“The Catholic school sets out to be a school for the human person and human persons”

A comparative study of the work of Gerald Grace and John Sullivan in the field of Catholic Education.

Sarah Mason

BA (Hons)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the Degree of Master of Philosophy (Research)

School of Education

College of Social Sciences

University of Glasgow

Deposited: November, 2022

Word Count: 30,927

Contents Page

Abstract

This paper is a qualitative comparison of two seminal academics in the field of Catholic education: Gerald Grace and John Sullivan. The selection of Grace and Sullivan is a result of their respective interdisciplinary approaches to the study of Catholic education, each has offered a significant research contribution to their chosen field. Incorporating evidence from a large pool of their research, as well as corroborating work from other scholars, my paper aims to assess the ways in which Grace and Sullivan understand the present state and challenges faced by Catholic education in the United Kingdom. It argues that Grace and Sullivan, when assessed together, represent a reinvigorated field of Catholic education and Catholic intellectual heritage.

Acknowledgments

This paper would not have born without the consistent and unyielding support of my primary supervisor, Professor Stephen McKinney. Arguably, Professor McKinney is deserving of his own robust analysis into his significant contributions to the study of Catholic education. Indeed, Professor McKinney features prominently within my work and such is a testament to his exceptional academic rigour. I would also like to thank the University of Glasgow for supplying me with additional funding to complete my MPhil studies at the University. Additionally, I would like to thank my family and friends without whom this paper would not have been fully realised.

Introduction

Gerald Grace and John Sullivan are prolific scholars in the field of Catholic education, their respective research has spanned over four decades and has covered a dense repertoire of topics and methodologies. I intend within this paper to engage in an analytical comparison of both Grace and Sullivan, this comparison will seek to deconstruct how these scholars engage with the various facets of Catholic education. Comparative analyses hinge on an element of compatibility; Grace and Sullivan's partnership within my paper is a result of their sustained focus regarding Catholic mission, Catholic intellectual heritage and the communication and perception of Catholic education. My comparison is a synthesis, not a bipartite study, each chapter will consider Grace and Sullivan together, not as separate components. Comparison is a process of relational self-definition, it is an analytical structure that allows micro engagements to be considered on a macro level. Grace and Sullivan offer individual contributions to the research field; however, when taken together they represent a wealth of diverse study into Catholic education. I recognise that there is a large cohort of scholars who have similarly offered significant contributions to an understanding of Catholic education: Sean Whittle, Stephen McKinney, Terence McLaughlin and James Conroy are such examples. These scholars feature in my paper as a reinforcement, or in certain cases, a criticism of the work of Grace and Sullivan. However, my explicit focus on Grace and Sullivan is due not only to their solidified history within the modern study of Catholic education, but as a result of their differing disciplinary scopes. Grace and Sullivan share similar points of focus, yet their perspectives are moulded by differing expertise and training across the fields of sociology, philosophy and theology.

Professor Gerald Grace is associated with the Catholic theological university, St Mary's of Twickenham, as a teaching member of their school of educational theology and leadership. Grace is renowned for his understanding of the sociology of education within a distinctive Catholic framework, indeed, his sociological grounding continues to permeate his research contributions concerning Catholic education. Grace's commitment to the pursuit of Catholic education saw him cofound the Centre for Research and Development in Catholic Education and to later institute, *International Studies in Catholic Education,* the first global intersectional editorial within the field[1]. The corpus of Grace's work is not unitary in scope, Grace's research focuses on Catholic leadership, secularisation theory, educational marketisation and Catholic mission. As a result of this wealth in scope, I acknowledge that my paper will be unable to analyse all of his academic submissions. Consequently, I have selected the most established works from his body of research to analyse these include: *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, *The State and Catholic Schooling in England and Wales, Taking Religions Seriously in the Sociology of Education* and *Renewing Spiritual Capital*. Throughout Grace's work crucial phenomena reoccur most notably the advancement of a holistic conception of Catholic education. Grace's discussion of Catholic mission and what makes it distinctive hinges on the centrality of a spiritual holism that is unique, and fundamental, to Catholic education.

John Sullivan is a Professor of Christian Education at Liverpool Hope University and an associate of Newman University, Birmingham. Sullivan's specific research focus is on the relationship between Catholic intellectual heritage and Catholic education as well as the interplay between philosophy and theology in the exaction of a distinctive Catholic educational tradition. Sullivan is especially

[1] Campbell, Franis, *Faith, Mission and Challenge in Catholic Education: the selected works of Gerald Grace*, Routledge, 2016, pg1

concerned with the nature and existence of a unique Catholic philosophy of education. Sullivan's analysis of Catholic philosophy and theology in particular pays homage to the lasting legacy of the Second Vatican Council, 1962-1965. This seismic theological event is a centripetal point of context for both Grace and Sullivan; Sullivan's work is heavily framed around the issue of philosophy in the post-Vatican II climate and how this influences a distinct form of Catholic education. Sullivan has published seven books and over 65 research articles and book chapters throughout his academic career, these range in scope from constructive guidance manuals on how to practice Catholic education and larger philosophical musings on the role of philosophy within Catholic academia[2]. As I have acknowledged with Grace, the entirety of Sullivan's writings cannot be considered within the bounds of this paper; however, in order to synthesise his work in an efficient manner I have focused on his most seminal works including: *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, *Catholic Schools in Contention* and *Education in a Catholic Perspective*.

This paper was largely born out of the need to rearticulate and reconsider the place and position of Catholic education at the turn of the millennium. The notion of rearticulation, especially concerning a distinctive Catholic mission within education and a Catholic educational philosophy, are a driving force in the respective writings of Grace and Sullivan. Furthermore, this paper aims to reflect the period of millennium change in Catholic education by focusing on two academics who were especially prominent in this period. The majority of Grace and Sullivan's work is focused on the period, 1990-2010. This twenty-year period encapsulates a series of significant shifts in the position of not only Catholic education, but Catholicism in British society. Grace and Sullivan consider these changes with their nuanced discussions of New Right politics, secularisation, multiculturalism and meritocratic education. I have isolated my paper to this time as I believe it is a significant contextualising period for those currently engaged in the contemporary study of Catholic education. Indeed, many scholars will have advanced upon the theories and conclusions voiced by both Grace and Sullivan, yet these newer contributions will hinge on a robust consultation with the previous academic literature. It is in this respect that I acknowledge that my paper is of a certain age, and focus, consequently my work will not contain a lengthy consultation with more recent additions in the field of Catholic education.

It is necessary to begin with a consideration of the academic literature surrounding the work of Grace and Sullivan, and how a review of this literature influences my analysis of the academics own original contributions. One of the primary contributors to the field of Catholic education is Professor Stephen McKinney; McKinney's research interests directly intersect with that of Grace and Sullivan, these include: Catholic intellectual history, Catholic schooling, Religious Education and faith leadership. McKinney is equally prolific in the field of Catholic education having published over 200 articles spanning the past two decades. This paper incorporates several prominent contributions from McKinney mainly concerning his collaboration with Sullivan, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, and his chapter in the seminal edition, *Reclaiming the Piazza III.* McKinney is concerned with challenging pejorative assumptions of faith-based schooling, a research focus that is reinforced by the work of Gardner and Lawton in, *Faith Schools: Consensus or Conflict*. Although my paper focuses on Catholic education specifically, it will touch on wider research concerning the status of faith schooling as a crucial contextualising factor in understanding the position of Catholic education. McKinney's engagement in the wider faith-school debate is a crucial component within the field of Catholic education and it is a research avenue shared by Grace in particular. McKinney is a prominent figure within the literature of this paper due to his shared academic engagement with Vatican II thinking, and his focus on the contemporary state of Catholic education following the millennium.

[2] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Farnham, 2013, Notes on Contributors, pgviii

The academic literature concerning Catholic education takes a multitude of research directions and interests. Sean Whittle represents one such avenue with his sustained focus on a theory of Catholic education, Whittle draws on Catholic theologians such as Karl Rahner to argue for a unique nonconfessional theory of education which centres on mystery in human existence[3]. Terence McLaughlin is also interested in the distinctive features of Catholic education as voiced in his magnum opus, *The Contemporary Catholic School: Context, Identity, and Diversity*. Indeed, the first chapter of this edition titled, "Setting the Scene", is a recognition of the history of Catholic schools in the United Kingdom and United States, and the lasting legacy of the Vatican's educational amendments as voiced by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education. McLaughlin's edited work is supplemented by the contributions of other international thinkers in Catholic education, including, Anthony Byrk, Joseph O'Keefe, and David Hollenbach. This paper is concerned with the position of Catholic education in the United Kingdom; however, both Grace and Sullivan reference and actively incorporate scholarship from around the world, most notably from across the Atlantic. Anthony Byrk's, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, is one such reference point. Bryk's research illuminates the centrality of human dignity and a culture of service within American Catholic schools at the turn of the millennium[4]. Despite its geographic locus the work of Byrk and other American thinkers has served to further illuminate the nature and purpose of Catholic education around the world.

Overview of the Paper

This paper is divided into seven sections: one, the introduction to the academics Gerald Grace and John Sullivan and an overview of the literature and core arguments within the field of Catholic education. Two, Chapter One, *Mission, Creative Tension and Perception*, this chapter seeks to define Catholic mission in the words of both Grace and Sullivan. Three, Chapter Two, *A Counter-Cultural Position*, this chapter discusses the position of the Catholic school vis-à-vis wider educational and cultural norms with direct reference to the impact of the Second Vatican Council. Four, Chapter Three, *Secularisation*, this chapter analyses how Grace and Sullivan deconstruct the impact of secularisation in the running of the contemporary Catholic school. Five, Chapter Four, *The Catholic Teacher*, this chapter considers the unique position of the Catholic teacher as Christ's apostolate, one who is tasked with ever increasing responsibility. Six, Chapter Five, *The Philosophy and Sociology of Catholic Education*, this chapter separates the works of Grace and Sullivan, and assesses the influence of their respective disciplinary backgrounds in their articulation of a unique Catholic form of education. Seven, concluding remarks, this section seeks to succinctly synthesise and evaluate the chapter contents of this paper whilst also paying commemoration to the significance and legacy of Grace and Sullivan's contributions to the study of Catholic education.

The body of this paper is separated into five chapters which each focus on a significant line of enquiry regarding the state, purpose and perception of Catholic education. Throughout each chapter the arguments and research of Grace and Sullivan will be assessed in conjunction with the specific themes of the chapter. The chronology of the chapters has been purposely constructed to provide a sense of clarity and continuity throughout the paper, and crucially to illuminate and define themes that will be of consequence in later chapters. The first chapter of the paper, *Mission, Creative Tension, and Perception*, centres on the fundamental question of what makes the Catholic mission in education distinctive? Mission is not only central to Catholic education, but to the entire conception of Catholicism, it is the energising force which sustains the various institutions of the Catholic Church. Grace and Sullivan assign a great deal of their research to the discussion of Catholic mission and how this has changed in contemporary times. I will begin this chapter by analysing Sullivan's critical

[3] Whittle, Sean, "What might a non-confessional theory of Catholic education look like?", Journal of Beliefs and Values, 37:1, 2016, pg93

[4] Byrk, Anthony, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1994, pgxi

theoretical work, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, which pivots heavily on Sullivan's assessment of the creative tension between an open, porous form of Catholic education, and one that is innately self-protective. I will analyse how Sullivan deconstructs Catholic mission by drawing on his favoured reference points: Maurice Blondel and St Augustine. Grace's discussion of the mission of Catholic education hinges not only on its purpose but how it is outwardly perceived. Grace focuses on the external hostilities to Catholic education and how the development of a perception problem regarding its mission has allowed the innate purpose of Catholic education to become disfigured.

It is essential that my paper begins with an examination of Catholic mission as it is a recurring theme in the academic's future discussions of other phenomena; one such phenomenon being Catholicism's counter-cultural position. Chapter two aims to assess how the Catholic school diverges from other secular configurations of education, and crucially why the notion of cultural retreatism is historically associated with the Catholic faith. Grace and Sullivan consider the importance of counter-culturalism in an educational landscape that is growing increasingly hostile and apathetic to the presence of Catholic schooling. This chapter concerns itself with the question of whether Catholic education should extend its services out to the wider world, or whether it must for the sake of its survival protect and conserve its unique spiritual identity. The nature of this question draws Grace and Sullivan to consult the educational directives issued by the convocation of the Second Vatican Council. This pivotal event in Catholicism's history will be utilised to not only contextualise the debate concerning Catholicism's counter-culturalism, but to also highlight the proficiency and expertise which both Grace and Sullivan bring to an educational analysis of the Second Vatican Council.

