacques Maritain. This renewed French Catholicism, combined with the renewed call for social action, resulted in the “worker-priest” movement among the French clergy to evangelize among the workers in industrialized France.⁵⁰ It was within the context of these influential developments that the new theology emerged, struggled, and eventually triumphed.

Yet, the term “new theology” was contentious in that its leading proponents argued that what they proposed was not in fact new.⁵¹ Moreover, new theology was a denigrating term first used in 1942 by Pietro Parente of the Holy Office,⁵² and thereafter employed by one of their major opponents, Garrigou-Lagrange, who identified the new theology as another form of modernism—an accusation sure to attract the attention of the Magisterium.⁵³ Modernism and the new theology, however, were similar in that both embraced historical criticism and were broad terms that encompassed various views.

Mettepenningen thus refers to new theology as a “cluster concept...a banner representing a variety of visions.”⁵⁴ The new theology was also committed to connecting theology with the “living reality of faith” of believers.⁵⁵ Mettepenningen identifies three major phases of the new theology, the first being associated with Neo-Thomism and the call to “return to Thomas.”⁵⁶ The new theologians benefitted from Etienne Gilson’s research, which determined that there was not just one Christian philosophy in the Middle Ages, but that systematic pluralism existed.⁵⁷ One such new theologian was Marie-Dominique Chenu, who was very critical of how he had studied Aquinas as a student, reading his texts “line-by-line, with little historical context or spiritual growth.”⁵⁸ Influenced by his friend and colleague Gilson, Chenu examined the works of Aquinas from the perspective of an existing medieval plurality and used historical studies to understand him in terms of his own societal-historical context. What Chenu discovered was an individual who had relied on biblical studies and on the writings of the Church Fathers, as well as classical scholars, to create a theological synthesis; he was, in the words of R. Royal, “a Christian looking to all available light in the thought with which he was familiar for a living presentation of the faith.”⁵⁹ In the approach of Saint Thomas himself, Chenu and other new theologians had found their approach, and the return to Thomas became a “ressourcement”—a return to the original sources of Christianity. Studying Aquinas in the context of systematic pluralism, however, did not mean for Chenu a complete rejection of strict Neo-Thomism. He acknowledged that the strict Neo-Thomists had a “hold on a portion of the truth in defending timeless metaphysical principles,”⁶⁰ but also that they did not hold the entire truth—a view consistent with that of Neo-Thomist pluralism.

The study of Thomas also led the new theologians to adopt another aspect of his approach. What Thomas had attempted was to provide theological answers to real problems and issues, particularly at a time when Europe was experiencing a period of socio-economic and intellectual growth with an increased access to classical learning. Modern theologians needed to do likewise. Thus, another leading new theologian, Yves Congar, in an influential 1935 article, “Déficit de la théologie,” argued that theology had become a “technical matter” out of touch with the faith and life of ordinary people.⁶¹ Congar compared Neo-Thomism to a “wax mask,” an “expressionless face lacking any genuine connection with reality.”⁶² A major thrust of the new theology was therefore to provide “spiritual nourishment” to ordinary believers from the “great mysteries of the faith” and from the original sources of Christianity: the Bible, the Fathers, and the liturgy. Jean Daniélou played a critical role with the publication of his *Bible and Liturgy* in 1951. According to J.W. O’Malley, the “driving force” behind the “ressourcement” was the search for texts that would “nourish the soul.”⁶³

Another fundamental aspect of the new theology was a deepening understanding of the datum of revelation and the role of tradition. Here, the new theologians were influenced by earlier scholars such as Johann Sebastian Drey, Johann Adam Möhler, and John Henry Newman. Drey, one of the most important German theologians prior to

Vatican I, was fascinated by the relationship between history and doctrine. God revealed himself in history. Combining the development of new perspectives and the discovery of new insights from the study of past events, Christianity embodied a dynamic process, “a living event and dogmas could only be understood, judged, and employed in the context of such a dynamic.”⁶⁴ Revelation was an essential component of this dynamic. Möhler was responsible for the rediscovery of the patristic period, a rediscovery that had an enormous impact on him as he explained in a letter to a close friend: “A careful study of the Fathers has stirred up much in me. While undertaking it I discovered for the first time a living, fresh, full Christianity, and Christ desires that I do not leave fruitless that which he gave life to and awakened for his full defense.”⁶⁵ After studying the Church Fathers, Möhler understood the Church as the community of the “incarnate Word kept alive” and united by the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶ Tradition, according to Möhler, was the “activity of the Holy Spirit through the generations.”⁶⁷ Late in his life, Congar acknowledged that Möhler had influenced his thinking considerably, especially in how he understood the role of the Holy Spirit in the tradition of the Church. Newman also had a major influence on the new theology, particularly in terms of the role of development in theology and in the Church.⁶⁸ As with Möhler, Newman’s patristic studies were essential to his understanding of the Church, which became for him a “living community” and not a “changeless idea.”⁶⁹ Jesus never changes, but our understanding of him increases as the search for the complete truth continues. Newman therefore emphasized the importance of the development of doctrine, believing that Catholicism was a “spiritual principle,”⁷⁰ transcendent and immanent, affecting the individual and the community.⁷¹

What developed was a new understanding of tradition. For Congar, the Church embodied a living tradition that began with Jesus—a source of religious knowledge other than scripture. In *Meaning of Tradition*, Congar emphasizes the historical importance of tradition: “It seems beyond serious question that the teaching of the apostles entrusted to the churches was a totality beside which what is formulated in their writings represents mere fragments.”⁷² Tradition allowed a “progress that is not simply a repetition of the past.”⁷³ However, this “totality”—this tradition—was guided by the Holy Spirit, resulting in a “real, living self-communication of God,” according to Cardinal A. Dulles.⁷⁴ Tradition was understood in terms of the complex relationship between the historical context of dogmatic development and the “continuity intrinsic to tradition.”⁷⁵ Tradition was not simply a “matrix of traditions as teachings and practices to be passed on.”⁷⁶

For the new theologians, then, revelation ended with the death of the last apostle, but human understanding of this revelation continues to grow and develop in a “living tradition.” Both scripture and tradition represented the “datum of revelation in history.”⁷⁷ For Chenu, the “stuff of revelation” did not exist to support a theological system, but the other way around. Any theological system needs to change according to new human insight and understanding as well as changed historical contexts.⁷⁸

Despite his obvious genius, Aquinas was nonetheless part of the living tradition wherein “our knowledge of the datum of revelation is ever growing.”⁷⁹ Thus, *ressourcement* came to characterize the new theology, especially in the second phase, from 1942–1950. The new theologians argued that theologians should no longer rely solely on the writings of one medieval theologian, no matter how great, but instead return to the sources of the faith: scripture, liturgy, and the Church Fathers of the patristic period.⁸⁰ The writings of Henri de Lubac epitomized this *ressourcement*, particularly his *Surnaturel* in which he analysed how theological concepts were understood in the patristic period, in the Middle Ages, and in the modern era.⁸¹ It was also during this second phase that Maurice Blondel became increasingly popular among theologians.⁸²

Blondel influenced the new theologians’ understanding of immanence and subjectivity by arguing that human beings could only be content with God because of the “inner drives” of the human being and the dynamics of the mind. In his philosophy of action, the spiritual dynamism of the individual—the “willing will”—possessed a built-in yearning that would only be satisfied by encountering God.⁸³ Blondel, in considering the Kantian assertion that there were strict limits on what human reason can know, concluded that there must be another means to discover religious truth: revelation.⁸⁴ Objective religious truth may exist, but it is historical subjects who receive it and attempt to understand it in terms of their lived experience. For Blondel, the supernatural revelation of God and the inner dynamism of the human mind were connected.⁸⁵ Blondel’s way of immanence was very much influenced by Augustine, who famously commented about God: “you have made us for yourself and our hearts are restless until they rest with you.”⁸⁶ Blondel drew upon the Augustinian tradition, as well as the contemplative and mystical prayer tradition of the Church, to explain how God’s truth could become a “spiritual possession” for individuals.⁸⁷ In his monumental 1893 work *L’Action*, Blondel termed this inner dynamism as “action”—“the activity of the soul at its source.”⁸⁸ Augustine’s “restless heart” became Blondel’s “willing will.”⁸⁹ Blondel’s influence was most noticeable with de Lubac’s *Surnaturel*, the result of de Lubac’s two decades of study to develop the “theological implications of Blondel’s thought.”⁹⁰ Thus, de Lubac and other new theologians inherited from the tradition of Augustine, Pascal, and Blondel, the belief that God’s revelation and the possibility of eternal life corresponded to the deepest yearnings of the human being and were not imposed from without by an “external authority.”⁹¹

The Implications for Educational Reform in North America

The new theology had significant potential for stimulating educational reform in North America, especially at the secondary level. This became possible with the third and fourth phases of the new theology. The first two phases of the new theology were

foundational in terms of philosophy and theology. With the third phase, the new theology extended beyond France, becoming an international movement, and with Vatican II, it entered its fourth phase, a period of success as its influence became widespread in the most important Church council since the Middle Ages.⁹² The potential for educational reform is even more fascinating if the new theology is understood in the context of Neo-Thomist pluralism and the ideas of Maritain and Carter. The two powerful ideas of transcendental Neo-Thomism, the subject's "inner drives" to desire God, and the ability of the subject's intellect to grasp "intelligible reality" through its "act of understanding," coincided with the new theology. Neo-Thomist pluralism also led to the possibility that there were different paths to religious truth, that each different philosophy and theology possessed a part of the religious truth, and that together they led to further human understanding. In the words of Mettepenningen, truth was "a human understanding of something divine" and therefore was open to development as human understanding evolved.⁹³

This concept of religious truth is a concept that could be introduced to students at the secondary level. As well, some of the key aspects of the new theology could also be integrated into secondary curriculum: patristic studies; historical-theological development; the significance of "the restless heart—the willing will" to human nature; the need to provide "nourishment for the soul"; and God's revelation in history as a living reality. Students could also be introduced to the living tradition—a tradition to which they belong with all of the mystery and wonder. Both Maritain and Carter suggested ways in which such a secondary curriculum could be conceived and implemented by developing the students' power of reason within academically challenging units of study that focused on the "big ideas" of both Neo-Thomism and the new theology, especially the thoughts of the great scholars of the Catholic intellectual tradition. On the eve of Vatican II, significant educational reform at the secondary level was possible. An opportunity existed to respond effectively to Dr. Lynch's lament for Catholic education. An opportunity to encourage wonder and intellectual curiosity among high school students, as Vatican II ushered in a new era for the Catholic Church.

Chapter Four: The Second Vatican Council and the Declaration on Christian Education

On January 25, 1959, when Pope John XXIII announced his plan to convene a general council for the entire Church, he began an unprecedented period of renewal as he endeavoured to adapt the Church to a changing modern world.¹ Part of this renewal was the rehabilitation of the new theologians, many of whom were intimately involved in the Second Vatican Council, especially Chenu, Congar, de Lubac, and Daniélou. John XXIII was particularly enthusiastic about Congar's work, appointing him to the committees drafting texts for Vatican II.² According to Mettepenningen, the council "ultimately appropriated the central features of the ambitions of the new theology,"³ which is evident in many of the conciliar documents. The dogmatic constitution, *Dei Verbum*, which emphasized the importance of the sources of the faith, had "definite echoes" of the new theology.⁴ The constitution on Divine Revelation also reflected the influence of the new theology, and the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et Spes* highlighted that theology should "pursue a profound understanding of revealed truth," and "at the same time it should not neglect close contact with its own time that it may be able to help these men skilled in various disciplines to attain a better understanding of the faith."⁵ Thus, the new theology played a critical role in the renewal process initiated by Pope John XIII once he opened the first session of Vatican II, a council in which bishops approached their responsibilities with a "historical mentality" more pronounced than at any other previous council.⁶

This sense of history is captured by three essential words used constantly at the council: *ressourcement*, the return to the sources of the faith; *aggiornamento*, an Italian word for updating or modernizing; and *development*, the unfolding or progress of ideas and events.⁷ The bishops shared the one common assumption that Catholic tradition was "richer, broader, and more malleable" than had previously been understood since the early 1800s.⁸ In his opening allocution to the council, John XXIII emphasized the importance of *aggiornamento* in assuring that the Church adapt to the modern world,

yet with an enriched understanding of the past resulting from a return to the sources of the faith: “the church should never depart from the sacred patrimony...but at the same time must ever look to the present, to the new conditions and new forms of life introduced into the modern world that have opened up new avenues to the Catholic apostolate.”⁹ Aggiornamento also implied that the updating would continue after the council had concluded, and thus the Vatican documents were in fact “starting points.”¹⁰ The development of doctrine was also of critical importance, the “issue under all issues” according to one of the leading American theologians at the council, John Courtney Murray.¹¹ Nearly all of the theologians now agreed that some degree of development had occurred in the teachings of the Church, and J.H. Newman’s 1846 *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* was considered as the definitive text on the topic.¹² Thus, it was with this sense of history that the bishops participated in the process of renewal that was Vatican II.

The pope definitely had history in mind when he began this process. Aware of the power of the curia, and how this power was wielded, the council was structured so as to be beyond its authority. The council empowered the bishops, not the curia. In doing so, John XXIII returned to the past, to a time when the bishops played a more active role in ecumenical councils and in determining Church policy. The pope did not even consult with the curia when he decided to convene a council; it was his decision alone.¹³ When he informed a group of cardinals in the Basilica of St. Paul Outside the Wall, they responded with an “impressive and devout silence.”¹⁴ Within the curia, most cardinals were opposed to the idea of a council, evident in their response to the pope’s request for their initial thoughts. Twenty-five cardinals responded by letter, ten of which were strictly formal, meaningless replies, and thirty-eight did not respond at all. Only three expressed a “considered opinion.”¹⁵ The bishops’ response was the exact opposite. Long accustomed to being recipients of already decided ordinances from Rome, they were eager to be active participants in the council. During the preparatory stage, the bishops were invited to offer their opinions on the problems and issues that should be discussed at the council. In the first few months, the Vatican received over 2,000 responses from bishops around the world.¹⁶ Vatican II therefore represented a transition from an era some scholars have called the “long nineteenth century” (1800–1959), a period dominated by an anti-modernist Church with the power centralized in the curia, to an era in which the Church embraced the modern world, with the power now shared between the curia and the bishops.

This is not to argue that there was an easy, simplistic shift in power from the curia to the bishops. The distribution of authority was a major area of contention at the council that extended beyond the relationship between the bishops and the curia to include the laity, especially since *Lumen Gentium* referred to the Church as “the people of God.” At issue was the fundamental power structure. Was it more vertical or horizontal in nature? The council adopted the principle of subsidiarity in order to address this complex question. According to this principle, when there is a legitimate

authority dealing with an issue, a superior authority does not interfere.¹⁷ To examine the complexity of this power shift, O'Malley uses the broad category "the relationship in the church of center to periphery," which also includes the dynamism between law (the centre) and inspiration and initiative (the periphery). In "classic religious terms," this relationship of centre to periphery refers to the relationship between "order" and "obedience to the gifts of the Spirit." As O'Malley comments, for the Church to remain "healthy" a harmonious balance needs to be maintained in the relationship.¹⁸

The changed relationship between the centre and the periphery is also reflected in the language of discourse used during the council. The "power words" of previous papal ordinances were no longer employed. A more pastoral language was used with words implying a more reciprocal relationship such as dialogue, partnership, friendship, co-operation, and charism. Vatican II "radically altered" the legislative and judicial model that had dominated the ecumenical councils ever since Nicaea, replacing it with a model based on "persuasion and invitation—a monumental shift."¹⁹ This change in discourse also indicated that Vatican II abandoned the dialectic approach of Scholasticism, "the art of proving a point, of winning an argument," an approach that was adversarial in nature.²⁰ This new style of discourse reflected a return to the style of the Church Fathers and to an acceptance of the mysteries of the faith, rather than a continuation of the efforts to establish "grand conceptual schemes."²¹ It represented a return to the literary genre of the ancient Romans and adopted by the Church Fathers, the *panegyric*. The purpose of this genre was "not so much to clarify concepts as to heighten appreciation for a person, an event, or an institution and to excite emulation of an ideal."²² Its goal was to achieve the internal assent of the individual and not to impose a mode of thinking. What was significant was the "inner transformation" of values.²³ According to O'Malley, if the "special characteristics" of Vatican II were ranked, this change in discourse could perhaps be the highest ranked.²⁴

This style of discourse did not merely involve a new vocabulary, but also embodied the "ultimate expression of meaning...it does not adorn meaning, but is meaning."²⁵ In order to clarify the importance of the words in terms of meaning, O'Malley organizes them into five categories: "horizontal-words" or "equality-words" such as the people of God, brothers and sisters, and collegiality; "words of reciprocity" such as cooperation, dialogue, and collaboration; "humility-words" such as pilgrim and servant; words of change such as development and progress; and "interiority-words" such as charism, joy, hope, and conscience.²⁶ Thus, this style of discourse expressed the meaning of what happened at Vatican II, a council that rejected the traditional model of authority within the Church, emphasized the inner transformation of the individual, and accepted the fundamental aspects of the new theology.

All of the documents reflected this new style of discourse to varying degrees.²⁷ At the time, commentators recognized the coherence that permeated the documents in terms of this discourse and the principles that it expressed. This coherence was a deliberate act to assure the intertextual nature of the documents, which were

frequently revised in order to maintain this coherence. A vague term, the “spirit of the council,” was used to describe an “overriding vision that transcended the particularities of the documents.”²⁸ In terms of interpreting the different documents, this coherence needs to be considered. Furthermore, the overriding importance of the four constitutions was also recognized at the council, and the bishops at their 1985 Synod declared that these constitutions provided the “orientation” for all of the documents, which formed a “coherent corpus.”²⁹ When analysing *Gravissimum Educationis*, the Declaration on Christian Education, and in determining intentionality, this coherence must therefore provide the analytical framework.

What also must be considered is the overall impact of the council on Catholic identity. According to O’Malley, the issue of Catholic identity was perhaps the most controversial at the council, and most of the “great battles” involved this issue.³⁰ Catholic identity had been defined by the “Catholic mind,” sustained by an educational system based on integralism, classicism, and the fundamental belief that Church doctrine was immutable. Vatican II represented the “massive breakthrough” in the words of Lonergan—a shattering of this mindset that led to a serious identity crisis after the council. In analysing the Declaration on Christian Education, the “great debates” concerning Catholic identity must be taken into account.

Analysis of the Declaration

The new style of discourse is evident throughout the Declaration, reflecting the bishops’ clear intention in terms of meaning in certain aspects of the document. Nowhere to be found are the power words that emphasize threats, punishments, and obedience. The traditional “legislative and judicial” model of authority was abandoned. Emphasized instead were the rights of the individual believer. For example, unlike with Pius XI’s 1929 encyclical, *On Christian Education*, in which the Church’s supreme role in education is emphasized, its role in the Declaration is understood as being in partnership with both the school and the parents.³¹ No longer were parents ordered to send their children to Catholic schools, but rather were to enjoy “the fullest liberty in their choice of school.”³² Here, the principle of subsidiarity is invoked, with the parents recognized as an authentic authority. The “public authority” must therefore provide the necessary funds to Catholic schools so that parents are “truly free” to select schools for their children.³³ The lack of power words also indicated that the Church was somewhat humbler, more willing to admit that it did not yet know everything, and that it was not the inheritor of an immutable deposit of the faith that it needed to defend and protect—it accepted the concept of mystery. Students therefore should be introduced to “the knowledge of the mystery of salvation” and contribute to “the growth of the ‘Mystical Body.’”³⁴

Absent as well is the strict Neo-Thomism that permeated Pius XI's encyclical. Thomas Aquinas is only mentioned once as an example of how to approach "new and current" scientific questions by maintaining "the harmony of faith and science."³⁵ What is critical here is that it is the method of St. Thomas that is emphasized, not his philosophy—a method of "doing philosophy" as Etienne Gilson emphasized—which involved research and inquiry.³⁶ Such a method was appropriate since the concept of immutable doctrine had also been abandoned. The Declaration clearly states that the role of the "Faculties of Sacred Sciences" is to "promote research in the different fields of sacred learning" and "to ensure that an ever-growing understanding of sacred revelation be achieved, that the inheritance of Christian wisdom handed down by former generations be more fully appreciated...and that the questions arising from the development of thought be duly solved."³⁷ Thus, the Declaration embodied the new understanding of the role of tradition in the Church—the concept of a living tradition that had first been developed by Möhler, Newman, and the new theologians.

The style of discourse in the Declaration indicated another major shift away from the pure objectivity of strict Neo-Thomism. Words of inner transformation are throughout the document, emphasizing the subjectivity of the individual believer. When the Declaration discussed the parents' right to select a school for their children, it was to be "in accordance with their conscience."³⁸ Secular governments had to provide Catholic schools in order to preserve "the liberty of conscience."³⁹ Students had the right to "be stimulated to make sound moral judgments based on a well-formed conscience and to put them into practice with a sense of personal commitment."⁴⁰ They also should learn "how to give witness to the hope that is in them." Even the right to a Christian education is justified, not by the authority of the Church, but by the inner transformation of individuals reborn "in water and the Holy Spirit" who are "children of God."⁴¹ Students should be trained "to live their lives in the new self, justified and sanctified through the truth."⁴² Rather than being defined in terms of objective understanding of Church doctrine or the shaping of the will, the purpose of catechetical instruction is defined as a process that "develops a life in harmony with the spirit of Christ, stimulates a conscious and fervent participation in the liturgical mystery and encourages men to take an active part in the apostolate."⁴³ With such an emphasis on inner spirituality, the source of stimulation, and encouragement, the role of the Church is one of guidance and invitation, not one of legislation or judgement.

This emphasis on the individual's inner transformation also needs to be understood in the context of the more positive attitude toward humanity itself, as reflected in the constitutions of Vatican II. Since the constitutions provide the orientation for all of the conciliar documents, the Declaration must be read in the context of these constitutions. *Lumen Gentium*, the dogmatic constitution, emphasizes the dignity of the laity and its "exalted duty of working for the ever greater spread of the divine plan of salvation to all men."⁴⁴ In article 14 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the constitution on sacred liturgy, the laity is encouraged to participate more in the liturgy, to assume a

more active role worthy of “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people (1 Pet. 2:9, 4-5).”⁴⁵ In *Gaudium et Spes*, the pastoral constitution, an entire chapter is entitled “The Dignity of the Human Person.” This positive attitude is in direct contrast to the attitude evident in Pope Pius XI’s 1929 encyclical On Christian Education, *Divini Illius Magistri*, with its emphasis on sin. For example, Pope Pius XI emphasized the importance of traditional and influential Renaissance educator Cardinal Silvio Antoniano, who stressed humanity’s “misery and inclination to sin.”⁴⁶ *Gaudium et Spes* refers to sin, but emphasizes redemption, hope, and how the world has “been freed from the slavery of sin by Christ, who was crucified and rose again in order to break the stranglehold of the evil one, so that it might be fashioned anew according to God’s design and brought to its fulfilment.”⁴⁷ In article 3, this positive attitude is again clear: Christ entered this world to “bear witness to the truth, to save and not to judge, to serve and not to be served.”⁴⁸ The influence of the Vatican II constitutions, in particular *Gaudium et Spes*, on the Declaration is evident in its overall positive attitude and its lack of emphasis on the sinful nature of humanity. Indeed, in the preface of the Declaration, an increasing awareness of the “dignity and position” of the human person is emphasized.⁴⁹

Despite the new style of discourse that reflected a new approach to education that the bishops clearly intended, the Declaration nonetheless still represented continuity with regard to earlier Church teachings, particularly Pius XI’s 1929 encyclical, *Divini Illius Magistri*. This encyclical was quoted ten times in the notes of the Declaration.⁵⁰ Along with the new style and the subsequent new meaning, the bishops intended to defend and promote fundamental Catholic educational principles that were long-held positions of the Church, which, in other words, were part of the living tradition. What had changed was the manner in which the Church defended and promoted them, as the changes in the style of discourse indicated. In several articles, the Church’s traditional position in terms of the importance of the common good of the community was upheld. In the Declaration, the Church did emphasize the role of the individual conscience, a major shift in emphasis and understanding, but it nevertheless maintained its traditional position on the proper balance between individual rights and the common good of the community. In the very first article, the relationship between the individual and the community was highlighted: “True education is directed towards the formation of the human person in view of his final end and the good of that society to which he belongs and in the duties, as an adult, he will have a share.”⁵¹ Furthermore, the skills learned by a child should be employed in pursuit of the common good.⁵² This overall purpose of a Catholic education—the “formation of individuals who will be good citizens”—had not changed since the time of Augustine.⁵³ The role of educator was also a shared one that included the parents, the state, and the Church.⁵⁴ The Declaration, in other words, defended the traditional concept of the Catholic social order wherein the Church determined the nature of the common good.

Much of the Declaration also reflected the Church's traditional opposition to certain aspects of "progressive" education—the "current tendencies" in education that made social progress "the sole yard-stick of the educational system."⁵⁵ The Church took a stand against the tendency in which "learning, fact-finding and instruction are all too easily confused with the whole human education."⁵⁶ Nine of the twelve articles of the Declaration discuss these tendencies.⁵⁷ The Declaration also understood the purpose of education to be "building up religious and moral social structures" as the Church understood them.⁵⁸ The Church's "redemptive mission in the world of education" was highlighted throughout the Declaration as its "dominant leitmotif."⁵⁹

Other traditional principles were articulated in the different articles. In the first article, "The Meaning of the Universal Right to an Education," the Church emphasized the need to educate all children no matter their intellectual ability,⁶⁰ and exhorted those who were "in control of education to make it their care to ensure that young people are never deprived of this sacred right."⁶¹ A student's self-esteem and sense of self-worth was based on being a child of God, not academic achievement. The Declaration also stressed academic excellence, and that it was possible to educate all students and maintain academically rigorous programmes.⁶² Furthermore, parents were encouraged to demand that their children receive a religious education "to a degree that is abreast of their development in secular subjects."⁶³ The importance of ensuring the "cultural legacy bequeathed to them by former generations" was highlighted.⁶⁴ The pursuit of knowledge was also a consistent theme. Indeed, the Declaration concludes with an exhortation for educators to "strive so to excel in inspiring their pupils with the spirit of Christ, in their mastery of the art of teaching, and in their zeal for learning that they may not only promote the internal renewal of the Church but also maintain and augment its beneficial presence in the world today and especially in the intellectual sphere."⁶⁵

Another traditional principle of Catholic education was also emphasized: the Church was opposed to any form of state monopoly on education, although in practice it was willing to partner with the state to gain control of the public system, as in the case of Spain under Franco. The danger of too much state control was a major concern, at least from the time of Pius VII (1800–1823).⁶⁶ In Article 6, the issue of public funding was addressed. The right of parents to send their children to Catholic schools was asserted, but it also declared that official recognition of this right was insufficient. Sufficient public funding must be provided. Otherwise, the Church could not fulfil its mandate to educate all Catholics, including those without the financial means to send their children to private schools. There also should be no "practical administrative measures which makes this right ineffective."⁶⁷ The state must not impose a "monopoly of schools" wherein the Catholic schools lacked the freedom to defend and promote Catholic education.⁶⁸ In his analysis of the Declaration, Johannes Pohlschneider expressed in no uncertain terms the position of the Church: "There is an uncompromising rejection of any kind of State monopoly of schools. The school legislation of every State must be tested against this principle. This would show that in

many States, which boast of democracy, there is in fact a school monopoly, not always extending to the entire system, but covering very large areas.”⁶⁹ If the independence of Catholic schools was hindered by any form of state monopoly, the principles of Catholic education would be very difficult to uphold.

Thus, the Declaration clearly articulated traditional Catholic principles of education, while at the same time reflecting the new understanding of a living tradition in abandoning Neo-Thomism, and in adopting the new style of discourse along with the subsequent meanings. In harmony with the constitutions and the other conciliar documents, the Declaration rejected the traditional hierarchical power structure, emphasized the importance of the inner transformation of the individual believer, and projected a more positive view of humanity. Despite these changes in orientation, the Declaration remained a deeply flawed document. It lacked substance. O’Malley emphasizes that in terms of determining meaning, the new style of discourse and the document’s content must be considered in unison. The style of discourse, in other words, gave meaning to the content. With the Declaration, however, the problem was the lack of content. This problem was the result of the underlining flaw of the Declaration: the lack of clarity concerning the relationship between education and the modern world. Superficially, the Declaration expressed a “new attitude of openness to the world.”⁷⁰ This new attitude was clear from the tone of the Declaration compared with that of Pope Pius XI’s 1929 encyclical, which was defensive with a strong emphasis on Church authority. A more open approach towards modern educational methods was also noticeable in the Declaration compared to the earlier encyclical.⁷¹ This openness was reflected as well in a new concern for Catholics in non-Catholic schools.⁷² Article 8 on Catholic schools, the “heart” of the Declaration,⁷³ stated that the Catholic school must be “open...to the situation of the contemporary world.” Acknowledging the need for a Catholic school to be engaged in the modern world, the Declaration also emphasized its role “in developing the mission of the People of God and in promoting dialogue between the Church and the community at large to the advantage of both.”⁷⁴

What was meant by openness remained, however, vague. Educators were provided with little direction as to how Catholic education should adapt to the modern world. This was in part due to the tensions between the conservative and progressive forces within the Church. One of the most controversial issues involved the degree of importance that should be accorded to Thomas Aquinas, whose philosophy had dominated Catholic education since Leo XIII’s *Aeterni Patris*.⁷⁵ A lack of consensus concerning the meaning of education in different parts of the world resulted in many vague statements, such as highlighting the importance of modern communications in allowing people to avail themselves of “their birthright of culture of mind and spirit.”⁷⁶ Since it underwent several revisions, the Declaration had a “tortured history,” and just before the bishops voted, criticism of the document was still “widespread and wide ranging.”⁷⁷ The bishops almost rejected the document—a fate avoided for two reasons:

the obvious need to address the problems of education, and the decision to deal with these problems in the future.⁷⁸ It was stated in the introduction of the Declaration: “Accordingly the sacred Synod hereby promulgates some fundamental principles of Christian education, especially in regard to schools. These principles should be more fully developed by a special postconciliar commission and should be adapted to different local circumstances by episcopal conferences.”⁷⁹ The overall weakness of the document was also indicated by the use of the term declaration, since it was reserved for topics that proved too controversial to be formal decrees.⁸⁰ Even one of the principal authors of the Declaration, Father Dezza, stated that it was marked by a “generality” caused by the complexity of the issues.⁸¹ Cardinal Ratzinger also commented in 1966 that the Declaration was a weak document, and that “the text wasn’t treated by the council fathers with any special affection.”⁸² Bishop Emmett Carter agreed with this overall assessment, contending that the document brought “some clarification, if only to establish that the church has not changed its traditional positions.”⁸³

The weakness of the Declaration was most noticeable in its lack of vision. For example, even though the Declaration did recognize the importance of a living tradition, it did not elaborate on it in any depth. In the other conciliar documents, this concept of a living tradition was connected to a renewed understanding of God’s relationship with the world and a “recovery of the personal reality of tradition for the believer.”⁸⁴ This was especially true of *Dei Verbum*, which articulated a “dynamic and interpersonal account of revelation.”⁸⁵ Vatican II understood revelation as God speaking to human beings as “friends” invited to a relationship with God, a relationship that called for a commitment of one’s “whole self.”⁸⁶ The relationship between scripture and tradition was also viewed differently, not as two separate sources of revelation, but as “intrinsically bound up with each other.”⁸⁷ None of this complexity was captured in the Declaration, none of the richness of *Dei Verbum*. Nor did the Declaration inspire. It failed in the ultimate purpose of the panegyric literary genre: to excite the “emulation of an ideal.” Highlighting this failure, Emmett Carter commented after Vatican II that the Declaration “didn’t speak to me or make me want to shout ‘This thing is marvellous.’”⁸⁸

As a result of this fundamental flaw, educators were not given any clear direction in terms of how Catholic education should adapt to the modern world. Unlike Pope Pius XI’s 1929 encyclical, a definitive educative statement that set the agenda for the next thirty years, no such agenda was set after Vatican II. The Declaration was unclear, leading to major difficulties “for the development of a coherent approach to education in the period immediately following the council.”⁸⁹ Educators were therefore in the position of defending and promoting traditional Catholic principles of education, but without any clear direction as to how to be open to the modern world. Thus, the Declaration concluded with a call for action, urging the universal Church to defend and promote these fundamental traditional principles, and later to clarify and develop them further in the context of an increasingly secular world.⁹⁰

Despite the overall lack of clarity, the Declaration did point to a possible new direction for educators after the council—a direction with roots in the subjectivism that triumphed at Vatican II and in the conviction that the subject had the intellectual ability to abstract, to understand, and to judge. This subjectivism was expressed in the new emphasis on the inner transformation of the individual, who possessed undeniable rights. The Declaration upheld the right of the individual to be given the opportunity to experience this inner transformation and to form intelligent judgements. Even the existence of Catholic schools was justified by the individual's right to an inner transformation. A major goal of catechetical instruction was to stimulate the individual to take a more active role as a Christian. Students should be trained “to live their lives in the new self.” The individual also had the right to be “stimulated to make sound moral judgments.” One of the major tasks of schools was to develop within the students “a capacity for sound judgment.”⁹¹ Thus, this combination of an inner transformation and an intellectual ability to understand and to judge could provide the framework for a new possible direction for Catholic education in a post-Vatican II era. After Vatican II, it was no longer palatable to have secondary students learn by rote memory from a magisterial-sanctioned textbook permeated with strict Neo-Thomism. Catholic educators needed to focus on the students' inner transformation and their intellectual ability. Intriguingly, this new direction was not that new. It could be found in the method of Thomas, particularly as it was articulated in transcendental Neo-Thomism with its two powerful ideas: the subject's “inner drives” to desire God through “a dynamic openness to absolute being,” in the words of Maréchal, and the subject's ability to abstract, to understand, and to judge.

Chapter Five: The Conditions of Reception for the Reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Christian Education

It is no surprise that the Declaration on Christian Education did not set the agenda for Catholic education, and that there was a degree of uncertainty about how to move forward, not only in education, but in terms of how to proceed with modernizing the Church given the societal changes that occurred during the post-World War II period. A growing sense of uncertainty emerged at the Council, as the “great battles” concerned Church identity, not fundamental dogmas. All of the major issues concerned identity and the question of how to maintain it while at the same time embracing the “inevitability of change.”¹ The Church was coming to grips with the decline of the classicist Catholic culture, and with the emergence of a new dominant secular culture that the majority of Catholics had embraced. In the 1960s, the conditions of reception for the reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Christian Education challenged the authority of the Church, decreased its overall influence, led to fundamental changes in secondary education, and ushered in a period of considerable confusion.

The Process of Secularization and the Dominant Culture

One of the most significant conditions of reception was the process of secularization itself. Understood as a process that “weakened traditional religious faith, affiliations and practices along with insisting upon a stronger distinction/separation between religion and education,”² secularization led to the erosion of the dominant culture in Canada, and indeed to the end of “Christendom” in the western world.³ According to Hugh McLeod, secularization resulted from a multitude of factors with deep roots in the history of Western Europe.⁴ McLeod argues that the 1960s was the “hinge decade”

between the more religiously oriented 1940s and 1950s and the more secular 1970s and 1980s.⁵ For centuries, Christianity had formed the cultural hegemony in Canada, where the dominant culture remained fundamentally Christian even into the 1960s when society became increasingly secular.⁶ As late as 1965, 83 percent of Canadian Catholics still went to church on a regular basis.⁷ In Ontario public schools, religion was a mandatory course until 1969.⁸ Christianity also continued to hold a prominent place in terms of how the country understood itself, as religious symbols and rituals still assumed a significant public role well into the 1960s. Throughout the decade, Parliament opened with the Speaker of the House reciting non-sectarian Christian prayers.⁹ When the new Canadian flag was adopted in 1965, the ceremony included a prayer service at the request of Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson.¹⁰ A non-denominational prayer service was also a part of the Centennial celebrations on Parliament Hill.¹¹ At the same time, however, after World War II, this Christian hegemony, which included a profound attachment to the British Empire, began to be seriously undermined. Even though most Catholics did not share in this attachment, since the vast majority were either French or Irish, and thus did not fully share in this dominant cultural hegemony, its gradual erosion had a profound impact on Catholic classicist culture, especially in English Canada, where Catholics were a minority and where they had established their own subculture much like in the United States, a “ghetto Catholicism.” Nonetheless, despite the anti-Catholicism in English Canada, the dominant Christian, albeit Protestant, cultural hegemony helped to shelter Catholics from secularism, since both Protestants and Catholics shared the same fundamental Christian beliefs. Both Protestants and Catholics also shared the same moral code in terms of private and public behaviour,¹² with the mainstream churches invested with a privileged status as “possessors of moral authority” as far as the government was concerned.¹³ When this dominant Christian hegemony finally collapsed, Catholics found themselves living in a secular society vastly different from the one in which many of them had been born and raised. It was a secular society that was less anti-Catholic, but which posed new challenges as Catholics were exposed to the powerful forces of the secularization process, resulting in the decline and eventual collapse of their own distinct Catholic classicist culture that had sustained them for centuries. It is in the context of this decline that the reception of the reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Christian Education must be understood.

An Increasingly Pluralistic Society

An essential aspect of the secularization process that undermined the dominant Christian culture was the increasing cultural pluralism that became evident especially during the hinge decade of the 1960s. Ever since the end of World War II, Canada had gradually become a more pluralistic society. Even by 1941, Canadians of British

descent no longer formed the majority.¹⁴ After the war, Canadians also became more receptive to ethnic diversity, largely because of the horrors of the war and the Holocaust. With Canada playing an active role in the United Nations and with increasing globalization, Canadians became somewhat more internationalist in their attitudes, leading to more tolerance towards ethnic minorities.¹⁵ In 1956–57, this new attitude was evident in the Canadian government's response to the Soviet suppression of a popular revolt in Hungary, when thousands of Hungarians were admitted to Canada.¹⁶ A new era of openness in terms of immigration began in 1962, when the Conservative government of John Diefenbaker no longer used "race," a loosely used term usually referring to "white peoples" from Great Britain, northern Europe, and the United States as a criteria for the selection of immigrants.¹⁷ Later in the 1960s, the Liberal government of Lester B. Pearson continued this open immigration policy, admitting immigrants from non-traditional regions such as southern Europe and Asia.¹⁸ Between 1947 and 1966, approximately 1.6 million non-British immigrants came to Canada, and in any given year after 1948, the number of "displaced persons, refugees and migrants" was greater than the total number during the 1930s.¹⁹ Urban centres became more cosmopolitan, especially Toronto,²⁰ and by 1961, immigrants or new Canadians represented 25.2 percent of the population.²¹ As Canadians became more open to cultural diversity, their understanding of democratic and liberal values underwent a major shift. For decades, Canadians had assumed that these values were intrinsically connected to their Christian beliefs, that Christianity gave birth to these values, and therefore it was essential to maintain the dominant Christian culture of Canada.²² After the war, however, with increased exposure to different religions and cultures, this fundamental connection was broken. Liberal and democratic values continued to be cherished, but most Canadians no longer held that they were primarily "Christian values," but that peoples of other cultures and religions could share them.²³

During the 1960s, ethnic and religious minorities also became more vocal and less inclined to tolerate the dominance of the mainstream Christian churches, refusing to abandon their own cultural and religious traditions in order to be accepted as Canadians.²⁴ When, for example, the Pearson government established the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1963 as a response to the strengthening separatist movement in Quebec, many ethnic Canadians openly opposed the notion of Canada as a bicultural country.²⁵ The growing impact of pluralism in Canada was evident in the government's 1967 Centennial celebrations and Expo 67, when a concerted effort was made to strike a balance between recognizing the dominant Christian culture by including prayer services and acknowledging the increasing cultural diversity by presenting a vision of Canada as a "religiously and ethnically neutral" country.²⁶ By the late 1960s, Canada was increasingly understood as a multi-cultural country, leading to the federal government's adoption of the policy of multiculturalism.²⁷ What was clear was that cultural pluralism had undermined the dominant Christian culture of English Canada with its British roots, leaving Canada, in

the words of writer Hugh MacLennan, as a country that had “out-travelled its own soul and now is forced to search frantically for a new identity.”²⁸ The impact of this cultural pluralism did not go unnoticed among Catholic educators. One of Canada’s most distinguished among them, John T. McIlhone, noted in 1966 that the declining influence of Protestantism, not only in Canada but throughout western world, posed a threat to Catholic culture. In somewhat exaggerated terms, he commented, “Sixty years ago, no Catholic would have deplored the disappearance of the Protestant. Then, all sects regarded each other with distrust—but the one thing they held in common was their assessment of values. Protestant, Catholic, and Jew generally agreed on what was right and what was wrong. But today, this is not the case.”²⁹

Affluence, Consumerism, and Suburban Life: Impact of the Baby Boomers

Aside from cultural pluralism, another major factor in the secularization process was the impact of the so-called baby boomer generation on society, which contributed to the major shift in terms of values as a more affluent and consumer-oriented society developed. Combined with the impact of cultural pluralism, this major shift further undermined the dominant Christian values. Benefitting from a long period of post-war prosperity from 1945 to the late 1950s, a period characterized by increased industrialization and rapid urbanization, most Canadians were able to find secure employment, unlike before the war.³⁰ Anxious to enjoy what they considered a “normal life” after years of economic depression and war, they “settled down” and raised large families.³¹ In order to accommodate their needs, suburbs expanded in most cities across North America.³² Despite the evidence that a religious revival occurred during this period, with most Christian denominations, particularly the United and Anglican churches, experiencing impressive growth, most scholars contend that this revival was an expression of the intense desire to “return to normalcy,” and “going to church” was considered as an accepted social norm.³³ The revival, in other words, did not represent a deepening of the faith.³⁴ It was also largely a suburban phenomenon, where new churches were built to accommodate the growing population, whereas in small towns and inner city areas, few signs of any revival could be found.³⁵ Rather than evidence of a profound spiritual revival, the increasing number of new churches reflected not only a desire for normalcy, but the affluence of suburban life in that the construction of many of these churches depended on donations.³⁶ At the same time, the Canadian government increasingly provided the social welfare services that the churches had traditionally supplied, somewhat undermining their relevancy. What characterized this period was therefore not a religious revival, but the emergence of an affluent society of consumers. After years of “self-restraint and deferred gratification,” long considered to be “cardinal virtues,” the post-war prosperity offered immediate comfort and

pleasure—the benefits of a consumer society which “overshadowed, if they did not entirely subvert, the forces of religious revival.”³⁷ Most parents wanted to provide their children with the consumer goods that they themselves had never possessed in the pre-war years. A general consensus exists among scholars that the values of consumerism and affluence, in other words, a desire for material goods, gradually became dominant.³⁸ Given their increasing numbers, children and teenagers became a major commercial focus for entrepreneurs—a “material mainstay of capitalist production” that coincided with the “rising ideology and actuality of affluence.”³⁹ Even the child expert Dr. Spock, who enjoyed enormous popularity among baby boomer families, contended that “when children show a unusual craving for something...we’ve got to assume that it has a positive, constructive value for them.”⁴⁰ According to Nancy Christie, leisure also replaced work as the “fundamental nexus” of cultural values and morality, with even church attendance “redefined as a leisure activity” as churches were social centres where families and friends met and which provided social activities such as youth groups for their children.⁴¹ In the final analysis, the fundamental impact of affluence and consumerism was the overall “absence of social reproduction of religious values within the family.”⁴²

A New Emerging Cultural Hegemony: Individualism within a Democratic Context

With the gradual decline of the dominant Christian culture in an increasingly pluralistic, affluent society, a new cultural hegemony was emerging during the 1960s centred on individualism and the democratic rights of the individual—a hegemony that undermined the traditional Catholic classicist culture. In both Canada and the United States, ghetto Catholicism was coming to an end as many Catholics participated in the post-war prosperity and moved to the suburbs. Instead of being isolated from different religions and cultures, Catholics were now being assimilated into the mainstream culture.⁴³ Individualism, with its commitment to the core values of freedom, tolerance, and individual rights,⁴⁴ was emerging as the major feature of North American society. The rights of the individual were understood to be more important than the rights of the community, since individuals themselves determined their own set of values and morals.⁴⁵ In a society that was child-centred “to an unparalleled degree” because of the baby boom, and in which young people were convinced that society was “designed for them” given the degree of attention that they received from child-experts such as Dr. Spock and from entrepreneurs, it not surprising that individualism became a hallmark of the era.⁴⁶

This individualism was strengthened by a growing concern for democracy. A new awareness of the fragility of democracy itself and the need to preserve and defend democratic values was evident after the defeat of the totalitarian regimes during World

War II, an awareness that was accentuated by the Cold War and the perceived threat of international communism. Education played a critical role in emphasizing the importance of both democracy and individual rights. Three themes appeared in textbooks during the 1950s, including those used in Catholic schools, warning students of the dangers of authoritarianism: democracy, tolerance, and inclusiveness.⁴⁷ Young people were therefore conditioned to be wary of authoritarianism in all its forms. As Justice John Hope emphasized in his 1950 Ontario Royal Commission on Education, “two world wars within one generation, with the consequent social upheaval, have focussed attention upon the need for an adequate preparation of our young people for the responsibilities of citizenship.”⁴⁸ By the 1960s, individualism, understood in the context of democracy, had emerged as a prominent feature of a North American society where “the concept of authority flows from within the self.”⁴⁹

The Crisis of Authority and Christianity

At the same time that this new concept of authority was developing, North America was experiencing a crisis in terms of traditional authority. When the civil rights movement gathered steam in the mid-1950s, the youth were more inclined to be critical of their own society and government—especially after the assassination of American President John F. Kennedy in 1963. Taught to be critical of authority, they also viewed international crises differently from their parents, who tended to be loyal to the state against the communist threat of the Cold War. When the international situation took a turn for the worse in the 1960s, with the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, the invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, and the escalation in American involvement in Vietnam, young people blamed the government and took to the streets in protest. In Canada, the situation was further intensified by the Quebec separatist movement that threatened the authority of the federal government, undermining its very legitimacy in the minds of many Quebecois. A “crisis of authority” marked the 1960s. Young people questioned the “received wisdom” of the adult world, of the “Establishment,”⁵⁰ resulting in a proliferation of protest movements, youth radicalism, and the sexual revolution as the dominant social conservative mores and the institution of marriage itself were challenged as never before.