The third chapter of this paper is titled, *Secularisation*, this section bridges from the paper's earlier discussion of the threats facing Catholic education and the position of the Catholic school in the contemporary period. This chapter argues that the process of secularisation poses the greatest challenge to the status of Catholic education. It is important from the outset to accurately define secularisation, I acknowledge that this process is often conflated and confused with other terms such as a secularism, secularity and atheism. Conceptual clarity will allow me to fully assess how Grace and Sullivan interact with this phenomenon as a unique process. This chapter will also be framed in reference to two academics who are strong proponents of secularisation theory: Steve Bruce and Callum Brown. Both Bruce and Brown respectively helped to advance the early research into secularisation in the West, these academics very much function as a counterpoint to the religiously orientated research of Grace and Sullivan. I will primarily be utilising Bruce's 2002 publication, *God is Dead: Secularisation in the West*, and Brown's 2000 publication, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation*. Bruce and Brown are also academics of the early 2000s, although they starkly differ to the religious nature of Grace and Sullivan's research this shared temporality makes the process of comparison more appropriate.

Throughout the opening chapters of this paper the focus of my comparative analysis very much hinges on the theoretical arguments and conclusions of Grace and Sullivan. In the fourth chapter of this paper, *The Catholic Teacher*, I move to an approach that is more focused on the practical application of Catholic education which rests in the position of the Catholic teacher. I will consider the multiple obligations placed on the Catholic teacher to not only be a true communicator of the faith, but to remain a living witness of Gospel values throughout their work. This chapter will also consider the difficulties faced by the Catholic teacher, especially the newly prominent lay educator. The position of the lay educator will be analysed with direct reference to the 1982 Vatican document: *Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith*. I will assess how the contents of this document influenced the writings of Grace and Sullivan, and crucially how it addressed the growing need for further training and support for lay educators. Grace and Sullivan focus on the Catholic teacher as a figurehead who must embody the faith and serve as a living apostolate. In this chapter I will examine

the origins of this symbolism and whether it is truly feasible to place such professional and spiritual demands on the contemporary Catholic teacher.

In the final chapter of this paper, *The Philosophy and Sociology of Catholic Education,* I consider the differing disciplinary backgrounds and expertise of Grace and Sullivan. This is the only chapter that is divided between a separate analyses of the academics, I begin with the philosophical work of Sullivan and his research into a distinctive Catholic philosophy of education. I will assess Sullivan's reaction to what he perceives to be an under-development within the field, this assessment will require me to consult the academic literature regarding Catholic philosophy and how this directly implicates Catholic education. Sullivan's analysis is not just isolated to an educational philosophy, but is tied to a wider discussion of the changing state of Catholic philosophy following Vatican II and its rapprochement with the modern world. In the second portion of this chapter, I will assess Grace's understanding of the position of Catholic education within the wider field of the sociology of education. From the outset, it is clear that Grace is especially concerned with the secular nature of the sociological disciplines and seeks to actively recover the position of the religious within this field. It is within this chapter that I will directly engage with one of Grace's key authorities, Émile Durkheim, who plays a centripetal role in Grace's analysis of the relationship between religion and sociology, and who will feature heavily within this paper. The aim of this chapter is to understand how philosophy and sociology permeate Grace and Sullivan's understanding of Catholic education, and crucially how an interdisciplinary approach to this study can produce new routes of enquiry and nuanced conclusions.

Intended Achievements of the Paper

The central force within this paper is a comparative analysis between the major works of Grace and Sullivan. This paper does not stray from the authority of these academics and as a result of its analysis serves as a testament to the significant contributions made by these authors to the study of Catholic education. I intend for this paper not only to reach a Catholic audience, but a diverse readership, indeed, the issues surrounding the position of Catholic education has wider reverberations on the position of faith-schooling in the UK, and the changing values perpetuated by modern educational practices. I acknowledge that within some sections certain ideas and analyses may be difficult to comprehend for a non-Catholic readership; however, in these instances I have aimed to adopt a clear and concise tone in order to prevent over-complication and ambiguity. I am unable in this paper to analyse the full spectrum of challenges facing Catholic education, in light of this I will focus specifically on themes and issues that Grace and Sullivan focus on respectively. This paper is not a fieldwork or empirical study, its qualitative nature and its comparative methodology means the structure may not reflect conventional paper submissions. Despite the period of study being very much isolated to the early 2000s this paper is not a historical analysis. Periods in history will be consulted where appropriate, for example Grace charts the historic advance of educational marketisation with a thorough analysis of the advance of New Right ideologies. Indeed, other disciplines will be consulted that reflect the research focus of Grace and Sullivan these include, philosophy, sociology, anthropology and theology.

It is the hope and intention of any academic paper to function as a stimulus for future research and analysis. Grace and Sullivan have been a catalyst for a reinvigorated engagement with the study of Catholic education, I hope this paper's re-centring of these academic figures stimulates a new consideration for the conclusions of these seminal academics. Crucially, I intend for this paper to highlight the progress made in the field following the turn of the millennium. Of course, I acknowledge, and nor do I suggest that, Grace and Sullivan are omniscient authorities in the field of Catholic education. It is within this vein that some of the conclusions advanced by Grace and Sullivan will require further consultation and deconstruction, indeed, the requirement for further research will always remain an imperative. One such example of this rests in the development of a unique Catholic

philosophy of education which has drawn a range of contemporary scholars and continues to be a source of debate within the academic community. Key themes will be advanced in this paper that are already popular research interests: the assumptions regarding faith-based schooling, the relationship between Church and State, and the future of Catholic education. It is my hope that this paper will

offer a vital contribution to these discussions with an inquisitive eye to how comparative and interdisciplinary studies can offer new insights and textured analyses.

Chapter One: Mission, Creative Tension and Perception

"The Catholic School forms part of the saving mission of the Church", The Catholic School, 1977

Mission is a central tenet of Catholicism, mission allows one to follow the call of Christ, to spread the word and hope of the Gospel, and to follow in the footsteps of Jesus's ministry. Education is a fundamental part of this missionary work; indeed, Catholic education is part of the saving mission of the Church[5]. Grace and Sullivan in their respective works discuss the unique features of Catholic mission – what it entails, how it is defined and the challenges it faces. Although Grace and Sullivan are unified in their desire to reaffirm the mission integrity of Catholic education, they both adopt different academic scopes and disciplinary frameworks to analyse this topic. It is critical that my thesis begins with a robust analysis and discussion of mission, its centrality in the work of both of these academics lends itself as a crucial beginning in the story of Catholic education. One cannot hope to understand the nature of Catholic education without consulting its purpose, identity and mission.

Sullivan's understanding of Catholic mission is based on his articulation of two polarities: inclusion and distinction. Sullivan's most composite work on this subject is found within, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive,* this work effectively argues that these two polarities can co-exist in a healthy and synergetic relationship that enriches, rather than contradicts, Catholic identity. Mission can have manifold meanings; Sullivan uses the word mission to elaborate on the purpose of Catholic education, the integral notion of vocation, and mission as an outward process intended to spread the word of the Gospel[6]. Sullivan further discusses the mission of Catholic education alongside Stephen McKinney in, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, this collaborative work intends to re-articulate and re-assess the impact of Catholic intellectual heritage on Catholic education[7]. A crucial aspect of this rearticulation comes by reaffirming the centrality of love in Catholic education. Mission and identity can be understood and defined by a variety of themes – the theocentric, philosophical, scriptural and social; however, for Sullivan and McKinney love is the defining mission of Catholic education, it sits above all else[8]. Sullivan expands on the centrality of love by drawing on two key thinkers in Catholic education: St Augustine and Maurice Blondel. Sullivan begins with the former and discusses how St Augustine developed a deeply personal conception of education, for Augustine education is about learning to love correctly[9]. The writings of Blondel are heavily influenced by Augustine's philosophy, Blondel was a great admirer of Augustine's treatment of epistemology, philosophy, and theology; however, his main adoption of Augustine's work came in the centrality of love: "there is no way of entering into truth without love". Catholic education is innately tied to the pursuit of the truth: the

[5] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, pg46

[6] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg123

[7] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective,* Farnham, 2013, pg3

[8] Ibid. pg10

[9] Ibid. pg34

truth of the Gospel, the Life of Christ and the use of vocation to discover one's own truth. Love and truth when taken together form the basis of Catholic mission - love is treated as the foundation of all things, it leads us to the truth.

Grace in his work, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, states that Catholic education is charged with "renewing the culture of the sacred in a profane and secular world"[10]. Grace acknowledges the significance of this task as one that is "daunting", especially given the difficulty in defining a unique Catholic understanding of the sacred[11]. Another difficulty rests in the separation between the sacred and the profane. For Grace this stringent separation reflects the stance of the church prior to Vatican II, in this period the profane was perceived to be a threat to mission integrity, such thinking produced a culture of retreatism which permeated Catholic institutions, including education[12]. However, in the post Vatican II climate the new emphasis on Catholic education rests in the notion of the common good, this is stated in the 1977 Vatican document, *The Catholic School*: "a policy of working for the common good is undertaken seriously as working for the building up of the kingdom of God"[13]. Grace draws heavily on this Vatican document to reinforce the Catholic mission of service to all: "the Catholic school community therefore is an irreplaceable source of service, not only to the pupils … but to society"[14]. The centrality of service and common good in post Vatican II thinking aids in dispelling notions of Catholic insularity; Catholic education offers its labour, love and mission to all irrespective of belief, race or creed.

Grace's use of Vatican documents, principally *The Catholic School*, reinforces the necessity of Catholic education as a unique formation that simultaneously aims to enrich its own community and those outside of it. However, Grace is careful to acknowledge that Catholic education does prioritise certain groups: the poor and the outcast. Preferential treatment for the poor is the prime virtue of Catholic education, this prioritisation combines elements of social justice as well as liberation theory to aid the neediest amongst us[14]. Crucially, as Sullivan has effectively argued, a preferential treatment for the poor is an act of love[15]; the poor and disenfranchised are aided as children of God, worthy of spiritual engagement, care and instruction. Grace expands on the notion of the poor as a status that is not solely resigned to the financial: "those who are poor in family stability, those who are poor in support"[16]. Grace returns to the Vatican document, *The Catholic School,* to further reinforce this point: "first and foremost the church offers its educational service to the poor"[18]. Grace favours the use of Vatican documents to substantiate his understanding of Catholic education; however, it seems in this instance that one could to turn to Scripture as a more appropriate authority. Grace is not a scriptural scholar, yet when it comes to discussing Catholicism's duty to the poor there is no greater pool of evidence than found in Scripture. Galatians reminds the believer to centre the poor in their lives: "all that they asked was that we should continue to remember the poor"[17]. The centrality of the poor in Christian teaching is exemplified in the Gospel of Luke: "blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God"[18]. Grace's focus on Vatican documents does substantiate his

[10] Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, Taylor and Francis, 2002, pg5
[11] Ibid. pg5
[12] Ibid. pg8
[13] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, pg46
[14] Ibid. pg47
[14] Grace, Gerald, "Class, Inequality and Catholic schooling in Contemporary Contexts", *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2003, 13 (1), p37
[15] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective,* Farnham, 2013, pg5
[16] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, The Catholic School, Rome, March 19th 1977, pg47
[18] Ibid. pg46
[17] New King James Version, Galatians, (2:10)
[18] New King James Version, Luke, (6:20)

understanding of Catholic mission, yet this would only be further enriched by scriptural reference. The issue of whether or not to use Scripture is a deeply personal matter for the researcher; however, I would argue that where necessary Scripture offers an incomparable source of evidence and analysis. Scripture should not necessarily be divorced from academic analyses, instead it should be used as a nourishing form of evidence that aids the researcher in their assessments.

Sullivan's treatment of inclusion and distinction does not stray into ambivalence or dissonance, Sullivan avoids confusion and binary thinking by his use of the term "creative tension". It is this creative tension which provides Catholic education with a unique synergy and a dynamic fidelity: the potency of tradition remains, but with an acute understanding of how traditions evolve[19]. Sullivan also refers to this as a "balancing act", a delicate procedure that could easily fall off kilter[20]. However, who has the authority to maintain this equilibrium? It is here that Sullivan considers the role of educators as the main agents who are charged with maintaining this balance. The position of the Catholic teacher will be analysed with greater depth in chapter four; however, it is necessary here to include how Catholic educators are forced to respond to this difficult "balancing act". The first challenge to educators Sullivan identifies relates to secular criticisms of Catholic education as a misuse of state funding[21]. Sullivan suggests that the main way to counter this accusation is by showing how the Catholic school makes good use of public resource, and secondly how the Catholic school functions for the wider community[24]. Educators need to possess both a local and a worldview, yet this can be extremely difficult to maintain and can lead to what Sullivan describes as a "helicopter mind"[22]. Indeed, creative tension on a theoretical level is plausible; however, its practical implementation requires extensive negotiation, collaboration and compromise on the part of the educator. The question remains: is too much pressure being placed on Catholic educators? Sullivan may pinpoint the way for the educator to mitigate criticism, but he does not elaborate further on how educators can evidence "good use of public resource". Sullivan's work in, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, has a much greater practical emphasis than his other works, however it still seems that effective practical responses are limited or under-developed. One must here question how far removed Sullivan is from the practicalities of Catholic education. Creative tension drives Sullivan's analysis of inclusion and distinction, but its practical application still errs on the theoretical side.

Grace does not specifically utilise the term "creative tension"; however, he discusses a series of other tensions and confrontations that face Catholic education. The first begins with the "long historic tension" between Church and State[23], indeed, for Grace an evaluation of this relationship is critical to understanding the current status of Catholic education. Grace begins by drawing on the work of Dale in his book, *The State and Education Policy,* Dale argues against the idea of the Church and State as two separate monoliths engaged in persistent confrontation[24]. Instead, both Church and State are interwoven in a complex relationship, within which both powers are continually changing, it is this change which makes the nature of their interactions unpredictable. Grace historicises this difficulty with his analysis of Thatcherism and the emergence of the ideologically strong state in the 1980s. The desire for a market-driven conception of education posed a threat to Catholic education's holistic

[19] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg161

[20] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Farnham, 2013, pg140

[21] Sullivan, John, Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg161

[24] Ibid. pg161

[22] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg146

[23] Grace, Gerald "Renewing Spiritual Capital: an urgent priority for the future of Catholic education internationally", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2010, 2(2), pg118

[24] Dale, Roger, *The State and Education Policy*, Open University Press, 1989, pg57

approach[25]. This tension escalated through the introduction of grant-maintained schools and a redefinition of core subjects, of which religious studies was not deemed as fundamental[26]. Grace focuses on the issue of grant-maintained schools as institutions inherently opposed to the common good in education[30]; the marketisation of schools and the perception of students as economic units fails to account for education as a moral, spiritual and emotional pursuit. Opposition to these changes was voiced by Catholic bishops in response to the government's 1992 White Paper, here the bishops highlighted the fractious nature of grant-maintained schools: "It intensifies financial and circular inequalities between schools and creates new inequalities". This critique went beyond mere political tension, for Grace this response highlighted the counter-cultural position adopted by the Church against changes that threatened the heart of its mission[27]. The theme of counter-culturalism will be fully addressed within chapter two of this paper, yet it is interesting to note how such a phenomenon already pervades questions regarding the mission of Catholic education. It is clear that the Church is obligated to counter the State when necessary; however, this counter-cultural position is not intended to be inherently confrontational, but to serve as a defensive measure to ensure the survival of Catholic mission.

Thus far, I have discussed Grace and Sullivan's interpretations of Catholic mission and the issue of its articulation. Mission and creative tension are phenomena that both Grace and Sullivan discuss with an inward-looking analysis; they require one to understand the teaching of the Catholic Church and a distinct Catholic philosophy of education. An analysis of the perception of Catholic education requires a complementary mode of investigation, perception requires one to reach outward and considers the various ways in which academics, politicians, teachers and students understand Catholic identity. Indeed, this external approach when combined with the internal analyses' integral to mission and creative tension combine to produce a thorough and nuanced understanding of Catholic education. Grace and Sullivan understand perception as how both members of the Catholic community and those outside of it, such as academics and politicians, see, respond to and appreciate Catholic education. The process of perception is rarely neutral and both academics discuss how specific perception problems have drawn undue criticism of Catholic education. Sullivan discusses the perception of Catholic education as an institution in his chapter, "Individual and Institution", in *Education in a Catholic Perspective*. Institutions, of which the Catholic school is a part of, are open to overt criticism given the significant power they possess to sway, influence, and distort practices and purposes[28]. Sullivan repeatedly discusses the "sway of institutional authority"[29] in relation to the enterprise of Catholic education, for Sullivan the excessive application of institutional authority has produced criticism of the treatment of the individual within Catholic education. The macro needs of the institution have marginalised the micro needs of the individual. Sullivan offers practical ways in which Catholic education can respond to this accusation of institutional dominance, the first begins with openness[30].

The question of openness reflects Sullivan's interpretation of Catholic education as a balancing act between the distinctive and the inclusive[31]. Openness deepens the notion of inclusivity by invoking a truthful transparency; openness does not threaten mission integrity, it reinforces it as a practical

---

[25] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic Schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", *Oxford Review of Education*, 2001, 27 (4), pg495
[26] Ibid. pg497
[30] Ibid. pg498
[27] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", *Oxford Review of Education*, 2001, 27 (4), pg499
[28] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Farnham, 2013, pg142
[29] Ibid. pg144
[30] Ibid. pg140
[31] Ibid. pg140

application of the Gospel's call to all. Openness is effective as it does two important things. First, it counters the claim that Catholic education is a "holy huddle"[32], parochial and unwelcoming of outside influence. Second, a spirit of openness further substantiates the importance of Catholic education for those beyond the immediate community: "Catholic education serves in the formation of its community, but also to serve the world"[33]. Openness has been a critical factor in Catholic education following the teachings of Vatican II. Prior to Vatican II, the Catholic Church was perceived as inward-looking with a self-protective philosophy[34], this separationist agenda translated to Catholic education where the defence of Catholicity was prioritised over openness and transparency. The post Vatican II climate gives greater weight to co-operation, a collaborative approach which is at the very heart of Sullivan's recommendation for openness. For Sullivan, it is only by offering a hand to the wider community that Catholic education can hope to have a stable position within it. Sullivan draws upon the Vatican II document, *Declaration on Christian Education*, to reinforce the new impetus within Catholic education to conduct itself in a collegial fashion: "education should pave the way to brotherly association with other peoples"[35]. Vatican II teaching emphasises a proactive approach to education that looks outward by adopting a new theology from below. Sullivan emphasises that perception problems can be mitigated, and in certain circumstances discredited, by a proactive Catholic Church which seeks to remain open to all in the conducting of its mission.

Grace's treatment of perception focuses on a specific group: academics. In the introduction to *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets, and Morality,* Grace highlights the removal of Catholic education from the wider academic canon[36]. Compared to Sullivan, the issue of perception here rests in its absence, or significant removal, from wider academic analyses. For Grace, absence is equally as much as a perception problem as direct critique, this argument is elucidated further in his article: "*Educational Studies and Faith Based Schooling – moving from prejudice to evidence-based argument".* The stimulus for Grace's discussion of the issue of religious absence begins with a quote from Michael Gallagher: "religion is subtly ignored as unimportant"[37]. This ignorance is a result of a secular marginalisation, a process which has actively removed the sacred and the spiritual from the realm of academic analysis. Indeed, in the instances where the religious is consulted it only amounts to an ad hoc or under-developed inclusion: "research into faith-based schooling is an exotic minor activity which is not relevant to mainstream educational discourse"[38]. It is this perception of religious orientated research as an "exotic minor activity" which fuels a ghettoed and insular approach when it comes to understanding the place of religion in the wider educational landscape[39].

This phenomenon is not exclusive to educational research, Grace draws on the work of Berger to assess the wider consequences of his "secularisation of consciousness" theory[40]. Berger's discussion of secularisation is on a macro scale, his comments on the "evacuation of churches" has implications that go beyond education alone. This concept of a process of secularisation will be analysed further in chapter three of this paper; however, it essential here to understand why Grace specifically draws on Berger's work to discuss the marginalisation of Catholic education within the wider academic canon. Indeed, it is the prioritisation of the rational, empirical and scientific which for Grace and Berger

---

[32] Ibid. pg98

[33] Ibid. pg56

[34] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg9

[35] *Declaration on Christian Education,* The Documents of Vatican II, pg639, 1967

[36] Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg13

[37] Grace, Gerald, "Taking Religions Seriously in the Sociology of Education: going beyond the secular paradigm" *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, vol 41, No 6, 2002. pg860

[38] Grace, Gerald, "Educational Studies and faith-based schooling: moving from prejudice to evidence-based argument*"*, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 2003, 51(2), pg150

[39] Ibid. pg151

[40] Berger, Peter, *The Social Reality of Religion,* Penguin Books, 1973, pg113

poses a great threat to the inclusion of the sacred within academic discourse. Religion is perceived as immaterial and contradictory to intellectual cultures that have welcomed secular transformation. Grace takes issue with the forced separation between the sacred and the secular, the introduction of this false dialectic suggests that each aspect exists in complete isolation to the other. Grace responds to this separation by referring to the pioneering work of Durkheim who argued that central to the cultivation of society was religion: "if religion has given birth to all that is essential in society, it is because the idea of society is the soul of religion". Grace as a prominent academic within the sociology of education is especially influenced by Durkheim's belief that there can be no meaningful sociological analysis without consulting religion. The elision of Catholic education from academic analyses is only one part of a wider retreat from the religious within intellectual circles. The perception of the religious as antithetical to wider research sets a dangerous precedent, one that fails to account for the rich influence of religious cultures in the establishment and maintenance of education. Indeed, in the United Kingdom, Catholic schools are increasingly popular, as Grace states they have adeptly move from a marginal position to one that is "centre-stage"[41]. Yet, this popularity cannot be understood properly if Catholic education is not thoroughly analysed in an academic context. If academics intend to offer authentic scholarship, they must widen their scope and crucially challenge the inherent assumption that religious orientated research is a subsidiary, or constituent, arm of intellectual interest.

Sullivan returns to the notion of perception in his analysis of the holistic approach to Catholic education. Holism focuses on the formation of the whole being, its emphasis rests on the interconnected nature of all human persons, the individual is not a series of independent parts but a whole. The holistic mission is a central tenet of Catholic education as it seeks to enrich the whole student: spiritually, academically, socially and emotionally. Sullivan acknowledges that the holistic approach has been perceived as "authoritarian" due to the overt focus on transforming the whole person, this transformation questions the autonomy and the consent of the student in this process[42]. However, for Sullivan the criticism of holism seems to be a more specific critique of the spiritual formation provided by Catholic education. The association between spiritual formation and holistic critique is voiced by Davina Cooper: "faiths are seen as discrete phenomena that should remain, pure, simple and unchanging"[43]. How can students respond critically to a phenomenon that defies change and is understood to be sacrosanct? Sullivan offers a response to this accusation by focusing on the centrality of living tradition in the teaching of Maurice Blondel. Living tradition is a central point of Blondel's teaching, this term invites a new picture of tradition that is dynamic, one that aims not only to conserve but to discover[44]. Blondel stressed that Christ is still communicating, and that no tradition should be treated as the last word[45]. This dynamic view of tradition invites students to collaborate and contribute to Catholic tradition as active agents in the teaching of the Church. Sullivan highlights how living tradition invites the thinking and understanding of all, it is not authoritarian nor prescriptive. Catholic education allows space for collaboration, each believer actively imbues and enriches the mission of the church[46].

[41] Grace, Gerald, Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality, Routledge, 2002, pg5
[42] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive,* Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg158
[43] Cooper, Davina "Strategies of Power: Legislating Worship and Religious Education" in *Lloyd, Maya, The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities*, Basingstoke, 1997, Chapter 8, pg164
[44] Sullivan, John*, Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive,* Kluwer Academic Publishers*, 2001, pg165*
[45] Blondel, Maurice, *Les premiers écrits de Maurice Blondel*, Paris, 1956, pg213
[46] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg164

Chapter Two: A Counter-Cultural Position

"The Catholic school … becomes the Christian leaven in the world", The Catholic School, 1977

The term counter-cultural relates to that which runs against the normative and the dominant. Counter culturalism is an innately reactive phenomenon; it requires one to understand the values of the majority in order to assess the reactions of the minority. Grace and Sullivan utilise the term countercultural to refer to the specific stance adopted by Catholic education in response to prevalent cultural values that threaten the mission, ethos and survival of Catholic schooling. It is useful here to dissect and define these cultural values drawing on the specific terminology employed by both Grace and Sullivan, these include the following phenomena: pluralism, individualism, materialism, marketisation and multiculturalism. I will begin my assessment of the counter-cultural thesis by focusing on Grace and Sullivan's respective interpretations of the oppositional nature of the counter-cultural. Both academics are careful not to conflate counter-culturalism with staunch antagonism, the position of Catholic education vis-à-vis wider cultural trends is a process of ongoing negotiation and constructive disagreement: the counter-cultural is not innately defensive, nor antipathetic. The notion of balance and rapproachment with human culture is a central tenet to the contemporary configuration of Catholic education following the amendments of the Second Vatican Council. The theme of reconciliation and rapproachment will form the subsequent portion of my analysis of the countercultural, this analysis will draw heavily on Grace and Sullivan's interpretations of the mission of Catholic education following the theological revival instated by the convocation of the Second Vatican Council.