Reform became the rallying cry of the era, a cry that was not only uttered by the youth but also by social critics and public intellectuals, who were extremely critical of what they considered the dominant conservative and conformist structures of authority, and the “banality” of middle class suburban life that had resulted in the “sterility of postwar affluence.”⁵¹ Their ideas also exemplified the new belief in the significance of the individual. Among the most popular public intellectuals were William H. Whyte, with his 1956 *The Organization Man*, and John Kenneth Galbraith, with his 1958 *The Affluent Society*. Both Whyte and Galbraith emphasized the need for “the

creative individual” who would rise above this “banality” and “sterility” to provide the leadership necessary to overcome the traditional authority structures and reform society.⁵² Such social critics and public scholars expressed considerable faith in the social sciences and technology as sources of knowledge for individuals as they made important life decisions. The average North American increasingly placed more trust in these sources rather than in traditional authorities such as churches.⁵³

Pierre Berton and *The Comfortable Pew*

One of the most influential books in Canada during the 1960s was Pierre Berton’s 1965 study, *The Comfortable Pew: A Critical Look at Christianity and the Religious Establishment in the New Age*, which captured the spirit of the “new age,” as he positioned himself as both social critic and public intellectual with numerous references to studies by leading scholars such as Whyte and Galbraith.⁵⁴ Calling for a new creative individual, a “modern day prophet,” who would arise from modern media and not from any church, Berton openly criticized Christianity itself.⁵⁵ Never before had Christian churches in Canada experienced such a degree of criticism. Even though Berton was specifically criticizing the Anglican Church in a “systematic and comprehensive attack,” all Christian churches were implicated in his criticism.⁵⁶

Among Berton’s most severe criticisms was the inability of churches to say anything relevant to people about the “twentieth century world in which they live.”⁵⁷ They had failed to escape the past. As a result, churches had failed to assume a leadership position in terms of social justice, ignoring the pressing problems of the age.⁵⁸ In a particularly damning chapter titled “The Tyranny of the Religious Establishment,” Berton criticized churches for becoming too affluent, mocking the “so-called religious revival,” and commenting that “the cliché phrase used in a thousand magazine titles ‘How I...Found God’ has become a classic joke inside and outside of the trade.”⁵⁹ Emphasizing that church property had reached the “one-billion mark,” with over 200 new churches built in the last decade, Berton contended that a “successful church is like a successful business.”⁶⁰ A pastor’s success rested in his ability to be an effective “organization man” who worked well with his parishioners, especially the affluent members, to raise funds for his church, and who was careful not to bother them with “too many abrasive points of Christian conscience.”⁶¹ As for the parishioners themselves, Berton cited several social scientists who were critical of the suburban middle class in general, and who contended that people selected a specific church or parish depending on its business and social success rather than for its doctrinal position.⁶² Berton also called into question the need for Christian doctrine in his chapter, “Faith without Dogma,” asking “why, in the New Age, is dogma necessary at all?”⁶³ By arguing that the Christian faith would only be accepted in this “New Age” once people no longer needed to “accept a whole body of specific beliefs,” Berton

separated faith from dogma.⁶⁴ Church doctrine had become “fossilized” and needed to become more flexible and adapt to the new liberal and secular age.⁶⁵ In brief, Berton argued for a Christianity “free from doctrinal structures,”⁶⁶ a faith of ethics suitable for the “New Age.”

Berton’s critical appraisal enjoyed widespread influence as a result of the enormous success of *The Comfortable Pew*. Within six months of its publication in January 1965, 150,000 copies had been printed, far surpassing the publishing success of any prior book in Canadian history.⁶⁷ Berton also received over 3,000 letters in the first ten months after the first publication, most of which were very supportive.⁶⁸ Its influence was extended even further as an extensive debate ensued after the enormous popularity of *The Comfortable Pew* became obvious. What is intriguing, however, is that even his critics accepted his overall thesis that the Christian faith need not be concerned with the “unessential,” that is, doctrine.⁶⁹ His success as he appeared on television in several interviews and panel discussions in order to promote his book also revealed the authority that the social sciences and the new technology now possessed as sources of knowledge for the average Canadian. He also articulated a widespread public sense of discontent with regard to the traditional dominant position that the churches held. The ultimate impact of *The Comfortable Pew* was in its contribution to undermining “the public authority of the church by subordinating the church to the media as the arbiter of the intersection between religion, culture, and politics in modern Canadian society.”⁷⁰ Most Canadians accepted the notion that the churches now formed only a “minority voice” within Canadian culture.⁷¹

Catholics and Church Authority: The Contraception Debate

Given the extent to which Catholics had become assimilated into the mainstream culture by the mid-1960s, many of them also accepted the notion that churches only formed a minority voice in Canada. For most Catholics, however, another issue played a decisive role in undermining Church authority, an issue that had little impact on Protestant North Americans: the Catholic Church’s prohibition on the use of contraceptives. Although it was once accepted as a “proud if onerous badge of Catholic identity,”⁷² most North American Catholics ignored the prohibition when Pope Paul VI reaffirmed it in his 1968 encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*, opening the door for Catholics to ignore other Church teachings and doctrines that were taught in Catholic schools. During the early baby boom years, most Catholics were not too concerned about the prohibition since having a large family was considered normal, but by the mid-1950s, when many Catholic families were prosperous, more women were joining the work force, and smaller families had become the norm, dissent was more noticeable.⁷³ By the early 1950s, many Catholics disagreed with the Church’s position even while they continued to obey the prohibition.⁷⁴ Adding to the growing Catholic

frustration were the seemingly contradictory messages from the Church: ever since the 1930s, the Church's teaching on marriage had emphasized the importance of a healthy sexual relationship, but at the same time declared that the sole purpose of this relationship was to produce children.⁷⁵ With Vatican II, the frustration and tension in the Catholic community heightened, especially when ecumenism became a widely discussed topic. For some Catholics, this meant that Protestants practising birth control could be "candidates for heaven" whereas if Catholics used contraceptives, they might not be.⁷⁶ Invoking the language of the Council, particularly phrases such as "pilgrim church" and "people of God," many Catholics understood the Church as becoming a more egalitarian institution even if this was not the bishops' intention.⁷⁷ Vatican II's emphasis on the role of the individual conscience also appealed to Catholics, who lived in an increasingly individualistic society, as did its call for a more active role in the Church for the laity.

It was no coincidence, then, that in the early 1960s, the laity found its voice when it came to the contraceptive issue, and in the spirit of the age, Catholic social critics and public intellectuals emerged. One of the most significant individuals was John Rock, a Boston gynecologist at the Harvard Medical School, whose 1963 publication *The Time Has Come: A Catholic Doctor's Proposal to End the Battle over Birth Control* had an enormous impact. Advocating for the end of the prohibition on birth control, Rock was adept at publicizing his message. He wrote for popular magazines such as *Life* and emerged as an "authoritative television presence."⁷⁸ Since Rock's book was published during the "excitement" of Vatican II, when other Catholic issues were being aired, the American media became convinced that Catholic dissent over contraception was a "safe, even profitable, topic to explore."⁷⁹ Quite suddenly, a topic that few Catholics had ever discussed publicly became an intriguing subject for the media. By mid-1964, almost all Catholics were aware that the Church's teaching was under public attack.⁸⁰ In April 1967, the debate intensified when the lay owned and edited newspaper the *National Catholic Reporter* published the until then secret majority report of the papal commission studying the contraception issue that called for an end to the prohibition.⁸¹ Across North America, the report was widely discussed in both the secular and Catholic media, with the result that the majority of Catholics expected the church to amend its teaching.⁸² When *Humanae Vitae* was released, it was therefore received with an "unprecedented storm of protest"⁸³ that undermined the authority of the Church.

Not only was the authority of the Church now seriously questioned, the new authority of the media was further enhanced. Simplifying the issue, the media reaction was mostly hostile, with few people ever reading the encyclical.⁸⁴ *Humanae Vitae* did not simply re-affirm the prohibition, but instead acknowledged the changing role of women in society and the subsequent difficulties that married couples faced. Priests were instructed to be lenient in confession with parishioners using birth control, which was no longer considered a mortal sin, but rather "a minor offense against morality."⁸⁵

It did not matter. The judgement of the media was decisive. The Pope had acted against the “spirit of the council” in failing to consult his bishops, ignoring the commission’s recommendation, and not recognizing the importance of individual conscience.⁸⁶ As a result, a divided Catholic community had reached its “Rubicon”: did they obey the pope as the majority traditionally had in North America, or did they cross the Rubicon and follow their own conscience? The majority crossed the river.⁸⁷ In Canada, the crossing was facilitated by the bishops who, in their Winnipeg Statement, recognized the primacy of individual conscience, declaring that if Catholics followed their informed conscience and used contraceptives, they should not “consider themselves in sin.”⁸⁸ Yet, the journey had not been an easy one; most Catholics had only gradually accepted the concept of individual moral autonomy since they were accustomed to obeying Church teachings, and they “agonized” over the contraception issue.⁸⁹ By the late 1960s, however, a “Reformation of sorts” had occurred within the Church—in the “minds and hearts of the people if not in terms of ecclesiastical structure”—as individual Catholics assumed a sense of moral autonomy. They would decide for themselves which Church teachings to follow.⁹⁰ Ultimately, then, the contraceptive debate played a key role in not only undermining the authority of the Church, but in removing a significant “badge of honour” that had distinguished Catholics from their fellow citizens. Combined with the reforms of Vatican II that removed some of the more distinctive Catholic practices, such as the use of Latin and the mandatory Friday abstinence from meat, changes that impacted the daily lives of Catholics, and the declining popularity of the traditional devotion to the saints and to the Virgin Mary, the acceptance of individual moral autonomy removed the “final bricks” of the “ghetto wall.”⁹¹

An Assertive Laity

As the contraception debate revealed, another significant condition of reception for the reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Education was the new assertiveness of the laity within the Catholic Church. By the 1960s, the Catholic laity was more willing to be outspoken and critical of the Church in complete contrast to their traditional obedience and docility.⁹² Not surprisingly, much of the criticism came from Catholics living in the suburbs, where almost “every aspect of Church life” was questioned.⁹³ Many well-educated Catholics were more inclined to criticize the Church, especially for its authoritarianism and moralism, and had a considerable understanding of the new theology even before Vatican II.⁹⁴ The 1960s were definitely the hinge decade for many educated Catholics in that they were becoming more secular, yet they remained very devout, possessing a “strong and vital spiritual zeal.” What they demanded was a more meaningful role in the Church, particularly during the years when the Vatican Council was in session as well as afterwards.⁹⁵

A major reason why the laity became more demanding and assertive was the new understanding of its role within the Church that emerged from Vatican II, a new understanding with roots in the major pre-conciliar theological developments. In the 1930s and 1940s, theologians “rediscovered” the sacrament of Baptism as the foundational Christian sacrament, which led to the new concept of the Church as the “people of God on its way” and as the mystical Body of Christ—a new concept adopted at the Second Vatican Council.⁹⁶ No longer was the Church understood as a hierarchical institution in which the laity did not play a major role. The Church hierarchy was a part of a larger community of believers, albeit a very significant part, yet not as significant as the baptized who constituted the Church itself.⁹⁷ The second chapter of *Lumen Gentium*, The People of God, emphasized this new status of the laity, stating that the “holy People of God shares also in Christ’s prophetic office,” and that the “whole body of the faithful...cannot err in matters of belief” when, guided by the Magisterium, “they manifest a universal consent in matters of faith and morals.”⁹⁸ All of the baptized, both the laity and the clergy, shared in Christ’s “prophetic office” as His church. With this new understanding of the role of the baptized as Church, the laity began to seek a larger voice in the “community of believers.”

In order to provide a voice for the different lay perspectives in Canada, the Catholic Information Centre of Toronto published, in 1965, the *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, in which several prominent Catholic lay persons offered advice to the bishops.⁹⁹ In the book’s introduction, Paul Harris, the Executive Director of the Centre, highlighted the major change that had occurred with the advent of a more educated laity and the new influential role of the media: “Intellectual and moral controversies which once took place in...isolated journals or among a small elite have become the grist mill of the mass media.”¹⁰⁰ Harris drew upon the new style of discourse introduced at the Council in the hope that the *Brief* would initiate a dialogue “with mature and intelligent laymen” who could help solve the many problems facing the Church.¹⁰¹ The need for more dialogue between the laity and the hierarchy was a common theme of the book. In his contribution to the *Brief*, Mark R. MacGuigan emphasized the importance of this dialogue in criticizing the bishops for “purporting to speak for the Catholic population of Ontario” in their 1962 brief on education to the Ontario government.¹⁰² Given the democratic nature of Canada and the “present level of education” of the laity, MacGuigan contended that it was “simply not appropriate” for the Church hierarchy to “make concrete political decisions for the laity.”¹⁰³ Lawrence Lynch, in his piece “The Catholic in a Pluralistic Society,” emphasized that the “world of Christendom” was gone and that Catholics now lived in a world where “a new concept of truth as conviction” had been introduced that was “no longer absolute and unchanging but intrinsically relative.”¹⁰⁴ In this world, the Church needed to demonstrate that God’s truth could be discovered “through human temporal experience and that revelation is a continuing personal experience.”¹⁰⁵ Lynch also contended that Catholics must be allowed to follow their own conscience, after being

informed by Church teachings, and they must also be “allowed to run their own affairs without dictation; their participation in the Church’s institutional life must be allowed to reflect their experience of freedom.”¹⁰⁶ Lynch also acknowledged that the Church was beginning to realize the “sacredness of work in the temporal world,” thereby enhancing the integrity of the laity. Romeo Maione agreed entirely with Lynch in his contribution, “The Catholic Mission,” emphasizing that the first thing to remember was that the laity were “members of the holy people of God” who by virtue of their baptism are called to participate in God’s work: “the ‘Amen’ of the laity at Mass is not to be seen as a sign of passivity, but rather as a sign of willingness to go and live what they have heard and done in the Mass.”¹⁰⁷ Maione emphasized the importance of the ordinary work of lay Catholics, citing Cardinal Joseph Cardijn, founder of the International Young Christian Workers, who declared to young people: “Your factory bench, your office desk is your altar of sacrifice.”¹⁰⁸ After providing a history of the traditional role of the laity, Maione urged the Church to develop a more active role for the laity.¹⁰⁹ Janet Somerville continued this theme in “Women and Christian Responsibility,” where she criticized the Church for not praising the efforts of single and married women working outside of the home.¹¹⁰ More dialogue was also needed between nuns and laywomen.¹¹¹ Centres for Christian formation should be established for lay people where the “discussion should be free, wide-ranging, and fed from the best sources available.”¹¹² Somerville believed that the Church had to recognize the “widespread desire among the laity to feel on their own faces the winds of new theological thought that are changing the Church.”¹¹³ In the final analysis, the *Brief to the Bishops* exemplified that the educated Catholic laity was eager to embrace the new theological thought as they advocated for a new active role within the Church.

The Laity and The Educational State of Ontario

In Catholic schools across North America, the laity certainly began to assume a more active role in the late 1950s as the number of lay teachers increased.¹¹⁴ In Ontario Catholic schools, a major shift occurred in terms of the relationship between the Church hierarchy and the laity. Historically, the bishops and the school boards shared power, and even though the bishop had no legal right to intervene in board decisions, his influence was often substantial since school boards were dependent on religious teaching orders and parish funds to run their schools.¹¹⁵ With the rapid laicization of the teaching profession in the 1960s, and with the Vatican Council acknowledging the important role of the laity within the Church, the power shifted to the school boards. In 1968, the former chair of the Metropolitan Separate School Board emphasized at an executive meeting of the English Catholic Education Association of Ontario that the pastor “has the official status of visitor to the school. Actual authority is vested in the Principal and in the Separate School Board.”¹¹⁶ Many individuals in the Church

hierarchy supported this power shift with Cardinal James McGuigan of Toronto informing one priest to “stay away” from school problems and “create good relations whereby you can enter the school to teach catechism and nothing else.”¹¹⁷ The importance of the laity became even more pronounced in the late 1960s after the government introduced major reforms impacting the school boards. When the province decreased the number of Catholic school boards across the province from five hundred in 1967 to forty by 1970, and increased their powers, the boards assumed a more important role than ever before in Ontario.¹¹⁸ The government transferred its supervisory powers to the boards, dismantling the province-wide system of school inspectors and empowering the boards to supervise school operations and teacher performance. Curriculum development was also now largely a board responsibility, with the government only providing the overall guidelines.¹¹⁹ With these new responsibilities, the boards now played a critical role in the Catholic school system, a system that by the late 1960s was increasingly controlled by the laity.

In Ontario, however, the boards operated within an educational system in which Catholic schools were not free to act independently. A separate Catholic school system existed, but it was not entirely separate. Nor was the Catholic system treated equally, as is evident in the lower level of funding for grades 9 and 10 and the complete lack of funding for the senior grades, 11 to 13.¹²⁰ Catholic schools also followed the prescribed curriculum without the authority to make any adjustments that they might deem necessary given their religious mandate. An exception existed for the religion program, but the provincial government determined its official status: the religion course was not one of the courses that students needed to pass in order to advance to the next grade level. Even when the government implemented needed educational reforms, the crucial factor for Catholic school system was its limited ability to influence the government’s decisions.

The government’s response to the bishops’ 1962 *Brief on Catholic Education* is evidence of this reality. Referring to the existing legislation governing Catholic schools as a “legislative strait-jacket,” the bishops requested more control over curriculum development, commenting: “We respectfully submit to the authorities of the Government that we feel we require greater freedom of action in framing the curriculum which is used in the separate public schools and greater possibilities of consultation and contribution in this matter.”¹²¹ Aware of the increasing number of lay teachers in Catholic schools, the bishops also asked for more control over teacher training, criticizing the nature of the existing teachers’ colleges: “We cannot be satisfied with the training of Catholic teachers as presently attempted...we are not interested, as such, in a simple course in Theology in the Teachers’ Colleges. This is essential but it does not even constitute a necessary minimum.”¹²² As far as the bishops were concerned, Catholic teachers were not prepared adequately “to teach according to Catholic principles,” and they did not “feel that teachers should go into our Catholic classrooms without some knowledge of the philosophy of Catholic education.”¹²³ An entire section

of the brief dealt with the lack of sufficient funding, requesting an improvement for the entire system, but especially for an extension of public funding for senior high school.¹²⁴ Despite their efforts, the bishops failed to persuade the government: none of their major requests were granted. Teachers' colleges did not introduce any intensive training for Catholic teachers beyond a single course, the bishops were not granted any control over curriculum development, and public funding was not extended to the senior level.¹²⁵ The educational state of Ontario remained largely unresponsive to the bishops' requests.

Living and Learning: The Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, 1968

Within a few years of the bishops' report, the educational state of Ontario experienced a period of considerable reforms—reforms over which the Catholic school system had limited control, but which influenced how religion was taught at the high school level.¹²⁶ One of the most significant documents released by the government in the long sixties was *Living and Learning*, the culmination of a reform movement that had begun much earlier.¹²⁷ It was also the government's response to the new pluralistic and secular society that was emerging in Ontario, where the dominant Christian dominant culture was collapsing.¹²⁸ Benefitting from a “wave of enthusiasm” for educational reform, the report was well received, with 60,000 copies sold in the first sixteen months after publication.¹²⁹ Highly critical of the educational system, and emphasizing the “outdated curriculum,” the “regimental organization,” and the “mistaken aims of education,”¹³⁰ the document called for a more child-centred education that focused on the social needs of the child, and in which:

The child will progress from year to year without the hazards and frustration of failure. His natural curiosity and initiative must be recognized and developed. New methods of assessment and promotion must be devised. Counselling by competent persons should be an integral part of the educational process. The atmosphere within the class room must be positive and encouraging. The fixed positions of pupil and teacher, the insistence on silence, and the punitive approach must give way to a more relaxed teacher-pupil relationship which will encourage discussion, inquiry, and experimentation, and enhance the dignity of the individual.¹³¹

Throughout the document, the importance of freedom, democracy, and the “search for truth” were also major themes: “Freedom to search for truth at every educational level is one of the stoutest ramparts of a free society, and this defence we must never yield if we are to protect our way of life.”¹³² Even the structure of the school needed to be changed in order to allow the students to learn in a less restrictive environment.¹³³ A new understanding of academic excellence was also adopted that emphasized self-

actualization and social responsibility.¹³⁴ The report, with its focus on democracy and child-centred education, reflected the values of a child-centred society increasingly concerned with individual fulfillment, and the philosophy of a government that embraced the educationalization process as education was understood as “instrumental in dealing with the profound changes” of the 1960s.¹³⁵

It also reflected the new belief in the power of technology, especially television. Here, the government relied on the works of Marshall McLuhan, a public intellectual who had an enormous influence on the committee that produced *Living and Learning*.¹³⁶ Even before this report was completed, McLuhan’s influence was evident in the 1965 Ministry of Education publication *Technology in Learning*, which emphasized that “to talk of media of communication theories without talking about McLuhan, would be incomplete.”¹³⁷ In this publication, McLuhan commented that “we have on our hands the largest obsolete school system in the world...Really it is a terrible waste, not only of money and time, but it is so confusing and frustrating to children and teacher and parents alike.” In effect, McLuhan was calling upon the government to “raze the Ontario school and the print-culture behind it.”¹³⁸ Advocating a more child-centred education, he also argued that in the new “global village,” “small children can now do top level research.”¹³⁹ According to J. Cole, McLuhan was “deeply influential” and “at the very least, he cast a spell” on the Department of Education.¹⁴⁰ Before the committee, he emphasized the importance of television, claiming that “it is as simple as this: T.V. has invented the inner trip, L.S.D. style, for the ordinary child. The T.V. watcher goes on an inner trip...[television] goes inside you. You are the screen; you go inside yourself, in depth.”¹⁴¹ Despite being somewhat “baffled” by McLuhan’s ideas, the committee accepted them, as is evident in the emphasis on the importance of educational television, film, and records in the final report—the information from which must be “accessible to each child.”¹⁴²

Living and Learning had considerable influence on both the curriculum and the methods of pedagogy. Among the most significant changes resulting from the report were the new concept of excellence, the subsequent abandonment of provincial exams, and at the high school level, the adoption of a credit system in which each academic course equaled one credit. In order to graduate, students needed to accumulate a certain number of credits: 27 to graduate from grade 12 with a secondary diploma, and another 6 to graduate from grade 13 with an honours secondary diploma necessary for entrance to university. Instead of having to pass every course before advancing to the next grade level, students were able to advance according to their performance in specific subjects. In other words, students could advance in mathematics from grade 10 to grade 11 if they achieved a passing grade, but if they failed to receive such a grade in English, they would have to repeat the grade 10 English course. The credit system was thus far more flexible, allowing for a more individualized approach to learning.¹⁴³ Combined with an increase in guidance

and counselling serves, both recommended in *Living and Learning*, the focus was now much more on the needs of the individual learner.

A New Challenging Period for Religious Secondary Education

The reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration of Christian Education thus faced challenging conditions of reception when they were introduced in the mid 1960s. It was a time when both the Catholic classicist culture and the overall dominant Christian culture that supported it were disappearing. Throughout North America, most Catholics had emerged from the so-called Catholic ghetto and had become active members in a secular, pluralistic, and affluent society that questioned the “truths” of established authority, including that of the Church. With *Humanae Vitae*, the moral authority of the Church was seriously undermined as the majority of Catholics refused to obey the prohibition on contraception. Moral authority was now in the hands of the individual. Increasingly, North Americans turned to the media and the social sciences as sources of authority. The Catholic laity also called for a more important role in the Church—a call that Vatican II supported. In education, although the laity began to assume a leadership role as student enrolment increased and the number of religious teachers declined, in Ontario they operated in an educational system in which Catholic schools could not act independently. In Catholic secondary schools, both administrators and religion teachers faced the challenges of adapting to the new theology of Vatican II, to the new direction articulated by the Declaration, and to the new educational philosophy and pedagogical approach announced in the *Living and Learning* document at a time when they themselves were becoming more secular.¹⁴⁴ It was a period of enthusiasm and innovation, but also of uncertainty and confusion as Catholic educators struggled to adapt to the emerging pluralistic and individualistic society in which the Catholics no longer had a distinct identity. A new and challenging period for secondary religious education had begun.

Chapter Six: The Fundamental Shift in Religious Secondary Education in the Catholic Schools of Ontario

A fundamental shift occurred in Catholic secondary religious education in Ontario and across North America during the long sixties, from 1957 to 1975, in part as a response to the reforms of Vatican II, but also as a response to the conditions of reception that existed.¹ This shift involved a major change in orientation from the objective, Neo-Thomistic understanding of the immutability of Church doctrine, with its emphasis on the intellect as the means to achieve religious knowledge, to a subjective understanding of the historical developmental nature of Church doctrine with an emphasis on the importance of the individual's inner conversion—a needed change, since the Magisterium policy of imposed Neo-Thomism was no longer appropriate in terms of either theology or Church governance. Accompanying this change in orientation were significant changes in pedagogy as Catholic educators focused less on knowledge accumulation and adopted a more child-centred approach. However, the shift was somewhat extreme, with much of traditional Catholic education abandoned. The traditional rote-memorization pedagogy was no longer acceptable, being replaced by a child-centred approach that adopted progressive teaching strategies, yet this led to an overall lack of understanding of Church practice and doctrine. Neo-Thomism was rejected, but the emphasis on subjectivity and individual conscience led many educators to question traditional truths of Catholicism. As well, religion was no longer considered a serious academic subject. A lack of leadership was also evident due to the principle of subsidiarity and the decentralization of Ministry authority, which although admirable concepts, led to a lack of consistency in terms of education. Overall, then, the long sixties were a period of considerable confusion for Catholic educators. By the mid-1970s, however, a concerted effort was being made to restore a sense of balance in Catholic secondary education with a renewed focus on

teaching Church doctrine, without abandoning the impressive educational reforms achieved during the long sixties.

The Declaration on Christian Education

Despite its overall weakness, the Declaration on Christian Education provided a useful “motherhood” statement, since it adopted the new style of discourse and articulated the fundamental shift in Catholic education. Several Catholic organizations and educators used the Declaration in this manner. The Sisters of St. Joseph in their 1970 report on Catholic Secondary School Education relied on the Declaration to explain their emphasis on the need for education to be “in the world” and to contribute to the “whole human community.”² In the 1973 national report, *Adolescent Catechesis in Canada*, the Declaration was quoted as a means to introduce the overall topic of Christian education, emphasizing that “the office of educating belongs by a unique title to the Church...most of all because she has the responsibility of announcing the way of salvation to all men.”³ The Canadian Catholic School Trustees’ Association, in a 1974–75 paper entitled “Catholic Education: From Principle to Practice in Catholic Schools,” cited the Declaration several times, highlighting especially the importance of having the entire Catholic community involved in education: school, parish, and family.⁴ Even as late as 1985, the Declaration was still used as an effective statement on the importance of Catholic education.⁵ It was at the Second Synod of the London Diocese (1966–1969) that the Declaration was most effectively used as an overall statement of Catholic education. With this synod, the London Diocese assumed a leadership role, not only in Ontario but internationally, as it was the first diocese to implement the reforms of Vatican II in a systematic fashion, since Bishop Emmett Carter established the synod in an effort to initiate a period of renewal and reform.⁶ In the documents dealing with education, the Declaration was cited several times, especially its sections that dealt with the new theology emphasis on the development of the whole person, the common good, and the integral nature of education in the everyday life of Catholics.

The report from the Commission on Christian Education emphasized the relationship between God and the child, who possessed both an “inalienable” right to an education “corresponding to his proper destiny in the next life and suited to his cultural heritage in this life,” and an “inner worth or dignity.”⁷ In the report on the Commission on Teachers, entitled “Philosophy of a Teacher,” the Declaration was often directly quoted: “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 man is a member, and in the service of which, as an adult, he will share.” The task of education involved the “full development of the human person” and “building a more human world,” requiring Catholic teachers to create

for the school community an atmosphere animated by the gospel spirit of freedom and charity, to help young people, in the development of their own person, simultaneously to grow according to the new creature that they were made through baptism; and finally to relate to all human culture to the good news of salvation so that the knowledge students gradually acquire of the world, life and man is illumined by faith.⁸

Given such a crucial responsibility, teachers needed, in the words of the Declaration, “special qualities of mind and heart, extremely careful preparation, and a constant readiness to begin anew and to adapt.”⁹ In the spirit of Vatican II, the report recommended the “essential missionary character of the teaching profession to be emphasized as teachers were critical members of the ‘people of God.’”¹⁰ With such “motherhood” statements, the Declaration proved quite useful in establishing the overall context for post-Vatican II Catholic education.¹¹

The New Emphasis on Subjectivity and Individual Experience in the “Real World”

In its emphasis on the inner transformation of the individual, the Declaration also indicated a new direction for secondary religious education—a direction aligned with the new theology adopted at Vatican II. Abandoning the objectivity of Neo-Thomism, the subjectivity of the individual was emphasized in the context of everyday experience in the “real world”—another major shift initiated by the new theologians. Evidence of this shift was widespread across the province and the country. In 1967, Sister Joan Mary, the newly appointed catechetics director for the Belleville Catholic schools, commented that “religion should be integrated into the life of individuals, and should not be something isolated from the mainstream, handed down by some authority.”¹² Likewise, Basilian priest Father Vincent Thompson highlighted in a letter to Bishop Carter that “the direct approach to imparting religious truth to adolescents is simply not likely to work,” and that “the subject matter of religion is not religion but life.” He further argued that “the place to start is where the learner is, that is, with the student’s own experiences in the real world of existing people, rather than with a construct of truths.”¹³ The 1971 report of the Christian Philosophy of Education Committee of the Ontario English Catholic Teachers’ Association of Ontario (OECTA) reflected the dramatic nature of this shift in declaring that faith was “not based on objective evidence,” but “a personal, thus mysterious encounter with the living God through Christ.”¹⁴ In 1970–71, the Metro Separate School Board relied on one of the most influential post-Vatican II theologians, Father Karl Rahner, in articulating its basic premise for religious education: “It must be based on real-life experience and should not call for long explanations or the juggling of complicated concepts.”¹⁵ Finally,

according to the 1973 national report, “the Copernican revolution in catechetics involved a shift from the deductive, intellectualist, dogmatic, authoritarian approach to the inductive, experiential, personal, questioning-discovering, life-centred, freedom approach.”¹⁶

As a result of this shift, “the starting point” was no longer the content, but “the person of the student and catechist, as believers in Jesus, and what they think, feel and live. The student is an indispensable part of the content of Catechesis.” Reflecting the widespread change in education during the long sixties, the students’ “interests, questions, experiences and needs, where he’s at with his world-view and given his perceptions and understanding was now central to the learning process.”¹⁷ Their “inner faith experience” was paramount, so therefore it was necessary to reach beyond “words and professions of faith” to establish “the vital link with life” – the students’ daily lives.¹⁸ The Second Synod Sub-Commission on the Youth fully supported this shift in understanding, declaring that a “more subjective and less impersonal” approach to religion was necessary.¹⁹ The purpose of education was to demonstrate to the students “how they may make their contribution to the whole community of man,” as young people were “quick to resent a protective atmosphere and to dread the narrow, closed mentality which this [education] may generate.”²⁰ By the early 1970s, according to the national report on adolescent catechesis, a general consensus existed among educators that “young people place a great deal of stress on the immediacies of experience,” and that “any educational endeavor which tries to locate the real in some realm that has no connection with their experience, or that appeals only to their intellects, will not be all that successful.”²¹

In response to this new understanding of the importance of connecting religious studies to the students’ real world experience, many educators began to emphasize the social aspect of religion, reflecting the new authority of the social sciences. One of the first pioneers was Rev. D. Bauer, the Director of Religious Teaching at St. Michael’s High School in Toronto, who in 1958 developed a sociology program designed to, in grade 9, “make the student aware of his world,” and at the senior level, provide a “world vision” necessary to “equip our young Christians” for the “brave new world.”²² At the 1968 Christian Curriculum Development Conference, keynote speaker Romeo Maione emphasized the need for the school to be “an educational experience” that was “socially involved,” leading students to a “life of service” in helping the less fortunate in their community.²³ In several schools, the religion program emphasized the “sociological” nature of religion and was incorporated into a larger curriculum department that focused on social studies.²⁴ By the mid-1970s, the “use of the behavioral sciences” was one of the new directions in religious education after Vatican II, according to Bishop Alexander Carter.²⁵

The importance of the relationship between students’ real world experience and their social commitment was also evident in the new focus on the local community in which the students lived. In 1964, for example, Bishop Emmett Carter initiated a

General Mission in the Diocese of London with the purpose of converting “the local church and community,” and hoping for a “complete renewal of our spiritual lives.” Before the mission began, an in-depth survey was undertaken in order to ascertain the “sociological conditions of the men and women who constitute the local community.”²⁶ A few years later, in 1970, the Diocese of London actually closed its Office of Religious Instruction because “the only solution to the problem of religious education is on the local level, i.e. the school board, the parish, the local school etc.”²⁷ In an address at the annual conference on Christian Curriculum Development (OECTA), J.T. McIlhone best articulated the importance of the local community, emphasizing that the modern Church was to be found in the local community, and arguing that “there can be no such thing as *the* Catholic school,” but rather “as many versions of the Catholic school as there are dioceses within any given area.”²⁸

The importance of the local community was also emphasized in many individual schools where a serious effort was undertaken to develop a Christian community in which the students “learned” their faith subjectively through personal experience. A Catholic school, according to the Archbishop of Toronto, Philip Pocock, was “not a school where religion is taught for two hours a week,” but “one in which God, his truth, his life are integrated into the entire syllabus, curriculum and life of the school.”²⁹ The Sisters of St. Joseph at Mount St. Joseph Academy concurred with this view, having as one of the school’s goals “in common with all Catholic schools...the mission of a school in which God, His Truth and His life are integrated into the entire syllabus, curriculum, and life of the school.”³⁰ For Catholic trustees, “community must be experienced to be learned,” in an experience that “enables a young person to grow in the religious commitment to building community where parents, teachers, pastors—and trustees—take their rightful place.”³¹ OECTA also emphasized the importance of establishing a faith community within the school, claiming that the “unifying agent is the teacher of mature, living faith who together with the faith community of teachers is a visible sign and expression that Christ is alive and operative today.”³²

Father Andrew M. Greeley, one of the most influential Catholic educators and social scientists in North America during the long sixties, also contended that the establishment of a faith community was critical to the success of a Catholic high school.³³ Adopting a social science approach, he argued that the “vast majority of middle- and upper-middle-class teenagers find the years between fourteen and twenty years of intense self-doubt, self-suspicion, self-loathing, and even self-hatred.” A high school needed to be aware of this “basic, intense fear of lovelessness in the personality of the adolescent,” and to do whatever was possible to meet the “developmental need for affection.” Identifying three of the “principal developmental needs of teenagers” as “love, belonging, and service,”³⁴ Greeley relied on recent research, which concluded that the smaller Catholic school provided the “atmosphere of intimacy and friendship” necessary in order to meet the developmental needs of the

teenager.³⁵ What was of the utmost importance was the creation of effective faith communities—a real possibility in Catholic high schools, according to Greeley.³⁶

Within these “faith communities,” the focus was on Christian values that the students would need in order to be active Christians in the larger community. In 1968, Bishop Carter emphasized that the teaching of religion was “above all a contact with Christian values.”³⁷ As far as the Catholic trustees were concerned, “education must be built on religious values,” which were necessary in a changing world that challenged traditional convictions such as the sanctity of life, and that was “searching for values.”³⁸ Emphasizing the importance of the Catholic school in such a world, the trustees declared: “the Catholic school must remain a vigorous exponent of Christian teaching and moral values in the world.”³⁹ In 1964, John J. Connolly, in a keynote address, “The Making of the Modern Christian,” at the annual conference of the Catholic Education Conference, highlighted the need for the Church to continue its traditional mission of transmitting moral values, contending that “it was Christian morality which gave the culture of the Mediterranean new values” during the era of the Roman Empire. Given the horrific wars of the twentieth century and the Cold War with its “balanced arsenals of self-destruction,” he argued, it was time “to encourage the teaching of morality with all the means we can muster.”⁴⁰ A serious effort was also being made to counter what was considered the negative impact of recent societal changes: “our values of the kingdom confront the myth of scientific autonomy; temper the hubris of technologism; ensure the integrity of human dignity and freedom.”⁴¹ The national report on adolescent catechesis concluded that “value education” had assumed a “large role” in religious education across the entire country.⁴²

New Methods of Pedagogy and New Teaching Resources

Religion teachers also began to use new methods of pedagogy and new resources that focused on subjectivity and the individual’s experience in the “real world.” In doing so, teachers were not only influenced by Vatican II, but also by the educational reforms articulated in *Living and Learning* and by the social sciences. What was also clear was that religion teachers no longer considered it heresy to adopt innovative teaching methods and resources. Instead of having students learn by rote memory, they were encouraged to examine religious issues in the “free and open discussions so necessary in religion classes today.”⁴³ In the London Diocese, according to a 1968 survey of its thirteen secondary schools, student dialogue and discussion were the most prominent methods of instruction. No school reported that a teacher-led lecture format was the regular teaching method.⁴⁴ Usually, the discussions focused on social issues that concerned the students, with one school reporting that the “11th and 12th graders are fed up with being taught religion...We have round table discussions on subjects of concern to the teen-agers.”⁴⁵ A wide range of films, records, and filmstrips

were used, reflecting the new “authority” of media-based technology.⁴⁶ As for textbooks, schools used various ones, with Bishop Carter advising that for the senior level, “anything up-to-date...is acceptable and preferable to texts produced seven or eight years ago.”⁴⁷ In the 1969 Report of the Office of Religious Education for the London Diocese, for example, eleven recommended texts were listed. Most textbooks adopted the sociological approach, focusing on the needs of the students in the context of their own daily lives within their own communities.⁴⁸

One of the most popular texts used in Ontario was the American publication *Hi-Time*, which took the form of a weekly magazine. Little attention was given to Church teachings, with the different regular features instead focussing on the students’ lived experience in a secular world. For example, one regular column, “Straight Talk,” responded to student letters about their personal issues. One such article, entitled “Friends Take Drugs,” featured a student’s request for advice, since “my girlfriends and I have a serious problem” because some of their acquaintances were “busted” by the police. The columnist, Mary Reed Newland, a popular writer and lecturer on family life, commented, “you had better start where you are. Be their friends who don’t use drugs for sensible reasons.”⁴⁹ Another Straight Talk column discussed a student’s mental health, with the caption, “Hates Depression and Loneliness.” In his response, the columnist, Father Klink, a high school counselor with a graduate degree in counselling and guidance, focused on the “feeling of boredom” that “comes through the letter,” suggesting that the individual become more involved in social work by visiting the elderly or babysitting for “a family with no income to pay for a sitter.”⁵⁰

Another regular feature, “Situation,” dealt with typical teenage concerns in a story format. One article dealt with a student who disliked working on her “religion book report” on a religion other than Christianity, and concluded by advising readers that learning about a non-Christian religion could lead to “a deeper understanding of your own beliefs.”⁵¹ In another “Situation” article, a young woman recalled the time when she was infatuated with an older neighbourhood boy who “enkindled both love and hate within me so much over those years.” Among the most useful advice that she received was that she had to be herself.⁵² Many articles also dealt with the moral issues that young people confronted as they matured into adults.⁵³ Overall, *Hi-Time* was typical of the texts used during this period in its emphasis on the students’ inner life, their relationships, their daily lives, and the development of their Christian values and morals.