The Second Vatican Council

Any assessment of the relationship between Catholicism and counter-culturalism must acknowledge the profound changes wrought by the convocation of the Vatican II Council, between 1962- 1965. Hastings defined Vatican II as "the most important ecclesiastical event of this century"[47]. Vatican II produced the greatest Catholic theological revival since the Council of Trent. Crucially, the council wished to foster engagement with the world of human culture, Vatican II produced a creative dialogue with those entities external to the Church. Grace and Sullivan respectively analyse both the contents of the Council as well as the latter reception and implementation of the Council's educational amendments. Sullivan from the outset of, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, acknowledges how Vatican II transformed Catholic teaching from a "self-protective philosophy" to one of co-creationism with the outside world[48]. Indeed, prior to the convocation of the Council, Catholic theology was underpinned by Thomsim. Thomist philosophy, derived from the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, was criticised as a philosophy overtly focused on substance. Ratzinger offers the primary critique of Thomism as a limited philosophy of existence, it restricts existence to Christology and the doctrine of the Trinity, but not to the full spectrum of intellectual life[49]. Ratzinger was a peritus at the Council and he asserted that Thomist theology had produced a stagnant monolithic intellectual system, one that could be revived with his own personalist philosophical approach[50]. This transition away from Thomism hallmarked the creative theological revival of the Council. O'Collins highlights this transformation via his analysis of the ressourcement theology that underpinned the

[47] Hastings, Adrien, *A History of English Christianity 1920-1990*, SCM Press Philadelphia, 1991, pg525
[48] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg9
[49] Ratzinger, Joseph, "On the Understanding of the "Person" in Theology", in Miller, Michael and O'Connell, Benedict, *Dogma and Preaching: applying Christian Doctrine to daily life,* Ignatius Press, 2011, pg191
[50] Rowland, Tracey, *Catholic Theology*, Bloomsbury, 2017, pg91

Vatican's return to biblical and liturgical authorities: "this was a return to lost dimensions of the great tradition found in Scripture"[51].

The educational document that emerged from Vatican II was *Gravissimum Educationis,* promulgated in 1965. This document functioned as the prototype for the subsequent post-Vatican II documents: *The Catholic School (1977), Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses in Faith (1982), The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School (1988), and The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium (1997)*. In spite of the formative teaching inscribed by *Gravissimum Educationis* as a Vatican document it has not been thoroughly acknowledged nor rendered as resoundingly significant by either Grace or Sullivan[52]. Grace is one such scholar who expresses displeasure with the *Gravissimum Educationis*, in Grace's chapter, *Aggiornamento Thinking and Principles into Practice*, he outlines the limitations of the 1965 document preferring to turn to the 1977 work, *The Catholic School*, as the prime authority for post-Vatican II educational practice[53]. Grace describes, *The Catholic School*, as the "mission statement for contemporary Catholic education"[54]. It is here that post-Vatican teaching imbued by a new relationship with human culture seeks to make Catholic education more inclusive and service driven. Grace highlights the documents call to all, "the Catholic school offers itself to all, non-Christians included, with all its distinctive aims and means"[55]. Grace focuses on the Church as offering an open hand to all in the spirit of service, indeed, the entire intellectual project of the school is to be conducted not for individual achievement, but for communal benefit: "knowledge is not to be considered as a means of material prosperity and success, but as a call to serve and to be responsible for others"[56]. Grace's veneration for *The Catholic School* aligns with his insistence on the contemporary impetus of Catholic education to work towards the common good. Service to others and an inclusionary dialogue with human culture enables Catholic education to work towards the transformation of the world whilst retaining its missionary imperative.

Sullivan examines the lasting legacy of Vatican II as a crucial transition in Catholicism's relationship to human culture, Sullivan acknowledges that prior to the convocation of the council the Church exhibited a specific "separationist mentality", one that produced an ideologically closed system[57]. In the post Vatican II climate Sullivan identifies a "general trend in Catholicism"[58] towards inclusive rapprochement with the modern world. Crucially, Vatican II allowed ample scope for criticism and questioning, Sullivan acknowledges this in is his discussion of post-Vatican educational thought: "religious education in Catholic schools in the years after the Council was less dogmatic and authoritarian … it was more open to criticism"[59]. Sullivan's interpretation of the effects of Vatican II are not without due consideration for certain "accompanying losses[64]" that followed from the Council's renewed theological outlook. Prior to Vatican II, Sullivan identifies a "high degree of clarity" that accompanied the Church's previous theological orthodoxy, a clarity that has been subsequently blurred following the Vatican's amendments. Sullivan is not overtly critical of this loss, he acknowledges that such large-scale systemic change requires certain losses in order for critical

[51] O'Collins, Gerald, "Ressourcement and Vatican II" in Flynn, Gabriel and Murray, Paul, *Ressourcement a Movement for Renewal in twentieth century Catholic theology*, Oxford University Press, 2011, pg374
[52] Whittle, Sean, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Routledge, 2016, pg2
[53] Grace, Gerald, "Aggiornamento thinking and principles in practice" in Whittle, Sean, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Routledge, 2016, Chapter 1, pg14
[54] Grace, Gerald, "Aggiornamento thinking and principles in practice" in Whittle, Sean, Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education, Routledge, 2016, Chapter 1, pg14
[55] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, par85
[56] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, par56
[57] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg9
[58] Ibid. pg9
[59] Ibid. pg59
[64] Ibid. pg9

gains to be made. Sullivan's work on the importance of inclusivity within Catholic education hinges significantly on the creative dialogue fostered by the Council. The Vatican spirit of rapproachment with the world enabled contemporary Catholic education to move beyond exclusionary and parochial thinking.

Gerald Grace

A central theme across the works of Gerald Grace is the increasing threat posed by the marketisation of education. One of Grace's most significant published works, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, focuses directly on the impact of market values in the actualisation of Catholic education. Grace's conception of Catholic social teaching focuses on the prioritisation of the common good, as noted in chapter one the centrality of the common good is critical for a rounded understanding of Catholic mission[60]. The importance of the common good within Catholic schools emerged in the United States in the late 20th century. Bryk in his magnum opus, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good,* describes the vitality of American Catholic schools following their admission and acceptance of a diverse, and largely non-Catholic, student cohort[61]. This heterogeneous student body allowed for the flourishing of a new Catholicity that focused on communal service to all; the spiritual mission of the Catholic school was no longer centred on simply creating new and faithful Catholics. However, the prevalence of market values threatens the very survival of this new dimension within Catholic education. Grace articulates this threat in several ways, firstly the threat of marketisation rests in its inevitable commodification of the educational enterprise: "the ultimate aim of the whole enterprise is to achieve a maximum value-added product"[62]. Commodification requires that all things take on a market value, in a free-market economy commodification is a central process that emphasises a tradeable value in all things. Grace articulates his grievance with this phenomenon by drawing on the 1997 document, *The Common Good in Catholic Education*, which was the response of Catholic bishops to a series of New Right attempts to centralise the education system. "Education is not a commodity to be offered for sale … teachers and pupils are not economic units, education is about service to others, not the self"[63]. It is the latter quotation, "service to others" that reifies Grace's belief that commodification stands as an affront to the advance of the common good in education.

The advancement of market values within education presents a series of acute challenges to Catholic education's focus on vocation. Grace argues that Catholic education privileges a culture of vocation rather than an economic and utilitarian culture, which Grace coins as "the culture of the job"[64]. Vocational commitment is a holy endeavour, Grace describes vocation as a unique form of spirituality that allows the believer to build, and maintain, a conscious relationship with God[65]. The significance of vocation is acknowledged by the 1988 Vatican document, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, "the educational process is not simply a human activity; it is a genuine Christian journey towards perfection"[66]. God remains at the heart of the Catholic school, and thus the vocation of every student is prioritised as maintaining and reaffirming the centrality of God within Catholic education. Grace returns to the 1977 document, *The Catholic School*, to reinforce Catholic

---

[60] Grace, Gerald, "Catholic Schools and the Common Good: what this means in educational practice", *Professional Focus Series,* 2000, No 2, pg3

[61] Byrk, Anthony, Lee, Valerie, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1993, pg11

[62] Grace, Gerald, *School Leadership: Beyond Educational Management*, Routledge, 1995, pg21

[63] Catholic Bishops of England and Wales, *The Common Good in Education*, 1997, pg13

[64] Grace, Gerald, "Aggiornamento thinking and principles in practice" in Whittle, Sean, Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education, Routledge, 2016, Chapter 1, pg15

[65] Grace, Gerald, "Renewing Spiritual Capital", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2010, Vol 2 (2), pg126

[66] Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, Rome, April 7th, 1988, par 48

education's protection of students vocational commitment: "they are to overcome their individualism and discover, in the light of the faith, their specific vocation … and to make the world a better place"[67].

Market values are inherently interlinked with the advancement of utilitarian concepts of the individual: students are understood in functional terms that align with capitalism's onus on labour intensity and economic utility. McKinney in his analysis of Catholic anthropology suggests that the Catholic school can offer an alternative to this utilitarian approach: "the greatest strength of Catholic education is that it can assess and challenge views of education that serve utilitarian means alone"[68]. Catholic education is tasked with countering a culture of marketisation which seeks to reduce education to the normative acquisition of skills based on utilitarian precepts. One's vocation is a deeply personal spiritual journey, it is a life-long commitment to Christ, for Grace the importance of this journey cannot be endangered in order to prioritise a merely instrumentalist form of education.

Grace's discussion of the counter-cultural draws heavily upon the notion of cultural retreatism. In chapter one I discussed how counter-culturalism was understood to be a self-protective philosophy used by the Church prior to the Second Vatican Council. However, the practice of retreat has a much deeper history, personal retreat is well founded in Catholicism, it is a critical time of self-examination, meditation and divine consultation. Both Catholic mission and retreat rely heavily on the educational space to preserve and advance Catholic teaching. Protection is central to the understanding of Catholic retreatism, Grace describes Catholic education as a historic "protective bastion against hegemonic Protestantism and secular rationalism"[69]. However, Catholic protectionism is not merely historic, Grace finds the advancement of individualism, neo-capitalism and marketisation to pose an equally significant threat to the contemporary survival of Catholic mission. If the Catholic school is to hold the mantel of "protective bastion", it must assume the inherently oppositional nature of this position. Grace proposes a divergent configuration of Catholic education, one in which conformity with marketised and secular models of education is rejected in the name of mission integrity.

One must be cautious in overly reinforcing the oppositional nature of the counter-cultural approach within Catholic education, indeed, an inherent component of counter-culturalism is the notion of balance. McLaughlin stresses that a balanced judgement is central to the function of Catholic education[70], this equilibrium maintains the relationship between faith and reason. It is necessary here to reconcile the centrality of cultural balance with Grace's focus on the Catholic school as a "protective bastion". Catholic education must prepare students for the world; a protective bastion may promote the survival of the unique Catholic mission, yet it equally fosters a parochial and insular view of the culture in which the Catholic school is situated. Kelty effectively translates this issue: "the transformation of the world requires engagement with the world"[71]. Kelty focuses on the role of the Catholic school as offering a unique spiritual formation that allows students to work towards the transformation of the world[77]. Haughton elaborates further on this concept in her elucidation of the "Catholic Thing", the Catholicity of education is found in its attempt to integrate human life in the pursuit of the Kingdom of God[72]. The Catholic school is not simply a bulwark against human culture, it is a holy intermediary between the world and the faith. This balance is articulated best in the 1988

---

[67] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, par45
[68] McKinney, Stephen, in Franchi, Leonardo, *Reclaiming the Piazza III: Catholic Culture and the New Evangelisation*, Gracewing Publishing, 2021, pg202
[69] Grace, Gerald, *Mission, Markets and Morality,* Routledge, 2002, pg11
[70] McLaughlin, Terence, "A Catholic Perspective on Education", *Journal of Education and Christian belief*, 2002, Vol 6, (2), pg121
[71] Kelty, BJ, "Towards of Theology of Catholic Education", *Religious Education*, 1999, Vol 94, 1, pg18 [77] Ibid. pg13
[72] Haughton, Rosemary, *The Catholic Thing*, Templegate, 1980, p15

document, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, "The world of human culture and the world of religion are not like two parallel lines that never meet … for a believer is both human and a person of faith"[73]. Indeed, culture is not to be separated from God's creation, the believer is tasked with negotiating with the world as a person fuelled by the faith.

The relationship between balance and counter-culturalism is most efficiently reflected by a profound understanding of the centrality of Catholic anthropology within education. It is necessary here to return to the work of McKinney who offers a clear definition of a distinctive Catholic anthropology within education. For McKinney, Catholic anthropology is a transcendent form of humanism[74]. McKinney argues that Catholic education values the divinity in every person, Christ remains both the foundation and the heart of the school. The imperative of human dignity and divinity defines a Catholic anthropology within education; however, this is not an anthropology shared by all educational institutions. McKinney highlights the dialectic between Catholic anthropology and an operational anthropology of education[75]. McKinney echoes the concerns of Grace regarding utilitarian configurations of education as an operational anthropology functions for the primary purpose of civic and economic ends. Kelty responds to the proliferation of an operational anthropology by calling on Catholic education to offer a divine alternative: "we must form in modern students a new mentality with new dynamic ideals, which are based on the Gospel"[76]. A Catholic anthropology within education stresses balance between faith and reason; however, it also serves to counter reductionist educational programs in order to honour the divine vocation found within all students.

In the words of Philip Brown: "education has manifested into a global war for talent"[77], the marketisation of academic success represents a new dangerous stage in neoliberal education policy. This global war for talent marginalises all concepts of spiritual and emotional formation, it is a structured form of education that serves the financial needs of the nation state[78]. Peter Mandler defines this process as citizen-formation: "the state has become the senior partner in education, using education as an instrument to make citizens and consumers"[79]. For Grace, the growing prioritisation of academic attainment poses two threats to Catholic education: the denigration of its holistic approach and the replacement of its spiritual function to one that is solely academic. Catholic holism focuses on the dignity of the entire person as a divine entity crafted in the likeness of God. Grace reasserts that the Catholic school values human dignity beyond academic attainment[80]. Grace draws on the growing use of School Effectiveness Research, as a branch of political enquiry that promotes an essentialist, and crucially academic-orientated, conception of effective education. School Effectiveness Research focuses on individual quantifiables: the student is reduced to an academic statistic[87]. Catholic education does not devalue the importance of qualifications nor academic

[73] Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, Rome, April 7th, 1988, par 51

[74] Kelty, BJ, "Towards of Theology of Catholic Education", Religious Education, 1999, Vol 94, 1, pg15

[75] McKinney, Stephen, in Franchi, Leonardo, *Reclaiming the Piazza III: Catholic Culture and the New Evangelisation*, Gracewing Publishing, 2021, pg202

[76] Kelty, BJ, "Towards of Theology of Catholic Education", Religious Education, 1999, Vol 94, 1, pg6

[77] Brown, Philip, "Education, Meritocracy and the Global War for Talent", *Journal of Educational Policy*, 2009, Vol 24 (4), pg379

[78] Mandler, Peter, *The Crisis of Meritocracy: Britain's Transition to Mass Education since the Second World War*, Oxford University Press, 2020, pg8

[79] Ibid. pg3

[80] Grace, Gerald, "Realizing the Mission: Catholic approaches to school effectiveness", in Slee, Roger and Tomlinson, Sally, *School Effectiveness for Whom?* Taylor & Francis, 1998, pg119 [87]
Ibid. pg124

attainment[81]; however, these pursuits do not form the foundation of the Catholic school. The centrality of Catholic education's holistic mission by nature evades statistical analysis or quantifiables; the holy heart of the Catholic school cannot be understood in mere empirical terms.

Paradoxically, the Catholic school finds itself the most threatened by the growing hegemony of academia given the Catholic school's success in formal examinations and qualifications. Cardinal Hume recognised this in 1997 during his discussion regarding the contemporary attraction to Catholic schools: "Catholic schools are increasingly popular, not only because of the good academic results they achieve"[82]. Hume continues to elaborate on the moral attractions to the Catholic school, but recognises in the first instance the primary academic attraction to parents. Grace expands on the work of Hume by citing the "strong surface and visible indicators of success[83]" the Catholic school displays; however, Grace argues that it is the monopolisation of academic success which risks the Catholic school relinquishing its primary spiritual imperative[84]. Grace elaborates on the dangers of this process: "the potential for schools to focus on the visible and material comes at a threat to the intangible, the holistic mission"[85]. The marketisation of education has increased the popularity of the Catholic school, but for the wrong reasons[86]. Grace finds the veneration of the academic to reaffirm a changing cultural shift towards materialism and staunch individualism, the notion of collective commitment begins to recede within such a market driven landscape: "What becomes of a Catholic school's prime commitment to religious, moral and spiritual interests? How can Catholic schools remain faithful to values of solidarity and community?"[87] It is necessary here to question whether Grace is straying too far into hyperbole, Catholic schools, although spiritual in nature, are also academic institutions, they aim to educate their students across a variety of subjects to foster intelligence and inquisitiveness. It is dubious to argue that academic success necessarily correlates with the spiritual dilution of the school, indeed, it is more optimistic to argue that academic success and mission integrity can peacefully co-exist. Grace too readily equates academic success with notions of meritocracy and student profitability. Of course, the mission of the Catholic school should remain an imperative, but that does not mean the school should feel forced to counter notions of academic success in order to remain loyal to its spiritual foundations.

Grace focuses on the educational changes wrought by Thatcherism and the New Right in the 1980s as an especially pertinent example of the Church's counter-cultural position. The New Right ideology within education focused on an acute blending of economic and civic values, economic libertarianism was combined with social authoritarianism to produce a profit-focused model of education[88]. The political exactions of the ideologically strong state devalued the position of the religious within education, spiritual formation was considered subsidiary to core functional pursuits that prioritised academic capability. Grace highlights how this transition towards a profit-driven model of education contravened three fundamental freedoms of the Catholic Church: religious integrity, management integrity and episcopal jurisdiction[89]. Mission integrity is not the sole precept Catholic education

[81] McKinney, Stephen, in Franchi, Leonardo, *Reclaiming the Piazza III: Catholic Culture and the New Evangelisation*, Gracewing Publishing, 2021, pg203
[82] Hume, B, "The Church's Mission in Education", pg25
[83] Grace, Gerald, *Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg3
[84] Grace, Gerald, *Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg10
[85] Ibid. pg11
[86] Grace, Gerald, "Educational Studies and Faith-based Schooling, moving from prejudice to evidence-based argument", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 2003, 51 (2), pg159
[87] Grace, Gerald, Mission, Markets and Morality, Routledge, 2002, pg180
[88] Whitty, Geoff, Menter, Ian, "Lessons of Thatcherism, educational policy in England and Wales: 1979-1988", Journal of Law and Society, 1988, Vol 16 (1), pg52
[89] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", Oxford Review of Education, 2001, Vol 27 (4), pg494

strives to retain, threats to religious autonomy must also be opposed. Thatcher's ideologically strong state sought to architect a market-driven culture that would serve to monetise educational output. Grace draws on the work of Christopher Dawson to substantiate his view on the necessary opposition of the Church: "To the Catholic … the State is itself the servant of a spiritual order which transcends the sphere of the political"[90]. The Catholic Church is not simply an ancillary arm of the State; the autonomy of the Church is divinely instituted and cannot be curtailed by state intervention no matter how authoritative.

Thatcher's New Right education programme posed a key threat to the Catholic curriculum via the introduction of the National Curriculum in the 1989 Education Reform Act[91]. The National Curriculum produced a government-mandated programme of core subjects, yet this new curriculum reflected an intense desire amongst the Conservatives to place political and civic virtues into public education[92]. Grace discusses the National Curriculum as a direct contravention of Catholic education's prioritisation of the religious[93], indeed, all faith-based schools would fall victim to the wholesale stripping of their spiritual imperative. The National Curriculum was a political project, as Robert Philips states it was a text "loaded with ideological and political demands"[94]. The elision of religious studies as a core subject placed the entire mission of Catholic education in peril; however, the initial opposition of Catholic bishops was rejected. Grace believes this rejection to symbolise the wider power struggle between state bodies and that of the Church[95]. The immediacy of the bishops' reactions reaffirms the Church's continued desire to defend its autonomy and mission; the countercultural position was once again donned to counter state interference.

Grace concludes his analysis of Church and State relations with a detailed study of Grant-Maintained Schools. The 1988 Education Act created new Grant Maintained Schools that were to function as quasi-independent state schools, most significantly these schools were to be separate from local education authorities. GM schools threatened not only the curricular independence of Catholic education but also its financial survival as Grace argues, "Grant-Maintained schools are another arm of the wider marketisation of education"[103]. The initial counter-cultural position of Catholic bishops' came to fruition in their robust response to the government's 1992 White Paper: "the GM option is more than this … it intensifies financial and circular inequalities between schools and creates new inequalities"[96]. Grace focuses on the latter concept of renewed inequality as a significant violation of Catholic education's prioritisation of the poor and disadvantaged – where was the common good in this enterprise?[97] The primacy of the common good is once again referred to in the 1977 document, *The Catholic School,* "the Catholic school shows that it is possible to create true communities, out of common effort, for the common good"[98]. Indeed, Catholic bishops were reacting in line with post Vatican teaching on the contemporary mission of Catholic education. This counter-cultural stance was

---

[90] Dawson, Christopher, *Religion and the Modern State*, Sheed & Ward, 1935, pg136
[91] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", Oxford Review of Education, 2001, Vol 27 (4), pg494
[92] Dunn, Ross, "The Making of a National Curriculum: The British Case", *The History Teacher*, 2000, Vol 33 (3), pg396
[93] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", Oxford Review of Education, 2001, Vol 27 (4), pg494
[94] Philips, Robert, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics,* Continuum Publishing, 1998, pg151
[95] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", Oxford Review of Education, 2001, Vol 27 (4), pg495 [103] Ibid. pg494
[96] Catholic Education Service for England and Wales, *Catholic Education*, London, 1992, pg7
[97] Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", Oxford Review of Education, 2001, Vol 27 (4), pg495
[98] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, par62

further reified in the 1995 Catholic Bishops Conference: "while there are at times merits in the market principle, it resists the conclusion that the principle should be extended wherever possible".[99] Resistance, where necessary, is inherent to counter-culturalism, the Catholic bishops' response highlighted the Church's primary loyalty to its mission and community. For Grace, the bishops' opposition exists as a microcosm of the wider tensions between Church and State, especially when the State in question propagates individualistic and materialist values.

John Sullivan

Grace's analysis of the counter-cultural has a keen historic and political awareness, Grace looks outwards to the external forces acting on Catholic education as opposed to Sullivan's introspective and meditative form of philosophical analysis. Sullivan's treatment of the counter-cultural position does not contain the historic context offered by Grace, nor is Sullivan's analysis intent on placing the counter-cultural within a specific time frame. Sullivan situates his discussion of the counter-cultural firmly within his wider treatment of the inclusive / distinctive dialectic. This alternative framework however does not contradict, but rather complements Grace's initial conclusions. Sullivan's main study of the counter-cultural is contained in his practical handbook, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, which aims to highlight the continued rationale for Catholic schools. Sullivan's interpretations align more closely with the idea of Catholic education as an alternative, as opposed to a direct countering of contemporary cultural values. Sullivan seeks to reaffirm the importance of an alternative configuration of education as a way of equipping students to "swim against the tide"[100]. In Sullivan's understanding to counter is not to depose, nor challenge, but to offer a viable alternative, one that seeks to maintain the mission of Catholic education.

Sullivan begins his discussion of this alternative path in his introductory chapter, "Contested Rationale", here Sullivan offers multiple ways of envisaging the purpose of Catholic education, one such path being as a "counter-cultural witness"[101]. In a similar manner to Grace, Sullivan expands on the myriad interpretations of contemporary culture by making distinct reference to the following phenomena: "success, materialism, hedonism, individualism and managerialism"[102]. However, Sullivan introduces two central tenants of contemporary culture that Grace does not discuss: multiculturalism and pluralism. Sullivan routinely mentions the need for Catholicism to proactively engage with pluralism, this engagement aligns heavily with Sullivan's belief in the inherent inclusivity of Catholic identity[111]. Catholic education is tasked with respecting and honouring the religious loyalties of those outside of its community, whilst honouring its own spiritual prerogative. The difficulty of this task is acknowledged in the 1988 document, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, "the religious freedom and the personal conscience of individual students and their families must be respected … on the other hand, a Catholic school cannot relinquish its own freedom to proclaim the Gospel"[103].

One issue remains however, Sullivan does not offer a substantial definition of pluralism within the Catholic context. Here I will draw on the work of Peter Berger whose work has established the existence of two pluralisms, a paradigm intended to replace secularisation theory. One, religious worldviews exist and function alongside secular worldviews, this is the first understanding of pluralism. Two, religious worldviews also exist and function alongside other religious worldviews, for

[99] Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, pg19, 1995
[100] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg13
[101] Ibid. pg13
[102] Ibid. pg13
[111] Ibid. pg23
[103] Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, Rome, April 7th, 1988, par 6

example the co-existence of Christians and Jews. For Berger, this represents a double plurality: how religions interact with other religions, and how religions interact with secular worldviews[104]. Sullivan outlines why pluralism, within both of these contexts, poses a threat to Catholic education: "for pluralists there is the denial that there can ever be one authoritative order … the issue here is that the Church is divinely authorised"[105]. Indeed, it is the infinitude of pluralism which warrants concern, the Catholic Church stresses its divine inception and authority, for Sullivan this power is ordained by God and should not be diluted due to the presence of multiple worldviews, whether they be religious or secular. The counter-cultural position in this respect does not seek to denigrate the concept of pluralism, nor does it intend to force one ruling order to reign supreme, Sullivan openly acknowledges that the Catholic Church does not have the mandate nor the desire to impose itself as omnipotent[106]. Instead, the Church seeks to reify its divine foundations; pluralistic values are to be welcomed in so far as they respect the centrality of God's primary authority within the Catholic faith.