Another major feature of secondary religious education that developed after Vatican II was its non-academic nature.⁵⁴ Rejecting the pre-Vatican focus on content, Church teachings, and doctrine, educators regarded the religion class as less important than the school faith community itself.⁵⁵ With the emphasis now on the individual’s inner transformation and on moral development, there was less need for an academic approach that involved any form of technical excellence. No doubt influenced by the concepts of excellence articulated in *Living and Learning*, which emphasized human

potential, self-actualization, and social responsibility, many religion teachers questioned the need for formal tests and exams. The London Diocese Sub-Commission on the Youth expressed this point of view, contending that “obviously religion cannot be imparted like an academic subject. Christianity is caught, not taught.”⁵⁶ Schools were certainly not treating religion as the most serious academic subject, according to Carter, who in 1965 felt it necessary to inform the principals:

a situation exists across the Diocese which should not exist. It is this: whenever extra time is needed in the school day for some special event, the religion period is the one sacrificed. I can understand this happening *occasionally*, e.g. for confession, a *special* Mass, etc. but it should not be the regular occurrence that it is...teachers are usually the guilty parties. Choir practice, flag-raising ceremonies, concerts, etc. should not take place instead of the religion period. Nor should a regular religious practice take its place, even Mass.⁵⁷

Yet, three years later, Bishop Carter, who had once believed that religion exams were necessary if only to send the message that religion was just as important as other academic subjects, was considering “the idea of declaring at least a moratorium on formal classes in religion and above all in examinations in religion,” after reading the results of a survey on high school religion that included quotations from some students expressing their intense dislike for religion classes.⁵⁸ One of the schools in his diocese certainly agreed: in 1973, Mount St. Joseph Academy only offered one religion course in the entire school, “Man in Society,” focusing on “values and value education.”⁵⁹

The Long Sixties: A Period of Confusion in Secondary Religious Education

In considering a moratorium on formal religion classes and on examinations, Bishop Carter was not only influenced by the new focus on values and faith development, but also by the existing confusion as to what should actually be taught in a religion classroom, especially given the pluralism that existed among theologians and the overall lack of precise instructions from the Vatican.⁶⁰ The Sub-Committee on Youth noted this confusion, highlighting that unlike in other courses, “a sense of wholeness and harmony apparently never emerged from the study of religion. This unfortunate condition is still the case today as confirmed by all of our surveys and interviews.”⁶¹ Much of this confusion was caused by the dramatic shift from a strict Neo-Thomistic approach to an approach that attempted to adopt the new Vatican II theology without teachers being properly prepared, resulting in a lack of direction and poor quality of instruction. Unlike in the pre-Vatican classroom, where most teachers relied on some form of rote-memory approach, using similar textbooks and closely supervised by the Church hierarchy, in the post-Vatican II classroom, teaching methods “varied widely,”

with some teachers using textbooks whereas others were relying on “subjects introduced by the teacher or the students” according to the London Diocese survey. Nor were the textbooks considered excellent, only “fairly good but there are no better ones available as yet.” Although, as Father Grannan indicated, a qualified teacher “could conduct much better classes than the text material would indicate,” only two schools had some teachers qualified to teach religion.⁶²

The confusion was further exacerbated since teachers no longer focused on Church doctrine and often left the impression that there were no truths to be taught. According to the OECTA Report of the Christian Philosophy of Education Committee, “since Faith is a new life, and thus a process, a task, a becoming, students must see their teacher as one who walks along with them, still searching, still learning, still undergoing the risk and tensions of faith. The posture of the teacher should be an invitation: ‘Let us seek faith together—not, this is what you must believe!’” Furthermore, “faith must not be presented...as a magic formula solving all problems.” Faith should “instil a hope that there is an answer and supply the strength to live with the still unanswered situation while one keeps searching.”⁶³ Gone was the confidence that there were even answers, let alone certain truths. In the hands of lay teachers with little theological formation, it is no small wonder that considerable confusion existed with regard to what should be taught. This may also help explain the discouraging state of religious education, according to the London Diocese survey, which included several negative comments from school administrators concerning religious education: “the problems of teaching Religion today are pretty great”; “It is a strong conviction of almost all our staff that formal classes of religion are not nearly as important for the imparting of a Christian way of life as the habitual conduct of the teachers”; “the problem in the classroom itself is no longer rejection but a real indifference”; and “at present time the hardest subject to teach well in the Catholic Hi School is Religion.”⁶⁴ Bishop Carter’s idea of a moratorium, then, was in response to the rather chaotic state of religious education in his diocese, a situation that had to be rectified. As he commented, “It is rather ludicrous to think of the effort and money expended in our Catholic High Schools and then to assist at a collapse in the area of presentation.” Carter was convinced that “most of our trouble” came from “a confusion of ideas which arises between the teaching of the science of theology and the presentation of the values of religion,” arguing that the former should be the focus at the university level.⁶⁵

Such confusion was a widespread problem beyond the borders of the London Diocese. In 1964, Reverend J.C. Wey, Superior General of the Basilians, recognized this confusion at the high school level: “This area...is one of great confusion and dissatisfaction for the teachers themselves, and consequently for the students also.”⁶⁶ In 1970, the Sisters of St. Joseph in Toronto reported that “more and more teachers, both religious and lay, are requesting release from religion teaching. This does not represent a lack of generosity...It represents a fear of doing the Lord’s work badly and

of bringing about an even greater estrangement and rejection on the part of the youth.” Recognizing that all educators “must use the new approach,” the Sisters also noted “the need to permit our Sisters to work with confidence and optimism and never with fear and distaste.”⁶⁷ Their counterparts in London also reported that it was difficult to obtain a consensus among the Sisters at Mount St. Joseph Academy as to the future educational goal, explaining that the five statements pertaining to the Goal of the Academy “represented the thinking of five separate groups...It was not possible to form a ‘consensus statement’ from the varying opinions.”⁶⁸ Throughout the long sixties, considerable confusion existed in the secondary religion classroom, with the Catholic Trustees of Canada reporting in 1974 that “what was actually taking place is a redefinition of religion across the Christian spectrum. A great effort is being made to present the values of the Gospel in a way that responds to the new dynamic of society...there is an amalgam of reactions to this process, not the least of which is confusion. Old forms are giving way to new imperatives.”⁶⁹ The Sisters of St. Joseph highlighted what was required for Catholic high school teachers in order to eliminate such confusion: “adequate training in Scripture, theology, and catechetics.”⁷⁰ Yet, Catholic educators did not have the necessary authority to improve teacher education given the control of the Ministry of Education, which refused to allow the Faculties of Education to offer more courses in Catholic education.⁷¹ The situation in Ontario was not unique. Across Canada, more teacher education was acknowledged as the “greatest need” in religious education, with the secular Faculties of Education failing to provide the necessary “theological and pastoral preparation.”⁷²

Another major reason for this confusion was no doubt the difficulty that Catholic educators faced in teaching religion to young people, many of whom rejected the authority of the Church as one of the “Establishment” institutions. Bishop Carter, in his forward to the religion series *Roots of Faith*, mentioned that if anyone had spoken to any graduates from Catholic high schools, they would have been surprised by the “number who no longer look to the Church for guidance and who, in some cases, no longer practice their religion.”⁷³ The overall result was a “crisis of faith” according to many observers. The Sub-Committee on Youth emphasized the importance of this crisis, which “manifests itself most commonly by rebellion against the structural, institutional Church,” and by rejecting “anything that savours of the institutional Church (clerics, Mass, reception of the sacraments, and so on).”⁷⁴ According to the Catholic Trustees, this crisis of faith was accentuated by the “technological and cultural changes that swept the world,” which have “challenged values from the past,” resulting in the “secular man’s uncertainty in what to believe.”⁷⁵ This crisis of faith also manifested itself in a crisis of identity shared by many Catholics—a crisis fundamentally connected to secularism, to the decline of the dominant Christian culture, and to the rise of a new faith in the authority of the media and the social sciences. In his national report, Murchland highlighted the extreme difficulty that Catholics were experiencing in the post-Vatican II years:

We have lost to some extent our vital core, our sense of purpose. We have lost some of our assurance and nerve. Our energies are dissipated and fragmented. We've become unglued, unraveled and disoriented. We are searching again for the renewed force and dynamism of our faith. It does not make it any easier in that this search must be carried out in a context of pluralism, relativity, disbelief, secularization, the autonomy of the profane, religious freedom and ecumenism.⁷⁶

Nor was this identity crisis limited to Canada, but was widespread across North America as American Catholics shared the same “search” in a similar context. Philip Gleason, the President of the American Catholic Historical Association, provided a personal testimony to the “profound shock” and the “identity crisis” that most Catholics in North America experienced in the years after Vatican II. The Catholic classicist culture had disintegrated along with the certitude that most Catholics once possessed. According to Gleason, one questioned haunted many of them: Who are we?⁷⁷

Corpus Christi—Brennan High School, 1963–1976: A Case Study

One of the high schools in the London Diocese that made a concerted effort to adapt to the changing cultural conditions and to the reforms of Vatican II was Corpus Christi, a school of 600 students in Windsor under the direction of the Ursuline Sisters. Corpus Christi was the first high school in the diocese to have a lay vice-principal, an appointment that gave “new prominence to the increasingly important role of the laity in catholic schools” according to Carter.⁷⁸ In 1963, Carter also gave Corpus Christi the “honor of trial” in implementing the new approach to religious education, declaring that the upcoming school year was an “experimental year” and that Corpus Christi would be providing an “example to the whole Diocese.”⁷⁹ Two years later, it was decided that the name of the school would be changed from Corpus Christi to F.J. Brennan High School “in conformity with the need for a somewhat less sacred name for a high school which engages in all forms of activity including sports, but it corresponded to the development of the school itself”—an interesting reason given that Catholic schools had always engaged in “all forms of activity,” but had never felt a need for a less sacred name.⁸⁰

In his yearbook message to the students of Corpus Christi, Carter focused on why the change was made: “Your school is going through a period of change which also must have adaptation. The name itself has been changed, to honor a man who was loyal and firm, yet at the same time vigorous and open.” He then explained what he meant by “vigorous and open,” emphasizing the new focus of religious education: “It is a challenge for you to take your Catholic education and to make sure that it contributes to your own sense of dedication to the world in which you live.” Using Monsignor F.J.

Brennan as an example, Carter highlighted the importance of maintaining a balance in accepting necessary changes without abandoning “established truths.”⁸¹ Carter told the students that “one of the great lessons that life has to teach us is that we continuously balance between the necessity to hold to old familiar and established truths and, at the same time, to adjust, to adapt and to change as circumstances dictate.” He then continued with a direct reference to the overall confusion that many Catholics were experiencing immediately after Vatican II: “Some have been deceived by the changes into imagining that we have abandoned our basic positions. Nothing could be more inaccurate, or, for that matter, more absurd.” At the end of his message, Carter reiterated one of the fundamental convictions of the new theology: “Through your Catholic education may you carry your ideals with you but may your ideals never lose their contact with reality.”⁸²

Brennan High School, however, experienced considerable difficulty in maintaining the balance that Carter deemed essential in Catholic education, focusing far less on the “established truths” and “basic positions” than on the new approach to religious education in its “development” as a school. The religion program was now referred to as “Christian Living” with religion no longer considered as an academic subject.⁸³ By 1968, the non-academic approach had been extended to the structure of the classroom itself, since “a special room for religion” was “outfitted as a lounge” in order to establish a more leisurely atmosphere to encourage student discussion.⁸⁴ The non-academic nature of religious instruction continued into the 1970s. For example, a 1971 teacher handbook included a school-wide schedule for all major tests and assignments so as to maintain a reasonable workload for the students. Religion was not listed as one of the subjects for which a schedule was necessary.⁸⁵ As a non-academic subject, the religion program focused on students’ own experience and local situation, and on creating a Christian community within the school. The social dimension of Christianity was emphasized, with the school deciding in 1972 to use the *Hi-Time* texts at every grade level.⁸⁶ In a lengthy 1972 interview with the *Windsor Star*, Brennan High School’s principal, Jim Kennedy, articulated the philosophy of the school: “A school is not Catholic because it offers a Christian Living course; it becomes Catholic only when the spirit of Christ...permeates it.” According to Kennedy, the “concept of the Christian community is what justifies the separate school system,” a concept which manifested itself more in the “atmosphere” of the school rather than in “formal course content.” Emphasizing social service to the larger community, Kennedy referred to student involvement in charity initiatives. At Brennan High School, teachers also had the “freedom to expose students to basic questions about life and to present a specific philosophy,” which, however, was not “pushed down the students’ throats.” In emphasizing the importance of the school’s atmosphere and social service—critical factors in establishing a valid Christian community within the school—to the detriment of “course content,” Brennan High School failed to maintain the balance needed in Catholic education, according to Carter.

This was evident as early as 1966, when the school chaplain, Father R.C. Haines, reported that the high school was experiencing major problems, most of which were related to certain conditions of reception that existed for the reforms of Vatican II, and to the difficulties in maintaining the balance between the “established truths” and the need for change. In a long letter to Carter, Haines outlined the major problems that he was facing. The religion class did not seem to be considered very important given that at the beginning of the year there were “insufficient books or other materials,” and no funds had been allocated to purchase them. Unlike other courses, a mere three periods a week were devoted to “religious formation,” with the students considering the religion class as “play periods.”⁸⁷ Another major problem that Haines encountered was the failure to fulfil the intended purpose of establishing a Christian community within the school. The school’s overall culture was secular and lacked “an atmosphere” in which the students could “develop and find their vital purposes—social, intellectual, and spiritual.” According to Haines, the school had “failed miserably,” adding that “there is very little difference between this school and any public school.”⁸⁸ As far as the “spirit of the school” was concerned, Haines contended that the “chief mark is confusion.”⁸⁹ Nor were the teaching staff and the board administrators making religion a school priority, evidence of a certain degree of secularization of consciousness.⁹⁰ According to Haines, the staff was “divided and uncertain,” and lacked “the conviction concerning the possibilities of a Catholic school.”⁹¹ Despite his overall negative appraisal of religious education at Brennan High School, Haines remained convinced that the problems could be solved if all of those responsible for the Catholicity of the school shared the same goals and worked together in order to achieve them.⁹²

Yet, these problems persisted well into the 1970s to the extent that on April 4, 1974, the Chair of the Board of Education established a Committee on Catechetics to “assist the Christian Living Department in carrying out its responsibilities,” and “as the year progressed the Board became increasingly concerned about the catholicity of the school.”⁹³ As a result, the scope of the committee was expanded to examine whether or not the entire school was achieving “its aims and purposes as a Catholic high school.”⁹⁴ The committee deemed the situation serious enough, particularly given the doubts expressed by “parents, alumni, and teachers” concerning the “overall effectiveness of Brennan as a Catholic high school,” to recommend to the Board of Education that Bishop Carter be petitioned to establish a commission to assess the situation in further depth. Consequently, after receiving a formal request from the board, Bishop Carter established a Special Commission of Inquiry to examine and report on the Catholicity of Brennan High School.⁹⁵ After six months of investigation, including “hundreds of interviews with Brennan students, their parents, faculty members, administrative staff, board members and local parish priests,” the Commission released its final report.⁹⁶

This report was an in-depth analysis providing several recommendations that reflected the various challenges facing the school in terms of Catholicity—many of

which were related to the conditions of reception for the reforms of Vatican II, especially the decline of the classicist Catholic and dominant Christian cultures. Much of the report confirmed Haines' criticisms. A considerable degree of secularization of consciousness within the school was also evident. According to the report, there was "an openness and cordiality among the students and between the faculty and students" along with a "positive attitude...fittingly found in a Catholic school." However, "this spirit of community was not as firmly based on the Gospel as it should be" and "could quite conceivably be found in schools that are non-Catholic."⁹⁷ In the Faculty Handbook, the statement of the school's goals made "no direct reference to God" despite emphasizing the important of a Christian community.⁹⁸ According to the commission, the "liturgical functions" of the school needed to "be offered more frequently."⁹⁹ Explicit Catholic symbols were not prominent, with "crucifixes and other religious emblems" absent from the classrooms. Nor was the chapel given a place of prominence in the school, leading the commission to recommend that the chapel "be given a more eminent function and...a more suitable location...and that crucifixes or other Catholic signs be placed in the classrooms to give visible witness of the dedication of the School to Christ."¹⁰⁰ The report also indicated there was an impressive "degree of freedom and self-determination given to the students in matters of discipline and activities" that reflected the Vatican II emphasis on the rights of the individual and the role of the individual conscience, but that this freedom and self-determination was not accompanied by "sufficient guidance and direction."¹⁰¹ According to the commission, what was needed was not a freedom that permitted students "to do their own thing," but a freedom that allowed them "choices available within the framework of Catholic standards and values."¹⁰² The commission therefore recommended that "the regulations and structures regarding behaviour and discipline in the School be reviewed from the point of view of consistency with Catholic principles and aims of the School."¹⁰³

The report also alluded to a major reason for the lack of a real Catholic community within the school: the secular nature of society. According to the commission, little evidence existed of a relationship among the school, the parents, the pastors, and parishes, so it was recommended that parents and pastors be invited to the school's liturgical services.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, very few of the students interviewed had decided to attend the high school because it was Catholic—a reflection of the Church's declining influence as a source of moral and spiritual authority.¹⁰⁵ The commission was also critical of some teachers whose "lifestyle" had been influenced by the secular culture: "All teachers must bear witness in their teaching, and in their lives, to the end and purpose of the school," highlighting that the board was responsible for ensuring that a teacher's lifestyle was not "openly and publicly contrary to the avowed purpose of the school," and that such a teacher not be "allowed to give scandal to the students or jeopardize the school."¹⁰⁶ Although the findings of the commission did not clearly articulate it, they underlined the major difficulty in establishing a Christian community

within the school: the lack of a strong Catholic culture in the larger community that could act as a support system for the school's efforts to establish such a community.

The commission also recommended significant changes to the religion program in order to reflect the balance between "established truths" and the necessary changes resulting from Vatican II. Recognizing the importance of integrating "God, His truth, and His life" into the "entire syllabus, curriculum and life of the school," the commission sought to restore the significance of the religion courses, which also played "an indispensable role in carrying out the fundamental purpose of the school." The report continued with a summary of why the commission viewed the religion courses as critical to the success of a Catholic school:

If they do not inculcate sound doctrine, basic attitudes towards God and the Church, and the purposes and values of human life...the whole school suffers. Instruction in the basic truths of the Catholic faith is of paramount importance in our time, and particularly for the adolescent, who is surrounded by those who question basic truths, challenge the authority of the Church, and call into doubt moral and religious values established for centuries.¹⁰⁷

The commission then explained why it believed that the religion program was not fulfilling its fundamental purpose, emphasizing that since the provincial government did not recognize courses in Religious Studies "as a basis for professional certification, some of the teachers have received no formal training in the methods of teaching, and do not hold professional teaching certificates."¹⁰⁸ Moreover, there had been an "over-emphasis on the human and social aspects of Christian life," with some courses appearing "to be more a sociology of religion than a course in Theology, the Study of God."¹⁰⁹ Another serious problem that the commission highlighted was that religion was not an accredited course, and therefore "the time allotted to Religious Knowledge is curtailed" so that students could "devote sufficient hours to other subjects and obtain sufficient credits for graduation."¹¹⁰ Not surprisingly, then, the commission recommended that the content of the religion courses be "modified to give greater emphasis to basic truths regarding God, the Church, the Sacraments, and the Liturgy," and that "the efforts on the provincial-wide level be continued to obtain credit standing for Religion courses...and proper accreditation for teachers in this field."¹¹¹

At the end of the report, the commission criticized the school for following one of the fundamental principles of the post-Vatican II Church: the primary importance of the local community. Acknowledging that the school served a "local area," the commission emphasized that "a Catholic school is not just a local concern...it is a part of the teaching Magisterium of the Church, putting into practice the mission of the Church to teach all nations." Nor was the Bishop spared some gentle criticism:

nothing could provide this sense of belonging to the Universal Church, in participating in the work of Christ, as much as regular visits to the School by the Bishop of the Diocese or his assistant. This practice would impress upon the students that their school is different from others, that they owe an allegiance to the Church, that they are chosen by Christ to carry on His work in their own lives and among others.¹¹²

In making this recommendation, the commission was implicitly criticizing Carter's firm belief in the principle of subsidiarity, which admirable in itself, hindered his ability to provide the leadership that the commission felt necessary in order to solve the problems confronting Brennan High School.¹¹³

In the final analysis, the commission's recommendations concluded a significant period in the development of Brennan High School during the long sixties.¹¹⁴ Beginning as an experiment in 1963, the school fully embraced the new approach to religious education, rejected the pre-Vatican focus on the academic formal course in religion, and attempted to establish an authentic Christian community within the school. In terms of the overall religion program, the school endeavoured to adopt the new theology of Vatican II with its emphasis on the individual's inner transformation, the role of the individual conscience, and real social issues that mattered to the students. In doing so, however, formal instruction of Church doctrine and teachings was neglected. Furthermore, the efforts to establish a real Christian community in the school were hampered by the dominant secular culture, a certain degree of secularization of consciousness among the staff and students, the decline in the Church as a moral authority, and poor teacher formation in Catholic theology and ethics.¹¹⁵ In its "development" as a school, Brennan High School exemplified the experience of many Catholic high schools and bore witness to Murchland's contention that Catholics had lost to some extent their "vital core," and becoming "unglued, unraveled, and disoriented."¹¹⁶

Another Shift in Secondary Religious Education

The commission's recommendations concerning the quality of religious education at Brennan High School also represented another shift in secondary religious education in the Diocese and beyond—not a return to the pre-Vatican years, but a concerted effort to discover a balance between teaching the essential content in the context of the new theology and establishing a Christian community within the school that embraced the universal Church—a balance that Carter had emphasized at the beginning of the Brennan experiment. At the end of the long sixties, evidence of this shift—this new balance—was widespread. Mount St. Joseph Academy in London, a school that had only one religion course for a number of years, "Man in Society," provided in the late

1970s a distinct religion course for every grade level. Each course was guided by the principle that for an individual to develop a personal relationship with God by sharing “in Jesus’ understanding and love of his Father and his fellowmen...there must be knowledge, communication and a search for Truth.”¹¹⁷ In grade 10, for example, the students examined the Old Testament, in particular the Books of Genesis and Exodus, but also focused on the role of prayer as a “personal response” to God, providing the students with the “opportunity to share in the exploration for a life of prayer that is faithful to scriptural inspiration and to the Christian traditions and also adaptable to the needs of our times.” At the senior level, the students studied “the values that underlie personal and societal decisions about lifestyles and families” along with the role of the Church in the modern world.¹¹⁸ In Toronto, at Loretta Abbey, the new shift was also noticeable in the religious programs of study. A student-centred approach was dominant, with the religion courses “defined by the needs and desires of the students,” but with “a core of doctrine which forms the basis of each course and creates a continuous development as the student progresses from one year to the next.”¹¹⁹

The religion program at St Joseph’s Morrow Park High School in Toronto reflected this balance as well. During the academic year of 1975–1976, students in grade 9 studied the Old Testament, and in grade 10, the Gospels. The approach, however, was different from the pre-Vatican years in that the emphasis was on personal worth, personal prayer, and the intimate relationship between a loving God and the individual, with the Sacraments understood as “an encounter with this God Who loves us.”¹²⁰ At the grade 11 level, the “great personalities” in the history of the Church who “lived out” the Gospel message were examined, but without neglecting those individuals who were presently “living out” this message; social justice was an “integral part” of the course. Adopting a post-Vatican II perspective, penance was understood as the “social sacrament,” encompassing “the whole idea of return to Him Who loves us.” In grade 12 and 13, the focus was more on “major Christian issues” that were relevant in the modern world, and on the nature of vocation, “the fundamental call of each person,” with an emphasis on both the role of the laity and religious life.¹²¹ The cited goals of religious education also reflected this balance. Some of these goals highlighted the “inner directedness of the students” in order to help them to “develop a personal belief in and a cognitive-emotional relationship with God in Jesus Christ.” Another set of goals focused on “the expression of this faith-relatedness in the life of the Christian community,” introducing the students in a “practical way” to the “meaning of ministry and service in the Christian community.” One of these goals was to present the “doctrinal teaching of the Church in a manner which is verbally accessible to the students and with respect for the teaching magisterium.”¹²² Schools such as Morrow Park were not alone in experiencing this shift, as Murchland in his national report sensed a “certain mood” among Catholics to “put on the brakes,” reflecting what he considered “one area that rattles catechists”—how to maintain “perspective and balance” in religious education.¹²³

A major component of this shift was the re-emergence of the Church hierarchy as a leader in Catholic education in Ontario and in the universal Church itself. The Special Commission of Inquiry investigating Brennan High School therefore had relied on the four goals articulated in a recent report from an ad-hoc committee of the Catholic Conference of Ontario Bishops as a framework for its own inquiry.¹²⁴ Under the direction of the Canadian bishops, for example, a group of consultants from the Ontario Catholic school boards worked with those responsible “for the constant revision of the Canadian Catechism” in order to “build up doctrinal content.”¹²⁵ In the Archdiocese of Toronto, Archbishop Philip Pocock re-established the Archdiocesan High School Board with the overall purpose of “fostering the spiritual and temporal welfare, the Christian and academic excellence of all existing and future Catholic High Schools in the Archdiocese.” One of the board’s major objectives was “to promote the highest standard of religious education and Christian Catholic community in the schools.”¹²⁶ On March 19, 1977, the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education issued a document on Catholic education, *The Catholic School*—the first such statement since the Vatican II Declaration on Christian Education.

With this statement, the Church was responding to the need for more leadership given the criticism that Catholic schools were facing, not only in Ontario, but world-wide, pointing out that they were sometimes “accused of not knowing how to form convinced, articulate Christians ready to take their place in social and political life.”¹²⁷ The central message of *The Catholic School* was that Catholic schools must strike the right balance between the new approach to religious education that reflected the new theology and the teaching of Church doctrine and the essential content. It was also clear that the Congregation was responding to the confusion that existed in Catholic education.¹²⁸ Acknowledging the difficulties for Catholic educators in a pluralistic society that challenged many of the tenets of the Catholic faith, the document reflected the new shift in religious education by emphasizing the importance of teaching these tenets despite these challenges, but in the context of Vatican II. There was no return to the pre-Vatican II Church.¹²⁹ The teaching of values was considered essential, yet the Congregation emphasized “absolute values,” that is, those of the Church. These values, however, needed to be taught in terms of the students’ lived experience:

A school is...a privileged place in which, through a living encounter with a cultural inheritance, integral formation occurs. This vital approach takes place...in the form of personal contacts and commitments which consider absolute values in a life-context and seek to insert them into a life-framework. Indeed, culture is only educational when young people can relate their study to real-life situations with which they are familiar.¹³⁰

Maintaining a balance between the importance of the individual and the community, the document argued that these “absolute values” were communicated “through the

interpersonal and sincere relationships of its members and through both the individual and corporative adherence to the outlook on life that permeates the school.”¹³¹ *The Catholic School* also took a strong position against the secularization of consciousness and moral relativism in contending that behind the students’ “moral freedom” stood “those absolute values which alone give meaning and value to human life. This needs to be said because the tendency to adopt present-day values as a yardstick is not absent even in the educational world.”¹³² A Catholic school therefore had to instruct students in Church doctrine so that they learned these “absolute values,” understood as “permanent virtues” in the context of a Christian community:

The Catholic school tries to create a climate in which the pupil’s faith will gradually mature and enable him to assume the responsibility placed on him by Baptism. It will give pride of place in the education it provides through Christian Doctrine to the gradual formation of conscience in fundamental, permanent virtues—above all the theological virtues, and charity in particular, which is, so to speak, the life-giving spirit which transforms a man of virtue into a man of Christ.¹³³

Adhering to the new approach to religious education, the document therefore supported the position that the teaching of religion was not “merely confined to religion classes,” but at the same time emphasized the importance of these classes in imparting “explicitly and in a systematic manner” Church teachings in order to “prevent a distortion in the child’s mind between general and religious culture.” The fundamental difference between “religious and other forms of education” was the combined objective of both the “intellectual assent to religious truths” and the “total commitment of one’s whole being to the Person of Christ.”¹³⁴

Under a section entitled “Practical Directions,” the Congregation examined the implementation of subsidiarity, upholding the principle in recognizing the different levels of “competencies” and “responsibilities” involved in the decision-making process, but clarifying what it considered as the role of the bishop by quoting from the Second Vatican Council Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church, *Christus Dominus*: “In the whole diocese or in given areas of it the coordination and close interconnection of all apostolic works should be fostered under the direction of the Bishop. In this way all undertakings and organization, whether catechetical, missionary, charitable, social, family, educational, or any other program serving a pastoral goal will be coordinated.”¹³⁵ While recognizing the critical role of the “whole educative community,” in particular, the students’ parents, the Congregation noted that “where difficulties and conflicts arise about the authentic Christian character of the Catholic school, hierarchical authority can and must intervene.”¹³⁶

By the end of the long sixties, then, the Church had reasserted itself as the ultimate authority in Catholic education, yet without abandoning the significant educational improvements achieved during the era. The reforms of Vatican II remained paramount.

Secondary Catholic education remained focused on the students' moral development and on establishing a Christian community within the school. Likewise, the essential tenets of the new theology remained fundamental to secondary Catholic education, especially the emphasis on the importance of connecting Church teachings to the students' lived experience and social justice. What was different by the end of the long sixties was the gradual decline in the confusion that had marked secondary religious education. A concerted effort was made to emphasize once again the traditional teachings of the Church, the essential content, but in the context of Vatican II and the new theology that had emerged from the Council. A significant chapter in the history of secondary Catholic education had ended. A new chapter had begun, one that would prove in many ways just as challenging.

Chapter Seven: A Proposal for a New Curricular Framework for Secondary Religious Education in the Post-Vatican II Era

After the long sixties, certain trends continued as far as secondary religious education was concerned. The conditions of reception for the reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Christian Education remained essentially the same, but grew even more challenging because of the gradual breakdown of the social fabric as society became more fractured, and further complicated by the pervasive influence of neo-liberal ideology. With far fewer Catholics attending weekly Mass, thus weakening the transmission of Catholic beliefs and traditions within the family, it would have been difficult to argue that a strong identifiable Catholic culture still existed, in Ontario and throughout North America. The classicist Catholic culture was dead and buried. In terms of moral authority, the Church never recovered from its loss of status in the long sixties, becoming one voice among many in North American society. The individual conscience remained the final source of moral authority.¹ Within the Catholic school system, the bishops continued to play a leadership role as secondary religious education curriculum became more uniform across the province, especially after the government granted full funding in 1984.² In 1986, the Ontario Institute for Catholic Education (ICE), an organization that worked closely with the bishops, was established with the mission being to promote Catholic education. One of its mandates was to provide curriculum materials for Catholic teachers. By the late 1990s, ICE was responsible for creating the Ontario Catholic Secondary Curriculum Policy Document in Religious Education. Such a document was needed given that religion was an accredited ministry course subject to ministry guidelines, and that the Ministry of Education was reforming the entire curriculum structure at the secondary level.³ At the same time, however, religion courses were still not given the same academic status as other courses.⁴ These courses remained catechetical in nature based on the

assumption that the students possessed considerable core knowledge of their faith, and were therefore prepared to discuss faith issues.

Many scholars have recently questioned the effectiveness of the catechetical approach because of the increasingly secular nature of society and the weakening of the transmission of faith within the family. An important distinction has been made between religious education and catechism: in religious education, the religion course is treated like any other academic course. The students are not expected to have a considerable amount of prior knowledge, and their work is subject to formal assessment and evaluation equal in academic rigour to any other course. The new curricular framework for secondary religious education proposed here adopts the religious education approach.

A major goal of this new framework is to maintain a balance between the teaching of Church doctrine and the establishment of a Christian community with shared Catholic values in the school—a balance that the Church has sought to achieve since the long sixties. This curricular framework achieves this balance by providing an academically rigorous religious education program that focuses on the essential knowledge that the students need to possess before they are able to engage in any meaningful dialogue on faith issues. The catechetical approach is not entirely abandoned, however the emphasis is on this essential knowledge—Church doctrine and teachings—but within a school that still has the ultimate objective of establishing an authentic Christianity community. While this curricular framework adopts the new theology of Vatican II, it also reflects the thinking of some of the leading pre-Vatican II scholars such as Jacques Maritain and Emmett Carter. In doing so, it adheres to an important aspect of the new direction for Catholic education articulated in the Declaration on Christian Education but not fully implemented in Catholic secondary schools: the conviction that the individual, the subject, has the intellectual ability to abstract, to understand, and to judge. Such an ability is considered essential to the process of inner transformation or conversion fundamental to the Second Vatican Council. Both Maritain and Carter emphasized the need to foster this ability in secondary religion courses.

Another fundamental feature of this proposed curricular framework involves an approach that has been neglected in Catholic secondary religious education: the inquiry process. Traditionally, students have been presented with explanations of specific Church teachings in terms of doctrine and values, but without the opportunity to explore the historical, theological, and philosophical foundations of these teachings. It stands to reason that if Catholic secondary schools are to graduate students who understand their religion, who have experienced a real Catholic school community, and who remain or are to become practising Catholics, they must be given this opportunity to inquire about and to question these teachings. In order to do so in an effective manner, they must imitate the new theologians who returned to the sources of Christianity in their own inquiry process. They must consider the Church Fathers, the

early Church, and the historical Jesus himself. Without such a curriculum, it is doubtful that students will either experience an inner transformation or begin a spiritual journey that will lead to such a transformation.

Another component of the proposed curriculum essential to this transformation is the development of the students' understanding of how they have been affected by the dominant secular culture, in particular the secularization of consciousness. Students need to develop the critical thinking skills necessary to analyse the secular culture in which they live, so that they may "abstract, understand, and judge" how this culture has influenced their own "sense of self." Part of this process includes an analytical comparison between secular values and the Christian values that Catholic schools attempt to instill in the students. Relying on the thinking of several scholars, including John Dewey, Paulo Freire, Bernard Lonergan, and William Pinar, in particular the latter's autobiographic approach, this proposed curricular framework focuses on the inquiry process, the development of critical thinking skills, and the acquisition of the essential knowledge needed for critical thinking and inquiry. Central to this essential knowledge is the historical evidence pertaining to Jesus that the students examine and analyse in order to judge for themselves the contention that Jesus was indeed the Son of God. This student-centred inquiry process will ultimately lead students to judge for themselves the credibility of Christian belief, especially the values that Jesus embodied and that the Catholic schools strive to emulate and to instill in their students within the context of an authentically Christian community.

The Conditions of Reception Revisited

The conditions of reception for the reforms of Vatican II and the Declaration on Christian Education remained essentially the same, except that they became more challenging. According to Daniel Rogers, the long sixties witnessed the beginning of a "period of deep transformation in social thought."⁵ As a result of a complex configuration of factors, the social norms and social structures that provided a shared "social imagination" and helped shape an individual's sense of self fell apart.⁶ The "idea of the social" fragmented, with personal identities becoming "fluid and elective."⁷ More emphasis was placed on individual choice in almost every aspect of society. The sense of belonging to a larger community weakened considerably. As Rogers explains, "the most powerful of the era's social paradigms—the "rational choice" assumption that social behaviours of virtually every sort could be explained as the action of preference-seeking individuals—worked its way across the academic disciplines."⁸ One of the major consequences of this "transformation in social thought" was that "mental images" of society became more fragmented.⁹ Gradually, this new understanding of the relationship between the individual and the larger community permeated society to

the extent that it seemed “natural” and “ingrained in the very logic of things.”¹⁰ Individual autonomy was the rallying cry in this “age of fracture.”¹¹

This was especially evident in the spread of neo-liberal ideology. Relying on the human capital theory that emphasized the productive capacity of individuals in the marketplace and the role of education as an “investment” in this capacity, neo-liberalism became a significant mode of thinking in North America and throughout the world.¹² Neo-liberalism focused on developing economic efficiency and competitiveness, not on developing good citizens within the context of a caring community.¹³ A new understanding of learning was also promoted that reflected the “individualising impact of neo-liberal policies.”¹⁴ By the 1990s, learning was increasingly understood as a process that was “characterized by an economic rationale and a focus on life-long learning as the development of human capital.”¹⁵ The emphasis was on the life-long learning of the autonomous individual.¹⁶ Such an emphasis was contrary to the Catholic focus on developing a Christian community and on the Catholic understanding of moral living. In this age of fracture, with its pervasive neo-liberalism, the conditions of reception for the reforms of Vatican II, particularly with regard to education, were all the more challenging.

Another challenging condition was the further weakening of the transmission of the faith within the family. Far fewer Catholics attended Sunday Mass on a regular basis after the long sixties. In the United States, for example, in 1965, 55 percent of Catholics attended Mass at least once a week; in 2014, only 24 percent did. In Canada, the situation was similar: in 2009, only 28.5 percent of Canadians attended Mass on a weekly basis.¹⁷ Even more dramatic was the decline in regular Sunday attendance among the youth.¹⁸ As a result, the transmission of the faith within the family has been weakened—a transmission that is of critical importance according to a leading theologian of Vatican II, Yves Congar: it is “the Christian parents, much more than priests and preachers, who really transmit the faith. They do it, above all, in the intimate and vital way. The daily example given right up to death...the way in which topics are discussed and events judged; the prayer and humble, familiar gestures of the liturgy.”¹⁹ Aside from regular attendance at Sunday Mass, another major problem related to the transmission of the faith is the increasing number of Catholics who either don’t marry or marry outside the Church.²⁰ It is unlikely that they will raise their children as practising Catholics if they don’t consider it important to be married in the Church. For the Church, the transmission of the faith threatens to become an even more serious challenge in the future.

This transmission of the faith has become even more difficult given the various, rather dubious, interpretations concerning Jesus and the early Church that are now prevalent. Many of these interpretations have permeated popular culture. For example, M.C. Scott, in his murder mystery, *Rome: The Emperor’s Spy*, bases his story on the theory that Jesus was taken off the cross before he died, and that his Resurrection was faked.²¹ Saint Paul was not the great Christian missionary, but a Roman spy. Scott

even refers to Christianity as the “Christian myth,” arguing that there is not any “concrete proof that Jesus and Saint Paul even existed.”²² In the “Author’s Note,” Scott indicates that the works of Robert Eisenmann and Hyam Maccoby support his viewpoint.²³ According to another author, Joseph Atwill, in *Caesar’s Messiah* (2005), the Gospels were not composed by early Christians, but by the Romans Titus and Vespasian, who saw the “continuing value” of the work of their spy, Saint Paul, and created a religion acceptable to Rome and anti-Semitic.²⁴ Many other authors have proposed theories that criticize traditional Christian belief, but based on rather dubious “historical” evidence. For example, the Australian writer, Barbara Thiering supports her viewpoint that Jesus did not die but came down from the cross on scraps of uninterpretable papyrus discovered in Cave 7 at the Dead Sea.²⁵ At different times, Jesus has been portrayed as a peasant revolutionary, a sage, and a magician.²⁶ Most of these theories have received widespread attention through mass media, despite the fact that most scholars have dismissed them as historically inaccurate.²⁷ Pope Benedict XVI emphasized the danger that these inaccurate portrayals of Jesus pose:

All these attempts (i.e. inaccurate portrayals) have produced a common result: the impression that we have very little knowledge of Jesus...this impression has by now penetrated deeply into the minds of the Christian people at large. This is a dramatic situation for faith, because its point of reference is being placed in doubt: Intimate friendship with Jesus, on which everything depends, is in danger of clutching at thin air.²⁸

Such portrayals present a major challenge to the Catholic Church given that Western society is now fundamentally secular in nature, with the majority of Catholics no longer practising their religion, and with Catholic parents no longer fulfilling the critical role of transmitting the faith to the next generation.²⁹ In this secular society, even the existence of the historical Jesus is doubted.³⁰

A New Curricular Framework: Religious Education and Academic Rigour

Given the modern doubt about the historical Jesus and the lack of an effective transmission of the faith, a new religious curriculum is needed at the high school level that focuses on religious education and not catechism. Religion must be treated like any other academic subject, in that the students are not expected to have a considerable amount of prior knowledge.³¹ Yet, many of the official documents on religious education are catechetical. For example, the majority of the documents from the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCCB), first produced in the mid-1990s, reflect a “strong catechetical mindset.”³² In the teachers’ manual for the grade 12 course, *In Search of the Good*, one of the major aims of the course is catechetical: “To

assist young men and women to understand themselves as moral persons living the way of Christ through an examination of ethical theories, the revelation of sacred scripture, and the experience and teaching of the Catholic Church.”³³ The assumption here is that the students are already living, or at least are willing to live, “the way of Christ”—a highly questionable assumption. Furthermore, a major contradiction exists in the policy document concerning the fundamental nature of the curriculum. Despite the insistence on religion courses being recognized “as a scholastic discipline with the same systematic demands and the same rigour as other disciplines,” there is the following reference to the “catechetical process” with regard to assessment and evaluation: “It is most definitely the most difficult to assess and should probably never be evaluated, for here we are talking about the divine action of God in the life of the person.”³⁴ No serious, academically rigorous “scholarly discipline” would have such an evaluation policy. The curriculum is essentially catechetical at a time when religious education is needed.³⁵

Another major problem with the religion curriculum is therefore the lack of academic rigour in terms of technical and rational excellence, that is, “the acquisition of discrete skills, competencies” and “rational inquiry” in the context of an “intellectual, or scholarly” discipline such as religious studies.³⁶ Academic rigour needs to be understood as a curriculum goal so that students develop “the capacity to understand content that is complex, ambiguous, provocative, and personally or emotionally challenging.”³⁷ In a rigorous curriculum, students are also taught the skills required to analyse and understand this content.³⁸ In Ontario, no such religious education curriculum exists. At the grade 9 and 10 levels, religion courses are offered at the open level, meaning that they are open to all students with no academic differentiation. In other words, students at the workplace level and students at the university-preparation level are in the same course and complete the same assessments.³⁹ Such a course by definition cannot be academically rigorous. Even at the senior level, religion courses are not considered as academically rigorous as other courses. Religion is offered at the open and the “M” levels, the latter of which being a designation for courses that may be used to qualify students for either college or university. These courses are not as academically challenging as university-preparation courses.⁴⁰ It would be difficult indeed to argue that high school religion courses are academically rigorous.⁴¹

What is needed is an inquiry-based, academically rigorous curriculum that allows the students to ask questions, to analyse, and thereby “discover” the essential content of their religion. One of the leading scholars in religious education, Graham Rossiter, agrees that students must be given this opportunity. He argues convincingly that most teachers have a mistaken belief that the students possess a shared faith, and therefore do not allow for “an open, critical inquiring approach to the study of religion.” By adopting this “faith approach,” the students’ faith is weakened since the students are not given the opportunity for inquiry and discussion. According to Rossiter, students

need “intellectual freedom,” and it is “this freedom of inquiry which in turn provides students with the very freedom to move into discussion” of their personal faith.⁴²

In developing such an inquiry-based curriculum, it is also critical to integrate some important criteria that Jacques Maritain and Bishop Carter provided in their pre-Vatican approach to secondary religious education. One of the major goals of this education, according to Maritain, is to develop the students’ powers of reason necessary to enable them to shape their own will, and to understand the significance of Catholic values and therefore adopt them as their own—an attainable goal for Maritain as long as the students are the principal agents in the educative process. Carter also maintained that the students’ intellect needs to grasp and understand theological concepts and that religious content must not be watered-down. Not all content, however, is equal. Only the content deemed essential and meaningful should be emphasized in such a manner that the students understand it. Critical here are the students’ interests—so critical that Carter argued that it is a law of the mind that people remember best what they understand and what interests them. Religion curriculum therefore needs to be centred on the essential and meaningful big ideas.