Sullivan situates the issue of pluralism and Catholic distinction within the overlapping debate of the universalising and particularising functions of education[107]. The Catholic community has the right to preserve its identity and purpose, that which makes it distinctive; however Catholic education is also obliged to accommodate self-expression and the rights of the individual[117]. It is here that Sullivan confronts an inevitable catch-22 scenario in which the community and the individual face the relinquishment of their respective autonomy. Sullivan offers a prospective resolution to this conundrum via the cultivation of a distinct Catholic philosophy of education which seeks to preserve its identity without descending into exclusionary practices[108]. The nature and debate surrounding a distinct Catholic philosophy of education will be discussed in the final chapter of this paper. However, the issue of a Catholic philosophy within education is its perceived underdevelopment, McLaughlin notes this inadequacy[109] and Kelty criticises the inability of the Vatican education documents to provide a "concrete philosophy of education"[110]. Therefore, Sullivan's promise of the saving potential of a distinct Catholic philosophy must be confronted with caution. Indeed, in matters of material consideration a Catholic philosophy of education, although theoretically plausible, does not offer a series of tangible solutions to the current practical issues facing Catholic education.

Sullivan and Grace repeatedly confront the ways in which contemporary culture has influenced, or crucially altered, the spiritual imperative of Catholic education. These cultural changes have activated a certain survival instinct within Catholic education; however, this instinct seeks to preserve not destroy. Catholic education utilises the counter-cultural imperative to defend its spiritual autonomy as a divine authority instituted by God. The counter-cultural position with Catholic education is not consistently adopted in the name of political subversion, but as an essential reaction to external authorities that threaten the advancement of its mission. The story of Catholic counter-culturalism is also one of balance and negotiation. Vatican II teaching instituted a new theological imperative: the Church was to open its arms to the world of human culture. The contemporary configuration of Catholic education does not divorce faith from culture. Indeed, this is an onerous responsibility, now more than ever the Catholic school faces enormous difficulties in maintaining its missionary

---

[104] Berger, Peter, "The Good of Religious Pluralism", *First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life*, April 2016, N262, pg39
[105] Sullivan, John, Catholic Schools in Contention, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg21
[106] Ibid. pg23
[107] Ibid. pg23
[117] Ibid. pg23
[108] Sullivan, John, Catholic Schools in Contention, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg23
[109] McLaughlin, Terence, "A Catholic Perspective on Education", *Journal of Education and Christian Belief*, 2002, Vol 6 (2), pg127
[110] Kelty, BJ, "Towards of Theology of Catholic Education", Religious Education, 1999, Vol 94, 1, pg14

imperative whilst respecting the values of its diverse community[111]. If the Catholic school is to be the true Christian leaven of the world it must foster an attentive relationship with the world, one that seeks reconciliation, not enmity.

Chapter Three: Secularisation

"The world building potency of religion is thus restricted to the construction of sub-worlds … of fragmented universes of meaning" – Peter Berger, The Social Reality of Religion

The mission of Catholic education rests in the clear communication, and transmission, of the Catholic faith. Grace and Sullivan introduce, and analyse, various cultural and theological obstacles to the successful pursuit of this mission; however, it is the advance of a secular ethic, and crucially the process of secularisation, which remains the focus of Grace and Sullivan's concerns regarding the survival of Catholic education. Secularisation, which is separate to the wider epistemic category of the secular[112], pertains to the multiple and complex social-cultural processes that have transformed and differentiated the path of the religious and the non-religious. I will primarily be discussing secularisation as it is a theory which Grace and Sullivan specifically engage with across their respective arguments. Secularisation theory emerged from a traditional functional understanding of sociology and anthropology; this theory aims to account for the historic and contemporary decline of the social and institutional significance of religion. Within this chapter, I will utilise two ardent proponents of secularisation theory, Steve Bruce and Callum Brown, to frame my discussion of Grace and Sullivan's considerations of secularisation within the remit of Catholic education. I acknowledge that Bruce and Brown are significant proponents of secularisation theory, yet the potency of their arguments must be considered as a focal part of any assessment of the credibility of secularisation theory, specifically in the context of the United Kingdom.

God is Dead: Secularisation in the West, is Steve Bruce's most renowned work regarding secularisation theory; however, within this work Bruce does not utilise the term "theory" instead he introduces the notion of an all-encompassing secularisation paradigm. This paradigm reflects and accounts for the "declining importance of religion in the operation of non-religious roles"[113]. Published in 2002, Bruce's work concerns itself with the decline in the popular demand for religion at the turn of the 21st century. Bruce argues that secularisation is not all-abiding, or indeed inevitable for every single culture or nation, but he stresses that once a secular ethic takes hold it is hard to reverse this process and thus the significance of popular religion declines[114]. Conversely, Callum Brown, in his magnum opus, *The Death of Christian Britain*, takes a more radical approach to secularisation theory, Brown argues that secularisation has produced the death of a unique Christian culture within Britain[115]. Brown differs however to Bruce in his argument that this process will eventually lead to an

[111] Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, Rome, April 7th, 1988, par 100
[112] Casanova, Jose, "The Secular, Secularisations, Secularisms" in Calhoun, Craig, *Rethinking Secularism*, Oxford University Press, 2011, pg42
[113] Bruce, Steve, *God is Dead: Secularisation in the West*, Oxford, 2002, pg3
[114] Ibid. pg37
[115] Brown, Callum, *The Death of Christian Britain: understanding secularisation, 1800-2000*, Routledge, 2000, pg197

atheist culture, Brown argues that in, "in the past sixty years millions of people have become atheists, without rancour or obstacle"[116]. Brown sees atheism as the inherent endgame of a secularisation process which has welcomed in a new wave of "mass unbelief"[127]. In this vein, Brown's argument is far more radical than Bruce who does not share the notion of an atheism endgame within his secularisation paradigm. However, both academics reinforce a wholesale decline in the social significance of religious practice, whether that is institutional, organised religion or personal latent religiosity. Grace and Sullivan aim to counter claims of secularisation's totality via a series of arguments that reinforce the continued vitality of religious practices.

Before I continue with any assessment of Grace and Sullivan's responses regarding secularisation it is essential to provide some conceptual clarity, especially in regards to the difference between secularisation, secularism and the secular. Within academic discourse this tricolon is often used interchangeably, and many conflate one phenomenon with the other. It is necessary to delineate between these terms first if one is to fully appreciate how and in what ways Sullivan and Grace analyse the notion of secularisation as a whole. Although they share the same etymological stem these terms reflect different phenomena. We will begin with the term secular, often misused to merely translate the absence or obsolescence of religion, the task of accurately defining the secular remains a challenge for contemporary academics. Calhoun, in his critical work, *Rethinking Secularism*, argues for the robust reframing of the term secular, one that does not simply consider it as the antithesis of religion, but as an individual ideological concept with unique cultural components. Jose Casanova distinguishes further distinguishes these concepts by separating the secular and secularism: the secular is a modern epistemic category whilst secularism constitutes a unique worldview and ideology[117]. Grace and Sullivan acknowledge that the difference with secularisation is that it refers to a specific set of *processes,* it is not a worldview nor a concrete category reflecting the non-religious, it is a series of movements and trends that are still ongoing. A prominent issue in the elaboration of secularisation theory is the belief in rudimentary "subtraction theories", which posit that a secular ethics have merely replaced religious ethics. The fundamental issue associated with the subtraction model is that is presupposes an endgame in which religion will be completely absent and obsolete, it suggests that it is a question of one or the other as opposed to a gradual set of interchanging processes. However, it is Bruce who reminds us that the difficulty in separating these terms and analysing their distinct conceptual frameworks is due to the inability to accurately define their antonym: religion. Religion and the secular are utilised as a dialectic pairing within academic discourse, yet each seems to evade robust definition. These difficulties with definition persist; however, for the needs of this chapter the above distinctions will be made in order to maintain conceptual clarity.

The epigraph used to introduce this chapter has been selected from Peter Berger's magnum opus, *The Social Reality of Religion*, a seminal text that analyses the links between secularisation and popular religion. Grace is a strong proponent of Berger's thesis pertaining to the socio-cultural process of secularisation; however, it is the term "secularisation of consciousness" which emerged from Berger's writings that Grace utilises to discuss the changing landscape of Catholic education. Grace considers the difficulty of the Catholic school to maintain and renew the Gospel's sacred culture within a secular world[118]. Indeed, it is the totality of this secular world which poses the greatest modern challenge to the survival of Catholic education. [119] Grace argues that this secularisation of consciousness poses a serious threat to sacred values: "it represents the denial of the validity of the

[116] Brown, Callum, *Becoming Atheist: Humanism and the Secular West*, Bloomsbury, 2017, pg1 [127] Ibid. pg1

[117] Casanova, Jose, "The Secular, Secularisations, Secularisms" in Calhoun, Craig, *Rethinking Secularism*, Oxford University Press, 2011, pg54

[118] Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools, Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg5

[119] Ibid. pg5

[131] Ibid. pg9

sacred … and its replacement by logical, rational, empirical and scientific intellectual culture"[131]. However, it is use of the term "replacement" which aligns Grace's argument with the problematic aforementioned "subtraction theories". Charles Taylor in his renowned work, *The Secular Age*, argues that one must deconstruct and nuance the notion of mere replacement processes, indeed, it would be ahistorical and rudimentary to posit that only one cultural mode can exist in the modern age, either that be the secular or the religious[120]. One must question why Grace has utilised the notion of "replacement", Grace's argument pivots on the dialectic between the sacred and the secular, he appears to adopt a binary understanding of these terms. For Grace, these terms cannot coalesce thus the secularisation process is not a question of devaluation, but a partial replacement of the sacred. Berger's "secularisation of consciousness" theory posits that secularisation exists beyond the transformation of culture and power relations, but affects the world view of individuals by relegating religious concepts in the everyday business of life[121]. Grace finds this concept to signify a loss of ethical direction and crucially the diminution of the transcendent within human life[122]. Catholic education seeks to anchor students with a core sense of the supernatural, transcendent and holy, concepts that are endangered within a secularisation of consciousness.

Ideology plays a central role in the debate surrounding the ethics of secular and religious principles, Grace argues that within this debate the accusation of ideology is levied exclusively towards faith education. It is necessary here to define the ideological accusation, an ideology relates to a series of interrelated ideas, values and virtues, the ideological accusation is levied against those institutions where a collective worldview is utilised to inculcate a specific set of ideas and ideals. For Grace, the ideological accusation in regards to Catholic education argues that Catholic values are being privileged and prioritised within the school setting to the detriment of a wider understanding of other worldviews and ideas. The ideological accusation argues that Catholic education creates a sealed and parochial environment. Grace expands on these claims: "Catholic educational institutions, it is claimed, are characterised as indoctrination centres, marked by social selectivity"[123]. Grace draws on religious critic and sceptic, Peter Hirst, who has argued that the whole principle of faith education is indefensible, and an affront to individual autonomy[124]. Indeed, there is a presumption that religious institutions require one to relinquish their free will and self-determination. Catholic thinker, Kevin Nichols, elaborates on this phenomenon: "a strong shared lifestyle easily slips into being seen as an ideology, visions turn into rules"[125]. However, the ideological accusation is resoundingly isolated to faith education whilst secular institutions evade such critique. Grace argues that this overt criticism is more than an academic idiosyncrasy, but borders on prejudice. Grace elaborates on this idiosyncrasy: "what this argument fails to recognise is that there has not been … cannot be, a school, or an educational experience which is entirely autonomous, objective, neutral and ideologically free"[126]. Copson calls this the problematic "myth of neutrality" which exists in the study of the secular institutions[127]. Calhoun reinforces this rudimentary notion of the "ideologically free" by questioning what the secular really constitutes, in his word's secularism is "taken for granted", subsumed under notions of neutrality and ambivalence[128]. Grace argues that secularism also shares innate assumptions about the human person, culture, anthropology, and ethics, in the similar vein that religious teachings

[120] Taylor, Charles, *The Secular Age*, Harvard University Press, 2007, pg22
[121] Berger, Peter, *The Social Reality of Religion*, Penguin, 1973, pg113
[122] Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools, Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg10
[123] Grace, Gerald, "On the International Study of Catholic Education: why we need more systematic scholarship and research", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2009, 1(1), pg7
[124] Hirst, Paul, "Religious Beliefs and Educational Principles", *Learning for Living*, 1976, Vol 15, pg155
[125] Nichols, Kevin, *Refracting The Light: Learning the Languages of the Faith*, Veritas Books, 1997, pg45
[126] Grace, Gerald, *Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg11
[127] Copson, Andrew, *Secularism: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2019, pg73
[128] Calhoun, Craig, *Rethinking Secularism*, Oxford University Press, 2011, pg3

holds assumptions about the human person[129]. Grace seeks parity from his fellow academics when it comes to measuring the presence of ideological pressures within education. Indeed, no educational structure can evade ideological practice, whether intentional or innate, academics must acknowledge this shared quality instead of purporting the current diachronic analysis of religious ideology versus secular neutrality.

Sullivan also discusses the issues posed by the ideological accusation, Sullivan's chapter, "Individual and Institution", within his collaborative work, *Education in a Catholic Perspective,* relates the issue of ideology to the perception of Catholic education as an institution. Institutions, whether secular or religious in nature, mediate meaning, they operate within a system of power politics that aims to create specific and unique realities[130]. However, Sullivan acknowledges how Catholicism, as a historic institution with a global system of education, has faced the ideological accusation due to its institutional largesse. This largesse fosters a belief that Catholicism has too much educational sway, its significant authority becoming deleterious rather than enhancing[131]. However, Sullivan argues that this level of institutional sway is also found within secular education. Sullivan reminds us of the prerogative of secular institutions to aid in citizen-formation and political participation. Indeed, it is here that one can see how this process of citizen-development could easily be understood as a process of indoctrination. Secular education has been too readily aligned with the concept of citizenship whilst faith education is believed to fail in the task of citizen development[132]. However, this assumes that faith education only focuses on the cultivation of faith rather than the cultivation of citizenship. Sullivan argues that Catholic education specifically aims to cultivate both, "Catholic education holds both heaven and earth in view, it is the light of heaven which we can only properly respond to on earth"[145]. Catholic education is not incompatible with the notion of citizenship, Sullivan's argument stresses the fine balance within the Catholic school to cultivate both the spiritual and political capabilities of the students.

Sullivan in the introduction of, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, argues against the perceived totality of the secularisation process by stressing that Christian principles are still be utilised even within secular paradigms. Sullivan notes how, "the narratives, scriptures, doctrines and devotional practices" of Christianity have been abandoned but certain elements of Christian morality has been maintained without the encumberment of its accompanying metaphysics and mysticism[133].. Sullivan discusses the deleterious effect of this ill-adoption; a diluted form of religious teaching jeopardises the vitality of the entire religious life-force rendering it shallow and "endlessly plastic"[147]. Sullivan's comments are a significant contribution to the continued debate surrounding the totality of a secularisation, and crucially the progression of secularisation towards a cultural configuration completely devoid of religious influence on both a macro and micro scale. Bruce, a strong proponent of secularisation theory, cites the composite decline in religious participation as not just evidenced in declining church attendance, but in the decline of the social significance and cultural capital religious values formerly possessed[134]. Bruce introduces a phenomenon of the "religiously indifferent", a significant cohort in contemporary society that have no robust understanding or knowledge of

---

[129] Grace, Gerald, *Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002, pg12

[130] Sullivan, John, "Individual and Institution", in, McKinney, Stephen, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Taylor & Francis, 2013, pg142

[131] Sullivan, John, "Individual and Institution", in, McKinney, Stephen, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Taylor & Francis, 2013, pg144

[132] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg155 [145]
Ibid. pg156

[133] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pgxi [147]
Ibid. pgxi

[134] Bruce, Steve, "The Sociology of Late Secularisation Social Divisions and Religiosity", *The British Journal of Sociology,* 12/2016, Vol 67 issue 4, pg615

religious values[135]. In the same vein as Sullivan, Bruce's "religiously indifferent" possess a diluted view of the religious enterprise as simply "being nice", or as an attempt to "promote a limited worldview"[150]. Bruce posits that this indifference engenders religious hostility; religion becomes a threatening unknown and is consequently shunned[151]. It is this combination of misunderstanding and religious ignorance has perpetuated ill-evidenced and unfounded criticisms of faith education. Indeed, one is assuming Bruce is referring to the public when he cites the "religiously indifferent"; however this can also be applied to an academic context. Academics who possess this "religious indifference" criticise the state of faith education whilst having no clear or robust understanding of how this genre of education functions[136]. Sullivan clearly argues that secular ethics do not simply eliminate religious principles, instead they present a blurred image of the true purpose of religious faith. Misrepresentation and misunderstanding contributes to the consistent apprehension and concern regarding faith institutions, especially in the field of Catholic education.

Thus far, I have presented Grace and Sullivan's theoretical and analytical accounts of how the process of secularisation impacts the enterprise of Catholic education; this section will now analyse how Catholic education can hope to respond to these processes. Both academics stress the term "openness" to describe how Catholic education must proceed in order to delegitimise claims of insularity and parochialism. Indeed, this concept of openness has already been referred to in the opening chapter of this paper; however, it is essential to revisit it here as Grace argues that this spirit of openness is essential for Catholic education to transition from a position of faith indoctrination towards one of faith encounter and dialogue[137]. Grace derives this concept from Bryk in his renowned work, *Catholic School and the Common Good,* Byrk describes how Catholic schools in the United States display an "openness with roots", an educational spirit which stresses a dialogic relationship with the world[138]. It is this synthesis which provides an efficient alternative to the oil and water analogy previously used to describe the relationship between church and world. Catholic education, as a priority, strives to maintain its spiritual integrity and its holistic mission, yet this purpose is also tied to the needs of the world in which Catholic education is situated within. Although Sullivan is a strong proponent of this balance he introduces a key issue regarding the extent of such openness: "a policy of openness that is not accompanied by discernment and a concern for fidelity to tradition is also a perilous path"[139]. Openness is to be cultivated, yet it should not reach the point of complete saturation. Indeed, a saturation of openness simultaneously dilutes the religious fidelity of the school's mission, the religious roots of the school must be maintained if the whole enterprise is to flourish.

Secular marginalisation as a phenomenon is not solely isolated to matters of culture it also implicates academia where religious matters have suffered chronic neglect and misrepresentation within the academy. Grace finds this new secular approach within academia to have a prejudicial element as argued in his 2003 article, *"Educational Studies and Faith-Based Schooling: moving from prejudice to evidence-based argument".* Grace borrows the term "secular marginalisation" from the work of Michael Gallagher who has argued that Western intellectual culture has rendered religion as

[135] Ibid. pg621
[150] Ibid. pg621
[151] Ibid. pg625
[136] Grace, Gerald, "Educational Studies and Faith-based Schooling, moving from prejudice to evidence-based argument", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 2003, 51 (2), pg151
[137] Grace, G, "Faith school leadership: a neglected sector of in-service education in the United Kingdom", *Professional Development in Education*, 2009, Vol 35 (3), pg489
[138] Byrk, Anthony, Lee, Valerie, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1993, pg102
[139] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg15

"unimportant" within sociological study[140]. The peripheral position of religion within academia runs counter to the teachings of one of the most formative academics within sociology, Emile Durkheim, who argues that the constructive capacity of religion to form unique worlds makes it a centripetal element within society: "it may be said that nearly all great social institutions have been born in religion"[141]. However, the development of sociology has deviated strongly from Durkheim's initial thesis, Calhoun finds this deviation to be the result of a "separate sphere" ideology within academia which seeks to exclude religious concepts from political, social and cultural assessments[142]. Brown offers an alternative reasoning for this "secular marginalisation", one that is entrenched in sociology's inability to accurately define religion: "social science has a profound difficulty in defining religion … this looks to formal religion and not discursive Christianity"[143]. Similar to Sullivan's dilution hypothesis, sociology as an academic discipline has strayed into mere assertive and prejudicial accounts of religious proceedings; religion is marginalised due to the weight of its perceived uncertainty. The secular world, and consequently secular academia, finds comfort in the perceived tangible knowns associated with secularity, whilst religion and its supernatural complexity evades empirical classifications and is thus marginalised to the point of complete erasure.

In order to combat the advance of this secular marginalisation Grace calls for more robust and nuanced scholarship into the state of Catholic education, its mission, reception and threats. The need for systematic research is especially pertinent given the international acknowledgment of the growing challenges facing Catholic schooling as published in the 2007 International Handbook of Catholic Education (IHCE). Grace refers to this investigation as an accurate depiction of the matrix of forces acting on the contemporary state of Catholic education; the primary consideration being "the impact of secularisation upon the work of Catholic education"[144]. The advance of secularisation has been accompanied by polemic works that assert a "God is Dead" argument, Grace refers here to Bruce's works which argue that a widespread religious indifference has progressively lead to a collective dismissal of the religious world[145]. Grace argues that it is only through robust research that Catholic education can hope to defend itself against such claims: "a research-based approach to Catholic education will provide a necessary intellectual and cultural defence"[146]. Evidence is the critical component; without it the substantiation of Catholic education will merely devolve into a mere assertive and counter-assertive argument. Grace argues that without new empirical and quantative research into the nature and perception of Catholic education, the academic canon will still remain beleaguered by assumptive and ill-evidenced conclusions. The emphasis here rests on robust methodologies that aim to quantify and ascertain, how and what ways, Catholic education functions.

The Death of Christian Britain, is not simply a manifesto in secularisation theory, but an attempt to understand how the British public self-identifies, and how personal identification has been separated from religion. Brown focuses specifically on the 1960s as the veritable turning point in the trajectory of secularisation, yet he raises a crucial issue regarding the cycle of inter-generational religious

---

[140] Gallagher, Michael, "New Forms of Cultural Unbelief", in Hogan, Padraig, *The Future of Religion in Irish Education*, Dublin, 1997, pg23

[141] Durkheim, Emile, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, London, 1915, pg419

[142] Calhoun, Craig, *Rethinking Secularism*, Oxford University Press, 2011, pg4

[143] Brown, Callum, *The Death of Christian Britain: understanding secularisation, 1800-2000*, Routledge, 2000, pg11

[144] Grace, Gerald, O'Keffe, Joseph, *International Handbook on Catholic Education, challenges for school systems in the 21st century*, London, 2007, pg816

[145] Grace, Gerald, "On the international study of Catholic education: why we need more systematic scholarship and research", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2009, Vol 1 (1), pg10

[146] Grace, Gerald, "On the international study of Catholic education: why we need more systematic scholarship and research", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2009, Vol 1 (1), pg10

renewal[147]. Catholic education, at its most foundational level, seeks to raise the next generation of students within the faith, to instil religious affiliation to further ensure the future prosperity of the Catholic Church. To borrow the words of Brown this is a cycle, a process of renewal. Brown argues that the loss of the social significance of religion and its immersion within popular culture places this cycle of inter-generational renewal in jeopardy. The supposed dechristianisation of society means it is harder for the Church to socialise children within the faith, this leaves education as the primary domain through which religious affiliation can hope to be maintained. Brown's thesis regarding dechristianisation is especially pessimistic, yet in regards to Catholic education its consistent popularity in attendance and merit counters Browns belief in the rupturing of this cycle. Grace in the introduction to his work, *Mission, Markets and Morality*, describes a bright future for Catholic education, Catholic schools are no longer marginal but rather centre stage in the educational landscape, applauded for their ethos, academic attainment and spiritual environment[148]. This cycle of renewal reflects the ongoing task of evangelisation within Catholic education; Sullivan notes the close ties between evangelisation and the mission of Catholic education[149]. Evangelisation and secularisation are oppositional phenomena, one is a process moving closer to the religious and one is a process moving further from it. However, if we are to consider both Brown and Grace's work then these phenomena, albeit antithetical, can operate within the same space. Neither evangelisation nor secularisation exist in a totality, in today's world God is not dead, nor is God all powerful. The cycle of inter-generational religious affiliation may have waned, but within the realm of education it has still found surety.

Upon returning to Berger the term "fragmented universes" takes upon a new resonance, Grace and Sullivan do not treat secularisation, nor the secular world, as the final damning of religious life, but as a fragmentary force, one that has subdivided the former world of "religious potency". Of course, secularisation has not completely replaced religion, but it has reconfigured cultural affiliations, altered collective consciousness and commandeered academic spheres. In the realm of education, the secularisation paradigm has questioned the very meaning and pursuit of Catholic education, it has accused Catholic institutions of being ideologically driven and promoting institutional dogma. What Grace and Sullivan collectively identify is a certain secular immunity, a critical imbalance. Secularity is perceived as devoid of ideology**,** rendered inoffensive whilst religion, and especially Catholic education, abounds in assumptive, and often prejudicial, criticisms. It is the rectification of this imbalance which Grace and Sullivan seek, whether this necessitates a new genre of robust research or further self-introspection and re-evaluation from the Church. Catholicism and its system of education will remain a firm adversary of secularisation, as Grace asserts the richness of Catholicism's sacred culture cannot in any way capitulate to secular notions of the human world[150]. However, what this chapter has elucidated is the ways in which Grace and Sullivan advocate for the survival of Catholic education within this increasingly secular world. Despite the unequivocal beliefs espoused by Bruce and Brown in their support of secularisation theory, it is clear that Catholic education still retains its vitality and significance in spite of such processes.