It is also critical to integrate into this new curriculum the two ideas of transcendental Neo-Thomism that merged with the new theology adopted at the Second Vatican Council: the subject’s inner drives to desire God and the subject’s intellect and ability to grasp intelligible reality through its act of understanding. Moreover, the students need to imitate the approach of the new theologians in order to understand the developmental nature of Christian belief, in the sense that our understanding of the essential religious content is open to further development. Students need to become aware that they belong to a living tradition with all of its mystery and wonder. This new curricular framework is not entirely new in the sense that it embodies much of the thinking of leading pre-Vatican II scholars in its emphasis on inquiry, academic rigour, and essential content in the context of the new theology.

The Theoretical Basis for the New Curricular Framework

The theoretical basis of this new curricular framework relies on the theories of some of the leading curricular theorists, especially William Pinar, Paulo Freire, and John Dewey, who, despite significant differences in their philosophies, agreed on certain essentials: the importance of inquiry and discussion, the development of critical thinking skills, student-centred pedagogy, and the discovery of self in the context of the dominant culture or ideology. Pinar’s curriculum theory of subjectivity and development of self provides the overall structure to the new framework, particularly with regard to the secularization of consciousness. His theory also meshes well with the new theology emphasis on the individual’s inner transformation and the importance of the individual conscience. Pinar argues that schools need to connect the students’ “lived experience

with academic knowledge, to foster students' intellectual development and students' capacities for critical thinking."⁴³ They must therefore be given sufficient opportunity to use these capacities, to examine their own subjectivity in the context of their society. Pinar criticizes school systems for controlling what the students learn by insisting on a detailed curriculum that teachers must follow. Embedded within this curriculum are the values that the government considers essential for the student to internalize. As Pinar states, students possess a sense of self that has been "conditioned, and, perhaps, required to be...the 'self' conceived by others."⁴⁴ The secularization of consciousness needs to be understood in this context.

In order to become aware of this conditioning, and therefore to achieve more self-understanding, students must be given the opportunity to analyse and discuss any relevant content that pertains to the process of internalization of values inherent in the prescribed curriculum, the school environment, and the overall society.⁴⁵ Particular attention must be given to the pervasive influence of dominant ideologies—"the unchallengeable, non-negotiable views of life"—such as neo-liberalism.⁴⁶ Calling this an "autobiographical approach," Pinar argues that the students must "reconstruct themselves through academic knowledge, knowledge self-reflexively studied and dialogically encountered."⁴⁷ Within the classroom, the teacher and the students engage in a "complicated conversation"⁴⁸ about the content with the ultimate objective of employing "academic knowledge (and popular culture, increasingly via the media and the Internet) to understand their own self-formation within society."⁴⁹ They must become independent, critical thinkers who are self-aware and thus aware of how the society has shaped their sense of self.

Using different language, Paulo Freire's thinking was in line with Pinar's approach. Referring to the imposition of dominant ideologies, Freire used the phrase "domestication" to describe the process. As agents of the state, teachers deliver the subscribed curriculum that the students must learn without engaging in any meaningful discussion or inquiry. Part of this process includes the adoption of the imposed values of the state—values that the students are not permitted to question. Freire termed this type of education as "banking": knowledge is "deposited" into the students' minds with the "subscribed" values shaping their sense of self, since they are not the "subjects" of their own learning, but rather placed in a state of passivity.⁵⁰ In describing the relationship between the teacher and the students, Freire emphasized that the latter are turned into "containers" or "receptacles" to be "filled" by the teacher: "The more completely she fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are."⁵¹ Deprived of any opportunity to inquire and to question, the students accept the validity of the knowledge that they receive from the teacher, resulting in their acceptance of their lived experience as normal and natural:

the banking concept of education regards men as adaptable, manageable beings. The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them.⁵²

For Freire, it was essential that this banking system of education be abandoned, replaced by an educational process in which students are the subjects in control of their own learning. Such a process must focus on inquiry and discussion, thereby allowing the students to develop a “critical consciousness” of their lived experience. After reflecting on this experience and obtaining more self-understanding in the context of this experience, the next step is to become active agents of change—a process Freire called “conscientisation.”⁵³ In this process, Freire envisioned the teacher as the students’ partner and not as an authoritarian figure: the teacher is “no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. In this process, arguments based on ‘authority’ are no longer valid.”⁵⁴ A major role of teachers is also to stimulate the students’ curiosity and allow it to direct their own learning: “curiosity about the object of knowledge and the willingness and openness to engage theoretical readings and discussions is fundamental.”⁵⁵ Students must also be taught the critical thinking skills necessary to allow them to inquire effectively and to analyse the knowledge that they obtain, and to allow them to “transform their lived experience into knowledge.”⁵⁶ The essential component of Freire’s educational approach was the students’ inner transformation as they gained more self-understanding in the context of their oppressed lived experience—a transformation that Freire understood in terms of the new theology of Vatican II, as he rejected class conflict, but embraced the concept of the individual living “in communion” with others.⁵⁷

Both Freire and Pinar relied on the curriculum ideas of John Dewey, who pioneered much of the present-day, student-centred pedagogy. Central to Dewey’s thought was the need for students to play an active role in their own education, especially by engaging in the process of inquiry. It was therefore critical for educators to understand the psychology of the students. The key to the success of this process was to focus on the students’ interests, to stimulate their natural curiosity—a process that “is finished when there is no longer the unsettled situation that gave rise to the inquiry process in the first place.”⁵⁸ Any effective curriculum needed to provide a “focused, deliberate framework and program that is in keeping with the point and purpose of inquiry can augment a child’s successful understanding of the world.”⁵⁹ An essential step was therefore to “train” the student to be ready to “use of all of his capacities” so that “his judgment may be capable of grasping the conditions under which it has to work.”⁶⁰

Understanding these conditions—social, political, and economic—was fundamental, since Dewey understood education as key to the development of a “social consciousness” that would lead to social progress: “it is the business of everyone interested in education to insist upon the school as the primary and most effective instrument of social progress and reform.”⁶¹ Central to the development of this “social consciousness” was the students’ capacity for self knowledge, self-correction, and ultimately self-transformation—a capacity developed through inquiry.⁶² Dewey therefore understood education as a “process of reconstruction of experience, of the shaping of habits...and of the reflective establishment of values.”⁶³ He also understood this educative process in the context of self-transformed individuals who wished to improve the community in which they lived.

Several Catholic scholars have also adapted Dewey’s philosophy, arguing convincingly that it could be integrated into a distinctly Catholic approach to education despite his pragmatism. Long before Vatican II, Chilean Jesuit priest Alberto Hurtado (1901–1952) contended that important aspects of John Dewey’s educational, pragmatic philosophy could be reconciled with Catholicism,⁶⁴ in particular “reflective thinking,” the development of “a spirit inclined to observation,” wise scepticism of “precipitated conclusions” and of “exaggerated dogmatism, freedom in the classroom, and emphasis on internal motivation.”⁶⁵ Hurtado also agreed with Dewey that education was a “means for individual and social transformation.”⁶⁶ Critical of the mediocre education that many Catholics received, based on “a code of prescriptions, external to them,” Hurtado argued that Catholic education needed to be child-centred, that this education should aim for the students to internalize moral attitude as a “personal light,” and that the role of the teacher should be to “place the child in such an environment that would facilitate the light to become brighter and brighter.”⁶⁷ Hurtado also agreed with Dewey that the teacher acted as a guide, leading the students to “discover the truth.”⁶⁸ Influenced by the new theology, Hurtado understood truth as involving the “dynamic” and “internal renewal of dogmas”—truth that was subject to inquiry.⁶⁹ He therefore accepted Dewey’s concept of democracy in the classroom as creating a “community of inquirers.”⁷⁰

Another Catholic scholar who argued that Dewey’s educational philosophy was adaptable to a Catholic approach to education was William M. Shea, who compared the ideas of Dewey to those of Bernard Lonergan.⁷¹ Both Dewey and Lonergan shared similar socio-political views, and both shared similar methods in terms of the acquisition of knowledge and self-understanding or appropriation.⁷² The process of inquiry was central to their methods. Both argued that there was no real knowledge without inquiry and that values should also be subject to objective analysis.⁷³ All texts and intellectual claims were open to inquiry: “the given has become the questioned.”⁷⁴ Critical here is the role of the subject—the students—in that they engage in inquiry in order to understand the traditional wisdom that has been transmitted through the community. Rather than have this wisdom imposed on them as the norm, the students’

use of their own intelligence becomes the norm, in that it leads them to a “critical appropriation of the tradition”—that is, if they judge that the tradition under investigation is worthy of acceptance.⁷⁵ Thus, even Christian scripture could not escape an “historical and evaluative review” in this process of inquiry.⁷⁶

Although both Dewey and Lonergan agreed on the importance of self-understanding and inner transformation, Lonergan went where Dewey could not follow: the realm of the transcendent. For Lonergan, the ultimate purpose in the process of inquiry, self-understanding, and inner transformation was religious conversion achieved through “self-transcendence.”⁷⁷ A critical stage in achieving self-transcendence is intellectual and rational, where the individual, after a lengthy process of inquiry, reaches the level of understanding necessary to make judgements.⁷⁸ After this stage, self-transcendence involves the “responsible level of consciousness” that is directed towards action: an “interior reflectivity,” leading to a moral conversion that enables the individual to become a moral agent of change within the community.⁷⁹ Ultimately, self-transcendence results in a “total and permanent self-surrender.”⁸⁰ Lonergan understood this self-surrender in the context of the individual’s innate desire for God, who has provided a moral code for humanity that can be discovered through the individual conscience. Self-transcendence is the “inner sense” of having achieved a profound relationship with God. According to Lonergan, such a self-transcendent conversion is the culmination of a long process in which individuals need a Christian community in order to sustain them in their efforts.⁸¹ For Lonergan, this community was the Catholic Church.

An Example of the New Curricular Framework: The Miracles of Jesus

This new curricular framework therefore incorporates essential aspects of the theories of Pinar, Freire, and Dewey: the importance of inquiry and discussion; the development of the necessary critical thinking skills; student-centred pedagogy; the discovery of the self in the context of the dominant culture or ideology; and the need for students to become agents of social change—in other words, active and informed Catholics who have embraced the process of religious conversion. The first critical step involves ensuring that inquiry and discussion are embedded in the curriculum. Before the students are able to ascertain the extent to which their sense of self has been shaped by others, and before they can be expected to become active and “converted” Catholics, they must be given the opportunity to question and to inquire about their own faith. They must not just be told what to believe after receiving an explanation of a “canon of knowledge.” Rather, they must be allowed to analyse this knowledge and judge for themselves its validity, and then, as critical thinkers capable of both understanding and judging, decide for themselves how their faith could be used to shape their sense of self. The place to start is with an analysis of the historical Jesus—

the natural entry point for students as they begin to examine the living tradition of the Church, especially given the doubt that has been raised even about his actual existence. One of the big ideas of this curricular framework is therefore the discovery of the historical Jesus, and the most intriguing way to begin is with the Gospel stories of his miracles.⁸²

These stories need to be told in an engaging fashion for they are great stories that will capture students' imagination, and establishing a narrative is critical for the students' understanding and retention of knowledge.⁸³ The Gospel stories are then analysed as historical documents. It is no longer enough to have the students learn stories that they may not believe are historically authentic. Critical here is the role of the teacher in explaining that the Gospels should not be understood simply as accurate historical biographies of Jesus whose authors were "secretaries of the Apostles" as was traditionally taught. The Gospels must be explained as being "evangelical" in nature with the purpose of conversion: not all of the content is historically accurate.⁸⁴

The students also need to understand some important historical context before analysing the miracle stories, in particular the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus. This is important since one of the earliest references to Jesus' miracles involves John. Traditionally, John was understood as the unquestioning cousin of Jesus who was convinced that Jesus was the Messiah. In Matthew's Gospel, Jesus' baptism is thus described: "As soon as Jesus was baptized, he went up out of the water. At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him. And a voice from heaven said, 'This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased'" (Matthew 3:13–17). The students should use the historical-critical method to analyse this passage, asking questions about historical authenticity.⁸⁵ Here, the teacher needs to explain that the early Church was somewhat embarrassed by the well-known fact that John baptized Jesus. Given this information, the students analyse the passage, beginning with the question: Why was the early Church embarrassed? The students will arrive at a logical conclusion without the teacher telling them: Jesus' baptism gives the impression that John was superior to Jesus.⁸⁶ Thus, in the story, God makes it quite clear that Jesus is His son. Astute students will quickly question the authenticity of the biblical account of Jesus' baptism. The students then examine the biblical reference to Jesus' miracles that involves John. This analysis focuses on one of the earliest written documents about Jesus, the mysterious, long-lost document known as the Q source.⁸⁷ After providing the necessary historical context, that neither Matthew nor Luke was aware that the other was writing a Gospel, and that both possessed a copy of Mark, the first Gospel to be written, the students examine passages in Matthew and Luke that are almost identical and are not found in Mark. The students then determine that another document must have existed, and that this document preceded the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. This document must therefore have been written within forty years of Jesus' death. Then the key passage from the Q source is examined after the teacher briefly explains the

historical context. In the Gospel, John has sent one of his own disciples to ask Jesus a question: “Are you ‘He who is to come’ or do we look for another?” Given the earlier passage about Jesus’ baptism, this statement would raise questions for the students: Didn’t John know that Jesus was the Messiah? Does he doubt Jesus? Were they not relatives? Jesus’ answer is even more intriguing: “Go back and report to John what you hear and see: the blind recover their sight, cripples walk, lepers are cured, the deaf hear, dead men are raised to life, and the poor have the good news preached to them. Blest is the man who finds no stumbling block in me.”⁸⁸ The students then analyse the statement for what it reveals about Jesus. First of all, the students will note that his relationship with John is intriguing. Unlike the traditional portrayal of John as the unquestioning cousin of Jesus, he is revealed as a more historically authentic individual who doubted. John’s reaction to Jesus’ answer is unknown since he was executed soon after, which adds more “intrigue” to the story. Even more fascinating is Jesus’ answer. Rather than declare that he was the Messiah,⁸⁹ Jesus appears more historically authentic in his answer, implying that it is obvious who he is, given what he is doing, and directing John to examine the “evidence,” the poor, the cripples, and lepers. Furthermore, the students will likely realize that written evidence does exist concerning Jesus’ miracles. They will then continue to analyse other miracle stories.

One of the most important miracle stories that the students will examine involves the blind man at Jericho:

They reached Jericho; and as Jesus left Jericho with his disciples and a large crowd, Bartimaeus (that is, the son of Timaeus), a blind beggar, was sitting at the side of the road. When he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to shout and say, “Son of David, Jesus, have pity on me.” And many of them scolded him and told him to keep quiet, but Bartimaeus only shouted all the louder, “Son of David, have pity on me.” Jesus stopped and said, “Call him here.” “Courage,” they said, “get up; Jesus is calling you.” So throwing off his cloak, he jumped up and went to Jesus. Then Jesus spoke, “What do you want me to do for you?” “Rabbuni,” the blind man said to him, “Master, let me see again.” Jesus said to him, “Go your faith has saved you.” And immediately Bartimaeus’ sight returned and he followed Jesus along the road” (Mark 10: 46–52).

Depending on the grade level, and therefore on the level of student expertise in document analysis, the analysis of this Gospel passage can either be teacher-directed, student-led, or a combination of both approaches. A careful inquiry process will lead the students to gather historical information about the story that strongly indicates its essential historicity. A considerable amount of detail is provided, including Aramaic words—the language of Jesus—such as the name of the cured individual, Bartimaeus, and Rabbouni, meaning master or teacher. The exact time and location are also given: shortly before Passover at Jericho, at the last resting station on the road to Jerusalem

some twenty miles away. Trying to catch Jesus' attention, Bartimaeus calls out twice "Son of David," an archaic title not used in any other Gospel miracle story, and which refers to King Solomon, who had a reputation for being a healer. It makes complete sense that a Jewish individual would use this title to call out to Jesus, another miracle worker. Such historical evidence strongly suggests that the story originated with the historical Jesus. The end of the story is also intriguing when Bartimaeus follows Jesus "along the road," making it highly likely that he became a Christian and thus his story was preserved. Given the evidence, Meier argues that the story of Bartimaeus is one of the miracle accounts with the most supportive historical evidence.⁹⁰

In examining the different miracle stories such as the "blind man at Jericho," the students will also become aware of the number of such stories in the Gospels: six exorcisms, seventeen healings (including three stories of raising of the dead), and eight "nature miracles."⁹¹ Furthermore, in using the historical-critical method, they will determine how many are supported by more than one historical source, and conclude that given the number of them, they could not all have been invented by the early Church.⁹² Through a rigorous inquiry process, the students themselves are given the opportunity to evaluate Meier's thesis that Jesus performed "deeds deemed by himself and by others to be miracles."⁹³ During this process, the students also need to become aware of an important distinction between Jesus' healing miracles and the nature miracles, for which the historical evidence is very weak. According to scholars, the nature miracles were most likely invented by the early church as a way to explain the miraculous powers of Jesus even over nature and to emphasize specific theological positions.⁹⁴ It is important for the students to realize this. Catholic students need to have a sophisticated understanding, not only of the miracle stories—this is only one example—but of the Gospels themselves, before they can make their own informed judgements.

After analysing the miracle stories, the students will continue to apply the historical-critical method and the inquiry process to examine other intriguing and mysterious events in Jesus' life, including his trial, his death, and his resurrection. Fascinating questions can guide this process: Why did the Jewish leaders surrender one of their own to be crucified—to be punished in the most painful way possible? What did he say and do that so infuriated and frightened them? What is the historical evidence behind his resurrection? Why were his disciples so certain that he rose from the dead?⁹⁵ Why did he first reveal himself to a woman, Mary Magdalene, and not one of the apostles? Such questions would also guide the inquiry process dealing with the early Church: What happened in the small room at Pentecost? Why did one of the first persecutors of Christians, Saul, become one of the greatest Christian missionaries—known by his Roman name, Paul? This inquiry process will result in the students accumulating a considerable amount of historical evidence concerning the historical Jesus and the early Church—knowledge that they have themselves judged in terms of authenticity.

This accumulation of knowledge is a critical stage in the process of self-transformation: the students must possess the essential knowledge needed to judge whether or not they should even bother engaging in this process. With this knowledge, the students can then examine the values espoused by Jesus from the “personal light” of intellectual understanding—understanding derived from the study of the historical Jesus. The process of self-transformation and the accumulation of more knowledge and understanding go hand in hand, each reinforcing the other. Using the miracles as an example, the students form a logical argument based on faith and reason that Jesus performed miracles, thus strengthening their own faith. Jesus’ historical miracles can then be connected to modern day miracles. The students will be given several opportunities to reflect on this connection, to ponder, to evaluate, and to judge for themselves the Christian conviction that Jesus is not just an historical individual, but the Son of God who is still “alive” and with whom they can establish an “intimate friendship.” The students will then discover that the Gospels support the fundamental Christian belief: “And remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age” (Matthew 28: 20). Such a belief is essential if the students are to engage in a process of self-transformation leading to religious conversion, and if they are to understand the importance of belonging to a Christian community in order to sustain them in this process—a community that Jesus himself established.

A new curricular framework for religious secondary education is therefore essential if Catholic schools are to graduate well-informed, critical thinking students who understand their faith and who desire to be active members in this Christian community—the Church. Central to this curricular framework is an engaging inquiry approach that provides students with the opportunity to discover for themselves the essential knowledge of their own religion and to enter into a process of self-transformation. Such a curricular framework is especially needed given the challenging conditions facing the Church. The social fabric of modern society has become fractured as the overall sense of community has been undermined. Neo-liberalism has emerged as one of the dominant ideologies and the transmission of the faith has been weakened by the declining number of Catholics who practice their faith. With this new curricular framework, the Catholic secondary schools of Ontario might provide the means by which these challenging conditions can be met and overcome.

Conclusion

By the time Leo XIII issued his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* in 1879, power within the Church had been centralized in the papacy itself, and education had become an instrument of this power. Concerned with what he considered the “vagaries of secular philosophy” and other “modern ills,” Leo attempted to restore Christian philosophy in the form of Neo-Thomism. Unlike his predecessors, he was open to the modern world in the sense that he offered the world an alternative philosophy that he believed would lead to a religious renewal. Leo also issued another major encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, On Capital and Labor, which promoted the social ethics of Thomas Aquinas. Together, these two encyclicals represented Leo’s effort to initiate not only a religious revival, but also widespread conversion, with modern society adopting the philosophy and the social ethics of the Catholic Church. In terms of education, Leo insisted that Catholic schools promote Neo-Thomism, leading to the eventual imposition of this philosophy—a philosophy that understood religious truth and Church doctrine as immutable and objective. The Church alone was the guardian of this deposit of faith, rejecting the concept of individual subjectivity.

This imposition did not remain unchallenged, however. Many Catholic scholars and theologians disagreed with the official position of the Church. Unwittingly, Leo had encouraged such opposition when he encouraged scholars to return to Aquinas’ original writings for inspiration, not realizing that the Neo-Thomism that he promoted differed significantly from what Aquinas actually wrote. Leo had also given religious orders such as the Franciscans and the Jesuits permission to follow their own intellectual traditions that differed from Neo-Thomism. Thus, despite the draconian measures introduced during the modernist crisis, the Church was never able to shut the “intellectual door” that Leo had left open. Specific forms of Neo-Thomism emerged that differed from the official, strict Neo-Thomism of the Church. Of particular concern to the Church was the transcendental Neo-Thomism of Joseph Maréchal that adopted an inner subjective interpretation of Thomas Aquinas’ thought. What also emerged was

the new theology, with its emphasis on the historical and developmental nature of religious truth and doctrine, the importance of individual subjectivity, inner transformation, and the individual conscience, and the recognition that theology had to be related to the real problems and issues faced by ordinary believers. It was this new theology that emerged victorious at the Second Vatican Council.

In the years before Vatican II, however, Neo-Thomism was the major philosophy in North American Catholic schools, especially after the 1929 encyclical *Divini Illius Magistri*, On Christian Education of Youth, which set the agenda for Catholic education for the next thirty years. Sustained by the dominant Catholic classicist culture, Neo-Thomism in turn became the dominant philosophy. In order to promote its strict form of Neo-Thomism, the Sacred Congregation of the Council in 1935 issued its Decree on the Better Care and Promotion of Catechetical Education, which insisted on obedience and required bishops to report on the condition of religious education in their dioceses. In the Archdiocese of Toronto, strict Neo-Thomism was evident in the secondary curriculum, administrative policies, mandated textbooks, teacher preparation, and professional development. Only with Vatican II was this strict Neo-Thomism abandoned.

Vatican II ushered in a period of tremendous challenge and change in Catholic education. Educators across North America struggled to adapt Catholic education to the various reforms of the Council, in particular to the envisioned new active role for the laity and to the essential tenets of the new theology. This was not the only challenge: educators also had to adapt to the difficult conditions of reception that existed for the reforms of Vatican II. The classicist Catholic culture was undermined as the process of secularization eroded the dominant Christian culture in North America, leading to the end of Christendom in the western world. In an increasingly pluralist and affluent society that valued individual and democratic rights, the authority of established institutions, including the Catholic Church, was undermined. As Catholics became more assimilated into the emerging dominant secular culture during the long sixties, the Church gradually became one voice among many that influenced their personal moral decisions. A major turning point was the debate on contraception, especially when the Church upheld its moral teaching against the use of contraceptives—a teaching that most Catholics ignored. The individual conscience became the final authority in terms of moral decisions. During the long sixties, Catholic education was also affected by the wide-sweeping educational reforms across North America, which in Ontario resulted in the 1968 *Living and Learning* document that began a period of more student-centred pedagogy, and reflected a new understanding of academic excellence as encompassing individual fulfillment and social responsibility to the community.

A fundamental shift therefore occurred in Catholic secondary education during the long sixties as Catholic educators attempted to adopt the new Vatican II understanding of theology, as articulated in the Declaration on Christian Education, in the context of

challenging conditions of reception. The emphasis was now on the developmental nature of doctrine as well as the importance of inner transformation and individual conscience. More focus was also given to establishing an authentic Christian community within the school and to promoting students' involvement in their own local community. A less academic approach to religious education was adopted as the Neo-Thomist textbooks were abandoned in favour of those that embraced a more sociological perspective. Church doctrine and teachings received less attention in both the textbooks and the classroom. The pedagogical methods also changed as Catholic secondary schools began to use more student-centred methods. At the same time, Catholic secondary schools were experiencing a considerable degree of secularization of consciousness as lay teachers and administrators played increasingly important roles, and were influenced by the secular society in which they lived. One major result of the suddenness of this fundamental shift was confusion and uncertainty, a situation exacerbated by the principle of subsidiarity adopted at Vatican II that had the unintended consequence of a significant leadership void in terms of secondary religious education. Near the end of the long sixties, however, a concerted effort was made to restore a sense of balance through a renewed focus on Church doctrine, without abandoning the impressive reforms achieved in religious education, particularly regarding the importance of inner transformation of the individual in the context of a Christian community, and through the re-emergence of the bishops' leadership in partnership with the laity.

In the years after the long sixties, Catholic educators experienced some significant accomplishments in Ontario with the completion of full government funding for Catholic schools and with the establishment of the Institute for Catholic Education. Nonetheless, one major and fundamental flaw still exists in secondary religious education, as Catholic educators face the challenges posed by neo-liberalism, the fractured nature of society, and the weakened transmission of the faith: the lack of an academic religious education curriculum suitable for the twenty-first century. What is needed is a new approach based on an inquiry process that allows students to investigate their own religion, to ask questions, to ponder, and to judge for themselves the validity of its essential tenets. In doing so, the students will adopt the method of the new theologians who triumphed at Vatican II by returning to the historical Jesus and the foundational period of the Church. They will discover the "living tradition" of the Church—a tradition that they can inherit if they so choose. With this inquiry-based approach, the balance that Catholic educators attempted to achieve after the long sixties, between the teaching of Church doctrine and promoting an inner transformation of the individual in the context of an authentic Christian community, can be achieved. The students will ultimately have the final say. They will decide whether or not they wish to participate in the living tradition of the Christian community that Jesus established. If they so choose, the Vatican II vision of an educated laity engaged in the life of the Church will be fulfilled.

Notes

Introduction

1. This study focuses on Ontario in the context of North America, that is, English Canada and the United States. The impact of Vatican II on secondary religious education in the province of Quebec deserves its own separate study. Unlike elsewhere in North America, Catholics formed the majority in Quebec, with the church controlling the educational system, especially from the 1870s to the 1960s. The Quebec Church also embraced ultramontanism, the belief that the Church was supreme over the civil government even in temporal matters. By the end of the 1840s, the Church had formed an alliance with the major political party in Quebec, further enhancing its influence. In 1875, the Church persuaded the government to abolish the position of Minister of Public Instruction, resulting in the province of Quebec not having a ministry of education until 1964. Furthermore, few traditional secondary schools existed for French-Catholics before the 1960s, since Quebec had instead a system of private classical colleges.
2. The term “Neo-Thomist” is somewhat contentious. At times, “Neo-Scholasticism” and “Neo-Thomism” are used interchangeably. See Philip Gleason, *Keeping the Faith: American Catholicism Past and Present* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1987), 146–49. Furthermore, some scholars use the term Neo-Thomist to refer only to the period 1870–1920, whereas other scholars use the term to include the period 1920 to 1960. The term Neo-Thomist is used in the broader sense here for the sake of consistency.
3. In this context, secular values are understood as being different from Catholic values, which are based on a world view centred on God and Christian belief. See James Arthur, “Secularisation, Secularism and Catholic Education: the Challenges,” *International Studies in Catholic Education* 1, no. 2 (2009): 228–39, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422530138226>.
4. Egerton Ryerson, the first chief superintendent of education in Upper Canada who held this position from 1846 to 1876, was adamant that the curriculum would indoctrinate the youth with Protestant values, leading them away from the “evils of Catholicism.” See Terri-Lynn Kay Brennan, “Roman Catholic Schooling in Ontario: Past Struggles, Present Challenges, Future Direction?” *Canadian Journal of Education* 34, no. 4 (2011): 22.
5. In this context, academic excellence is understood as technical excellence, the mastery of specific skills and content, and the rational, “socializing students into forms

of language and thought in relation to practices and standards” of a particular intellectual or scholarly discipline. See Rosa Bruno-Jofré and George (Skip) Hills, “Changing Visions of Excellence in Ontario School Policy: The Cases of Living and Learning and For the Love of Learning” in *Educational Theory* 61, no. 3 (2011): 338, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2011.00407.x>. It will be argued in this study that technical and rational excellence are needed in secondary religious education. One aspect of technical excellence, however, is not promoted in this study: standardized tests in terms of content. Such tests are too restrictive and do not permit an authentic student engagement with complex issues and content.

6. Kenneth A. Strike, “Is There a Conflict Between Equity and Excellence?” *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 7, no. 4 (1985): 411, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163575>.

7. Daniel Rogers, “Age of Fracture,” *Historically Speaking* 12, no. 2 (2011): 13, <https://doi.org/10.1353/hsp.2011.0018>.

8. Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA), cara.georgetown.edu/index.html.

9. Joseph Ratzinger, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Vol. I (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007), xii, and M.C. Scott, *Rome: The Emperor’s Spy* (Toronto: Bantam Press, 2010), 16–19.

10. This historical evidence will be addressed in Chapter 7, using the miracles of Jesus as an example.

11. Richard Rymarz, “Conversion and the New Evangelization: A Perspective from Loneragan,” *The Heythrop Journal* 51, no. 5 (2010): 753–67, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j1468-2265.2009.00545.x>.

Chapter One

1. The Gregorian reforms refer to the complex religious reform movement named after its major proponent, Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085). Central to this movement was the issue of church–state relations since the Church protested against the right of secular leaders to appoint Church officials, including bishops and abbots. The end result of this movement was the emergence of a powerful Church that was considerably more independent from secular leaders, a noticeable improvement in the intellectual and moral level of the clergy, and a papacy that began to compete successfully with kings and emperors in terms of both power and wealth during the High Middle Ages. The Church had become “a great super state that was governed by the papal administration.” See Norman F. Cantor, *The Civilization of the Middle Ages* (New York: Harper Collins, 1993), 245.

2. J.W. O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008), 31.

3. Ibid., 28.
4. Ibid., 27. The absence of lay involvement is the result of the complex relationship between church and state concerning the extent of Church involvement in secular society and was central to the Gregorian reform movement. The traditional position of the Church was that there should be no separation between church and state, that both shared secular responsibilities—a position not shared by European leaders in the nineteenth century.
5. James Hennesey, “Leo XIII’s Thomistic Revival: A Political and Philosophical Event,” *The Journal of Religion* 58 (1978): S191, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/415759900>.
6. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 55–56.
7. Ibid., 55.
8. Ibid., 56.
9. Ibid., 56.
10. In the late fourth century, the Church was granted the power to issue its own laws, which became known as canon laws. One of the results of the Gregorian reform movement was the first major codification of all the canon laws. Previously, these laws were unorganized and differed according to region with some contradicting others. The process of codification began in northern Europe, but the papacy became concerned that the resulting code might not favour the “papal absolutism” that it envisioned. Thus, by the beginning of the twelfth century, Italian scholars under papal supervision had assumed control of the process. See Cantor, *The Civilization of the Middle Age*, 62, 312–13. These laws dealt with a wide range of issues affecting the everyday life of Catholics, including marriage and legal contracts. See Thomas E. Woods, *How the Catholic Church Built Western Civilization* (Washington: Regnery Publishing, 2005), 192–93.
11. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 45.
12. Ibid., 56.
13. Ibid., 32–33.
14. Lasting from December 8, 1869 to September 1, 1870, the Council was brought to an abrupt end because of the Franco-Prussian War.
15. Owens Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints: Shapers of Modern Catholic History* (New York: Paulist Press, 2007), 100.
16. Ibid., 100.
17. Hennesey, “Leo XIII’s Thomistic Revival,” S187–88.
18. Gerald A. McCool, “From Leo XIII to John Paul II: Continuity and Development,” *International Philosophical Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (2000): 178, <https://doi.org/10.5840/ipq2000402>.
19. The two most influential figures here were René Descartes (1596–1650), who argued that “the individual mind could find truth within itself,” and Immanuel Kant

- (1724–1803), who opposed the “traditional notion of supernatural Revelation.” See Michael Attridge, “From Objectivity to Subjectivity and the Varied Strands,” in *Catholic Education in the Wake of Vatican II*, ed. Rosa Bruno-Jofré and Jon Igelmo Zaldívar (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 26–27.
20. Heidi MacDonald, “Women Religious and the State in Atlantic Canada,” in Bruno-Jofré and Zaldívar, *Catholic Education*, 179.
21. Richard Tarnas, *Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas that have Shaped our World* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1991), 340–54.
22. Michael Attridge, “From Objectivity to Subjectivity,” 27.
23. McCool, “From Leo XIII to John Paul II,” 179.
24. Attridge, “From Objectivity to Subjectivity,” 26.
25. Gerard A. McCool, *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989), 7.
26. Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 104.
27. *Ibid.*, 104.
28. The Church understood natural reason as “created reason” and thus as subordinate to “uncreated Truth” as revealed by God. Faith and natural reason are interrelated. The Church distinguished between two orders of knowledge: the “order of natural reason” and the “order of faith.” The first order could only grasp truths that can be obtained from natural reason. Divinely revealed truths could not be grasped by natural reason without assistance from the first order of faith. Faith played the critical role. The Church did not believe that natural reason was autonomous but dependent on faith. See Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (London: T&T Clark International, 2010), 19.
29. According to G. Daly, it may not have been the intention of Vatican I to close the door completely on an “immanent dimension to the preparation for faith” and the importance of the “subjective dispositions of the believer” being key to the process that led the individual to belief. A leading figure at the council, Archbishop Victor Deschamps, championed this position. See Gabriel Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 21–22.
30. Hennesey, “Leo XIII’s Thomistic Revival,” S188. It is beyond the scope of this work to analyse the vigorous debate and the different interpretations concerning papal infallibility.
31. *Ibid.*, S187. According to J.W. O’Malley in *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 2003), this anthropology is in direct contrast to that of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which maintained a “positive tone throughout” and was “remarkably sparing in threat of hell and damnation” (265).

32. Hennesey, "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival," S187.
33. Ibid., S191.
34. Ibid., S187. As Hennesey mentioned with regard to the 1854 definition of the Immaculate Conception, the Church intended to strengthen its political position in terms of authority. By identifying Catholics as weak, sinful people whose passions needed to be controlled, the Church was positioning itself as the essential bulwark against the evils of the modern world. With the First Vatican Council, the Church clearly intended to establish itself as the ultimate spiritual and political authority in the Catholic world, an authority whose actions could not be questioned by the faithful.
35. Pius IX uttered this remark when on June 18, 1870, the Archbishop of Bologna, an infallibilist, stated that a condition of infallibility involved consultation with the international episcopate, since the pope was no "isolated monarch" but the first among the bishops. See Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 109.
36. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 9.
37. Robert Ventresca, "A Plague of Perverse Opinions: Leo XIII's Aeterni Patris and the Catholic Encounter with Modernity," *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 12, no. 1 (2009): 146, <https://doi.org/10.1353/log.0.0022>.
38. Jose Pereira, "Thomism and the Magisterium: From Aeterni Patris to Veritatis Splendor," *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 5, no. 3 (2002): 149, <https://doi.org/10.1353/log.2002.0043>.
39. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 10.
40. Robert Royal, *A Deeper Vision: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition in the Twentieth Century* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2015), 43.
41. Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 122. Gerald A. McCool concurs with this appraisal, arguing that "Leo XIII had never excluded the possibility of a rapprochement between the Church and the nineteenth-century parliamentary governments." See "Twentieth-Century Scholastics," *The Journal of Religion* 58 (1978): S203, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41575991>.
42. Marcia Colish, "St. Thomas Aquinas in Historical Perspective: The Modern Period," *American Society of Church History* 44, no. 4 (1975): 433–49, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3163823>.
43. For the purpose of historical accuracy, the original language of primary documents has been retained with the term "man" and male pronouns often used as synonyms for both males and females. Otherwise, gender-neutral language has been used.
44. Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 120.
45. Ibid., 121.
46. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 39.
47. Hennesey, "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival," 195.
48. McCool, "From Leo XIII to John Paul II," 174.

49. Marc Depaepe and Paul Smeyers, "Educationalization as an Ongoing Modernization Process," *Educational Theory* 58, no. 4 (2008): 379, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2008.00295.x>.
50. Taylor Marshall, *Thomas Aquinas in 50 Pages: A Layman's Quick Guide to Thomism* (Irvin, Texas: Saint John Press, 2014), 43–48.
51. *Ibid.*, 49.
52. *Rerum*, 34.
53. *Ibid.*, 34.
54. *Ibid.*, 45.
55. *Ibid.*, 26.
56. *Ibid.*, 27.
57. *Ibid.*, 31.
58. *Ibid.*, 57.
59. *Ibid.*, 61.
60. Hennesey, "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival," 190.
61. *Ibid.*, 189.
62. *Ibid.*, 189.
63. *Ibid.*, 190.
64. Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 1 (1969): 9–15, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2504188>. In his analysis, Skinner provides several examples of how certain concepts such as equality, progress, and the social contract have become doctrines whose meaning is essentially unchanged by historical change.
65. Pereira, "Thomism and the Magisterium," 153.
66. *Ibid.*, 154.
67. *Ibid.*, 150.
68. *Ibid.*, 150.
69. *Ibid.*, 155.
70. *Ibid.*, 155.
71. *Ibid.*, 156.
72. *Ibid.*, 148. Pereira surmises that the Franciscans most likely continued to follow their own chosen philosophies despite Leo's command. It is also important to emphasize the differences between Neo-Thomism and Neo-Scholasticism, even though Leo himself was not entirely aware of them. There were at least four scholastic systems: Bonaventurism, Scotism, Suárezianism, and Thomism.
73. *Ibid.*, 151.
74. *Ibid.*, 151. Perriera convincingly argues that this antinomy will remain a problem for the Magisterium from the pontificate of Leo XIII to that of John Paul II.

75. Ibid., 152. Skinner's concept of the "myth of coherence" is useful here. According to Skinner, many scholars err in writing a particular "history of thoughts that no one ever actually succeeded in thinking, at a level of coherence which no one ever actually attained" ("Meaning and Understanding," 17–18). In other words, the historian must take care in assuming Leo followed a coherent policy at all times, especially given the complexity of the Church's relationship with the modern world.

76. Gabriel Daly, "Catholicism and Modernity," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 5, no. 4 (1985): 775, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1464275>.

77. This was a key point of contention among Catholic theologians, even among supporters of Thomism.

78. Pereira, "Thomism and the Magisterium," 158.

79. At first, however, the imposition was only relaxed for the Jesuits. See Pereira, "Thomism and the Magisterium," 159.

80. Hennesey, "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival," 197.

81. Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 125–26.

82. Carolyn Osiek, "Catholic or Catholic? Biblical Scholarship at the Center," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, no. 1 (2006): 10–11, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27638344>. For example, in his 1893 encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, On the Study of Holy Scripture, Leo encouraged the use of scientific criticism and intellectual freedom, articulating a "foundational principle that is still affirmed today" that "Truth cannot contradict truth, and we may be sure that some mistake has been made either in the interpretation of the sacred words or in the polemical discussion." As Osiek states, the Church still follows this foundational principle, arguing that there cannot be any "real discrepancy between theology and the natural sciences, as long as each remains true to its own language and discipline," 10. In the same encyclical, however, Leo condemned the "so-called higher criticism" tainted with "false philosophy and rationalism" for its efforts to change "traditional understandings of the author origins of biblical books." Furthermore, three years later, Leo established the Pontifical Biblical Commission in 1902 to "ride herd on error in biblical study," seriously impeding progress in scholarship, 11.

83. Nonetheless, according to Gerald McCool, it is generally admitted that in the long term, "without the vigorous impulse given to its early development by Leo, the flowering of Catholic philosophy and theology" in the twentieth century, "which made the Second Vatican Council possible, might not have taken place." In terms of education in North America, however, this "flowering" was quite limited once the modernist crisis began and the Church imposed its version of Thomism on Catholic schools. See McCool, "From Leo XIII to John Paul II," 173.

84. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 5.

85. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 21.

86. It is important to note here that the modernists were critical mainly of the dominant form of Neo-Thomism during this period: “strict Thomism” or Roman Thomism; that is, the Thomism adhered to by the Magisterium. During the period of 1920 to 1950, different forms of Neo-Thomism would emerge.
87. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 19.
88. *Ibid.*, 21.
89. This criticism did not begin with the modernists. For example, Blaise Pascal in the seventeenth century examined the “inner drives” of the human being and the dynamics of the mind, leading him to conclude that human beings can only be content with God. See Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 23. Pascal also influenced French intellectuals during the modernist crisis. The French novelist, Francois Mauriac, in his 1963 *What I Believe*, commented that “it was the Christ of Pascal who said to me, in those hours, ‘Stay with me.’” See Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 518–19.
90. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 45.
91. McCool, “Twentieth-Century Scholasticism,” S201.
92. *Ibid.*, S202. This theology has also been called “conclusion theology,” which refers to a “system of reasoning” that results in conclusions compatible with Neo-Thomism. See Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 12. In terms of Skinner’s theoretical framework, this conclusion theology involves the reification of doctrine wherein concepts become entities in themselves.
93. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 44. The complete encyclical is available on the Holy See website, at: w2.vatican.va.
94. Pereira, “Thomism and the Magisterium,” 159.
95. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 25.
96. McCool, “Twentieth-Century Scholasticism,” S203.
97. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 45.
98. Pereira, “Thomism and the Magisterium,” 127. The oath remained in place until 1967.
99. *Ibid.*, 127.
100. *Ibid.*, 126–27. Pius X also seemed to believe that there were “enemies” everywhere. A network of informers was established, the Sodalitium Pianum, working mainly in France and Italy to seek out modernist reformers within the Church, the Catholic “fifth column.” Pius X also removed anyone from positions of authority in Catholic institutions whom he believed were not entirely loyal to the official Neo-Thomist philosophy. Censors were given wide powers to ensure that Catholic publications were not tainted with modernist ideas, and conferences of priests and laity were kept to a minimum to protect them from modernist views. Diocese “Watch Committees” were also established.

101. Thomism of the strict observance has also been referred to as Denzinger theology after Heinrich Denzinger, who in 1854 published the first collection of Roman texts, including conciliar documents. This term was used to describe a theology that was restricted to magisterial texts and endeavoured to legitimize them. In the words of Mettepenningen, it was a “theology that followed the course set out by the magisterium to the letter.” See *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 12.

102. Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 19.

103. *Ibid.*, 19–20.

104. *Ibid.*, 20.

Chapter Two

1. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 19.

2. Gerald McCool, “The Tradition of Saint Thomas in North America: At 50 Years,” *The Modern Schoolman*, 65, no. 3 (1988): 186, <https://doi.org/10.5840/schoolman198865328>.

3. G.B. Flahiff, “The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies at Toronto,” *Speculum* 24, no. 2 (1949): 251, <https://www.jstor.org/stable284856>.

4. McCool, “The Tradition of Saint Thomas,” 193.

5. *Ibid.*, 186–87. In his study on the tradition of St. Thomas in North America, McCool analyses the reasons why this tradition had less impact in Europe, including the fact that European Catholic institutions of higher education were “relatively rare.” In Europe, Catholic education was mainly restricted to the secondary level, where philosophy played only a “minor role,” particularly in France. See *Ibid.*

6. Emmett Carter, *The Modern Challenge to Religious Education* (New York: Palm Publisher, 1961), 1.

7. A certain degree of pluralism existed soon after the publication of *Aeterni Patris*, as Leo XIII encouraged historical research into the Medieval era, especially with the work of Mercier at Louvain. See Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, 11.

8. McCool, “The Tradition of Saint Thomas,” 192.

9. Pereira, “Thomism and the Magisterium,” 159–60. This gradual process of relaxation of the imposition began even earlier with Pope Benedict XV extending Leo’s relaxation of the imposition for the Jesuits to other religious orders.

10. *Ibid.*, 167. This limited freedom was not extended to intellectuals who questioned the essential tenets of Thomism, and thus this encyclical condemned the “nouvelle théologie,” whose adherents received treatment similar to the modernists at the turn of the century. Jürgen Mettepenningen contends that this encyclical aimed to send the nouvelle théologie to the “theological wastebasket” without ever actually naming the movement directly; see *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 4.

11. Gerald McCool, "Neo-Thomism and the Tradition of St. Thomas," *Thought* 62, no. 245 (1987): 140, <https://doi.org/105840/thought198762223>.
12. Marcia Colish, "St. Thomas Aquinas in Historical Perspective: The Modern Period," *American Society of Church History* 44, no. 4 (1975), 445–46, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3163823>. Colish refers to these intellectuals as members of "guerilla movements" opposed to strict Neo-Thomism and inspired by various intellectual trends such as phenomenology and historical-patristic studies.
13. McCool, "Neo-Thomism and the Tradition of St. Thomas," 138. See, as well, Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 26–27. Classical Thomism is not used here because it was characterized by two major forms: strict Neo-Thomism and the Neo-Thomism of Maritain, who criticized the former, especially the manuals used in seminaries. See Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 85. Terminology remains an issue when discussing Neo-Thomism. According to Fr. J. Farge, curator of the Gilson Collection at the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Etienne Gilson, usually identified as a Neo-Thomist, considered himself a Thomist, not a Neo-Thomist, since he focused on the actual works of Thomas Aquinas and not on later commentaries (personal communication via email, 23/05/17, 11:32 a.m.).
14. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 26. His ideas were influenced by Blondel, who argued that humans possessed "inner drives" that led to a desire for God. Pope John Paul also acknowledged the importance of Blondel in his encyclical on Faith and Reason. Important as well was the pioneering work of Pierre Rousselot, which referred to the "inner dynamism of the mind" as a "natural drive to become an angel." See Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 45 and 65–66.
15. Gerald McCool, "Jacques Maritain: A Neo-Thomist Classic," *The Journal of Religion* 58, no. 4 (1978): 386, <https://doi.org/10.1086/486651>.
16. *Ibid.*, 386.
17. *Ibid.*, 386.
18. *Ibid.*, 390.
19. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 26. Maritain is also widely recognized as the Neo-Thomist who best articulated Leo XIII's vision of a Christian philosophy capable of addressing the exigencies of modernity in his Christian humanism. See McCool, *Twentieth-Century Scholasticism*, S211. Maritain was also influenced by Rousselot's understanding of the relationship between the "inner dynamism" of the mind, which he connected to the "intellectus" and the intuitive mind, contending that this relationship was central to St. Thomas' epistemology and metaphysics. Rousselot also argued that the concept of ratio—the discursive intellect—was not the highest object of human knowledge, according to Aquinas, but "rather the deficient substitute for a missing intuition." See McCool, *Twentieth-Century Scholasticism*, S208. McCool concludes that Thomas's intellectualism is much closer

to that of Blondel than many scholars had believed; see *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 56.

20. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 60–61. It is important to note that the Neo-Thomist movement, since its early days in the mid-nineteenth century, promoted research of the Medieval Era, yet it was Gilson who best exemplified the Neo-Thomist focus on historical research. See Gerald McCool, *The Neo-Thomists* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2009), 134.

21. McCool, *The Neo-Thomists*, 135.

22. *Ibid.*, 136.

23. Cajetan, for example, argued that it was not possible to prove philosophically the immortality of the soul—a position contrary to Thomas’ own. According to Gilson, both Cajetan and Suárez (as well as other sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Thomists such as John of St. Thomas) misunderstood Thomas’ metaphysics of existence, in which “to be” meant “to exist” and the spiritual soul “communicated” this to the body, in which it existed by a “priority of nature.” The soul was “already placed in being through its own proper act of existence.” The soul would therefore continue to exist after the death of the body. See McCool, *The Neo-Thomists*, 140–41, and McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 193.

24. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 64.

25. McCool, “Neo-Thomism and the Tradition of St. Thomas,” 138. However, Gilson was not correct in this since both transcendentalism and intuition were prominent in Thomas’ thought. Aquinas’ understanding of the role played by intuition was different from that of Augustine and from the leading intellectuals of the first Thomist revival.

26. McCool, “The Tradition of Saint Thomas in North America,” 194.

27. *Ibid.*, 195.

28. *Ibid.*, 197.

29. John L. Elias, “Whatever Happened to Catholic Philosophy of Education?” *Religious Education* 94, no. 1 (1999): 98–99,

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408990940108>. Elias provides an explanation of Maritain’s educational goals.

30. McCool, “The Tradition of Saint Thomas in North America,” 198.

31. *Ibid.*, 188. It is important to note, however, that progressive education was extensively applied to schools in the United States. The leading classical Thomist, Jacques Maritain, admired many aspects of progressive education.

32. Gerald McCool, “Spirituality and Philosophy: The Ideal of the Catholic Mind,” *Sacred Heart University Review* 10, no. 1, art. 3 (1989): 28, <http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/shureview/vol10/iss/3>.

33. Richard Tarnas, *The Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas that Have Shaped Our World* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1991), 246. Tarnas outlines the

complex intellectual tradition embodied in the Church, highlighting in particular the role of the Jesuits in terms of education, and their role in both conserving and promoting the “humanistic program” from the classical era and the Renaissance.

34. Richard Rymarz, “Conversion and the New Evangelization: A Perspective from Lonergan,” *The Heythrop Journal* 51, no. 5 (2010): 754, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j1468-2265.2009.00545.x>.

35. *Ibid.*, 754.

36. *Ibid.*, 755. R.G. Collingwood uses the term “substantialism” to define classicism and the accompanying mindset, which held that major social entities like the Church sailed “like a hermetically sealed and fully defined substance through the sea of history without being affected by it.” See O’Malley, *What Happened*, 37.

37. Rymarz, “Conversion and the New Evangelization,” 754–55.

38. McCool, “The Tradition of Saint Thomas,” 188–89.

39. Philip Gleason, “In Search of Unity: American Catholic Thought 1920-1960,” *The Catholic Historical Review* 65, no. 2 (1979): 190–91, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25020551>.

40. *Ibid.*, 194.

41. James Hitchcock and David J. O’Brien, “How Has American Catholic Intellectual Life Changed Over the Past Thirty Years?” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 4, no. 2, *Catholics and Intellectual Life* (1985): 177, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25153726>.

42. *Ibid.*, 178.

43. Gleason, “In Search of Unity,” 203.

44. McCool, “Neo-Thomism and the Tradition of St. Thomas,” 134.

45. McCool, “Spirituality and Philosophy,” 30.

46. McCool, “Neo-Thomism and the Tradition of St. Thomas,” 134.

47. George Bull, “The Function of the Catholic Graduate School,” *Thought* 13, no. 3 (1933): 364, <https://doi.org/10.5840/thought193813343>.

48. *Ibid.*, 368.

49. *Ibid.*, 367.

50. *Ibid.*, 368.

51. *Ibid.*, 377.

52. Brian J. Kelty, “Toward a Theology of Catholic Education,” *Religious Education* 94, no. 1 (1999): 11, <https://doi.org/10.1080/003440899094010>.

53. McCool, “Spirituality and Philosophy,” 30.

54. In his paper, McCool emphasizes the many positive aspects of this classicist tradition, arguing that this tradition should still be drawn upon for insight as the Church continues to strive to increase its relevance in the modern world. It is important here to emphasize the historical-societal context of the early twentieth century, where this tradition took a “negative turn.”

55. Elias, "Whatever Happened," 93.
56. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 10.
57. In this instance, Tertullian's *Apologeticus* is used to emphasize how Catholics make excellent citizens, "attached to his country, and loyally submissive to constituted civil authority in every legitimate form of government." *Divini*, section 85.
58. *Divini*, section 87.
59. *Divini*, sections 31–33.
60. *Divini*, section 72. Pius refers to this treatise particularly to emphasize the important role of the family in terms of education. St. Charles Borromeo, a major reformer of the Renaissance era, had the treatise read in every parish in Milan. Pius also refers to the treatise in order to highlight human sinfulness and weakness in terms of sexuality. See section 66.
61. *Divini*, section 16.
62. *Divini*, section 1.
63. *Divini*, sections 58 and 59.
64. *Divini*, section 60.
65. The important role of the family in education is also emphasized—a role that supersedes that of the state. Relying on statements from Thomas Aquinas and Leo XIII, the family is understood as patriarchal in nature, with the father as the head of the family, whose "power is of such a nature that it cannot be destroyed or absorbed by the State." Thus, the State must respect and uphold the right of Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools. *Divini*, section 35.
66. *Divini*, section 24.
67. *Divini*, section 35 and 79.
68. *Divini*, section 18.
69. *Divini*, sections 43 to 54.
70. Carter, *The Modern Challenge*, 2.
71. *Ibid.*, 2.
72. *Ibid.*, 2.
73. *The Sacred Congregation of the Council Decree On the Better Care and Promotion of Catechetical Education*, National Center of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington D.C., Archdiocese of Toronto Archives (hereafter ARCAT), MGSO25.65 a., 12. The extent to which the Council was concerned with the quality of education is clearly indicated by the strong language in the decree: "faith in our day is sickly and almost to be accounted dead, for no other cause than the careless, negligent teaching of Christian doctrine, or the omission of this duty altogether," 4–5.
74. *The Sacred Congregation*, 7. In this instance, the decree refers to canons 1330, 1331, and 1332, all of which deal with punishment.
75. *Ibid.*, 10.

76. Ibid., 10.
77. Ibid., 8.
78. Ibid., 11.
79. Ibid., 13.
80. Questionnaire on the Teaching of Christian Doctrine, the Archdiocese of Toronto Office of Religious Instruction, ARCAT, GSO25.65 (b).
81. Monsignor Vincent Foy, "Catechetical Chaos in Canada: Cause and Cure," *St. Joseph's Worker for Life and Family* (1999): 2, https://msgrfoy.files.wordpress.com/2014/03/scan_20140303-4.jpg. After Vatican II, Foy did not alter his overall philosophy, calling liberal Catholicism the new "modernism."
82. Questionnaire on the Teaching of Christian Doctrine, the Archdiocese of Toronto Office of Religious Instruction, ARCAT, GSO25.65 (b).
83. Questionnaire on the Teaching of Christian Doctrine, 12.
84. It was not only the Archdiocese of Toronto that adopted final religion exams. The Archdiocese of Kingston, for example, had such exams. The 1957 final senior exam consisted mainly of memory-recall questions that required little analysis, such as "What is the sacrament of Holy Orders?" Under what circumstances did Our Lord institute this sacrament?" See Archives of the Sisters of Providence, Kingston, 13B2, 309.5.
85. Report on "Diocesan Catechetical Activities" for 1944–45. See ARCAT, EDSC04.66.
86. Francis B. Cassilly, S.J., *Religion: Doctrine and Practice* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1934), 350–51.
87. Ibid., 350.
88. Ibid.
89. ARCAT, MGDS59.07A and MGDS5907B.
90. Clarence Elwell, *Our Quest for Happiness, Book One, Our Goal and Our Guides* (Chicago: Mentzer, Bush, and Company, 1951), 38.
91. Ibid., 30.
92. Ibid., 494–95.
93. Richard Gilmour, *Bible History* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1894). This was the textbook used in Trenton, Ontario, when Father Brian Price, archivist for the Archdiocese of Kingston, was in grade nine.
94. "Program of Christian Doctrine Studies," ARCAT, MGDS.5907B.
95. Michael Attridge, "From Objectivity to Subjectivity and the Varied Strands," 36.
96. Rymarz, "Conversion and the New Evangelization," 756.
97. Cassilly, *Religion: Doctrine and Practice*, 271.
98. Emmett Carter's "Child Study in Relation to the Curriculum: The Adolescent Period" was a paper delivered in 1954 in the Archdiocese of Toronto while Carter was

the Director of the Montreal Jacques Cartier Normal School. He discusses how history is often used for propaganda and apologetic purposes, and not only by Catholics. According to Carter, “for the last century or more there has certainly been a tendency among Catholic writers to make history a department of apologetics and to idealize mediaeval culture in order to exalt their religious ideals.” He argues that high school students need to be taught the truth, asking a very practical question: “How much better that they should hear these truths from kind lips and Catholic sources than that they should be obliged to accept them later, to their chagrin, from hostile sources.” See ARCAT, EDSCO1.258(A), 20.

99. ARCAT, C04.154.

100. Duties of Inspectors. January 1954 Report of John M. Bennett, Inspector, for Division XVIII, Metropolitan Catholic Separate Schools of Greater Toronto. See ARCAT, EDSCO4.38 c.

101. “Teaching of Religion,” prepared by J.M. Bennett for the Catechetical Conference for Kingston. See Archives of the Sisters of Providence, Kingston, 13B2, 304.5, 1.

102. Bennett, “Teaching of Religion,” 2.

103. Ibid.

104. *The Toronto Telegram*, September 19, 1953, quoted in “Teaching Christian Living,” Catechetical Conference, Kingston, Oct 11, 1953. See Archives of the Sisters of Providence, Kingston, 13B2 304.5.

105. “Memorandum on the Training of Catechists.” See ARCAT, MGDS.5907B.

106. “Catechetical Instruction Course for School Teachers,” 1958. See ARCAT, SC04.38 d. It is important to note here that teachers were therefore exposed to a certain degree of the pluralism within Neo-Thomism; however, given the existing conditions of religious education with the mandated textbooks and exams, it is highly unlikely that the students were likewise exposed to any such pluralism. Even more revealing is the absence of Joseph Marachel’s works. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that his ideas influenced religious education in the archdiocese prior to Vatican II.

107. Bennett, “Teaching of Religion,” 3.

108. Ibid., 4.

109. Bennett, “Teaching of Religion,” 4. The Inspector listed twenty activities, including “Seeking gospel passages that prove Christ’s Divinity,” “Giving an oral or written account of a miracle of our Lord like an eye witness might do,” and a liturgical day in school to celebrate some feast (hymns, topics, poetry, drama, prayers from Mass of the day).” See *ibid.*

110. Patrick McNamara, *Conscience First, Tradition: A Study of Young American Catholics* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1991), 17.

111. *Ibid.*, 18.

112. This type of Catholicism has been termed “devotional Catholicism,” a “firm and long-standing tradition.” It is an expression of Catholic classism and the Catholic mind. *Ibid.*, 29.

113. Gary R. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake: Public Religion, Centennial Celebrations, and the Re-making of Canada in the 1960s* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2005), 7–8.

114. Raymond Williams, *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays* (London: Verso, 1980), 38.

115. According to Miedema, there is a growing consensus among scholars, including sociologists, anthropologists, cultural theorists, and historians, that public rituals and symbolism need to be understood as important cultural tools of dominance. See Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 9.

116. *Ibid.*, 10.

117. Steven Lukes, “Political Ritual and Social Integration,” *Sociology (Oxford)* 9, no. 2 (1975): 301, <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803857500900205>.

118. Bruce Curtis, *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871* (London: Althouse Press, 1988), 13.

119. *Ibid.*, 17.

120. The history of the relationship between the school boards and the local bishops is a complicated one. Suffice it to say, they worked together for the benefit of the Catholic school system.

121. The struggle to establish this Catholic school system has been well-documented. Terri-Lynn Kay Brennan’s *Roman Catholic Schooling in Ontario: Past Struggles, Present Challenges, Future Direction?* provides an excellent summary. Ontario (Canada West) was strongly anti-Catholic and Catholics were tolerated as a “political necessity.” In order to have schools for the Protestant minority in Quebec (Canada East), Catholics insisted that the Catholic minority in Canada West must also be granted their own school system. During the period of 1841–1867, Ontario and Quebec co-existed in one colony, Canada. Furthermore, as a barely tolerated minority, Catholics would be all the more inclined to accept the leadership of the Church in terms of their sense of collective identity.

122. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 81.

123. Gleason, *Keeping the Faith*, 149.

124. *Ibid.*, 28.

125. *Ibid.*, 149.

126. Interview with Cardinal Villeneuve, in *The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service* release for the week of November 6, 1933, 33.

127. Mary Irene Zotti, “The Young Christian Workers,” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 9 (1990): 390–91, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25153925>. Pope Pius XI’s encyclical, *Divini*

Redemptoris, On Atheistic Communism, was the impetus for the increase in Catholic Action activities in North America, as Pius called upon Catholics to undertake study circles, lecture courses, conferences, and other activities in order to promote the Catholic solution to existing social problems.

128. *Ibid.*, 395. The Church was understood increasingly as the mystical body of Christ (see Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie*, 27–28), especially after Pope Pius XII’s 1943 encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* was issued. This concept meshed nicely with Catholic classicism, the “Catholic mind,” and the social vision of Catholic Action.

129. *The Catholic Register*, June 1951, <https://www.catholicregister.org/archive>.

130. *The Catholic Register*, April 14, 1951, <https://www.catholicregister.org/archive>.

131. Zotti, “The Young Christian Workers,” 391.

132. Robert Hurley, *Hermeneutics and Catechesis: Biblical Interpretation in the Come to the Father Catechetical Series* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1997), 30.

133. *Ibid.*, 260.

134. Zotti, “The Young Christian Workers,” 388.

135. *Ibid.*, 387.

136. Michael Power and Daniel J. Brock, *Gather up the Fragments: A History of the Diocese of London* (London: Diocese of London, 2008), 215.

137. *The Catholic Register*, March 3, 1951, <https://www.catholicregister.org/archive>.

138. *The Catholic Register*, February 16, 1952, <https://www.catholicregister.org/archive>.

139. The degree of success is almost impossible to measure with any accuracy, and given the religious crisis of the 1960s, it is difficult to argue that the educationalization process enjoyed long-lasting success.

140. Rymarz, “Conversion and the New Evangelization,” 754.

141. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 34.

142. This sense of insecurity has been recognized as “one of the most pervasive characteristics of the time.” See John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1988), 162.

143. One of the cultural norms was belonging to a church. This period therefore witnessed a religious revival in the majority of Christian churches. See Doug Owrarn, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 104–5. This is not to argue that this revival necessarily resulted in a deepening of faith, since later, during the 1960s, many of these individuals no longer were active members of their church once the normal patterns of life had changed.

Chapter Three

1. Franklin Walker, *Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Volume III* (Toronto: Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario, 1986), 205. This address attracted

considerable attention, according to Rev. Vincent Priester, Executive-Director and Secretary of the English Catholic Education Association of Ontario. In a July 25, 1957 letter to Cardinal McGuigan, he referred not only to the publication of Lynch's address, but to all of the annual "special addresses" as "bearing fruit." As evidence, he also sent the cardinal a copy of a letter he had received from Dr. R.W.B. Jackson, Director of the Ontario College of Education, in which Jackson, a Protestant, admitted that he shared a common Protestant view that Catholic schools did not encourage "intellectual curiosity, or scientific search for truth," and that he looked forward to reading the address "carefully and in detail." He commented that he now believed that this common Protestant view was based on ignorance. See Archdiocese of Toronto Archives, EDS002.66 (a) and (b).

2. Elias, "Whatever Happened," 98.

3. Jacques Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), 12–13.

4. Elias, "Whatever Happened," 94.

5. Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, 32.

6. *Ibid.*, 32.

7. *Ibid.*, 33.

8. *Ibid.*, 10. Maritain also emphasized that "education by the rod is positively bad education."

9. *Ibid.*, 31–32.

10. *Ibid.*, 28.

11. Elias, "Whatever Happened," 99.

12. Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, 61.

13. *Ibid.*, 62.

14. *Ibid.*, 27.

15. *Ibid.*, 34.

16. *Ibid.*, 27. For an examination of the fundamental differences between the philosophies of John Dewey and Maritain, see Timothy S. Valentine, S.J., in "Truth or Consequences? Maritain and Dewey on the Philosophy of Education," in *Truth Matters: Essays in Honor of Jacques Maritain*, ed. John G. Trapani, Jr. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 76–88. Despite their fundamental differences, both Maritain and Dewey agreed on the importance of having clear educational aims.

17. Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, 43.

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*, 44.

20. When discussing secondary education, Maritain focuses on the development of the powers of reason. When discussing post-secondary education, Maritain reveals his

Neo-Thomist perspective by emphasizing the importance of discipline integration, the significance of studying the “great books” of western civilization, and the priority of contemplation rather than further inquiry. See *Ibid.*, 63–72.

21. Michael W. Higgins and Douglas Richard Letson, *My Father’s Business: A Biography of His Eminence G. Emmett Cardinal Carter* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1990), 91.

22. Carter, *The Modern Challenge*, 140.

23. *Ibid.*, 139.

24. *Ibid.*, 140.

25. *Ibid.*, 100.

26. *Ibid.*, 339.

27. *Ibid.*, 12. Carter argued that “it is a principle of pedagogy that repetition is the mother of good studies.” Many modern scholars would agree with this assertion. For example, a leading educational expert, Robert J. Marzano, agrees with Carter, contending that repetition is critical in terms of both content and skills. Interestingly, he uses the term “sameness,” but in Marzano’s case, sameness does not imply sterility, but rather a creative reworking of same content and skills, leading to a more sophisticated understanding. See Robert J. Marzano, *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action* (Alexandria: ASCD, 2003), 112.

28. Carter, *The Modern Challenge*, 82. It is also interesting to note here that this concept of the big idea is extremely popular today as a means to organize content. The entire educational method of what is called the “backward design” or “understanding by design,” popularized by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe, is based on this concept. In the Ontario curriculum, big ideas for specific subjects are now suggested.

29. Carter, *The Modern Challenge*, 83.

30. *Ibid.*, 212.

31. *Ibid.*, 215.

32. *Ibid.*, 212.

33. *Ibid.*, 214.

34. *Ibid.*, 210.

35. *Ibid.*, 216.

36. *Ibid.*, 101.

37. *Ibid.*, 108.

38. *Ibid.*, 222.

39. Considerable research has recently been conducted on this topic. The human brain searches for meaning. Please see Eric Jenson, *Teaching with the Brain in Mind* (Alexandria: ASCD, 1998); Marilee Sprenger, *Learning & Memory: The Brain in Action* (Alexandria: ASCD, 1999); and Marilee Sprenger, *How to Teach So Students Remember* (Alexandria: ASCD, 2005).

40. Carter also provided considerable information and guidance in terms of teacher methods of instruction. His preferred choice was the revised Munich method, popular at the time. He detailed the five steps involved in this method: teacher preparation of lesson; presentation of content with special attention given to student interest; explanation of content, appealing to the powers of the intellect to understand; summary of content, providing some practical advice; and application of content to the student's lived experience. He considered the last step the most important, in that it involved the students applying the religious truth that they had learned to their daily lives. See Carter, *The Modern Challenge*, 273–81.

41. *Ibid.*, 330.

42. *Ibid.*, 329.

43. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 230.

44. Rymarz, "Conversion and the New Evangelization," 155.

45. *Ibid.*, 214. Bernard Lonergan's inquiry approach was the method of Thomas himself. Lonergan argued that human beings possess an "inquiring intelligence." Insight occurs whenever a person, the subject, "comes to understand anything" and involves a release from "the tension of inquiry"—a sudden grasp of insight. For Lonergan, this inquiry process, this process of knowing, was also connected to transcendence, a "realm of human meaning" that was real. William M. Shea, "From Classicism to Method: John Dewey and Bernard Lonergan," *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 3 (1991): 304, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1085788>.

46. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 226.

47. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 88.

48. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 27.

49. *Ibid.*

50. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 27–29.

51. For example, two of the most significant scholars identified with the new theology disliked the term. Yves Congar referred to it as an "imaginary monster," and Henri de Lubac never considered himself as a new theologian. As early as 1946, de Lubac informed his Jesuit Superior that he never promoted any new theology, and in an interview, years after Vatican II, he said that it was a myth. See *Ibid.*, 101.

52. O'Malley, *What Happened*, 75.

53. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 4–5, 35. Particularly influential was Garrigou-Lagrange's 1947 article "Where is New Theology leading us?" in which he stated that it was leading back to modernism. He argued that the same "weapons" used against modernism should be used against the new theology. It is important to note here as well that the intense debate that occurred concerning the new theology took place within the different religious orders themselves. For example, Garrigou-Lagrange and Congar were both Dominicans.

54. Ibid., 141. There were other similarities that stemmed from the shared historical-criticism method, such as the presupposition that dogmas were not immutable, and that it was permissible to use inductive reasoning. See Ibid., 21.
55. Ibid., xiii.
56. Ibid., 33.
57. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 171. Gilson defended his position by publishing brilliant studies on St. Bonaventure, St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and John Duns Scotus. Their philosophies were “highly diverse,” allowing Gilson to conclude that a “radical philosophical pluralism” existed in the Middle Ages.
58. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 146.
59. Ibid., 147.
60. Ibid., 147.
61. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 31.
62. Ibid., 32. In holding this position, Congar and other new theologians shared in a key development identified by Mettepenningen, a desire to connect theology with the everyday life of believers, a desire evident as well in Carter’s *The Modern Challenge to Religious Education*.
63. O’Malley, J.W. *What Happened*, 75.
64. Ibid., 16.
65. Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 6–7. Jacques-Paul Migne, a diocesan priest and publishing entrepreneur, also played an important role here. His monumental *Patrologia* was an essential resource for researchers. Part one was the *Patrologia Latina* (1844–1864), a corpus of Latin Christian writers from the second to the thirteenth century, and part two was the *Patrologia Graeca*, a corpus of Greek writings from the first century to 1432. Altogether there were 162 volumes. See O’Malley, *What Happened*, 75.
66. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 16.
67. Ibid., 16.
68. It is interesting to note that Neo-Thomism had little impact on Newman’s thinking, since he had only a “layman’s acquaintance” with the writings of Thomas Aquinas. See Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 42.
69. Ibid., 41.
70. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 17.
71. Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 48. This conviction stems from Newman’s personal experience. He stated that he had a constant and deep sense of God’s presence ever since he was a young boy. This also led him to the same conviction as Congar that the laity played a critical role in the Church, and his pastoral work was always dear to him. Once, for example, he was invited to preach in Rome by the “pompous” Monsignor Talbot, who condescendingly commented that his audience

would be far superior to anything he could find in industrial Birmingham, where Newman worked. He refused the invitation, commenting that “Birmingham people have souls.” Ibid., 47.

72. Yves Congar, *The Meaning of Tradition* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004), 103.

73. Ibid., 2.

74. Ibid., ix.

75. David Braithwaite, S.J., “Vatican II on Tradition,” *The Heythrop Journal* 53 (2012): 917, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468.22265.2012.00747.x>.

76. Ibid., 918.

77. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 52.

78. Ibid., 52. This approach has also been called “positive-speculative theology.”

Positive theology, which includes an inductive approach, is used in the “search of the building blocks...in an exploration of the sources of faith,” and speculative theology involves an analytical approach rather than a “mystical-contemplative” one. Ibid., 11.

See also Cummings, *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints*, 9.

79. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 53.

80. Ibid., 33–34. Whereas in the first stage the Dominicans dominated, the Jesuits were more prominent in the second phase. Mettepenningen identifies three key publications that ushered in the second phase: Henri Bouillard’s 1944 *Conversion et grace chez Saint Thomas d’Aquin*; Jean Daniélou’s 1946 article “Orientations présentes de la pensée religieuse”; and Henri de Lubac’s *Surnaturel*, published in 1946 as well.

81. Ibid., 100. According to Mettepenningen, De Lubac’s publication became a “symbol” of the struggle for a more historical-oriented theology and resulted in the greatest crisis in twentieth-century Neo-Thomism. Mettepenningen identifies four major reasons to explain why: the theological climate at the time; his overt rejection of Neo-Thomism; his historical method; and his interest in Augustine. See Ibid., 34.

82. Ibid., 35.

83. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 44.

84. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 45.

85. William L. Portier, “Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology and the Triumph of Maurice Blondel,” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 33 Spring (2011): 110, https://www.comunioicr.com/files/Portier_Spring_2011.pdf.

86. Ibid., 110. According to Portier, “This Augustinian apologetic of the restless heart had been at the literary center of French religious sensibility at least since the time of Blaise Pascal in the seventeenth century.” Ibid., 110.

87. Ibid. The new theologians were also influenced by the growing interest in Augustine himself, stimulated by the 1500th anniversary of his death in 1930. As a result, the non-intellectual dimension of faith was highlighted—the emotional and devotional. The new

theologians used Augustine as a “crowbar” to break through the monopoly of the Neo-Thomists. See Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 145.

88. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 111.

89. *Ibid.*, 111–12.

90. *Ibid.*, 106.

91. *Ibid.*, 113.

92. This was accomplished despite the efforts to condemn and suppress it. For example, the works of both Congar and Chenu were placed on the Index of Prohibited Books and both were removed from their teaching positions. Furthermore, Pius XII’s 1950 encyclical *Humani Generis*, the spirit of which was similar to *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, rejected the new theology by condemning thirteen matters as “new,” even though the name “new theology” was never mentioned. Chenu and Congar, along with other new theologians, also paid a high personal price for this condemnation. In his diaries of 1946–56, Congar referred to himself as “someone killed while still alive,” referring to the Holy Office as “a police regime of betrayal.” See *Ibid.*, 35 and 42.

93. *Ibid.*, 114.

Chapter Four

1. Giuseppe Albergio, *History of Vatican II*, Vol. I (New York: Maryknoll, 1996), 1.

2. Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 148–49. Congar was also largely responsible for a renewed sense of the role of the laity within the Church.

3. Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, 36.

4. *Ibid.*, 36 and 143.

5. *Ibid.*, 36.

6. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 36.

7. *Ibid.*, 37.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*, 38.

10. *Ibid.*, 39 and 50.

11. *Ibid.*, 39.

12. *Ibid.*

13. John XXII never explained the reasons for his decision, yet his own personality and his lived experience outside of the Vatican predisposed him to make this decision. He was “open minded and ready to look for the signs of the times in everyone and everything he encountered. Everything was an occasion for growth and wisdom.” See Albergio, *History of Vatican II*, 11. It is highly likely that one of the “signs of the times” was the excessive degree of power vested in the curia at a time. Other such signs included major features of the social context of his era: a new set of humanist values

after the Holocaust; the de-colonization process in Asia and Africa; the focus on individual and democratic rights; and a more secular society. According to Etienne Fouilloux, “the papal decision, with its desire for union and openness, seemed to be in line with one of the major tendencies of that period.” See Albergio, *History of Vatican II*, 59–60.

14. *Ibid.*, 1.

15. *Ibid.*, 19.

16. *Ibid.*, 11–12.

17. Higgins and Letson, *My Father’s Business*, 76. This did not mean that the “superior authorities” always respected this principle during and after the council. For example, in 1974, Carter, frustrated that the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, the new title for the Holy Office, was interfering with the work of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy, commented: “the Holy Office...may have changed its name but does not appear to have changed its spots.” *Ibid.*

18. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 10–11.

19. *Ibid.*, 11.

20. *Ibid.*, 46.

21. *Ibid.*

22. *Ibid.*, 47.

23. *Ibid.*, 48.

24. *Ibid.*, 43.

25. *Ibid.*, 49.

26. *Ibid.*, 49–51.

27. This style of discourse was “best exemplified” in the four constitutions. This new style was different from the style of previous councils, yet it was not evenly used in the documents since its use was controversial and challenged by some council participants. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 46.

28. *Ibid.*, 52.

29. *Ibid.*, 2–3.

30. *Ibid.*, 42–43.

31. Austin Flannery, *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, Vol. One* (New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1998); *Gravissimum Educationis*, iv–viii.

32. *Gravissimum Educationis*, vi.

33. *Ibid.*

34. *Gravissimum Educationis*, ii.

35. *Gravissimum Educationis*, x.

36. McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 165–67.

37. *Gravissimum Educationis*, xi.

38. *Gravissimum Educationis*, xi.
39. *Gravissimum Educationis*, viii.
40. *Gravissimum Educationis*, i.
41. *Gravissimum Educationis*, ii.
42. Ibid.
43. *Gravissimum Educationis*, iv.
44. Flannery, *Lumen Gentium*, xxxi.
45. Flannery, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, xiv.
46. *Divini*, section 67.
47. Flannery, *Gaudium et Spes, Vatican Council I*, ii.
48. *Gaudium et Spes*, iii.
49. *Gravissimum Educationis*, preface.
50. Johannes Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1969), 13.
51. *Gravissimum Educationis*, i.
52. Ibid.
53. James Arthur, "Secularisation, Secularism and Catholic Education: The Challenges," *International Studies in Catholic Education* 1, no. 2 (2009): 233, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422530138226>.
54. *Gravissimum Educationis*, vi. As mentioned earlier, there was nonetheless a difference in emphasis since, in the Declaration, the Church was no longer understood as the most important partner in education.
55. Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," 15.
56. Ibid., 15.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., 15–16.
59. Ibid., 18.
60. Ibid., 19.
61. *Gravissimum Educationis*, i.
62. Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," 19.
63. *Gravissimum Educationis*, viii.
64. *Gravissimum Educationis*, v.
65. *Gravissimum Educationis*, conclusion.
66. Don J. Briel, "The Declaration on Christian Education, *Gravissimum Educationis*," in *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Leverin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 385.
67. Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," 26.
68. *Gravissimum Educationis*, vi.
69. Pohlschneider, "Declaration on Christian Education," 26–27.

70. Ibid., 13.
71. *Gravissimum Educationis*, preface.
72. Pohlschneider, “Declaration on Christian Education,” 13.
73. Ibid., 29.
74. *Gravissimum Educationis*, viii.
75. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 270.
76. *Gravissimum Educationis*, preface.
77. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 269–70.
78. Mauro Velati, “Completing the Conciliar Agenda,” in *History of Vatican II: Volume V*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995), 229–30.
79. *Gravissimum Educationis*, preface.
80. Giuseppe Alberigo, *A Brief History of Vatican II* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2006), 103.
81. Velati, “Completing the Conciliar Agenda,” 230.
82. Briel, “The Declaration on Christian Education,” 389.
83. G. Emmett Carter, “Introduction to Declaration on Christian Education,” in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (New York: Guild Press, 1966), 635.
84. Braithwaite, “Vatican II on Tradition,” 916.
85. Ibid., 918.
86. Ibid.
87. *Dei Verbum*, ii; Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, 751.
88. Higgins and Letson, *My Father’s Business*, 88. Carter also referred to the Declaration as a “rather technical document.” See Carter, “Introduction,” 635.
89. Briel, “The Declaration on Christian Education,” 384.
90. Ibid., 392.
91. *Gravissimum Educationis*, v.

Chapter Five

1. O’Malley, *What Happened*, 8, 42–43. At the beginning of the council, the College of Cardinals was unprepared for the upcoming “battles” as many of the cardinals still adhered to the Neo-Thomistic, classicist perspective. For instance, during the preparatory stage of the council, ten commissions were established with the responsibility of preparing the texts to be presented to the council. A cardinal chaired each commission. According to Joseph Ratzinger, the first schemata (the draft texts) for *Dei Verbum* were “utterly a product of the ‘Neoscholastic antimodernist’ mentality that had taken shape at the turn of the century” and “written in a spirit of condemnation and negation.” See Braithwaite, “Vatican II on Tradition,” 916. Many other schemata for the Vatican II texts were also originally “couched in the heavy

Scholastic and bureaucratic terminology of the past,” which the bishops rejected. See Royal, *A Deeper Vision*, 170.

2. James Arthur, “The De-Catholicising of the Curriculum in English Catholic Schools,” *International Studies in Catholic Education* 5, no. 1 (2013): 89, <https://doi.org/10.1111/milt.12000>.

3. Many scholars contend that the ultimate consequence of secularization was the “dechristianization” of the western world. However, in a recent detailed study, the editors cautioned against any generalizations, pointing to the overall conclusion of the study that the rate and depth of dechristianization varied according to country. One of the major differences between North America and Western Europe was that in North America, “the institutional structures remained more fully in the grip of mass religious cultures and consequently theology retained a more orthodox cast.” See Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, “Introduction,” in *The Sixties and Beyond: Dechristianization in North America and Western Europe, 1945-2000*, ed. Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 4. Timothy F. Hartnagel and Leo Klug in “Changing Religious Attitudes and Participation Among Catholics in the Post Vatican II Church: Some Canadian Data” support this contention. See *Sociological Analysis* 51, no. 4 (1990): 347–61, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3711076>.

4. The word secularization is a contentious term since it is a “socially and historically constructed word.” Arthur, “The De-Catholicising of the Curriculum,” 89. Recently, scholars have disputed its very nature as simply a “long term and inexorable process of religious decline in modernizing societies.” They contend that it was a long-term process, yet one in which certain decades were critical to its development, arguing that the 1960s was one of these significant decades that has been overlooked. See Christie and Gauvreau, *The Sixties*, 3. Hugh McLeod identifies three other such periods, the 1690s, the 1790s, and the 1890s, in “Reflections and New Perspectives,” in *The Sixties and Beyond: Dechristianization in North America and Western Europe, 1945-2000*, ed. Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 455.

5. McLeod, “Reflections,” 453. Christie and Gauvreau credit both Callum Brown and Hugh McLeod for opening a “new interpretation window to the importance of the 1960s.” Brown’s work is acknowledged as ground breaking in his focus on the 1960s, a period he limits to 1958–1963, and in his emphasis on the “crucial importance” of the new attitudes toward women within the Church. His research, however, was limited to Great Britain. Christie and Gauvreau clearly prefer McLeod’s interpretation, which emphasizes the long-term process and adopts the long-sixties chronology, 1958–1975. McLeod also adopts a more international approach in which he identifies multiple factors that led to what he calls the “End of Christendom.” This book adheres to McLeod’s interpretation, which supports the overall theoretical framework of Quentin

Skinner, who emphasizes the importance of “other happenings” when analysing significant historical documents—that is, the overall social, political, and economic historical conditions.

6. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 22.

7. *Ibid.*, 35.

8. John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1998), 179.

9. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 21.

10. *Ibid.*, 20.

11. *Ibid.*

12. This moralism was a fundamental characteristic of the intellectual elite of English Canada. Philip Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939-1970* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 3–4.

13. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 19.

14. *Ibid.*, 27.

15. *Ibid.*, 30.

16. J.L. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986), 4. According to Granatstein, the Canadian government was quite imaginative, establishing a special programme to facilitate the immigration process without any specific selectivity. The entire Faculty of Forestry of the University of Sopran was admitted and immediately attached to the University of British Columbia.

17. *Ibid.*, 5.

18. *Ibid.*

19. Bryan D. Palmer, *Canada’s 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 421.

20. *Ibid.*, 114. Palmer has an intriguing analysis of the famous George Chuvalo—Muhammad Ali boxing match in Toronto. According to Palmer, Chuvalo, born in Toronto to Croatian parents, represented the “new,” pluralistic Canada that was emerging during the 1960s. Many Canadians took great pride in the fact that he was able to compete with Muhammed Ali, yet the Toronto Anglo-Saxon elite refrained from attending the match largely because of Chuvalo’s ethnicity as well as Ali’s notoriety. The match itself embodied a “significant moment in Canadian identity, for it spoke of an old Canada forever gone and a new Canada struggling to be born.” *Ibid.*, 112, 127–34.

21. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967*, 6.

22. During the Flag Debate, which ensued after Prime Minister Pearson decided to adopt a new Canadian Flag, many Canadians felt that the Union Jack was an essential Christian symbol. The debate itself represented “the last hurrah of an entrenched

attachment to empire, its institutions, and its values.” See Palmer, *Canada’s 1960s*, 423–24.

23. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 38–39.

24. *Ibid.*, 32–33. Ukrainians and Jews, for example, became more outspoken and demanded public recognition of their cultural identities, especially after their numbers increased as displaced Ukrainians and Jews arrived in Canada after the war. Non-mainstream Christian denominations such as the Pentecostal Church, which had been excluded from the Protestant elite, also became more assertive.

25. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967*, 6. Given the protest, two representatives of the ethnic communities were included among the commissioners, yet this was correctly viewed as mere tokenism.

26. Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, xviii.

27. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967*, 6.

28. Palmer, *Canada’s 1960s*, 419.

29. John T. McIlhone, “How Necessary is the Catholic School in Contemporary Society?”, *Christian Education: Selections of Significance* (The Catholic School Journal, March 1967), 3. This article was the conclusion of a longer address presented to the English Catholic Education Association of Ontario on April 12, 1966. McIlhone was the Director of the English schools for the Montreal Catholic School Commission. See G.E. Carter, Religious Education, B19-F2, London Archives.

30. For example, by 1961, 81 percent of Ontarians lived in urban centres. See R.D. Gidney, *From Hope to Harris: The Reshaping of Ontario Schools* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 26.

31. The fertility rate in 1936 was 2.2 children. By 1961, there were nearly four children for each woman of childbearing years. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 27. The increase in the number of school-aged children was evident in the enrolment figures. Whereas the population of Ontario doubled between 1946 and 1961, the number of elementary aged children increased by 116 percent, and high school aged children by 141 percent (more students were staying in high school beyond the age of 15, unlike before the war). See *Ibid.*, 27. By 1966, almost five million people were in school across Canada, double the figure fourteen years earlier. See Doug Owrarn, *Born at the Right Time*, 114.

32. For example, the population of Scarborough, a suburb of Toronto, increased dramatically. In 1941, the population was 24,000; by 1971, it was 343,000. Other Ontario urban centres experienced similar increases in population. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 26.

33. Most scholars use the phrase “return to normalcy” to describe the post-war period. Cultural conformity was a major feature of this “return.”

34. Owrán, *Born at the Right Time*, 104. See also Mediema, *For Canada's Sake*, 34; Terence Murphy and Roberto Perin, *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996), 355; Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965), 69–71. In the late 1940s, more than half of those interviewed in an American survey indicated that religion had no effect on their behaviour in business or politics. Results would have been similar if Canadians had been surveyed. See Grant, *The Church*, 180. Even the leaders of the major Christian denominations questioned the extent to which a real religious revival was actually taking place. See Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 35.
35. Grant, *The Church*, 165. It is also important not to exaggerate the extent of the revival, even in the suburbs. According to a 1955 Gallup poll, only 44 percent of Ontarians attended regular Sunday service. (In Quebec 93 percent went to Mass on Sunday). Outside of Quebec, 75 percent of Catholics went to Sunday Mass, according to a 1957 poll. See Murphy and Perin, *A Concise History*, 356.
36. Mediema, *For Canada's Sake*, 34.
37. Murphy and Perin, *A Concise History*, 357.
38. The religious revival, even if it lacked any real deepening of the faith and was simply considered as an accepted norm especially in the suburbs, lent support to the dominant Christian culture that existed prior to the 1960s. More important in the long term was the increasing importance of consumerism and maintaining an affluent lifestyle. Hugh McLeod, however, has questioned whether a direct correlation can be made between growing affluence and the decline in religiosity: "It has become something of a cliché in recent years that diminishing interest in religion correlates with rising security and material comfort." He contends that more research needs to be completed in order to understand "how and why increasing prosperity was associated with greater secularity in the 1960s." See McLeod, "Reflections," 463. However, a leading American Catholic scholar in the 1960s identified a major theme in Catholic self-criticism: that Catholics "appeared to be obsessively interested in middle-class values: the accumulation of wealth and status symbols, social respectability, conformity to the manners and mores of popular culture." See Daniel Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), 98. Callahan was the associate editor of *The Commonweal*, an influential lay Catholic weekly.
39. Palmer, *Canada's 1960s*, 185.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Nancy Christie, "Belief Crucified Upon a Rooftop Antenna: Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew*, and Dechristianization," in *The Sixties and Beyond: Dechristianization in North America and Western Europe, 1945-2000*, ed. Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 327.
42. Christie and Gauvreau, "Introduction," 24.

43. This gradual assimilation has been more thoroughly analysed in the United States than in Canada. Several factors have been identified to explain this assimilation, including the wartime experience when thousands of Catholics fought for their country, increasing their overall patriotism and exposing them to the larger American culture. As the United States became more culturally diverse, it became less anti-Catholic, which contributed to the growing desire of many American Catholics to become more integrated into American society. After World War II, many American Catholics benefitted from the GI Bill, which provide financial support for veterans to obtain post-secondary education, and joined in the exodus to the suburbs with well-paying white-collar occupations. A Catholic middle class developed that rejected the notion of a ghetto Catholicism. In Canada, a similar process occurred as the predominantly Irish Catholic community itself became more culturally pluralistic with the arrival of immigrants from Catholic countries, especially Italy. As Canadian society became less anti-Catholic with the increased pluralism, and with the federal government providing free higher education to veterans, more Catholics became well-educated, and, as in the United States, obtained well-paying jobs and moved to the suburbs. See Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman*, 103–25.

44. Ian McKay, *The Challenge of Modernity: A Reader on Post-Confederation Canada* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1992), xii. McKay argues that individualism is fundamental to Canadian liberalism as embodied by the federal Liberal Party, the dominant political party since 1896 with the election of Wilfrid Laurier as Prime Minister. In the Canadian context, the Liberal State has one major responsibility: to protect the rights of the individual. See *Ibid.*, xiii.

45. According to McKay, individuals are understood as “essentially self-interested, non-social and egotistic, and guided by reason in their pursuit of the gratification of desire and appetites, generally in a ‘free-market.’” See *Ibid.*, xii–xiii.

46. Owrarn, *Born at the Right Time*, 135.

47. *Ibid.*, 132.

48. *Ibid.*, 127.

49. This was also a feature of Western European society. See Christie and Gauvreau, *The Sixties and Beyond*, 25–26.

50. Owrarn, *Born at the Right Time*, 184. Christie and Gauvreau, “Introduction,” 2. Reflecting the spirit of the times, the term “Establishment” was coined in 1959 to refer to the traditional forms of authority and the conservative socio-economic structures then in place. This distrust of authority often led to a “self-absorbed focus on rights” that paid “no attention to communal needs.” See Leslie Woodstock Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception: An American History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 208.

51. Christie, “Belief Crucified,” 321–22.

52. *Ibid.*, 321.

53. Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 26. One social science study, Erick H. Erikson's 1950 *Childhood and Society*, was especially influential. Using "identity" as a "central analytic category of the social sciences," Erikson focused on adolescence as the "passage way" to adulthood; see Palmer, *Canada's 1960s*, 184. He contended that young people were engaged in a search for identity and needed to be given the necessary freedom to determine their own sense of identity. Adults should consider them as "partners" who were in the process of becoming "fully autonomous agents"; see *Ibid.* Erikson's understanding of adolescence proliferated as a "popular and academic discourse" in the 1950s, helping to set the "analytic stage" for youth behaviour in the 1960s; see Palmer, *Canada's 1960s*, 185.

54. According to Christie, Berton wanted to demonstrate that *The Comfortable Pew* was a "piece of scientific social analysis," and "self-consciously crafted" the book as "an authentic, dispassionate, and scientific treatise that dealt perceptively with real problems." See Christie, "Belief Crucified," 332.

55. *Ibid.*, 337.

56. Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 35.

57. Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew*, 30.

58. For example, Berton recalls how the United Church had asked for his advice in producing a documentary television series to promote Christian ethics in modern society. The documentaries never materialized, evidence for Berton of the overall failure of the churches to provide the needed moral leadership. See *Ibid.*, 52.

59. *Ibid.*, 69.

60. *Ibid.*, 69, 71.

61. *Ibid.*, 73.

62. *Ibid.*, 71.

63. *Ibid.*, 126.

64. *Ibid.*, 127.

65. Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 36.

66. Christie, *Belief Crucified*, 335.

67. Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 36.

68. William Kilbourn, "What the People Said: Some Letters to Pierre Berton," in *The Restless Church: A Response to the Comfortable Pew*, ed. William Kilbourn (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966), 131. According to Christie, "by accepting much of Berton's perspective on the irrelevance of the institutional church and by envisioning Berton as some kind of modern-day prophet, a large majority of letter writers were unwittingly giving credence to Berton's central message: that it was the unquestionable right of the media to arbitrate between the church and religious values." See Christie, "Belief Crucified," 342.

69. Christie emphasizes this point, stating that despite its overall superficiality and lack of knowledge about mainstream Protestantism, “its conclusions were persuasive and given credence even by his critics”; see Christie, “Belief Crucified,” 344. Miedema also stresses this, highlighting one of the significant studies to be released in response to Berton’s work, a collection of essays, *The Restless Church*, as evidence that Berton’s thesis was accepted; see Miedema, *For Canada’s Sake*, 37. However, Miedema is not completely accurate in this assessment. Eugene Fairweather, in his essay “The Catholic Tradition,” argues that Berton’s “plea for ‘Faith without Dogma’ has moved me mightily. It has not persuaded me to give up teaching the subject known as ‘dogmatic theology,’ but it has made me reflect on how seldom the subject effectively informs the day-by-day ministry of our clergy, and how badly it must, therefore, have been presented to them in their theological schools.” Criticizing Berton for possessing the “vaguest notion of what is the historical Christian faith,” Fairweather then explains the Catholic tradition of dogma, arguing that “since faith depends on God’s self-disclosure, no dogma of faith can claim to be exhaustive and therefore altogether definitive.” According to Fairweather, Berton’s discussion on dogma offered two opposing possibilities of “We know fully” or “We can not know,” whereas Fairweather contends the truth lies in “We know in part.” Fairweather’s understanding of dogma reflects the new theology that was accepted at Vatican II. See Eugene Fairweather, “The Catholic Tradition,” *The Restless Church: A Response to the Comfortable Pew*, ed. William Kilbourn (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966), 65, 67. Fairweather was one of the only two Canadian ecumenical observers at Vatican II. For more information on him, please see Michael Attridge’s “A Canadian Anglican at Vatican II: The Activity of Eugene R. Fairweather,” in *Vatican II—Expériences Canadiennes/Canadian Experiences*, ed. Michael Attridge, Catherine E. Clifford, and Gilles Routhier (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2011).

70. Christie, “Belief Crucified,” 323. Christie argues even further that Berton’s use of sociological scholarship enabled him to “hoodwink the Canadian public” which gave him “permission to make media pundits such as himself the new secular priests of modern Canadian society.” Christie, “Belief Crucified,” 343–44.

71. *Ibid.*, 344.

72. Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*, 9.

73. According to several sociological studies, it was the “over 30” Catholics who were the most likely to use contraceptives. Many among this group did not participate in the sacraments while still attending the Mass, considered as an indication that they were using contraceptives. See Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*, 199.

74. A 1952 *Catholic Digest* poll indicated that 51 percent of Catholics did not consider “mechanical birth control” as sinful. See Tentler, *Catholics and Contraception*, 199–200.

75. McLeod, "Reflections," 459.
76. One father of four asked why Catholics who practice birth control "and who die without confessing this mortal sin, will be damned forever." See Tentley, *Catholics and Contraceptives*, 212.
77. *Ibid.*, 205.
78. *Ibid.*, 211.
79. *Ibid.*, 212.
80. *Ibid.*, 218.
81. The formal name of the commission was the Pontifical Commission for the Study of Population, Family and Births and was established by Pope John XXIII. In calling for an end to the prohibition, the commission recommended an important change in Church teaching: Catholic marriage must be open to the transmission of life, but not in terms of every conjugal act. A minority report was also written that supported the prohibition, yet it only represented the view of five of the seventy-two members of the commission. See *Ibid.*, 207, 227–29.
82. Even before the release of the commission report, 60 percent of Catholic laity expected the teaching to change, according to a 1965 Gallup poll. See *Ibid.*, 220.
83. *Ibid.*, 265.
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*
86. According to leading Catholic priest and scholar Andrew Greeley, *Humanae Vitae* was an "appeal to pure authority...which the Pope mistakenly assumed that he still had." See *Ibid.*, 230.
87. A 1967 *Newsweek* poll indicated that 73 percent of Catholics opposed the prohibition on birth control, with the percentage higher among the young and educated. By the 1970s, 68 percent of Catholics in the United States were using contraceptives. See *Ibid.*, 229–30, 220.
88. This statement was given in Winnipeg where the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops was held in the fall of 1968. See Higgins and Letson, *My Father's Business*, 105. In the United States, no such statement was made, with most bishops assuming a position of silence, a position that further undermined their authority among Catholics. See Tentley, *Catholics and Contraception*, 275–77.
89. Tentley, *Catholics and Contraception*, 231.
90. *Ibid.*, 230–31.
91. *Ibid.*, 207–8.
92. According to Yves Congar, this traditional obedience and docility was the result of the "Catholic system" that was established during the Counter Reformation and lasted essentially to Vatican II, which involved a "kind of conditioning." Even when the laity was called upon to be active Christians with Catholic Action, the Church monitored

and directed their actions. See Yves Congar, *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology: Conversations with Yves Congar*, ed. Bernard Lauret (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 4. Nor was the Church traditionally open to consulting the laity, as the “quick and violent” reaction to Cardinal Newman’s 1859 published essay, “On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine” indicated. See Paul T. Harris, “Introduction,” in *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, ed. Paul T. Harris (Don Mills: Longmans Canada, 1965), 5.

93. Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era*, 196.

94. Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman*, 105.

95. One of the most influential American Catholic critics, Monsignor John Tracy Ellis, commented in 1962 that the Catholic layman had “sharper and more critical turn of mind...quite different from unlettered immigrant grandparents of two or three generations ago.” See Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman*, 107.

96. O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 295.

97. Richard P. McBrien, *The Church: The Evolution of Catholicism* (New York: HarperCollins, 2008), 166.

98. *Lumen Gentium*, xii, in *Vatican Council II*, ed. Flannery. This document reflects the tensions concerning the power structure within the Church, and the extent to which this power was shared equally. See also O’Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 186. An intense debate also ensued over the placement of two of the chapters of *Lumen Gentium*: “The People of God” and “The Church is Hierarchical.” In previous drafts, the chapter on hierarchy was placed first in order to emphasize that the laity was subject to the authority of the hierarchy. In the final version, “The People of God” was placed first in order to stress that the hierarchy existed to serve the entire people of God, and not to dominate or control it. See McBrien, *The Church*, 167.

99. According to J.W. Grant, this advice was “coldly received by the hierarchy,” which is not surprising since it was unaccustomed to receiving such advice. See Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era*, 195. Interestingly, however, the *Brief* was written in response to a 1962 statement from the Canadian Catholic Conference in which the bishops declared: “Let no one hesitate to inform his bishop, in writing if necessary, about particular problems or certain specific issues. Every bishop, when leaving for the Second Vatican Council, will be pleased to be as fully informed as possible about the thoughts of those whom the Lord has entrusted to his care.” See Harris, “Introduction,” 9.

100. Harris, “Introduction,” 7. It is also important to note that universities had changed in the United States and in Canada. They no longer catered to a small elite, focusing on the humanities, but had expanded to serve the needs of the larger community with the introduction of the “multiversity” as the number of university graduates increased. See

Massolin, *Canadian Intellectuals*, 12–13; Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman*, 106–7.

101. Harris concludes his introduction with a quotation from Yves Congar, one of the leading theologians at the Council with considerable expertise concerning the role of the laity: “What we need is a dialogue, something that takes place between adult and responsible persons, face to face.” See Harris, “Introduction,” 11.

102. Mark R. MacGuigan, “The Political Freedom of Catholics,” 20. MacGuigan was a member of the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto. He emphasized that he was not dissatisfied with the contents of the bishops’ brief, but with the authorship.

103. *Ibid.*, 22.

104. Lawrence Lynch, “The Catholic in a Pluralistic Society,” 125, 127.

105. *Ibid.*, 126.

106. *Ibid.*, 127. Lynch also emphasized the need for a “middle ground” between the importance of individual conscience and Church doctrine, arguing that human understanding of the truth was developmental and therefore subject to historical context, but this did not mean the essential, absolute truths did not exist nor that human beings could not discover them.

107. Romeo Maione, “The Mission of the Laity,” 131, 136. Maione was the Assistant Director for the International Affairs Department of the Canadian Labour Congress.

108. *Ibid.*, 136.

109. Maione recounts how the Church had traditionally relegated the laity to an insignificant role, citing the Benedictine monk, Gratian, who in 1140 wrote the standard text on canon law that was used in medieval universities. Gratian distinguished between two types of Christians, the consecrated, the *kleros*, meaning those whom “God had chosen to be His” and the people, the *laos*, who if they did not commit evil, brought “their offerings to the altar,” and paid “their Church taxes” would be saved. See *Ibid.*, 134.

110. Janet Somerville, “Women and Christian Responsibility,” 145. Janet Somerville began her graduate work in theology as soon as women were permitted to do so, completing her master’s degree in theology in 1965. She was a member of the International Grail Movement, a women’s organization dedicated to spirituality and social renewal.

111. *Ibid.*, 147.

112. *Ibid.*, 148.

113. *Ibid.*, 147.

114. In the Metropolitan Separate School Board, for example, the number of religious in elementary schools decreased considerably from 1955, when there were 156 religious representing 18.8 percent of the teaching staff in 88.4 percent of the schools, to 1967, when there were 126 religious representing only 5.2 percent of the teaching

staff in 54 percent of the schools. The number of religious principals also declined from 88 in 1955 to 50 in 1967. See Letter from the Superintendent of Separate Schools, B.E. Nelligan, to Rev. Mother Constance, Loretto Archives, Ministries, Education, Initiation for funding, 16.1–13.

115. Franklin Walker, *Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Volume III: From the Hope Commission to the Promise of Completion (1945-1985)* (Toronto: Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario, 1986), 137–38.

116. *Ibid.*, 132.

117. *Ibid.*, 132–33. As the cardinal's comment implies, there was at times tension between the clergy and the lay teachers/administrators as this power shift took place, especially since many clerics were accustomed to possessing considerable informal authority.

118. Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, *A Handbook for Catholic School Councils—Revised* (LINK: 2009), 2. The number of public boards also decreased dramatically.

119. The Ministry of Education still remained powerful, since it retained the power to establish the overall curriculum guidelines, determine the funding policy, and pass any education laws that it believed necessary, including the powers of the boards themselves. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 50–51.

120. The history of Catholic schools is a complicated one. Catholics had been granted their own separate school system early in the nineteenth century, but it fell under the direct supervision of the provincial Department of Education. Catholic schools were to be tolerated at best, and Catholics were forced to fight for their educational rights. This struggle has been well-documented. By the 1960s, the Catholic secondary school system was a hybrid one: grades 9 and 10 received government funding, albeit at a much lower rate than its public counterpart, but the senior grades operated as private schools. Even in 1960 when the federal government passed the Technical and Vocational Training Assistant Act to help the provincial governments finance the building of more vocational facilities, Catholic schools did not receive any of the funding. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 44. An excellent summary is provided by Brennan's "Roman Catholic Schooling in Ontario." The situation in Ontario was in direct contrast with the school system established for the Protestant minority in Quebec. It was a parallel system that granted them "carte blanche" to organize and operate their own schools. They were provided with "considerable resources" that they were permitted to use as they so desired. The educational system in Quebec was considered as "a model of freedom from political interference and of respect for the rights of parents and minorities" (Henchey 1972, 100). The Catholics of Ontario were denied such a model. See Norman Henchey, "Quebec Education: The Unfinished

Revolution,” *McGill Journal of Education* 7, no. 2 (1972): 100, <https://mje.mcgill.ca/article/view/6874>.

121. Catholic Bishops of Ontario, *Brief on Education*, 31, 34.

122. The bishops also raised the possibility of establishing “a number of Catholic Teachers’ Colleges,” although they did not take an official position on the issue, waiting to “discuss the whole issue with the educational authorities of the Province.” See *Ibid.*, 35.

123. *Ibid.*, 35.

124. *Ibid.*, 37–38.

125. The government increased the amount of funding that Catholic schools received from grants, but fearing an outcry from the public schools, and therefore the public, did not change the corporate taxes, which were solely for the public schools. It is difficult to measure what the public’s reaction would have been if the government had implemented some of the bishops’ requests, given the lack of polling data. As for the press, however, it is somewhat easier. J. Bascom St John, a prominent journalist with *The Globe and Mail*, wrote a daily column, “The World of Learning,” which was both popular and influential. On 1 January 1963, he published a detailed report on the bishops’ brief in which he opposed the bishops’ requests. His viewpoint reflected a long-established resistance to the Catholic school system, which was accepted as a political necessity. There was strong resistance to any effort to improve the system, particularly concerning public funding for senior high school. For example, a special program to train Catholic teachers had been resisted since the days of Egerton Ryerson, with St. John arguing that the bishops’ request for such a program “strikes rather definitely at a fundamental element of the structure of the Ontario school system.” As for the request to have more control over the curriculum, St. John reiterated the traditional position of the government that there is a common curriculum “to which the Catholic separate schools integrally belong.” See St John 1963, 28. St. John also had considerable influence with the government. In 1964, he joined the Ontario Department of Education as chair of its Policy and Development Council.

126. This is not to suggest, however, that Catholic educators were opposed to the reforms. Quite the contrary, as many Catholic educators supported the reforms with some significant Catholic individuals on the provincial committee that produced *Living and Learning*. The co-chair, for example, was a distinguished Catholic jurist, Honourable Justice E.M. Hall. Rather, it is to emphasize that the Catholic school system itself had little choice but to accept all of the reforms, even if they were opposed to specific ones.

127. This reform movement had its roots in the earlier progressive education movement. By the mid-1930s, the provincial government began to make some major changes to the curriculum. What is interesting here is how the government responded

to the increasing demand for educational reform from outside the Department of Education. Various interest groups advocated for an educational system better suited to the changing economic and social conditions resulting from industrialization and urbanization. They wanted children to be better prepared for the “real world.” Influenced by the progressive movement in the United States, the “new education” championed by John Dewey, they demanded a more child-centred curriculum that focussed on enhancing the students’ self-esteem, emphasized the needs and interests of the child, and allowed for a variety of teaching methods. Self-directed learning was also advocated. Schools were to be vehicles of social change. The reformers insisted that “the whole child goes to school,” and thus the curriculum must also consider the child’s social and emotional needs. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 31.

128. In one of the major sections of the report, “The Cultural Environment,” the authors focused on the role of education in a society that was experiencing a national identity crisis and a period of rapid social change resulting in cultural pluralism. The document praises the “vast contributions” of immigrants to the “development of Canadian culture.” See *Living and Learning: The Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario*, 1968, 24.

129. One of the co-chairs, Dennis, observed that “it seems that the significance of this report has found acceptance across the board.” The report also attracted attention across North America and was favourably received by the press. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 75.

130. *Living and Learning*, 9.

131. *Ibid.*, 16.

132. *Ibid.*, 2. This was the “underlying aim of education” as expressed in the report: “the unending search for truth, a transformative emancipatory tool that is linked to the sense of autonomy of the child.” See Bruno-Jofré and Hills, “Changing Visions of Excellence,” 340.

133. Concerned with creating “chasms” between students and wishing to avoid “class distinctions,” the report recommended what came to be known as the “open plan school,” where walls were removed between classes, those “insurmountable walls and psychological barriers...built between children of different potentials.” See *Living and Learning*, 22.

134. The report embodied two concepts of excellence: the personal and the social. The personal adopted “human potential, self-actualization, and the search for authenticity” as “the organizing principles and standards of excellence.” The social linked excellence to social responsibility and considered that “the good of the individual” was “inseparable from the good of the community.” Consequently, the report recommended abolishing percentage marks, letter grades, and formal examinations, except for university entrance purposes. The two other concepts of excellence that

were not prominent in the report were the “technical,” which understood excellence as a “rational production” that focused on acquiring skills and competencies that could be measured by standardized tests, and the “rationale,” which viewed excellence as the result of rational inquiry based on specific academic disciplines that socialized the students in terms of specific language and thought. See Bruno-Jofré and Hills, “Changing Visions of Excellence,” 338, 342.

135. Bruno-Jofré and Hills, “Changing Visions of Excellence,” 339. Despite the emphasis on democracy and freedom within the report, the process within the Ministry of Education was far from democratic. A power struggle occurred within the Curriculum and Supervision Department. Traditionally, the curriculum section was responsible for textbooks and course content, whereas the supervision section dealt with school organization. Once the reform preparations had begun, the powerful civil servant, J. R. McCarthy, a former elementary teacher and school inspector, and a close confidant of the Minister of Education, Bill Davis, gave the curriculum section the power to change how schools were organized—including high schools. Neither the curriculum nor the overall organization of high schools had changed much since 1871, except for the introduction of commercial and vocational courses. The supervision section, dominated by former high school administrators, vigorously opposed this change, especially because the curriculum section was dominated by former elementary administrators. McCarthy then established a new committee of ten that would control the reform process, selecting seven members from the curriculum section and only three from the supervision section. McCarthy was determined that, for the first time, the educational reforms would include both elementary and secondary schools. It was this committee that began the reform process that resulted in *Living and Learning*. See Gidney, *From Hope to Harris*, 30, 77–78. According to one anonymous member of the committee, “we railroaded it through.” See *Ibid.*, 79. When one of the co-chairs of the provincial committee, E.M. Hall, asked if it would be “valuable to have a defender of the present system” on the committee, another committee member responded, “We are all fed up with the present system.” See Walker, *Catholic Education and Politics*, 216.

136. Two of his studies had considerable influence in the 1960s: *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*, published in 1962, and *Understanding the Media: The Extensions of Man*, published in 1964. His popularity and influence in North America were indicated by President of the University of Toronto Claude Bissell’s decision to establish a research centre, the Centre for Culture and Technology, in 1960 in order to entice McLuhan to remain in Canada. See Josh Cole, “Our Only Hope is Apocalypse: Marshall McLuhan, Catholic Antimodernism, and 1960s Educational Reform,” *Historia de la Educacion: Revista interuniversitaria* 35 (2016): 99, <https://doi.org/10.14201/hedu201635>.

137. Cole, "Our Only Hope," 99.

138. According to McLuhan, the "print-culture environment of the school constituted an alien world to the youth of the 1960s." He further argued that a young person would be "a fool not to drop out under such conditions." See *Ibid.*, 99.

139. McLuhan's ideas were treated with "great seriousness," especially with "forward-thinking educators." In its first edition in 1965, the publication *This Magazine is About Schools*, the "storm-centre of Canada's avant-garde," included McLuhan's "Electronics and the Psychic Drop-out," in which he contended that students no longer needed to be taught the basic skills because they would be "absorbed directly by the child." See *Ibid.*, 98.

140. *Ibid.*, 101.

141. *Ibid.*, 100.

142. *Ibid.*, 100; "*Living and Learning*," 17.

143. *Living and Learning* called for a system structured in such a way "so as to give the pupil headway in those subjects or activities in which he can fulfill himself, even though unable to make progress in all the disciplines." See *Living and Learning*, 13.

144. This process is known as the "secularization of consciousness," whereby the dominant secular culture permeated Catholic schools with the result that Catholic administrators, teachers, and students unconsciously adopted secular values. See James Arthur, "Secularisation, Secularism and Catholic Education," 228–39.

Chapter Six

1. This chapter focuses on Ontario, but this shift occurred across North America. This is evident from the resources and the scholarly works that Catholic educators in Ontario relied on—most of them were American.

2. "Catholic Secondary School Education," 2. See Archives of Sisters of St. Joseph, 200, 4–11, Box 5.

3. Wilfrid E. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis in Canada: A Preliminary Report* (Ottawa: National Office of Religious Education, 1973), 12.

4. ARCAT, EdSOO4.12, 6.

5. "Catholic Elementary and Secondary Education in Ontario: A Position Paper by the Basilian Fathers of Toronto," The Archives of the Basilian Fathers, C361-3, Box 4, File 32, 1–2.

6. The Second Synod lasted from February 16, 1966 to May 25, 1969. The First Synod had been held in 1956. See Power et al., *Gather up the Fragments*, 75, 85. Bishop Carter also established the Divine Word International Centre of Religious Education in London in 1965, modelling it after *Lumen Vitae* in Belgium—an admirable effort, even

though the Centre was not very successful given that his fellow bishops greeted it “with general scepticism.” See Higgins and Letson, *My Father’s Business*, 93.

7. “The Report of the Commission on Christian Education,” G.E. Carter Religious Education, B19-F13, London Diocese Archives, 1. In line with the Declaration, the report also stated that the parents and the Christian community—the “people of God”—played critical roles in the education of the child. Furthermore, the report stated that, at the high school level, students needed to be educated so that they could “promote effectively the welfare of the earthly city” and “serve the advancement of the Kingdom of God.” After graduation, they would therefore be able to “further the dialogue between the Church and the family of man.” See “The Report of the Commission on Christian Education,” 1, 31.

8. “The Commission on Teachers,” Bishop E.G. Carter Papers, Box 25, File 15, London Diocese Archives, 1.

9. *Ibid.*, 2.

10. *Ibid.*, 4–5. The Sub-Commission on the Youth also began its report with a lengthy quotation from the introduction of the Declaration, emphasizing that the “conditions of modern life make the preparation of young people...more urgent than ever.” The average age on this sub-commission was twenty-one. See The Sub-Commission on Youth Report, Bishop E.G. Carter Papers, Box 25, File 28, 2, 3.

11. Not all members of the Commission on Christian Education supported the use of the Declaration as an overall statement of Catholic educational principles. A small minority of members issued a minority report in which they disagreed with many of the conclusions of the majority report. According to the Protonotary of the Second Synod, Reverend A. Durand, the minority report only relied on one Vatican II document, the “Church in the Modern World,” dismissing the Declaration as “hastily put together and representing less of the Church’s new thinking.” Durand criticizes this judgement since it dismisses the power of the Holy Spirit: “Such a judgment is only possible by supposing that in one piece of teaching the Fathers are guided by the Holy Spirit while in the other they are deprived of such guidance.” See Letter from Durand to Carter.

G.E. Carter Religious Education, Minority Report, 1968, B19.F6.

12. *Catholic Register* news report, Sisters of Providence Archives, 309.5.

13. G.E. Carter Religious Education, Fathers Grannan/Demera 1966-1968, B19-F26, 7.

14. Report of the Christian Philosophy of Education Committee to the 1971 OECTA Annual General Meeting, ARCAT, EDSoll.31, 3.

15. Interim Curriculum Guidelines for Religious Education, Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, 200, 5–4, 3. Rahner was “probably the most influential figure in Catholic theology in the years immediately following the Council.” See Royal, “A Deeper Vision,” 210.

16. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 15. This is not to suggest that all teachers and schools participated in this “revolution,” nor that it was an easy transition from the objective, Neo-Thomist approach. Father W.E. Murchland, author of the national report, commented that this “revolution” was not “equally understood or accepted by everyone. This fact represents a major source of tension, anxiety and polarization. It leads to fear, mistrust and divisiveness in the community.” See *Ibid.*, 23.

17. *Ibid.*, 15.

18. *Ibid.*, 20.

19. Sub-Commission on Youth, 4.

20. *Ibid.*, 3.

21. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 40. In 1976, Bishop Alexander Carter identified the importance of the student’s own experience: “the basic learning process is recognized as flowing from the experience of the student and Catholic education as a result has been increasingly respectful of that experience, both on an individual and collective level.” See “New Directions in Catholic Education Since Vatican II,” in *Spotlight: News and Views on Catholic Education* (Toronto: Federation of Catholic Education Associations of Ontario), December 1976, 2; ARCAT, EDS008.15 e., 2.

22. Minutes of the first meeting of the Secondary School Teachers of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Saturday May 3, 1958. See the summary of Bauer’s talk to the sisters, 2, in the Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, Toronto.

23. Maione’s address was entitled “Who Educates the Youth?” The three-day conference was sponsored by the Ontario English Catholic Teacher’s Association. See Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, Lo0 6–4, 4, 7.

24. For example, at Mount St. Joseph Academy, there was not a religion department. Religion was placed in the Man and Society Department. See “Projection for a High School Religion Course,” Archives of the Sisters of St. Joseph, London, Ontario. At Loretto Abbey in Toronto, the religion program was in the Social & Environmental Studies Department. See Loretto Abbey Archives, Programmes of Study, 1975–1976.

25. Carter, “New Directions in Catholic Education,” 2.

26. Circular #10 to the clergy and the religious, April 1, 1964, 2–3. See London Archives, G.E. Carter Circulars 1963–1964, B5-F25. The Loretto Sisters shared this focus with the goal of creating in their schools “an atmosphere where people can grow together,” which was to be “done through community days...and a religious education program which encourages each student to become involved in Christian living by service in the Niagara Falls area.” See “Philosophy and Aims of Loretto,” 1, Loretto Abbey Archives, Programmes of Study, 76–77. Sister Joan Mary of the Sisters of Providence also considered the local community to be central to her approach to religious education: “The new approach to religious education will have to be

introduced according to the needs of the community.” See Sisters of Providence Archives, 309.5.

27. Letter from Bishop Carter to Mr. J. Havlik, Chair of the Essex County R.C. Separate School Board, April 23, 1970, London Diocese Archives, Essex County, B22-F2. The closing of the office represented a major change in thinking for Bishop Carter. Only two years earlier, he was encouraging the Director of the Office of Religious Instruction to expand beyond Windsor, declaring “I feel that the whole diocese needs someone in charge of the Catechetical office.” See Letter to Father Grannan, May 29, 1968, London Diocese Archives, Essex County, B19-F26. The importance of the local community was also evident in the selection of textbooks, with Bishop Carter in a 1965 letter to the principals and teachers of the diocese recommending a series of religion textbooks for grade 9 and 10, but leaving the final decision to the local school because “not *all* texts will suit *all* school situations” (emphasis original). See G. E. Carter, Religious Education, Fathers J.P. Finn/J.J. O’Flaharty, 1960-1965, London Diocese Archives, Essex County, B19-F25, March 8, 1965, 1.

28. McIlhone, “Principles or Philosophical Goals in the Light of Vatican II” (1967), ARCAT, ED50II.18, 10. In his paper, McIlhone applied the principle of subsidiarity to explain the importance of the local community, emphasizing the “redefined freedom” that resulted from the “redefining of the position, the power, and the function of the Bishops in general and of the individual Bishop in particular.” He also referred directly to Karl Rahner, who argued that “where the Christian of tomorrow will apprehend the actual nature of the Church” will be in the local community, “for this is where the most original religious and theological experience of the Church will take place.” Rahner argued that the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* returns to the “semantic usage of the Acts of the Apostles and of St. Paul’s letters: the community at Ephesus, for example, is *the* Church, and not just *a* Church. In view of this approbation by the Constitution, therefore, we too may take up...contemplation of this ecclesiology of the local Church, and to let it become living and real for us” (emphasis original). See Karl Rahner, *The Church After the Council* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 49.

29. “Catholic Education: From Principle to Practice in Catholic Schools,” ARCAT, EDSOO4.12, 8.

30. Minutes of Meeting of the Evaluation Committee, 2, Sisters of St. Joseph London Archives.

31. “Catholic Education,” 8.

32. “Report on the Christian Philosophy,” 1.

33. Greeley worked with the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago, Illinois. Indicative of his influence was the fact that there was only one item in the appendix of the London Diocese Commission on Christian Education: a list of quotations from Greeley’s “Catholic High Schools and the Secular City.”

34. This is not to argue that Greeley was correct in his analysis of the adolescent years as years of “self-loathing and even self-hatred.” A case could be made that his analysis was somewhat extreme. See Andrew M. Greeley, “Catholic High Schools and the Secular City,” in *Christian Education: Selections of Significance*, 4–5. G.E. Carter Religious Education “Christian Education” 1968, B19–F3.

35. Greeley discussed in depth the research completed by one of his colleagues, Donald Light, published in the *Review of Religious Research*. Light discovered that “Catholic high schools were considerably more successful in bringing the socially and emotionally disadvantaged into full participation in school activities...to put the matter in less social-scientific terms....there seemed to be more charity in the smaller Catholic high schools.” See Greeley, “Catholic High Schools,” 2–3. Many other Catholic educators also wished that Catholic schools would remain quite small in order to preserve their Catholic identity. In 1970, the Chair of the Catholic High Schools Principals’ group in Toronto wrote a letter to various influential Catholic educators in order to express the principals’ concern over the possible expansion of the Catholic high school system, if Catholic schools received full funding from the government and therefore became public schools. He stated that, “it seems to be universally true publicly owned schools get bigger and bigger and, unfortunately, more and more impersonal...There are valid reasons for having larger secondary schools than those we have now, but these reasons do not come from a consideration of the Christian dimension of these schools.” See Letter from Father Peter Somerville to Reverend J.C. Wey, Superior General of the Basilian Fathers, Oct 4, 1970, 2, Archives of the Basilian Fathers, C 3115.24.

36. In a section of his paper, “How to Promote Community Formation,” Greeley also proposed that Catholic high schools become even smaller, arguing that they should become “decentralized into a number of much smaller and much more intimate groups.” Each group should include “no more than eight classrooms” so that there would be no more than two hundred students in each “small school.” He further argued that “this suggestion is not as radical as it may first sound. It all makes sociological and psychological sense.” See Greeley, “Catholic High Schools,” 7–8.

37. September 18, 1968 letter to Reverend James Grannan, London Diocese Archives, B19 F26.

38. “Catholic Education,” 5.

39. “Catholic Education,” 15.

40. John J. Connolly, “The Making of the Modern Christian,” 4, Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, 200, 6–4. Connolly had been the president of the English Catholic Education Association of Ontario for ten years. In 1964, he was a member of Lester B. Pearson’s Cabinet as a Minister without Portfolio and the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

41. Here, the term technologism refers to the belief in the power of technology to shape and improve society. See Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 29.

42. It was also noted that “serious difficulties” were encountered in “determining the hierarchy of values.” See *Ibid.*, 27. The teaching of moral values was not the main focus of Catholic education prior to Vatican II. For example, in a 1961 letter to parents from the Sisters of St. Joseph Morrow Park, the parents were informed that the “primary purpose of the high school is the intellectual formation...of the student...Moral development can only be effected by the Church and the Home; it is primarily their obligation.” See Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, 205-2-2.

43. “Projection for a High School Religion Course,” Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, London.

44. Summary Report of the conducted survey. G.E. Carter Religious Education Fathers Grannan/Demera, 1969, London Diocese Archives, B19-F26.

45. Summary Report, 1.

46. The use of these new methods and the new technology was widespread across the province. For example, at Loretta Abbey, the grade nine class began with a “Microcosm Workshop” aimed at developing “within the student the freedom to reflect their needs, aspirations, anxieties, feelings, creativity and fantasies with each other.” The ideas “expressed in this workshop will launch the rest of the course. Such ideas will be examined through panel discussions, group discussions, films.” The course featured student-led seminar discussion of topics that interested the students. After the discussion sessions, which took place over several class periods, were completed, the entire class watched “films or filmstrips on topics which interest all students.” See Loretta Abbey Archives, “Programmes of Study,” 1975–1976, 1. Murchland, in his national report, noted that “there is plenty of audio-visual hardware being used in religious education,” but he was critical of how this “hardware” was applied in the classroom—criticism worthy of McLuhan: “What we need to get is the whole new mode of perceiving reality...We are in a world of rapid images and sounds; of the sensorial and the immediate; and not as spectators but as instantaneous participants from within.” Teachers therefore needed to learn “how to read” this hardware “from within.” What he meant by “from within” was not clarified. See Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 39–40.

47. Bishop Carter’s Memorandum to principals and teachers, October 12, 1965, 2, London Diocese Archives, G.E. Carter, Religious Education Fathers J.P. Finn/J.J. O’Flaherty 1960-1966, B19-F25.

48. Ontario schools relied heavily on American resources, since “no distinctive Canadian series or program is in widespread use.” That the texts focused on student concerns and problems is evident in Associate Director of Education for Secondary Schools in Ontario Joseph P. Finn’s comment in a letter to the R.E. Neuwein of the

University of Notre Dame, Indiana, when referring to the reliance on American textbooks: “My educated guess is that the problems and concerns of our Catholic teen-agers are similar to those experienced by their counter parts ‘south of the border.’” See Regina Mundi, B11–F29, 1-2, London Diocese Archives.

49. *Hi-Time Awake/Fall One*, Vol. 19, September, 1972, 3, G.E. Carter High Schools Brennan High School-Teaching Material, London Diocese, B11–F16.

50. *Hi-Time Venture/Fall One*, Volume 19, September 1972, 3, London Diocese Archives, B11–F16.

51. *Ibid.*, 6–7, London Archives B11-F16. This article also reflected the increasing interest in ecumenism that began with Vatican II. One regular feature of *Hi-Time* was “The Non-Christian Religions.”

52. *Hi-Time/Awake/Fall One*, Volume 19, September 1972, 6–7, London Diocese Archives, B11-F16.

53. One article outlined the “tasks” that young people needed to complete as they matured into adults, including the task of developing a healthy self-identity and the task of becoming a “good valuer” who possessed “a moral and ethical view of the world.” See *Hi-Time Awake/Fall One*, “Adventure in Change,” 9–13, London Diocese, B11-F16. A similar article discussed how young people could establish moral principles, emphasizing that all people must “learn to match feelings with thoughts, thoughts with words, words with actions, and finally, actions with life.” See *Hi-Time Venture/Fall One*, “If I Think It’s Right, It’s Right, Right?” 22–25, London Diocese, B11-F16.

54. Even before Vatican II, religion was often not considered as serious a subject as other courses. One major reason for this was the fact that religion was not a Ministry of Education accredited subject. It was not one of the subjects that the ministry inspector evaluated. There were no departmental (provincial) exams for religion and the religion mark did not count in terms of overall grade for entry to university. In the spring of 1963, the Catholic Principals’ Committee of the Archdiocese of Toronto, with OECTA approval, asked the Department of Education to accredit religion. Context is important here: at the same time, there was a movement in the public high school system to offer an accredited non-denominational religion course. Catholic educators supported this initiative in the hope that Catholic religion courses would also be accredited. They remained hopeful: “While no approval was given, no refusal was offered either.” *Report on Religion “As a Credit Subject” in High School*, 1, Archives of the Basilian Fathers, C3115.19. In the end, religion did not become an accredited subject until the late 1970s.

55. One of the major reasons why Bishop Carter called for a survey of the diocesan high schools was because of this shift in importance, as he stated in a memorandum to the principals: “One of the subjects which comes to my attention with most regularity is

that of the teaching of religion in our high schools. I am sure that it is not necessary to belabor this point in terms of its importance. I am well aware that our Catholic high schools do not exist, at a price and a sacrifice you well understand, only to teach religion in a formal period. At the same time, it would be a strange anomaly if having this opportunity we were not to give it our best attention.” See G.E. Carter High Schools Education in Diocesan High Schools 1966-1968, B11-F27.

56. Sub-Commission Report, 4, Bishop E.G. Carter, Box 25, File 28, London Diocese.

57. “Memorandum to Principals,” March 8, 1965, G.E. Carter, Religious Education Fathers J.P. Finn/J.J. O’Flaharty 1960-1966, B19-F25.

58. Letter from Bishop Carter to Father James Grannan (September 17, 1968), the Director of Religious Education, September 17, 1968, B19-F26. Carter thought that it was better to focus on values. Father Grannan approved of Bishop Carter’s idea of “separating Theology from Faith-Commitment,” indicating that he had “made a few careful inquiries at Brennan [high school] while at a Department meeting and they would be open to a change.” See Letter to Bishop Carter, October 10, 1968, B19-F26. It is not clear whether or not any moratorium was ever adopted, but it is doubtful given Carter’s support for the principle of subsidiarity. Not all schools agreed with Bishop Carter. One of the largest schools, Catholic Central in London, reported, “we are committed to examinations and marks in religion, because there is a definite body of knowledge contained in any good course of religion for Catholic teen-agers and we are not convinced that an examination and marks are detrimental to the real goal of religious education. This also gives the religion course a degree of academic respectability. We would be quite willing to debate this point with any one else.” See Letter from L. Harold Conway, Principal, to Bishop Carter. March 12, 1968, B19-F26, London Diocese Archives.

59. This Ministry approved course was worth two credits, half of a credit for each year from grade 9 to grade 10. Students were divided into Catholics and non-Catholics “in the hope that a measure of Catholicity might be brought to the teaching of the course in the Catholic division.” It was a compulsory course, but the focus was certainly not religion in any academic sense. See “Projection for a High School Religion Course,” Archives of the Sisters of St. Joseph, London.

60. In his national report, Murchland referred to the pluralism in Catholicism: “There are different theologies among us. The polarization and divergent opinions are evidenced in the countless controversies we live with and read about every day.” See Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 41.

61. Sub-Committee Report, 2, Bishop E.G. Carter, Box 25, File 28.

62. Survey Summary, B19-F26, London Diocese Archives.

63. *Report of the Christian Philosophy of Education Committee*, 2, ARCAT, EDSOII.31.

64. Survey Summary, B19-F26, 1-3, London Diocese.

65. Letter to Father Grannan, B19-F26, London Diocese. This letter also revealed the range of issues that both Father Grannan and Bishop Carter were facing in a time of rapid change and expansion: “The problem of teaching in High Schools is only one of your many concerns, I am sure. As for me, my concerns are as the sands of the sea.”

66. Letter from Rev. J.C. Wey to Rev. G. Delcuve, Director of the International Centre, December 16, 1964. Wey mentioned this confusion in order to emphasize why he wanted to enrol a priest in one of the leading catechetical centres, the International Centre for Religious Education (*Lumae Vitae*) in Belgium. Wey was very persistent, and after writing a series of letters trying to persuade the Centre to accept one of his priests, he finally succeeded in February 1965. His success was in part because of the support he received from leading Catholic figures, who also wrote letters to Delcuve after Wey had received a discouraging letter in January 1965. These were Coadjutor Archbishop of Toronto, Philip Pocock, and Bishop Emmett Carter. See Basilian Fathers Archives, C.3115.36.

67. *Report on Catholic Secondary School Education*, 4, Archives of Sisters of St. Joseph, 200 4–11, Box 5.

68. Minutes of Evaluation Committee Meeting (1972), 2, Mount St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Joseph London Archives. The goals varied considerably: developing in their students “an appreciation of refinement and Christian principles”; providing an “opportunity for girls who would not otherwise have this opportunity to attend a Catholic school”; developing in the students a “Christian social sense” and a “Christian philosophy and attitude”; and establishing a faith community with the mission to integrate “God, His Truth and His Life” into the “life of the school.”

69. “Catholic Education: From Principle to Practice,” 4, ARCAT, EDSOO4.12.

70. *Report on Catholic Secondary School Education*, 4, Archives of Sisters of St. Joseph, 200 4–11, Box 5. The Basilian Father also stressed the need for improvement in teacher education, strongly encouraging the trustees to make an urgent request to the Ministry for courses in a “truly Christian philosophy of education and in the methodology of the teaching of Catechetics and religious education at the Ontario College of Education, Althouse College of Education, and McArthur College of Education.” See “Brief to be Submitted to the Ontario Separate School Trustees’ Association,” 16, Archives of the Basilian Fathers, Toronto, C 3115.23.

71. The key problem was Catholic Boards’ lack of control over the religion program in the educational state of Ontario, as several prominent Catholic educators identified one of the major reasons why so many teachers were ill-prepared to teach religion: the poor preparation at the Faculties of Education—a problem noted in the 1962 Bishops’ Brief to the Minister of Education. Another problem related to the definition of a “teachable subject” at these faculties. Religion, according to Ministry Regulation 407/78, was not a teachable subject as far as the Ministry was concerned. As Father

Joseph T. Culliton, Head of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Windsor, explained to Rev. Patrick Fogarty, Secretary of the Association of Catholic High School Boards of Ontario, students who wished to focus on religious studies and to teach religion at a Catholic high school “find it almost impossible to carry many courses in Religious Studies while getting their B.A. degree.” The overall result was that “teachers of Religion in Separate Schools do not have the same background in Religious Studies as they have to have in 2 other subjects. Many have very few if any university courses in it, some not even high school Religion. The half year or full year course at the Faculty of Education in Religion cannot possibly make up for this deficiency,” March 12, 1981 letter, Archives of the Sisters of St. Joseph, 2006-2.

72. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 37–39.

73. “Catholic Secondary School Education,” 4, Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, 200, 4-11, Box 5.

74. Sub-Committee Report, 12. The report also pointed out that while young people rejected the institutional Church, they “show deep concern for social evils and a great desire to demonstrate their love of their fellow-man...and they may yet share in anti-poverty campaigns, peace marches, and so on.” This “deep concern” may further explain why religion teachers focused on social issues in the classroom given the level of student interest. See *Ibid.*

75. “Catholic Education: From Principal to Practice,” 4.

76. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 42–43.

77. Gleason, “In Search of Unity,” 186–87.

78. Letter from Bishop Carter to Father Jansen, chaplain at Corpus Christi, (September 27, 1963), G.E. Carter High Schools, Brennan High School, 1962-1965, London Diocese Archives, B11-F14.

79. Letter from Bishop Carter to Father M.F. White, religion teacher (September 30, 1963). It is interesting to note that Bishop Carter was not yet adhering to the policy of subsidiarity. In this letter, he informed Father White that he had already selected the textbooks for each grade level. A few years later, he left such decisions to the local schools, and only provided recommendations. *Ibid.*

80. Letter from Bishop Carter to Clifford Hatch, a member of the local Knights of Malta (February 8, 1965). *Ibid.* Monsignor F.J. Brennan was an important figure in the history of Catholic education in the London Diocese who had died on April 21, 1964. It is also interesting to note that the word “Catholic” was not part of the official name of the school.

81. Monsignor F.J. Brennan was a major figure in education within the London Diocese, serving on the faculty of St. Peter’s Seminar for many years. See Power and Brock, *Gather Up the Fragments*, 365.

82. Yearbook message sent to Miss Jo Ann Wellwood, Editor of the Corpus Christi High School, March 26, 1965, G.E. Carter High Schools, Brennan High School.
83. Letter from L.L. Brunet, chaplain at Brennan, to Bishop Carter, November 6, 1972, Brennan High School, B11-F13.
84. Summary Report on religious instruction in the London Diocese, September 17, 1968.
85. G.E. Carter, High Schools Brennan High School, Teaching Materials, B11-F16.
86. Letter from Father L.L. Brunet, chaplain at Brennan, to Bishop Carter, November 6, 1972, Brennan High School, B11-F13.
87. Only one aspect of the religion class impressed him: the students no longer viewed religion as “an academic subject.” Haines does not seem to make any connection between the religion class being considered a “play period” and the lack of academic standards similar to other courses. Haines’ understanding of the nature of “religious formation” was typical of the period in its rejection of anything akin to the traditional approach. It is also clear that the school had not yet completely embraced the new approach to religious education. This is evident from Haines’ proposed solution to the “crisis of religious formation.” He wrote, “I believe that the only possible solution” to this crisis was “the use of audio-visual aids, guest speakers, field trips, class retreats, class Masses and discussions orientated towards actual situations and involving these aids.” Letter from Haines to Carter, June 9, 1966, 4, G.E. Carter High Schools—Brennan High School, 1963-1970, B11-F15.
88. Letter from Father Haines to Bishop Carter, June 9, 1966, 1. G.E. Carter High Schools—Brennan High School, 1963-1970, B11-F15.
89. Letter from Haines to Carter, 2.
90. The attitude of the Windsor Metropolitan Catholic High School Board was revealed four years later when the only religious on the board, Father A. Sillery, resigned after learning of the board’s policy “in regard to the hiring and dismissal of religious teachers who, for personal reasons, return to the lay state.” Sillery was informed that the board “refuses to re-hire them as lay persons because it does not want to pay the increase in salary commensurate to their new status.” Members of religious orders were paid far less than lay teachers. He criticized “a policy which systematically discards qualified and experienced personnel in favor of barely certified and inexperienced teachers,” who were paid considerably less. As far as Sillery was concerned, it was a question of social justice—justice for individuals who were devoted to Catholic education: “Their passing to the lay state seems to wipe away the years of devotion and of monetary sacrifice which were personal as well as community efforts for the survival of Catholic education.” Sillery had only been on the board for three months when he resigned. See Resignation Letter to Bishop Carter, September 26, 1970, G.E Carter- High Schools—Brennan High School, B11-F15.

91. Haines was very critical of board administrators, to whom he wrote two letters that were unanswered. Furthermore, the staff “did request one day in the year when a member might make a cursillo” —a spiritual retreat—but the request was refused. (This contradicts what Haines had written earlier about the staff’s lack of conviction. Enough staff members must have been aware of the need for their own spiritual formation.) Haines was also critical of the organization of the school, which had no given priority to the location of the chapel, which was located beside the cafeteria. Haines, with help from an architect, presented a plan for a “small chaplain’s complex.” His request never received a formal response, but he learned through the “grapevine” that his plan was not accepted. No alternative proposal was offered by the board. See Letter from Haines to Carter, 2–3.
92. In his response to Haines’ letter, Carter stated that he agreed with him “in principle, with hardly any reservation.” He added, however, that he was “much less pessimistic than” Haines. By 1966, Carter was adhering to the principle of subsidiarity, so he also refused to interfere: “It would only be after everything else in the line of subsidiarity is exhausted that I would consider any action suitable on my part.” See Letter from Carter to Haines, 1.
93. Letter from McMahan to Carter, May 27, 1975, B11-F13.
94. Letter from McMahan to Carter, May 27, 1975, B11-F13.
95. The commission was established on October 21, 1975. The Letter of Appointment clearly indicated that the commission’s “scope of inquiries is limited to the religious oriented and general spiritual and moral formation of the School.” See *Report of the Special Commission of Inquiry in Regard to Brennan High School*, Windsor, Ontario, 1, G.E. Carter High Schools Brennan High School, 1971-1977, B11-F13.
96. *The Windsor Star*, Wednesday, April 28, 1976, B11-F13.
97. *Report of the Special Commission*, 3.
98. *Ibid.*, 3.
99. *Ibid.*, 10.
100. *Ibid.*, 3–4. The commission also recommended that “an additional priest-chaplain be appointed or [a] chaplaincy team” in order to serve adequately a school population that had increased to 1,700 students. See *Report of the Special Commission*, 9.
101. The report included a quotation from the Declaration on Christian Education: “This holy Synod likewise affirms that children and young people have a right to be encouraged to weigh moral values with an upright conscience, and to embrace them by personal choice, and to know and love God more adequately.” See *Report of the Special Commission*, 4.
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Ibid.*, 5.
104. *Ibid.*, 3, 10.

105. Only 10 percent of the student body had been interviewed. See *Report of the Special Commission*, 2. However, a study conducted earlier confirmed the report's conclusion. In 1973, an extensive survey was conducted entitled, "Attitudes and Values of Grade Eight Students in their Choice of a Public or Catholic High School Education." Several factors were examined: family, grade school teacher, friends, opportunity for religious education, athletic reputation, academic reputation, and tuition. For students, the opportunity for a Catholic education was not a major reason for attending Brennan High School, and "enthusiasm for a formal course in religion was low." The major reason for going to Brennan was the "strong influence of the family." Here, the study findings underlined the influence of the predominant secular culture, especially among English-speaking families for whom the academic and athletic reputations of Brennan High School were the most important reasons for sending their children to the school. These families also demonstrated "a lesser interest in continuing in the Separate School System until the end of grade 13." They were more reluctant to pay the necessary tuition for a Catholic education than Italian-speaking families, that is, than immigrant families who were less influenced by the secular culture. See *Report on Attitudes and Values of Grade Eight Students*, 2, 3, 5, 6.

106. The fact that the commission emphasized the problems with such a lifestyle strongly suggests that some teachers were behaving in a manner that the commission considered contrary to Church teaching. These "problems" were not restricted to Brennan High School, since the report quoted from a statement by J.A. Plourde, Archbishop of Ottawa, entitled "Today's Catholic School": The lifestyle of the teacher "must not constitute a public contradiction of the Gospel ideal or the Church teaching. A Catholic School System has the right to determine what is essential to preserve its authenticity, otherwise its confessional character is meaningless." The report also highlighted the role of the principal, who must be a "person well grounded in the truths of the Catholic faith" and never allow other concerns such as "financial matters" to "take priority over Catholic principles." On a positive note, the commission recommended that the school offer more spiritual retreats in order to assist the staff in following what it considered to be a proper Christian lifestyle. See *Report of the Special Commission*, 7, 8.

107. *Report of the Special Commission*, 5.

108. *Ibid.*

109. *Ibid.*, 5-6.

110. In 1972, the Ontario Government adopted a credit system in which students had to accumulate at least 27 credits, some of which had to be achieved in specific subject areas such as English, Social Sciences, Math, and Science. Religion was not deemed academic enough to be a credited subject. In doing so, the government was following its traditional policy of not recognizing religion as a subject needed for graduation. To

be fair to the government, Catholic schools themselves are in part responsible for the non-credit status for religion courses, given that they emphasized the non-academic nature of these courses.

111. *Report of the Special Commission*, 7.

112. *Ibid.*, 11.

113. Carter took this criticism in stride, commenting, “Even the bishop comes in for his share.” See “Commission Reports on Brennan,” *Windsor Star*, April 28, 1976.

114. One of the recommendations was implemented soon after the report was published. It was decided to increase the number of hours for religious instruction. The students had been taking religion for only one semester for 46 hours in total. In the next academic year, they would take religion in both semesters: 46 hours in the first semester, and an additional 30 hours in the second. See “Brennan plans expansion of its religion program,” *Windsor Star*, May 14, 1976. It is unclear whether or not the other recommendations were fully implemented. By April 1977, however, a new religion course had been prepared for the diocesan high schools, with more focus on “content.” See Circular Letter, April 15, 1977, 3, G.E. Carter, Circulars, B6-F3. The accreditation of the religion course would not occur until 1978.

115. The pervasive influence of the dominant secular culture is evident in the history of Regina Mundi High School in the London Diocese. Established as a Minor Seminary in 1963, the school focused on forming future priests and opened with a considerable amount of confidence and enthusiasm. The two major aims of the seminary were to “instruct the intellect” and to “educate the will,” reflecting a pre-Vatican II Neo-Thomistic philosophy. See *Report to the Clergy of the London Diocese*, G.E. Carter High Schools—Regina Mundi High School, 1963-1969, B11-F29, 2. Initially, the school administrators were encouraged by the number of students that the school attracted for grade 9, fifty-five students in 1963. By 1966, however, the situation was much different, with the Rector of the Minor Seminary, Joseph P. Finn, reporting to Bishop Carter that “there has been a significant falling off of interest and applications to minor seminaries this year”—an indication that this decline was noticeable across North America. (Finn was reporting from a meeting with other minor seminaries in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.) See Letter from Finn to Carter, August 11, 1966, G.E. Carter High Schools, Regina Mundi High School, 1963-1969, B11-F29. Soon after, the decision was made to admit students who were not interested in the priesthood and the name of the school was changed from Regina Mundi Minor Seminary to Regina Mundi College. These changes were explained in the context of Vatican II, with an emphasis on preparing both future priests and future lay leaders, reflecting the “concept of the People of God,” which “precludes any division among our youth,” according to Carter. See Bishop Carter’s “Message Concerning the New Concept of Regina Mundi College,” G.E. Carter High Schools, Regina Mundi High School, 1963–1969, B11-F29.

116. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 42.
117. "Purpose of Program," Religious Education Department, Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, London.
118. "Course Outlines for Religion Courses," Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, London.
119. Religion Programme of Study, 1975-1976, Programs of Study, Loretto Archives. This definition was used in subsequent programmes of study into the 1980s.
120. *The Religion Education Manual*, St. Joseph's Morrow Park, 1978-79, Sisters of St. Joseph Archives, 205 2-2, 1. This manual was an in-depth analysis of religious education—in itself an indication of the renewed importance of the formal religious program. The manual included the following sections: The goals of religious education; Adolescent Readiness for religion; Types of activities and assignments; and detailed course outlines for each grade level.
121. *Religion Education Manual*, 1.
122. *Ibid.*, 2–3.
123. Murchland, *Adolescent Catechesis*, 45, 47.
124. This report was entitled, *Revised Draft of a Statement on the Goals and Objectives of Catholic Education as applied to the Ontario Separate School System*. These goals focused on moral development and the creation of a Christian community in Catholic schools, but the document also emphasized the importance of the formal teaching of Church doctrine: "In a Catholic school the direct teaching of religion occupies an honored place. The religious truths taught in a Catholic school must be in accord with the magisterium of the Catholic Church. As an institution of the Catholic community the Roman Catholic separate school in Ontario must reflect Catholic doctrine and practice." In terms of moral values, the statement underlined that they must be based "not solely on a conventional code of human ethics, but rather on the Divine plan." The four goals were to "provide an environment favorable to the interiorization of Catholic moral values and religious practices; to "develop quality and excellence in education that provides an equal opportunity for all to grow...as unique and responsible Christian persons; to "integrate God's truth and His life...into the entire syllabus curriculum and life of the school; and to "build a vibrant Christian community where the gospel spirit of freedom and DISCIPLINE, SERVICE AND BROTHERHOOD PREVAILS." See "The Cloud over Brennan High School," *The Windsor Star*, Saturday, February 28, 1976.
125. *The Quinquennial Report (1974-1977) of the Diocese of London*, 15, London Diocese Archives.
126. "The Archdiocesan High School Board," Loretto Abbey Archives, Ministries/Education, Research Papers, Loretto in Canada, 16.1-2.
127. Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, 611.
128. It is interesting to note that Bishop Carter in a keynote address to the Federation of Catholic Education Associations of Ontario, "Catholic Education in Ontario in

Context,” referred to this confusion and the role of Second Vatican Council only one month after the Congregation released its document: “The Second Council of the Vatican deliberately avoided the use of formulas and definitions. This Council is constantly called a ‘*Pastoral Council*’ because its insistence was on meeting the people where they are and asking them to reaffirm their living faith...As a result our treatment was couched in more human terms than the Councils of the past with the hope that the psychological approach would be more relevant and more easily accepted by people who had been treated to over half a century of psychological conditioning. At no time did the Council intend to confuse the basic teachings of the Church. The confusion arose afterwards. What happened was, and is, a real crisis of Faith.” See *The Spotlight: News and Views on Catholic Education*, 4, London Diocese Archives, EDS008.15b. 129. This was made clear at the beginning of the document in which it was situated squarely in the context of Vatican II, in particular *Gravissimum Educationis*, the Declaration on Christian Education. In the Council’s Declaration, the Catholic school is “discussed in the wider sphere of Christian Education. The present document develops the idea of this Declaration, limiting itself to a deeper reflection on the Catholic School.” See Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, 606.

130. *Ibid.*, 612.

131. *Ibid.*, 613.

132. *Ibid.*

133. *Ibid.*, 616.

134. *Ibid.*, 617.

135. *Ibid.*, 622–23.

136. *Ibid.*, 624.

Chapter Seven

1. Patrick H. McNamara provides a detailed analysis of the shift from traditional authority to that of the individual, particularly during the 1970s and 1980s, in *Conscience First, Tradition Second: A Study of Young American Catholics* (New York: State of New York University Press, 1991).

2. G.E. Carter played a major role in achieving full funding. In 1978, Carter was appointed as the Archbishop of Toronto, the largest English-speaking archdiocese in Canada. Later that year, in October, Pope John Paul II elevated him to the cardinalate. As a cardinal, Carter had an excellent working relationship with Premier of Ontario Bill Davis, influencing him no doubt in his decision to grant full funding. For Davis, it was also a question of equity and political expedience. According to Carter, he was well aware that by the early 1980s, “half the population of Toronto was Catholic.” See

Higgins and Letson, *My Father's Business*, 174. In 1984, the Catholic struggle for full funding that began in the 1840s came to an end.

3. In the mid-1990s, the government of Ontario initiated a major overhaul of the secondary curriculum, referred to as "Secondary Reform," in order to standardize the curriculum in terms of both content, skills, and student assessment/evaluation.

Detailed Ministry expectations (objectives) were developed for each subject and for each level of difficulty: workplace, open, applied, academic, college, college/university, and university preparation. Standardized report cards were adopted. Religion courses were therefore also standardized. Before Secondary Reform, many of the subject curriculum documents were far less detailed, providing teachers with considerably more leeway and decision-making independence in terms of what content and skills were emphasized as well as how student learning was assessed and evaluated. ICE established a writing team consisting of representatives (mainly consultants) from different Catholic school boards. The Ontario Catholic Council of Bishop Education Commission was also involved in developing the curriculum document. This Secondary Reform was the most significant reform of secondary education since the 1960s, yet it was not the only one. During the 1980s and early 1990s, there were other reform initiatives. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE) released in 2002 an in-depth study of Secondary Reform, which included an excellent summary of these earlier reform initiatives: "Policies, Politics, Pedagogy and People: Early Perceptions and Challenges in Large-scale Reform in Ontario Secondary Schools."

4. In 1978, for example, when religion courses were accredited in grade 9 and 10, they were only granted one-half of a credit each. They were also taught at the lowest academic level possible.

5. Daniel Rogers, "Age of Fracture," 12.

6. Daniel Rogers, *The Age of Fracture* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2011), 5–6.

7. Rogers, "Age of Fracture," 13.

8. *Ibid.*, 13.

9. Rogers also notes that the "mass-audience, network television," which had gained a new authority during the long sixties, had lost its "hegemony," giving way to a wide array of other forms of social media. This led to further fragmentation of the social pressures on the individual's sense of self. See *Ibid.*, 13.

10. Rogers, *Age of Fracture*, 9–10.

11. This is evident even in the more conservative religious groups in the United States, which purported to stand for the importance of community and not individual autonomy. According to Rodgers, "individualized rights" flourished on both the cultural left and right. For example, religious conservatives defended the practice of prayer in

public schools, not in terms of a “civic obligation,” but as the “protected individual right” of those who felt called to witness publicly their faith. Rogers, “Age of Fracture,” 13.

12. Kenneth A. Strike, “Is There a Conflict Between Equity and Excellence?,” 411.

13. Excellence is understood in terms of competition: “The point is not to do something well. It is to do it better than someone else.” See *Ibid.*, 411. Strike contrasts the human capital theory with the Jeffersonian Ideal, which emphasized the development of an informed citizenry capable of participating in a democratic community.

14. Gert Biesta, “Interrupting the Politics of Learning,” *Power and Education* 5, no. 1 (2013): 4–5, <https://www.wwords.co.uk/power>.

15. Here, Biesta discusses the gradual change in the understanding of learning. Traditionally, learning was understood in the context of education. The concept of life-long learning has a fairly long history, dating back to at least the 1920s, but was understood in terms of education. By the 1990s, however, a major shift had occurred with life-long learning being more associated with neo-liberal ideology. This shift is evident in the difference between two UNESCO reports: the 1972 *Learning to Be: The World of Education Today* and the 1996 *Learning: The Treasure Within*. The latter report dropped any reference to education in its title. See *Ibid.*, 7.

16. Biesta argues that a “subtle but a crucial semantic shift” had occurred from “‘lifelong education’—a *relational* concept—to ‘lifelong learning’—an *individualistic* concept.” See *Ibid.*, 7.

17. Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA), cara.georgetown.edu.

18. According to CARA, in 2007, only 10 percent of Millennials (ages 18–25) regularly attended Sunday Mass; for Generation X (ages 26–46) it was 13 percent; for the Boomers (ages 47–64) 20 percent, and for the Builders (ages 65+) 45 percent. Sherry A. Weddell, *Forming Intentional Disciples: The Path to Knowing and Following Jesus* (Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 2012), 38.

19. Congar, *The Meaning of Tradition*, 73.

20. In 1972, 79 percent of adult Catholics and 69 percent of young adult Catholics were married in the Church. In 2010, the corresponding numbers were 53 percent and 38 percent—a total decrease of almost 60 percent. See Weddell, *Forming Intentional Disciples*, 36.

21. Scott, *Rome*, 16–19.

22. *Ibid.*, 487–88. This viewpoint is widespread among certain academic circles, particularly in Europe, despite considerable evidence supporting more traditional interpretations of the historical Jesus. Many academics no longer believe in God. For example, leading scholar F.C. Ingليس contends that only a minority of “historically minded theorists” are “still believers in God, and most of these are in North America.” He further argues that “religion cannot in its established churches bind societies

together as a unifying presence, and this is largely because its historical claims have become strictly incredible.” This belief has permeated much of society. Inglis was astonished that Charles Taylor, a leading Canadian philosopher and historical theorist, returned to the Catholic Church, stating that the “commonest response to Taylor’s return to a pacific Catholicism seems to be (it certainly is for me) a head-shaking incredulity.” Quentin Skinner was also shocked, commenting that what is “astonishing is Taylor’s failure to come to grips with the intellectual depth and reach of modern unbelief.” See F. C. Inglis, *History Man: The Life of R.G. Collingwood* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 99, 131.

23. Scott, *Rome*, 488–89.

24. *Ibid.*, 490–91.

25. Thomas Cahill, *The World Before and After Jesus: Desire of the Everlasting Hills* (New York: Random House, 1999), 74.

26. *Ibid.*, 209–10.

27. *Ibid.*, 74–76. The internet provides substantial information on these views. For example, see www.caesarsmessiah.com.

28. Ratzinger, *Jesus of Nazareth*, xii.

29. This is, of course, a challenge not only for the Catholic Church, but for all Christian denominations.

30. In his in-depth study of the historical Jesus, John P. Meier provides a lengthy analysis of the Flavius Josephus’ passage about Jesus in *The Jewish Antiquities* (A.D. 93–94) in order to provide historical evidence for Jesus’ existence. A Jewish aristocrat and historian, Josephus referred to Jesus as a miracle-worker and teacher who lived during the rule of Pontius Pilate and had gained a large following. Josephus also recorded that Jesus was tried and executed and that afterwards his followers remained devoted to him. In his analysis, Meier confirms that Josephus was indeed the author of the passage. Meier also explains why such a detailed analysis was necessary: “We seem to have given much space to a relatively small passage, but it is a passage of monumental importance. In my conversations with newspaper writers and book editors who have asked me at various times to write about the historical Jesus, almost invariably the first question that arises is: But can you prove that he existed? If I may reformulate that sweeping question into a more focused one, ‘Is there extrabiblical evidence in the first century A.D. for Jesus’ existence?’ then I believe, thanks to Josephus, that the answer is yes.” What is important here to note is that these newspaper writers and book editors doubted that the Gospels contained any historical evidence about Jesus. Meier alludes to this modern readiness to doubt the existence of the historical Jesus: “When we remember that we are hunting for a marginal Jew in a marginal province of the Roman Empire, it is amazing that a more prominent Jew of the 1st century, in no way connected with this marginal Jew’s followers, should have

preserved a thumbnail sketch of ‘Jesus-who-is-called-Messiah.’ Yet practically no one is astounded or refuses to believe that in the same Book 18 of *The Jewish Antiquities* Josephus also chose to write a longer sketch of another marginal Jew, another peculiar religious leader in Palestine, ‘John surnamed the Baptist.’” See John Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus Volume One: The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 68–69.

31. Here, the nature of catechesis is defined as “instructional dialogue between believers; sharing faith insights; continued evangelisation of believers” that presumes an “initial awakening or conversion to faith.” See Graham M. Rossiter, “The Need for a ‘Creative Divorce’ Between Catechesis and Religious Education in Catholic Schools,” *Religious Education: The Official Journal of the Religious Education Association* 77, no. 1 (2006): 25, <http://dx.org/10.1080/0034400820770103>.

32. Richard Rymarz, “Catechesis and Religious Education in Canadian Catholic Schools,” *Religious Education* 35, no. 5 (2011): 539, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2011.613355>.

33. *Teacher Manual for In Search of the Good* (Ottawa: Canadian Conference of Bishops, 2004), 11.

34. *The Ontario Catholic Secondary Curriculum Policy Document for Religious Education* (Toronto: Ontario Council of Bishops, 2006), 6.

35. For a detailed discussion of the debate concerning catechism and religious education in Canada, Richard Rymarz’s article is useful: “Catechesis and Religious Education in Canadian Catholic Schools,” *Religious Education* 106, no. 5 (2001): 537–49, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0034-4087.2011.613355>.

36. Bruno-Jofre and Hill, “Changing Visions of Excellence,” 338.

37. Richard W. Strong, Harvey F. Silver, and Matthew J. Perini, *Teaching What Matters Most: Standards and Strategies for Raising Student Achievement* (Alexandria: ASCD, 2001), 7.

38. Strong, Silver, and Perini, *Teaching What Matters Most*, 7. The authors provide five reasons why academic rigour is essential: “dumbed down” content does not demand the students’ attention, while academic rigour helps them handle uncertainty and understand the complexity of many issues; increases flexibility in their thinking; develops perseverance, intellectual modesty, and tolerance—by examining other points of view; and improves their self-confidence as they grapple with challenging content. See *Ibid.*, 9. If it can be implemented properly, such academic rigour should be integrated into all religion courses, not only at the university preparation level, but at all levels. Considerable care is needed to assure that the degree of academic rigour is appropriate for the given academic level of the course.

39. Students at the workplace level take courses that will lead directly to the workplace or to certain apprenticeship programs. In 2016, the Ontario curriculum policy for

religious education was once again revised in order to accommodate recent curriculum changes mandated by the Ministry of Education. More emphasis is therefore placed on skill development and on inquiry in the policy document, but the fundamental nature of the courses has not changed, and thus nor has the fundamental weakness of these courses: the lack of academic rigour.

40. For this reason, most universities in Ontario only permit students to include two M courses in their best six grade 12 marks required for university admittance.

41. The lack of a university preparation religion course is another example of the continued practice of the Ministry of Education in considering religion as a less serious academic discipline. This practice is also reflected in the fact that religion is still not considered a “teachable subject” in the vast majority of provincial faculties of education.

42. Graham Rossiter, “A Cognitive Basis for Affective Learning in Classroom Religious Education,” *British Journal of Religious Education* 11, no. 1 (2006): 6, 9, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141620880110102>.

43. William Pinar, *What is Curriculum Theory?* (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004), 21.

44. *Ibid.*, 22.

45. Pinar highlights in particular the “goal directed behaviour which is efficient, and thereby more likely effective.” However, as a result, in “teaching and classroom discourse...we have ignored such significant, but difficult to conceptualize and quantify, dimensions of educational activity as the ethical, the aesthetic, and the political.” Such “routinized behaviour comes at the cost of spontaneity and individuality. He [the student] becomes a social type we recognize. His specific self, now to some extent buried behind the mask, is probably as forgotten to him as it is hidden to us...This reduction of the individual to the social type numbs him to ethical, aesthetic, and political considerations as these are subservient to and forgotten in this consuming effort to achieve his objectives.” See William Pinar, “Whole, Bright, Deep with Understanding: Issues in Qualitative Research and Autobiographical Method,” *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 13, no. 3 (1981): 174, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027810130302>.

46. *Ibid.*, 181.

47. Pinar, *What is Curriculum Theory?*, 21.

48. *Ibid.*, xiv.

49. *Ibid.*, 16.

50. Freire refers to these “subscribed values” as the result of the “banking of consciousness,” where the teacher regulates “the way the world ‘enters into’ the students. The teacher’s task is to organise a process which already occurs spontaneously, to ‘fill’ the students by making deposits of information which he or she

- considers to constitute true knowledge.” See Paulo Freire, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2005), 76.
51. Ibid., 72.
52. Ibid., 73.
53. Liam Kane, *Popular Education and Social Change in Latin America* (London: Latin America Bureau, 2001), 37, 40.
54. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 80.
55. Paulo Freire and Donald Macedo, “A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race,” *Harvard Educational Review* 65, no. 3 (2001): 382, <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.3.12g1923330pixhj8>.
56. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 19.
57. Kane, *Popular Education*, 36. One of the major reasons why Freire’s pedagogical method was so popular in Latin America was its close relationship with Catholic thinking in the late 1960s and early 1970s. See Ibid., 48.
58. James Scott Johnston, *Dewey: Inquiry from Education Theory to Practice* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 3.
59. Ibid.
60. John Dewey, “My Pedagogic Creed,” *School Journal* 54 (January 1897): 3, <http://dewey.pragmatism.org/creed.htm>.
61. Ibid., 11.
62. William Shea, “From Classicism to Method: John Dewey and Bernard Lonergan,” *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 9 (1991): 306, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1085788>.
63. Ibid., 309.
64. Father Hurtado, canonized by Benedict XVI in 2005, was a “social educator committed to the poor, the education of young people as social leaders, and the organization of workers.” See Rosa Bruno-Jofré and Gonzalo Jover, “The Readings of John Dewey’s Work and the Intersection of Catholicism: The Cases of the Institucion Libre de Ensenanza and the Thesis of Father Alberto Hurtado, S.J. on Dewey,” in *The Global Reception of John Dewey's Thought: Multiple Refractions through Time and Space*, ed. Rosa Bruno-Jofré and Jürgen Schriewer (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2012), 26.
65. Ibid., 31.
66. Ibid., 28.
67. Hurtado’s 1935 PhD thesis, *Le système pédagogique de Dewey devant les exigences de la doctrine catholique*, quoted in Bruno-Jofré and Jover, “The Readings of John Dewey’s Work,” 45.
68. Bruno-Jofré and Jover, “The Readings of John Dewey’s Work,” 31.

69. This understanding of religious truth was one of Hurtado's pedagogical principles in terms of teaching religion as he explained them in 1947. The other principles were: the awareness of the dangers of designing a religion course on morals articulated as commandments and separate from theology; the supernatural life was not limited to the after life, but was "lived on earth and involved the entire being"; and the consideration of the psychology of students in designing religion courses. See *Ibid.*, 35.

70. *Ibid.*, 33. In matters of searching for the truth, Hurtado parted company with Dewey, who, as a pragmatist, rejected the concept of transcendental truth and understood truth in terms of "warranted assertability" and as open to revision. Hurtado, on the other hand, believed that absolute truths existed and were ordained by God. He argued that students could still inquire as to and discover these truths in the context of the new theology. Thus, when Dewey spoke of a "personal light," he thought of the power of reason alone, whereas Hurtado understood this light as the "manifestation" of the moral law of God. See *Ibid.*, 33–34.

71. Shea taught at three universities and two colleges over his forty-year career. He was a resident fellow of the Woodrow Wilson Center at the Smithsonian (1986–87) and of the Ecumenical Institute at St. John's University in Collegeville MN (1999). He held the chairmanship of the theology department at Saint Louis University from 1991 to 1997, and the directorship of the Center for Religion, Ethics and Culture at the College of the Holy Cross from July 2003 to June 2008.

72. Dewey and Lonergan both emphasized the importance of community. They rejected the view that the economy existed for competitive individuals who strove for personal material benefit, arguing that it existed for the benefit of the community. According to Shea, Dewey's "social and political philosophy would receive a respectful reading by the twentieth century popes, and especially so by John XXIII, Paul VI, and John Paul II." See William M. Shea, "From Classicism to Method," 309–6. In his detailed comparison of Dewey and Lonergan, Shea also explains the major differences in their thinking, particularly those originating from their contrary views of transcendence.

73. For both Dewey and Lonergan, values were not "emotive and private, and so beyond (or beneath) criticism." See *Ibid.*, 307.

74. *Ibid.*, 309. Dewey and Lonergan emphasized the importance of the scientific method of inquiry, with Dewey referring to it as "the method of intelligence" and Lonergan as "a generalized empirical method." See *Ibid.*, 310.

75. *Ibid.*, 309.

76. *Ibid.*, 310.

77. There are two fundamental types of conversion: exogenous, in which an "external event" leads to conversion, and endogenous conversion (self-transcendence), in which

an “interior process” leads to a “transformation of consciousness.” In his use of the concept of self-transcendence, Lonergan was influenced mainly by Cardinal Newman, who described the process “most eloquently” in his *Apologia*. See Rymarz, “Conversion and the New Evangelization,” 354. Lonergan’s philosophy was also grounded in the tradition of Maréchal Thomism and in the study of St. Thomas’ own text. This is clear from his understanding of the “act of insight,” when the intellect is faced with “scraps of information.” An insight is “the mental act by which these different scraps are grasped as cohering in an orderly and intelligible whole.” Lonergan identified three critical steps in the “process of knowing”: experience, understanding, and judgement. Experience provides “uncoordinated scraps of data” that the intellect grasps through insight into “intelligible unity,” and which, in judgement, the intellect determines whether or not the so-called knowledge, theory, or interpretation, is in fact true. See Hugh A. Meynell, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Bernard Lonergan* (London: Macmillan Academic and Professional LTD, 1991), 2–3.

78. Rymarz, “Conversion and the New Evangelization,” 756.

79. *Ibid.*, 755.

80. *Ibid.*, 756.

81. Following in the footsteps of Aquinas, Lonergan understood this process as God’s “operative grace.” See *Ibid.*, 757.

82. A distinction is made between the “historical” Jesus and the Jesus of “faith.” The focus here is to discover the historical evidence about Jesus that can be ascertained using the critical-historical method. The next step is to connect this evidence to a “faith claim” concerning Jesus—a claim that cannot be based solely on historical evidence. After determining the validity of the evidence, the students then judge whether or not the faith claim is reasonable. This analysis of the historical Jesus is generic in nature, meaning that it could be part of a unit offered at any secondary grade level. It is proposed here that this analysis be part of all secondary religion courses, with the level of difficulty in terms of analysis increasing as the students progress through the school’s religion program. The big ideas of this program should be continually revisited. Thus, this curricular framework adheres to Jerome Bruner’s notion of a “spiral curriculum,” in that the big ideas are “developed and redeveloped in a spiral fashion,” in increasing depth and breadth as the students continue in the program. See Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 52. More recent research in curriculum design supports the value of spiral curriculum, particularly in terms of the importance of “multiple exposures” to content. With these multiple exposures, it is far more likely that the students will remember what they have learned. See Marzano, *What Works in Schools*, 112–13.

83. Jerome Bruner examines in detail the importance of establishing a narrative in terms of understanding. See “The Narrative Construction of Reality,” *Critical Inquiry* 18,

no 1 (1999): 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.1086/448619>. Robert Marzano also highlights the research supporting the importance of a narrative approach in terms of student retention of content. See Marzano, *What Works in Schools*, 113.

84. The major source here is John Meier’s four-volume in-depth analysis of the historical Jesus. In order to ensure that he is only basing his conclusions on the available historical evidence, he imagines that a “unpapal conclave,” a “mythical committee of scholars made up of a Protestant, a Catholic, a Jew, and an agnostic,” has examined the evidence and issued a consensus statement. Thus, at times, certain conclusions are contrary to Church teaching. For example, the historical evidence strongly suggests that Jesus was not an only child, despite the official position of the Church. See John Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volume II: Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 509.

85. The role of teacher in terms of historical analysis, especially when dealing with primary documents, changes according to the grade level and the level of analytical difficulty. Usually, the analysis is teacher-directed until the students are ready to analyse independently or within a group.

86. Meier has fascinating historical criteria for such evidence, the criterion of embarrassment, arguing convincingly that anything in the Gospels that would have embarrassed the early Church such as the baptism of Jesus is most likely historical, since otherwise it would not have been included. In this instance, the baptism of Jesus was so well-known among early Christians that evangelists had no choice but to include it. See Meier, *The Marginal Jew*, Vol. 1, 168–71.

87. *Ibid.*, 44–45.

88. Meier, *The Marginal Jew*, Vol. II, 130–37, 400–1.

89. According to Biblical scholars, Jesus did not overtly declare himself as the Messiah. For evangelical purposes, the authors of the Gospels have Jesus making such utterances.

90. Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, Vol. 2, 686–90.

91. *Ibid.*, 618. Two of the most well-known “nature miracle” stories are Jesus walking on the water and His stilling of the storm.

92. Meier has identified four independent sources: Mark, the Q document, a specific Luke tradition, and John.

93. Meier also argues that multiple attestation of sources is impressive for the miracle stories: “For hardly any other type of Gospel material enjoys greater multiple attestation than do the miracles of Jesus.” See *Ibid.*, 622.

94. *Ibid.*, 970. Meier provides a detailed analysis of the nature miracles, calling into question whether or not they should even be categorized as “nature” miracles. See *Ibid.*, 874–970.

95. According to R. Tarnas, their “intense conviction” that he did rise from the dead can “scarcely be overestimated.” See Tarnas, *The Passion of the Western Mind*, 96.

Archival Sources and Bibliography

Archives

The Archdiocese of Kingston
The Canadian Conference of Bishops
The Catholic Register
The Diocese of London
The General Archives of the Basilian Fathers
Loretta Abbey, Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Canadian Province
The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto
Sisters of Providence of St. Vincent de Paul
Sisters of St. Joseph of London
Sisters of St. Joseph of Toronto

Bibliography

- Albergio, Giuseppe. *History of Vatican II*, Vol. I. New York: Maryknoll, 1996.
- Attridge, Michael. "A Canadian Anglican at Vatican II: The Activity of Eugene R. Fairweather." In *Vatican II—Expériences Canadiennes/Canadian Experiences*, edited by Michael Attridge, Catherine E. Clifford, and Gilles Routhier, 341–59. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2011.
- Attridge, Michael. "From Objectivity to Subjectivity and the Varied Strands." In *Catholic Education in the Wake of Vatican II*, edited by Rosa Bruno Jofré and Jon Igelmo Zaldívar, 21–41. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.
- Arthur, James. "Secularisation, Secularism and Catholic Education: The Challenges." *International Studies in Catholic Education* 1, no. 2 (2009): 228–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422530138226>.
- Arthur, James. "The De-Catholicising of the Curriculum in English Catholic Schools." *International Studies in Catholic Education* 5, no. 1 (2013): 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/milt.12000>.
- Berton, Pierre. *The Comfortable Pew*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
- Biesta, Gert. "Interrupting the Politics of Learning." *Power and Education* 5, no. 1 (2013): 4–15. <http://www.wwords.co.uk/power>.
- Braithwaite, David. "Vatican II on Tradition." *The Heythrop Journal* 53, no. 6 (2012): 915–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14682265.201200747.x>.

- Briel, Don J. "The *Declaration on Christian Education, Gravissimum Educationis*." In *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, edited by Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Leverin, 383–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Brennan, Terri-Lynn Kay. "Roman Catholic Schooling in Ontario: Past Struggles, Present Challenges, Future Direction?" *Canadian Journal of Education* 34, no. 4, (2011): 20–33.
- Brown, Callum. "What was the Religious Crisis of the 1960s?" *Journal of Religious History* 34, no. 4 (2010): 468–79.
- Bruner, Jerome. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Bruner, Jerome. "The Narrative Construction of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 18, no 1 (1999): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448619>.
- Bruno-Jofré, Rosa, and George (Skip) Hills. "Changing Visions of Excellence in Ontario School Policy: The Cases of Living and Learning and For the Love of Learning." *Educational Theory* 61, no. 3 (2011): 335–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2011.00407.x>.
- Bruno-Jofré, Rosa, and Gonzalo Jover. "The Readings of John Dewey's Work and the Intersection of Catholicism: The Cases of the Institucion Libre de Ensenanza and the Thesis of Father Alberto Hurtado, S.J. on Dewey." In *The Global Reception of John Dewey's Thought: Multiple Refractions through Time and Space*, edited by Rosa Bruno-Jofré and Jurgen Schriewer, 23–42. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2012.
- Bull, George. "The Function of the Catholic Graduate School." *Thought* 13, no.3 (1933): 364–80. <https://doi.org/10.5840/thought193813343>.
- Cahill, Thomas. *The World Before and After Jesus: Desire of the Everlasting Hills*. New York: Random House, 1999.
- Callahan, Daniel. *The Mind of the Catholic Layman*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.
- Cantor, Norman F. *The Civilization of the Middle Ages*. New York: Harper Collins, 1993.
- Carter, Gerald Emmett. "Introduction." In *The Documents of Vatican II*, edited by Walter M. Abbott, 634–36. New York: Guild Press, 1966.
- Carter, Gerald Emmett. G. *The Modern Challenge to Religious Education*. New York: Palm Publisher, 1961.
- Cassilly, Francis B. *Religion: Doctrine and Practice*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1934.
- Christie, Nancy. "Belief Crucified Upon a Rooftop Antenna: Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew*, and Dechristianization." In *The Sixties and Beyond: Dechristianization in North America and Western Europe, 1945-2000*, edited by Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, 321–50. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

- Christie, Nancy. "Introduction." In *The Sixties and Beyond: Dechristianization in North America and Western Europe, 1945-2000*, edited by Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, 3–38. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.
- Cole, Josh. "Our Only Hope is Apocalypse: Marshall McLuhan, Catholic AntiModernism, and 1960s Educational Reform." *Historia de la Educación: Revista interuniversitaria* 35 (2016): 89–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14201/hedu201635>.
- Colish, Marcia L. "St. Thomas Aquinas in Historical Perspective: The Modern Period." In *American Society of Church History* 44, no. 4 (1975): 433–49. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3163823>.
- Colvert, Gavin I. "Maritain and the Idea of a Catholic University." In *Truth Matters: Essays in Honor of Jacques Maritain*, edited by John G. Trapani Jr., 44–67. Washington: American Maritain Association, 2004.
- Congar, Yves. *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology: Conversations with Yves Congar*, edited by Bernard Lauret. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Congar, Yves. *The Meaning of Tradition*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004.
- Corcoran, Timothy. "Function of Religious Knowledge in Catholic Education." *Thought* 3, no. 2 (1928): 240–57. <https://doi.org/10.5840/thought19283234>.
- Cummings, Owen. *Prophets, Guardians, and Saints: Shapers of Modern Catholic History*. New York: Paulist Press, 2007.
- Curtis, Bruce. *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871*. London: Althouse Press, 1988.
- Daly, Gabriel. "Catholicism and Modernity." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 5, no. 4 (1985): 773–96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1464275>.
- Daly, Gabriel. *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Depaepe, Marc, and Paul Smeyers. "Educationalization as an Ongoing Modernization Process." *Educational Theory* 58, no. 4 (2008): 379–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2008.00295.x>.
- D'Souza, Mario O. "Jacques Maritain's Seven Misconceptions of Education: Implications for the Preparation of Catholic School Teachers." *Journal of Catholic Education*, 5, no. 4 (2013): 435–53. <http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ce/vol5/iss4/3>.
- D'Souza, Mario O. *Being in the World: A Quotable Maritain Reader*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2014.
- Dewey, John. "My Pedagogic Creed" *School Journal* 54 (1897). <http://dewey.pragmatism.org/creed.htm>.
- Elias, John L. "Whatever happened to Catholic Philosophy of Education?" *Religious Education* 94, no 1 (1999): 92–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344089900940108>.
- Ellis, Joseph A. *Jacques Maritain on Humanism and Education*. Fresno: Academy Guild Press, 1966.
- Elwel, Clarence. *Our Quest for Happiness*. Chicago: Mentzer, Bush, and Company, 1951.

- Ernst, Harold, E. "New Horizons in Catholic Philosophical Theology: Fides et Ratio and the Changed Status of Thomism." *Heythrop Journal* 41, no. 1 (2006): 26–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2265.2006.00277.x>.
- Fairweather, Eugene. "The Catholic Tradition." In *The Restless Church: A Response to the Comfortable Pew*, edited by William Kilbourn, 65–71. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966.
- Flahiff, G.B. "The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies at Toronto." *Speculum* 24, no. 2 (1949): 251–55.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/2848565?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.
- Flannery, Austin. *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents, Volume One*. New York: Costello Publishing Company, 1998.
- Foy, Vincent. "Catechetical Chaos in Canada: Cause and Cure." *St. Joseph's Worker for Life and Family* (1999): 1–5.
https://msgrfoy.files.wordpress.com/2014/03/scan_20140303-4.jpg.
- Freire, Paulo. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2005.
- Freire, Paulo, and Donald Macedo. "A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race." *Harvard Educational Review* 65, no. 3 (2001): 377–403.
<https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.3.12g1923330pixhj8>.
- Gidney, R.D. *From Hope to Harris: The Reshaping of Ontario Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Gilmour, Richard. *Bible History*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1894.
- Gleason, Philip. "In Search of Unity: American Catholic Thought 1920-1960." *The Catholic Historical Review* 65, no. 2 (1979): 185–205.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25020551>.
- Gleason, Philip. *Keeping the Faith: American Catholicism Past and Present*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1987.
- Granatstein, Jack L. *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986.
- Grant, John Webster. *The Church in the Canadian Era*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1998.
- Harris, Paul T. "Introduction." In *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, edited by Paul T Harris, 1–4. Don Mills: Longmans Canada, 1965.
- Hartnagel, Timothy F. and Leo Klug. "Changing Religious Attitudes and Participation in the Post Vatican II Church: Some Canadian Data." *Sociological Analysis* 51, no. 4 (1990): 347–61. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3711076>.
- Henchy, Norman. "Quebec Education: The Unfinished Revolution." *McGill Journal of Education* 7, no. 2 (1972): 95–118. <http://mje.mcgill.ca/article/view/6874>.
- Hennesey, James. "Leo XIII's Thomistic Revival: A Political and Philosophical Event." *The Journal of Religion* 58, (1978): S185–S197.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/415759900>.

- Higgins, Michael W., and Douglas Richard Letson. *My Father's Business: A Biography of His Eminence G. Emmett Cardinal Carter*. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1990.
- Hitchcock, James. and David J. O'Brien. "How Has American Catholic Intellectual Life Changed Over the Past Thirty Years?" *U.S. Catholic Historian* 4, no. 2 (1985): 176–87. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25153726>.
- Hurley, Robert J. *Hermeneutics and Catechesis: Biblical Interpretation in the Come to the Father Catechetical Series*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1997.
- Inglis, Fred C. *History Man: The Life of R.G. Collingwood*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Jenson, Eric. *Teaching with the Brain in Mind*. Alexandria: ASCD, 1998.
- Johnston, James Scott. *Dewey: Inquiry from Education Theory to Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.
- Kane, Liam. *Popular Education and Social Change in Latin America*. London: Latin America Bureau, 2001.
- Kelty, Brian J. "Toward a Theology of Catholic Education." *Religious Education* 94, no. 1 (1999): 6–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408990940102>.
- Kilbourn, William. "What the People Said: Some Letters to Pierre Berton." In *The Restless Church: A Response to the Comfortable Pew*, edited by William Kilbourn, 131–42. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966.
- Lukes, Steven. "Political Ritual and Social Integration." *Sociology (Oxford)* 9, no. 2 (1975): 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803857500900205>.
- Lynch, Lawrence. "The Catholic in a Pluralistic Society." In *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, edited by Paul T Harris, 124–30. Don Mills: Longmans Canada, 1965.
- MacGuigan, Mark R. "The Political Freedom of Catholics." In *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, edited by Paul T Harris, 18–25. Don Mills: Longmans Canada, 1965.
- Maione, Romeo. "The Mission of the Laity." In *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, edited by Paul T Harris, 124–30. Don Mills: Longmans Canada, 1965.
- Maritain, Jacques. *Education at the Crossroads*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
- Maritain, Jacques. *St. Thomas: Angel of the Schools*. Translated by J.F. Scanlan. London: Sheed and Ward, 1946.
- Marshall, Taylor R. *Thomas Aquinas in 50 Pages: A Layman's Quick Guide to Thomism*. Irvin: Saint John Press, 2014.
- Marwick, Arthur. *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Marzano, Robert J. *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*. Alexandria: ASCD, 2003.

- Massolin, Philip. *Canadian Intellectuals, the Tory Tradition, and the Challenge of Modernity, 1939–1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- McCool, Gerald A. *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- McCool, Gerald A. “From Leo XIII to John Paul II: Continuity and Development.” *International Philosophical Quarterly* 40, no. 2 (2000): 173–83. <https://doi.org/10.5840/ipq20000021>.
- McCool, Gerald A. “Jacques Maritain: A Neo-Thomist Classic” *The Journal of Religion* 58, no. 4 (1978): 380–404. <https://doi.org/10.1086/486651>.
- McCool, Gerald A. “Neo-Thomism and the Tradition of St. Thomas.” *Thought* 62, no. 2 (1987): 132–46. <https://doi.org/10.5840/thought198762223>.
- McCool, Gerald A. *The Neo-Thomists*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2009.
- McCool, Gerald A. “The Tradition of Saint Thomas in North America: At 50 Years.” *The Modern Schoolman* 65, no. 3 (1988): 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.5840/schoolman198865328>.
- McCool, Gerald A. “Twentieth-Century Scholasticism.” *The Journal of Religion* 58 (1978): S198–S221. <https://doi.org/10.1086/jr.58.41575991>.
- McCool, Gerald A. “Why Saint Thomas Stays Alive.” *The International Philosophical Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (1990): 275–87. <https://doi.org/10.5840/ipq199030317>.
- McInerney, Ralph. *The Very Rich Hours of Jacques Maritain*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003.
- McKay, Ian. *The Challenge of Modernity: A Reader on Post-Confederation Canada*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1992.
- McLeod, Hugh. “Reflections and New Perspectives.” In *The Sixties and Beyond: Dechristianization in North America and Western Europe, 1945–2000*, edited by Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, 453–67. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.
- McNamara, Patrick. *Conscience First, Tradition: A Study of Young American Catholics*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Meier, John. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volume I: The Roots of the Problem and the Person*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Meier, John. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. Volume II: Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Mettepenningen, Jurgen. *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II*. London: T&T Clark International, 2010.
- Meynell, Hugo A. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Bernard Lonergan*. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional LTD, 1991.
- Miedema, Gary R. *For Canada’s Sake: Public Religion, Centennial Celebrations, and the Re-making of Canada in the 1960s*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2005.

- Murchland, Wilfrid. *Adolescent Catechesis in Canada: A Preliminary Report*. Ottawa: National Office of Religious Education, 1973.
- Murphy, Terence and Roberto Perin. *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- O'Malley, John, W. *Trent: What Happened at the Council*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2003.
- O'Malley, John, W. *What Happened at Vatican II*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2008.
- Osiek, Carolyn. "Catholic or Catholic? Biblical Scholarship at the Center" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, no. 1 (2006): 5–22. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27638344>.
- Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Palmer, Bryan D. *Canada's 1960s: The Ironies of Identity in a Rebellious Era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Pereira, Jose. "Thomism and the Magisterium: From Aeterni Patris to Veritatis Splendor." *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 5, no. 3 (2002): 147–83. <https://doi.org/10.1353/log.2002.0043>.
- Pinar, William. *What is Curriculum Theory?* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, 2004.
- Pinar, William. "Whole, Bright, Deep with Understanding: Issues in Qualitative Research and Autobiographical Method." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 13, no. 3 (1981): 173–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027810130302>.
- Pius XI. *Divini Illius Magistri*. Washington D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1936.
- Pohlschneider, Johannes. "Declaration on Christian Education." In *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, edited by Herbert Vorgrimler, 1–48. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1969.
- Portier, William. "Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology and the Triumph of Maurice Blondel." *Communio: International Catholic Review* 33 Spring (2011): 103–37. http://www.communio-icr.com/files/Portier_Spring_2011.pdf.
- Power, Michael, and Daniel J. Brock. *Gather up the Fragments: A History of the Diocese of London*. London: Diocese of London, 2008.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Vol. I. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007.
- Rogers, Daniel. "Age of Fracture." *Historically Speaking* 12, no. 2 (2011): 12–14. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hsp.2011.0018>.
- Rogers, Daniel. *Age of Fracture*. Cambridge: the Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2011.
- Rossiter, Graham M. "A Cognitive Basis for Affective Learning in Classroom Religious Education." *British Journal of Religious Education* 11, no. 1 (2006): 4–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141620880110102>.

- Rossiter, Graham M. "The Need for a 'Creative Divorce' Between Catechesis and Religious Education in Catholic Schools." *Religious Education: The Official Journal of the Religious Education Association* 77, no. 1 (2006): 21–40.
<http://dx.org/10.1080/0034400820770103>.
- Royal, Robert. *A Deeper Vision: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition in the Twentieth Century*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2015.
- Rymarz, Richard. "Catechesis and Religious Education in Canadian Catholic Schools." *Religious Education* 35, no. 5 (2011): 537–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2011.613355>.
- Rymarz, Richard. "Comparing Religious Education in Canadian and Australian Catholic High Schools: Identifying Some Key Structural Issues." *The British Journal of Religious Education* 35, no. 2 (Nov. 9, 2011): 175–87.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2011.628203>.
- Rymarz, Richard. "Conversion and the New Evangelization: A Perspective from Lonergan." *The Heythrop Journal* 51 (2010): 753–67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2265.2009.00545.x>.
- Rymarz, Richard. "Faithful Dissent and Religious Education in Canadian Catholic Schools: A Response to McDonough." *International Studies in Catholic Education* 4, no. 1 (2012): 82–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2012.650493>.
- Scott, Manda C. *Rome: The Emperor's Spy*. Toronto: Bantam Press, 2010.
- Shea, William. "From Classicism to Method: John Dewey and Bernard Lonergan." *American Journal of Education* 99, no. 3 (1991): 298–319.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1085788>.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2504188>.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action." *Political Theory* 2 no. 3 (1974): 277–303. <http://www.jstorg.org/stable/190781>.
- Somerville, Janet. "Women and Christian Responsibility." In *Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds*, edited by Paul T. Harris, 143–48. Don Mills: Longmans Canada, 1965.
- Sprenger, Marilee. *How to Teach So Students Remember*. Alexandria: ASCD, 2005.
- Sprenger, Marilee. *Learning & Memory: The Brain in Action*. Alexandria: ASCD, 1999.
- Strike, Kenneth A. "Is There a Conflict Between Equity and Excellence?" *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 7, no. 4 (1985): 409–16.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163575>.
- Strong, Richard W., Harvey F. Silver, and Matthew J. Perini. *Teaching What Matters Most: Standards and Strategies for Raising Student Achievement*. Alexandria: ASCD, 2001.
- Tarnas, Richard. *Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas that have Shaped Our World*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1991.

- Teacher Manual for In Search of the Good*. Ottawa: Canadian Conference of Bishops, 2004.
- Tentler, Leslie Woodstock. *Catholics and Contraception: An American History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- The Ontario Catholic Secondary Curriculum Policy Document for Religious Education*. Toronto: Ontario Council of Bishops, 2006.
- Valentine, Timothy. "Truth or Consequences? Maritain and Dewey on the Philosophy of Education." In *Truth Matters: Essays in Honor of Jacques Maritain*, edited by John G. Trapani Jr., 76–87. Washington: American Maritain Association, 2004.
- Velati, Mauro. "Completing the Conciliar Agenda." In *History of Vatican II: Volume V*, edited by G. Albergio, 185–273. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995.
- Ventresca, Robert A. "A Plague of Perverse Opinions": Leo XIII's Aeterni Patris and the Catholic Encounter with Modernity." *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 12, no. 1 (2009): 143–68. <https://doi.org/10.1353/log.0.0022>.
- Walker, Franklin A. *Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Volume III*. Toronto: Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario, 1986.
- Weddell, Sherry A. *Forming Intentional Disciples: The Path to Knowing and Following Jesus*. Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, 2012.
- Wiles, Anne. M. 2004. "Becoming Oneself: Maritain on Liberal Education." *Truth Matters: Essays in Honor of Jacques Maritain*, edited by John G. Trapani Jr., 88–96. Washington: American Maritain Association, 2004.
- Williams, Raymond. *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays*. London: Verso, 1980.
- Woods, Thomas E. *How the Catholic Church Built Western Civilization*. Washington: Regnery Publishing, 2005.
- Zotti, Mary Irene. "The Young Christian Workers." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 9, no. 4 (1990): 387–400. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25153925>.

Index

- academic rigour and erosion of, 3, 40, 47, 67, 73–74, 78, 82, 87–88, 91–93, 104, 152nn58–59, 155n87, 157n110, 161n4, 164nn38–39, 165n41
- Adolescent Catechesis in Canada* (1973), 68, 70, 72
- Aeterni Patris* (On the Restoration of Christian Philosophy), 1, 5–6, 8–12, 15, 16, 20, 48, 102, 113n7
- anti-modernist oath, 13–14
- Antonelli, Giacomo (cardinal), 9
- Antoniano, Silvio (cardinal), 20, 46; *The Christian Education of Youth*, 20
- Archdiocese of Toronto, 21–26, 84, 103, 118n84, 119n106, 151n54, 160n2
- Aristotle, 11
- Atwill, Joseph: *Caesar's Messiah*, 91
- Augustine, Saint, 39, 46, 115n25, 125n57, 126n81, 126nn86–87
- baby boom, 54–55, 58, 162n18
- baptism, sacrament of, 61–62, 69, 85, 98–99, 169n86
- Basil, Saint, 20
- Basilian Order, 69, 75, 153n70
- Bauer, D., 70
- Beckx, Pierre, 12
- Benedict XV (pope), 113n9
- Benedict XVI (pope), 91, 166n64
- Benedictine Order, 140n109
- Bennett, John M., 25–26; *Teaching of Religion*, 25–26
- Berton, Pierre, 57–58, 136n54, 136n58, 136n68, 137nn69–70; *The Comfortable Pew*, 57–58, 136n54
- Bible History* (school textbook): Richard Gilmour, 24, 118n93
- Blondel, Maurice, 13, 16, 39, 114n14, 114n19; *L'Action*, 39
- Bonaventurism, 12, 110n72
- Brennan High School, F.J., 77–82, 84, 152n58, 157n105
- Brennan, F.J., 77–78, 154nn80–81
- Brief on Catholic Education* (1962), 63
- Brief to the Bishops: Canadian Catholic Laymen Speak Their Minds* (1965), 61–62
- Bruner, Jerome, 168nn82–83
- Bull, George: *The Function of Catholic Graduate School*, 19
- Cajetan, Thomas, 11, 16–17, 115n23
- Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association (CCSTA), 68, 76
- Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops (CCCCB), 91, 138n88
- Cardijn, Joseph (cardinal), 62; *International Young Christian Workers*, 62
- Carter, Alexander (bishop), 70, 147n21
- Carter, Gerald Emmett (cardinal), 1, 15–16, 22, 24, 26, 31, 33–35, 40, 49, 68–77, 88, 93, 118n98, 123n27, 124n40, 125n62, 128n17, 145n6, 148n27, 151n55, 152n58, 153n65, 154n79, 156n92, 158n113, 158n115, 159n128, 160n2; and F.J. Brennan High School, 77–82; *The Modern*

- Challenge to Religious Education*, 15–16, 33, 125n62; *Roots of Faith*, 76. See also religious education, Catholic.
- catechesis/catechetical approach, 22–23, 25, 33, 45, 50, 63, 68–70, 76, 79, 83–85, 87–88, 91–92, 103, 153n70, 164n31; revival, 22, 29, 31
- Catechetical Days, 22–23, 27
- Catholic Action, 28–30, 120n127, 121n128, 138n92
- Catholic Conference of Ontario Bishops, 84
- Catholic mind, 2, 18–20, 25–30, 44, 120n112, 121n128
- Catholic School, The* (1977), 84–85
- Chenu, Marie-Dominique, 37–38, 41, 127n92
- child-centred pedagogy. See student-centred pedagogy
- Christian Family Movement, 29
- Christian Philosophy of Education Committee, Report of the (1971), 69, 75
- Christie, Nancy, 55, 131n5, 136n54, 136n68, 137nn69–70
- Chrysostom, Saint John, 20
- Church Fathers, 13, 20, 37–39, 43, 88–89
- Chualo, George, 132n20
- classicist culture, Catholic, 2–3, 18–22, 25–26, 29–30, 44, 51–52, 55, 66, 77, 80, 87, 103, 116n36, 116n54, 121n128
- Cole, Josh, 65
- Commission on Christian Education, report from, 68, 146n7, 146n11, 148n33
- Congar, Yves, 37–38, 41, 90, 124n51, 124n53, 125n62, 125n71, 127n2, 127n92, 138n92, 140n101; *Meaning of Tradition*, 38
- Connolly, John J., 72, 149n40
- contraception debate, 58–60, 66, 103, 137n73, 138n87
- Corpus Christ High School. See Brennan High School, F.J.
- Council of Nicaea, 5, 43
- Council of Trent, 1, 108n31
- Culliton, Joseph T., 153n71
- Curia, Roman, 6, 42, 127n13
- Curtis, Bruce, 27; *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871*, 27
- Daly, Gabriel, 12–14, 108n29
- Daniélou, Jean, 37, 41; *Bible and Liturgy*, 37
- Declaration on Christian Education (Vatican II) (*Gravissimum Educationis*), 1–2, 41–50, 51–52, 60, 66, 68–69, 84, 87–89, 103–04, 129n54, 146n7, 146nn10–11, 156n101, 160n129; and academic excellence, 47, 64–65, 84, 103, 105n5; analysis of, 44–50; comparison with *Divini Illius Magistri* (On Christian Education of Youth), 44, 46, 48–49; The Meaning of the Universal Right to an Education, 47. See also religious education, Catholic
- Decree on the Better Care and Promotion of Catechetical Education, 22, 103
- Delcuve, G., 153n65
- Denzinger, Heinrich: Denzinger theology, 113n101
- Descartes, René, 7, 107n19
- Dewey, John, 4, 89, 93, 95–97, 122n16, 142n127, 167n70, 167nn72–74;

- development of social consciousness, 96
- Dezza, Paolo, 49
- Diefenbaker, John (prime minister), 53
- Divini Illius Magistri* (On Christian Education of Youth), 20–22, 46, 103
- Divino afflante Spiritu* (On Promoting Biblical Studies), 16, 36
- Dominican Order, 11, 16, 124n53, 126n80
- Donceel, Joseph, 18; *A Maréchal Reader*, 18
- Drey, Johann Sebastien, 37–38
- Dulles, A. (cardinal), 38
- Education, Ministry of (Ontario), 25, 65, 67, 76, 87, 141n119, 144n135, 151n54, 152n59, 153nn70–71, 161n3, 164n39, 165n41; *Technology in Learning*, 65
- educational state, 3, 27–28, 62–64, 153n71
- educationalization, 9–10, 28–30, 65, 121n139
- Eisenmann, Robert, 91
- empiricist culture, 2, 18–19
- Erikson, Erick, 136n53
- Expo 67, 53
- Fairweather, Eugene, 137n69
- fideism, 7–8
- Finn, Joseph, 150n48, 158n115
- First Vatican Council. See Vatican I
- Fogarty, Patrick, 153n71
- Foy, Vincent, 22–23, 118n81
- Franciscan Order, 12, 16, 102, 110n72
- Franco-Prussian War, 1, 107n14
- Freire, Paulo, 4, 89, 93–95, 97, 165n50, 166n57; critical consciousness, 95
- Fulton, T.P., 23
- Galbraith, John Kenneth, 56–57; *The Affluent Society*, 56
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Reginald, 16, 36, 124n53
- Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World), 41, 46
- ghetto Catholicism, 21, 24, 52, 55, 60, 66, 135n43
- Gilson, Etienne, 15–18, 25, 29, 37, 45, 114n13, 115n20, 115n23, 115n25, 125n57; *A Gilson Reader*, 17; impact on Catholic education, 17–18
- Gleason, Philip, 19, 77; *In Search of Unity: American Catholic Thought 1920-1960*, 19
- Grannan, James, 75, 152n58, 153n65
- Gravissimum Educationis*. See Declaration on Christian Education (Vatican II)
- Greeley, Andrew M., 71–72, 138n86, 148n33, 149nn34–36
- Gregory VII (pope), 106n1
- Haines, R.C., 79–80, 155n87, 156nn91–92
- Harris, Paul, 61, 140n101
- Hennesey, James, 7–8, 9–10, 109n34
- Hi-Time*, 73, 78
- Hilary of Poitiers, Saint, 20
- historical-critical method, 13–14, 24, 36–37, 97–101
- Holy Office (*Suprema Congregatis*), 6, 36, 127n92, 128n17
- Hope, John, 56
- human capital theory, 90, 162n13
- Humanae Vitae* (On the Regulation of Birth), 58–59, 66, 138n86
- Hurtado, Alberto, 96, 166n64, 167nn69–70

- Immaculate Conception, 7–8, 20–21, 23–24, 109
- In Search of the Good* (teacher's manual), 91–92
- individual conscience, 2, 46, 59–60, 67, 80, 82, 87, 93–94, 97, 103–04, 140n106
- individualism, 55–56, 59, 66, 135n44
- Inglis, F.C., 162n22
- inner transformation, 2, 43, 45, 48, 50, 69, 73–74, 82, 88–89, 93, 95–97, 101, 103–04
- Institute for Catholic Education (ICE), Ontario, 87, 104
- Jesuit Order, 11, 16, 18–19, 102, 111n79, 113n9, 115n33, 126n80
- Joan Mary, Sister, 69, 147n26
- John of St. Thomas, 11, 16, 115n23
- John the Baptist, 98
- John XXIII (pope), 1, 41–42, 138n81, 167n72
- Josephus, Flavius, 163n30
- Kant, Immanuel and Kantianism, 7, 13, 16, 39, 107n19
- Kennedy, Jim, 78
- Kennedy, John F. (US pres.), 56
- kerygmatic theology, 36
- Klink, Father, 73
- laity, role of, 2, 5, 29, 36, 42, 45–46, 59–64, 66, 83, 103–04, 106n4, 112n100, 125n71, 127n2, 138n92, 139n95, 139n98, 140n101, 140n109, 158n115; in education, 23, 62–64, 66, 75–77, 104, 138n82, 141n117, 155n90; *National Catholic Reporter*, 59; *The Commonweal*, 134n38
- Leo XII (pope), 28; *Rerum*, 28
- Leo XIII (pope), 1, 5–6, 8–12, 16–17, 20–21, 24, 35, 48, 102, 109n41, 110n72, 110n74, 111n75, 111nn82–83, 113n7, 113n9, 114n19, 117n65; *Aeterni Patris*, 1, 5–6, 8–12, 15, 16, 20, 48, 102, 113n7; *Gravissime Nos*, 11–12; *Inscrutabili Dei Consilio* (On the Evils of Society), 10; *Rerum Novarum* (On Capital and Labour), 9–10, 102; and Thomism, 11–12, 16–17
- Leonine Commission, 11
- Living and Learning* (1968), 64–66, 72–74, 103, 142n126, 144n135, 145n143
- living tradition, 2, 4, 38–40, 45–46, 48–49, 93, 98, 104
- London Diocese, 68, 71–75, 77, 154nn80–81, 158n115; Second Synod, 68, 70, 145n6, 146n11; Sub-Commission on the Youth, 70, 74, 146n10
- Lonergan, Bernard, 4, 18, 24, 26, 30, 35, 44, 89, 96–97, 124n45, 167n77, 167nn72–74, 168n81; self-transcendence, 4, 97, 167n77
- long sixties (1955–1975), 2–3, 64, 67–68, 70–71, 74–77, 82, 85–86, 87–90, 103–04, 131n5, 161n9
- Loretto Sisters, 147n26
- Lubac, Henri de, 39, 41, 124n51, 126n81; *Surnaturel*, 39
- Lumen Gentium* (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church), 42, 45, 61, 139n98
- Luther, Martin, 24
- Lynch, Lawrence E., 31, 40, 61–62, 121n1, 140n106
- Maccoby, Hyam, 91
- MacGuigan, Mark R., 61, 140n102
- MacLennan, Hugh, 54

- Magisterium, 7, 14, 22–23, 30, 36, 61, 67, 81, 110n74, 112n86, 159n124
- Maione, Romeo, 62, 70, 140n109
- Marcinkus, P.C., 23
- Maréchal, Joseph, 16–18, 24, 50, 102, 167n77; impact on Catholic education, 17–18
- Maritain, Jacques, 16–19, 25, 31–34, 36, 40, 88, 93, 114n13, 114n19, 115n29, 115n31, 122n16, 122n20; *Education at the Crossroads*, 32–33; impact on Catholic education, 17–18
- Marzano, Robert, 123n27, 168n83
- McCool, Gerald A., 9, 13, 15–18, 20, 35, 109n41, 111n83, 113n5, 114n19, 116n54
- McGuigan, James (cardinal), 25, 63, 121n1
- McIlhone, John T., 54, 71, 148n28
- McLeod, Hugh, 51–52, 131nn4–5, 134n38
- McLuhan, Marshall, 65, 144n136, 145nn138–39, 150n46
- McNamara, Patrick, 26, 160n1; *Conscience First, Tradition: A Study of Young American Catholics*, 26, 160n1
- Meier, John, 100, 163n30, 169n84, 169n86, 169nn93–94
- Mettepenningen, Jürgen, 36–37, 40–41, 108n28, 113n10, 113n101, 125n62, 126n80
- Miedema, Gary R., 27, 120n115, 137n69
- miracles, 14, 97–101, 169n91, 169nn93–94
- Modern Schoolman, The*, 15
- modernism/modernists, 10, 12–14, 36–37, 112n86, 112n100, 113n10, 118n81, 124n53; and Catholic education, 14
- modernist crisis, 12–14, 102, 111n83, 112n89
- Möhler, Johann Adam, 37–38, 45
- Mount St. Joseph Academy (London), 71, 74, 76, 82–83, 147n24
- Murchland, Wilfrid E., 76–77, 82–83, 147n16, 150n46, 152n60
- Murray, John Courtney, 28, 42
- Mystici Corporis Christi* (On the Mystical Body of Christ), 36, 121n128
- Nazianzen, Saint Gregory, 20
- neo-liberalism, 3, 87, 90, 94, 101, 104, 162n15
- Neo-Thomism, 1–2, 5–14, 14–30, 31, 34–35, 37, 40, 48, 67, 69, 74, 93, 102–04, 105n2, 110n72, 112n86, 112n92, 112n100, 114nn12–13, 114n19, 115n20, 125n68, 126n81, 126n87, 147n16, 158n115; and classicist culture, 18, 20–22, 27–30, 130n1; criticism of, 13–14, 16–17, 19, 67, 114n12, 126n81; historical Neo-Thomism, 16; impact on Catholic education, 14, 15, 17, 19–30, 35, 48, 93, 102–04, 122n20; intuitive Neo-Thomism, 16–17; and pluralism, 2, 16–17, 21–22, 24, 26, 31–32, 35, 37, 40, 119n106; strict Neo-Thomism, 1–2, 14, 15–17, 19–26, 28, 30, 31, 34–35, 37, 45, 50, 74, 102–03, 112n86, 114n13; transcendental Neo-Thomism, 4, 16–18, 24, 35, 40, 50, 93, 102
- new theology, 2, 4, 31–32, 35–40, 41, 43, 45, 60, 62, 66, 68, 69, 78, 82, 84, 86, 88, 93, 95–96, 102–04, 124n51, 124n53, 125n62, 126n87, 127n92, 137n69, 167n70; and educational reform, 2, 39–40, 82–86, 93–97, 103–04; ressourcement, 37, 39, 41

- Newland, Mary Reed, 73
- Newman, John Henry, 37–38, 42, 45, 125n68, 125n71, 138n92, 167n77; *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 42
- O'Malley, J.W., 37, 43–44, 48, 108n31
- Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association (OECTA), 69, 71, 75, 152n54
- Our Quest for Happiness* (school textbook series), 23–25; *The Eternal Commencement*, 23–24; *Our Goal and Our Guides*, 23
- papal infallibility, 7–8, 20, 23–24, 108n30, 109n35
- Parente, Pietro, 36
- Pascal, Blaise, 39, 112n89, 126n86
- Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (On the Doctrine of Modernists), 13, 127n92
- Pastor Aeternus* (First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ), 7–8
- patristic era, 19, 38–40, 114n12
- Paul VI, 58, 167n72; *Humanae Vitae*, 58–59, 66, 138n86
- Paul, Saint, 90–91
- Pax Romana, 29–30
- Pearon, Lester B. (prime minister), 52–53, 132n22, 149n40
- Pecci, Gioacchino Vincenzo. See Pius IX (pope)
- Pereira, Jose, 11–12, 110n72
- Pinar, William, 4, 89, 93–95, 97, 165n45; autobiographical approach, 94
- Pius VI (pope), 5
- Pius VII (pope), 47
- Pius IX (pope), 5, 7–10, 24, 109n35; *Dei Filius* (Apostolic Constitution on Faith), 7; Syllabus of Errors, 7–8, 10
- Pius X (pope), 13, 16, 112n100; *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, 13, 127n92
- Pius XI (pope), 20, 24–26, 28–29, 44–46, 48–49, 117n60, 120n127; *Divini Illius Magistri*, 20–22, 46, 103
- Pius XII (pope), 16, 25, 28, 36, 121n128, 127n92; *Divino afflante Spiritu*, 16, 36; *Humani Generis*, 16, 127n92; *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 36, 121n128
- Plourde, J.A. (archbishop), 157n106
- pluralism, cultural, 52–55, 64, 66, 74, 84, 103, 132n20, 135n43, 143n128
- Pocock, Philip (archbishop), 71, 84
- Pohlschneider, Johannes, 47
- Pontifical Commission for the Study of Population, Family and Births, 138n81
- progressive education, 21, 32–33, 47, 115n31
- Q source, 98–99
- Rahner, Karl, 18, 35, 69, 146n15, 148n28
- rationalism, 7–8, 13, 111n82
- Ratzinger, Joseph (cardinal), 49, 130n1
- Regina Mundi High School (London), 158n115
- Religion: Doctrine and Practise* (school textbook), 23
- religious education, Catholic, 22–26, 33, 45, 50, 63, 68–86, 87–101, 102–04, 153n70; impact of Vatican II, 1–3, 66, 67–74, 105n1; post-Vatican II, 87–101, 155n87, 157n105, 164n39; pre-Vatican II, 1, 28–30, 39–40, 119n106. See also Declaration on Christian Education (Vatican II); Carter, G. Emmett (cardinal)

- Rerum Novarum* (On Capital and Labour), 9–10, 102
- Rock, John, 59; *The Time Has Come*, 59
- Rogers, Daniel, 89, 161n9
- Rossiter, Graham, 92–93
- Rousselot, Pierre, 24, 114n14, 114n19
- Royal, Robert, 9, 37; *A Deeper Vision: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition in the Twentieth Century*, 9
- Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 84
- Sacred Congregation of the Council, 22, 35, 103
- scholasticism, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19–20, 43
- Scott, M.C., 90–91; *Rome: The Emperor's Story*, 90
- Scotus, John Duns and Scotism, 12, 16, 110n72, 125n57
- Second Vatican Council. See Vatican II
- secularization of consciousness, 3, 79–80, 82, 85, 89, 93–94, 104, 145n144
- secularization, process of, 3–4, 51–52, 54, 58, 60, 64, 66, 76–77, 79–82, 88–89, 103–04, 131nn3–4
- self-transformation. See inner transformation
- Shea, William M., 96, 167nn71–72
- Sillery, A., 155n90
- Sisters of Providence, 147n26
- Sisters of St. Joseph, 68, 71, 75–76, 150n42
- Skinner, Quentin, 11, 110n64, 111n75, 112n92, 131n5, 162n22
- social inquiry method, 29
- Somerville, Janet, 62, 140n110
- Special Commission of Inquiry (London Diocese), 79–82, 84
- Spock, Dr., 55
- St. Joseph's Morrow Park High School, 83, 150n42
- student-centred pedagogy, 3–4, 64–65, 67, 83, 89, 93–97, 103–04, 142n127
- Suárez, Francisco, 16–17, 110n72, 115n23
- subsidiarity, principle of, 2, 42–44, 67, 82, 85, 104, 148n28, 152n58, 154n79, 156n92
- Syllabus of Errors, 7–8, 10
- Technology in Learning* (1965), 65
- Tertullian, 20, 117n57
- Thiering, Barbara, 91
- Thomas Aquinas, Saint, 1, 9, 11–13, 16–17, 19–20, 23, 25, 31, 35, 37, 39, 45, 48, 102, 105, 114n13, 114n19, 115n23, 115n25, 117n65, 125n68
- Thomism, 8, 9–12, 16–17, 20–21, 111n23, 113n101, 114n13, 167n77; Classical, 11–12, 114n13, 115n31; first revival of, 20, 115n25; method of, 12, 45, 50, 124n45
- Thompson, Vincent, 69
- Ursuline Sisters, 77
- Vatican I, 1, 5–8, 38, 108n29, 109n34; *Dei Filius* (Apostolic Constitution on Faith), 7; *Pastor Aeternus*, 7–8
- Vatican II, 1–4, 18, 20, 25, 31, 35–36, 40–50, 51–52, 59, 60–61, 66–70, 72–74, 76–86, 87–90, 93, 95, 103–04, 105n1, 111n83, 130n1, 137n69, 146n11, 158n115, 160n129; aggiornamento, 41–42; *Christus Dominus*, 85; *Dei Verbum*, 41, 49, 130n1; development, 41–42; *Gaudium et Spes*, 41, 46; *Gravissimum Educationis* (See Declaration on Christian Education

(Vatican II)); *Lumen gentium*, 42, 45, 61, 139n98; ressourcement, 39, 41–42; *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Constitution on the Sacred Constitution), 45

Wey, J.C., 75, 153n66

Whyte, William H., 56–57; *The Organization Man*, 56

William, Raymond, 27

Winnipeg Statement, 60, 138n88

worker-priest movement, 36

Young Christian Students, 29

Young Christian Workers, 29