[147] Brown, Callum, The Death of Christian Britain: understanding secularisation, 1800-2000, Routledge, 2000, pg1
[148] Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2003, pg4
[149] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Farnham, 2013, pg156
[150] Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2003, pg8

Chapter Four: The Catholic Teacher

"For the teacher does not write on inanimate materials, but on the very spirit of human beings" – The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium, 1997

The formal Catholic teacher is the centripetal figure in the Catholic school, a vocational model through which the mission of the school is realised. In my following analysis of the Catholic teacher, I will seek to deconstruct the multiple roles assigned to the Catholic educator and the contemporary challenges faced by these figures in the exaction of their duties. Grace and Sullivan refer to several authorities in their respective discussion of the Catholic teacher, principally they invoke a series of Vatican documents as well as fellow empirical studies of Catholic educators around the world. However, both Grace and Sullivan adopt a rather consultative approach to the Catholic teacher, their analyses are embedded by external works and are mostly theoretical in nature as opposed to a practical, grassroots understanding. Indeed, as scholars of Catholic education they adopt a top-down theoretical academic approach to the Catholic teacher as opposed to a more practical grassroots understanding. Throughout this chapter I will consider how such an approach impacts the veracity of their arguments, and whether a more practical understanding of the Catholic teacher would better aid their research. I will begin my analysis with the primary educator of Catholic students: the parent. The parent as a Catholic teacher is not to be conflated with the classroom educator who assumes a devolved responsibility in the instruction of students; parental teaching is informal and enmeshed in the Catholic spirit of the home and family. Subsequently, the rise of the lay teacher will be assessed as a reflection of the Church's new impetus to provide models of Catholic instruction that reflect both faith and culture. Finally, drawing on the practical fieldwork explorations of Gerald Grace, the Catholic head teacher will be assessed in order to ascertain the changing state of Catholic leadership.

Gravissimus Educationis, promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1965 is the foundational Vatican II document concerning the mission of Catholic education. This document functioned as the prototype for the subsequent post-Vatican II documents, indeed, as discussed in chapter two each newer addition to the Vatican corpus of documents inherently reflects the ideals promulgated in the 1965 edition**.** In order to provide chronological clarity it is necessary, and essential, to consult the *Gravissimus Educationis* first, this Vatican document is deconstructed into fourteen sections dedicated to the robust exploration of Catholic education on the eve of the Council's convocation. Despite Grace and McClelland's criticisms of the document as "weak" and "somewhat uninspiring"[151], it is a critical reflection of the Council's desire to clarify the Church's position in regards to Catholic education in the modern world. The profundity of this text begins with its direct recognition of the authority of the parent as the primary Catholic teacher.

> Since parents have given their children life, they are bound by the most serious obligation to educate their offspring and therefore must be recognised as the primary and principal educators[152].

This opening statement is referred to by Sullivan in his practical handbook, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, which offers a clear dissection of the various guises adopted by the Catholic school as a family, business, church, academy and political community. Sullivan highlights the Catholic school as an appendage of the Catholic family, one where students can feel "at home" and find solace in the

[151] Grace, Gerald, "Aggiornamento thinking and principles in practice" in Whittle, Sean, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Routledge, 2016, Chapter 1, pg13

[152] Pope Paul VI, *Gravissimus Educationis, Declaration on Christian Education,* Rome, October 28th 1965, par3

continuation of the values shared between the family and the school[153]. *Gravissimus Educationis*, stresses the interpolation between the home and the school. However, one must be cautious in stressing the similarities between these landscapes, the home represents an informal articulation of Catholic education whilst the Catholic school, and the classroom educator, represent a formal branch of Catholic formation. The difference between formal and informal education should not however prevent cohesion between the family and the school. Kevin Williams elaborates on this cooperative relationship in his contribution to, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Williams introduces the notion of loco parentis to symbolise the familial spirit found within the Catholic school.

> The school is considered as both complementing the work of the home in terms of religious or catechetical formation and also extending the parents remit of care … the school and the teacher thus stand in loco parentis[154].

Parents should feel welcomed by the school and understand fully and completely the Catholic mission which rests at the heart of the school's educational enterprise. Sullivan offers a response to the question of how to actively include parents within the Catholic school: "being kept informed, being invited to observe, being invited to comment on practice, being consulted on decision-making"[155]. Sullivan's practical guide to fostering this reciprocal relationship reflects the foundational principles of the *Gravissimus Educationis*, the primacy of partnership and the cultivation of an apostolic spirit serves to fully guide students through an education suffused by the faith. *Gravissimus Educationis*, lays the foundation for the aspirational agenda found within the later Vatican documents. However, one must recognise that these aspirations are a series of ideals, *Gravissimus Educationis* is an optimistic representation of the often difficult task of teaching within the Catholic faith.

The Vatican education documents each make direct reference to the teacher as an apostolate, a devout follower of Christ, one whose life is guided by a concerted desire to spread the Gospel and sanctify the people[156]. The possession of an apostolic spirit is innately tied to the vocation of the Catholic teacher; teaching within the faith is not to be considered a profession, nor obligation, but a personal dedication to Christ, to live by his Word and share in the faith. The 1982 Vatican document, *Lay Catholics in Schools*, explicitly focuses on the centrality of this vocational spirit as the centripetal force within the Catholic school: "the life of the Catholic teacher must be marked by the exercise of a personal vocation in the church, and not simply in the exercise of profession"[157]. Vocation stresses the spiritual, rather than the material gains offered by the pursuit of a profession, indeed, vocation is a selfless commitment to Christ and his followers, it is not to be misconstrued as an individualistic pursuit of career, or transactional labour. As discussed in the opening chapter of this paper, love is the central force within Catholic teaching, indeed, the vocation of the Catholic teacher must reflect this love**.** Here, we revisit the work of McKinney within, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, who argues for the reassertion of love as the defining aim of the Catholic teacher, "Love is here the dominant principle, the double love commandment, to love God and love your neighbour as yourself"[158]. The Catholic teacher is to embody this love through their personal vocation to Christ, their love should amplify the mission of the school and inspire their students to love in kind. The apostolic spirit, vocational commitment and love together create the exemplary tricolon of values to be found within

---

[153] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg46

[154] Williams, Kevin, "Teaching, Learning and the Curriculum" in McKinney, Stephen, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Taylor & Francis, 2013, pg192

[155] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg47

[156] Pope Paul VI, *Gravissimus Educationis, Declaration on Christian Education*, Rome, October 28th 1965, par33

[157] The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools: witnesses to faith*, Rome, October 15th, 1982, par37

[158] McKinney, Stephen and Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Farnham, 2013, pg10

the Catholic teacher, the constant exaction of these values sustains the unique spiritual mission of the Catholic school and aids in its continued evangelising prerogative.

The significance of vocation is further reinforced by Sullivan's focus on the teacher as a living witness to the faith; the Catholic teacher is not a mere orator but a living embodiment of Gospel values. Sullivan introduces this phenomenon in his discussion of the Catholic school as a reflection of the Gospel, here Sullivan highlights the importance of witnessing faith rather than being instructed in it, "teachers are only listened to if they "walk their talk"; they must live their words, if these words are to be credible for students"[159]. Sullivan continues with his focus on personal witness is his theoretical work, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, here Sullivan stresses the importance of personal witness for the lay Catholic teacher who embodies a, "unique synthesis of culture, faith and life"[160]. Indeed, it is the multifaceted nature of the lay educator, one who represents both the holy and the mundane, that proves the most effectual when it comes to bearing personal witness to the faith[177]. Sullivan's focus on the importance of the lay educator as an active witness is illuminated by the Vatican document, *Lay Catholics in Schools*.

> The lay Catholic educator is a person who exercises a specific mission within the church by living, in faith, a secular vocation in the communitarian structure of the school[161].

The word of the Gospel must be lived in order to be understood, conduct is always more important than speech[162], and as the students witness the lived faith of their educator, they too come to understand the fullness of the Gospel.

Thus far, I have assessed the central components of the Catholic teacher, an educator who embodies an apostolic spirit, an active commitment to the faith and seeks through their actions to inspire and nurture their student body. However, one must question whether too much is being asked of the Catholic teacher, especially the lay educator who does not possess the deep theological and aspirational spirit of the consecrated religious. Indeed, it appears that both the Vatican documents and the writings of Grace and Sullivan do not do enough to stress the idealism of the Catholic teacher, there is a limited acceptance of practical considerations and mounting pressures placed on educators. *Lay Catholics in Schools*, does acknowledge in one excerpt that the construction of the lay Catholic teacher is very much an idealised exemplar, "the identity of the lay Catholic educator is, of necessity, an ideal; innumerable obstacles stand in the way of its accomplishment".[163] Sullivan continues this premise in his acknowledgment of the plethora of personal demands exacted on the lay educator.

> Lay educators cannot impart from themselves what they do not internally possess … we must also recognise that few lay teachers themselves have had any comprehensive Catholic theological education[164].

These examples are however minimal in the context of the authors wider writings, considerations for the mounting difficulties of the Catholic teacher requires a much more robust analysis. It is here that one may look to the latter Vatican document, *Catholic Schools on the Threshold of the Third Millennium,* as a more realistic iteration of what it means to be a Catholic educator. This document refers to a growing "pedagogic tiredness" amongst teachers as a result of the increasing demands

---

[159] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg110

[160] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publications, 2001, pg82

[177] Ibid. pg82

[161] The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools: witnesses to faith*, Rome, October 15th, 1982, par24

[162] Ibid. par24

[163] Ibid. par26

[164] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publications, 2001, pg82

exacted on their role, especially in regards to straddling new morals with traditional Catholic teaching[165]. Compared to, *Lay Catholics in Schools*, this document calls for a collective unity amongst all teaching staff, the disbanding of hierarchy, and the alleviation of the pressures placed on the new lay educator.

> The presence of men and women religious, side by side with priests alongside lay teachers, affords pupils in the schools a "vivid image of the church and makes recognition of its riches easier"[166].

Catholic Schools on the Threshold of the Third Millennium, promulgated in 1997, reinforces the pivotal place of the Catholic school as the heart of the Church. Therefore the very vitality of the Church depends significantly on the strength of the Catholic school, and inherently the Catholic teacher. This document builds on the previous Vatican documents but calls for a "courageous renewal"[167] in the face of mounting difficulties. A hybrid of aspirational optimism and conciliatory realism, *Threshold of the Third Millennium*, serves as a reminder of the great survival instinct to be found in Catholic education.

Indeed, one cannot overlook the importance of the lay educator in the Catholic school, the growing significance of the lay apostolate correlates with a sustained decline in the influence of religious orders within Catholic schools. Prior to the convocation of the Second Vatican Council, 75% of Catholic teachers were from the religious orders, yet on the cusp of the millennium now 80% of Catholic teachers are from lay backgrounds[168]. However, Sullivan stresses that this change does not indicate any loss of spiritual capital within the Catholic school: "one must be careful, however, in suggesting that a decrease in religious staff is somewhat linked to a decline in the specific catholicity of a school"[169]. Sullivan calls for the active nurturance of the lay educator, "they should be invited to participate in spiritual and sacramental life … there needs to be spiritual nurturance"[187]. The lay educator is not to be marginalised, instead they remain key recipients of the Church's support and energy. Despite the consistent desire to demark the lay educator one must remember that every Catholic teacher shares in Christ's ministry and is tasked with being a true communicator of the faith both in mind and body. *Lay Catholics in Schools*, moves away from hierarchal notions of importance and reinforces the importance of all teachers, whom emboldened by Christ share a common dignity and purpose[170].

The work of Grace regarding the position of the Catholic teacher predominantly focuses on the leadership of the Catholic school, with a specific focus on the mounting pressures enacted on the Catholic headteacher. Grace conducted a small fieldwork study of thirty-four Catholic headteachers, these interviewees were questioned regarding the changing state of Catholic education in England and the contemporary obstacles that risk jeopardising the mission of the Catholic school[171]. These contemporary obstacles include marketisation, secularisation and the advance of pluralism. Grace argues that the advance of a pluralist and secular society has removed a crucial anchor for the Catholic school to advance its specific moral credo and mission[172]. School leaders are now tasked with "moral

---

[165] Congregation for Catholic Education, *Catholic Schools on the Threshold of the Third Millennium*, Rome, 28th December 1997, par6

[166] Ibid. par3

[167] Ibid. par3

[168] Arthur, James, *The Ebbing Tide*, Gracewing, 1995, pg135

[169] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive,* Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg63

[187] Ibid. pg83

[170] The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools: witnesses to faith*, Rome, October 15th, 1982, par6

[171] Grace, Gerald, *School Leadership: Beyond Educational Management*, Routledge, 1995, pg165

[172] Ibid. pg164

reasoning" and are to be open to new moral codes that may not align with traditional Catholic teaching. This creates a veritable conundrum for the Catholic headteacher, one female headteacher expresses this Catch 22 situation.

> Increasingly Catholic staff are divorced, separated, living together, as a leader of a Catholic community where do I draw the line between the church's teaching and my compassion as a Christian[173].

Catholic headteachers are held responsible when it comes to traversing these moral questions; however, amongst Grace's sample the greatest dilemma for the Catholic headteacher relates to the issue of admissions and exclusions. The dilemma of admissions pertains to the perceived "openness" of the school, yet this matter must also be understood as one that is innately logistical and thus cannot be misconstrued as a failure of the school to exact its mission. Grace somewhat strays into hyperbole when he asks, "by exclusion are we placing a child outside of our pastoral care?"[192]. This is further voiced by one headteacher, "when rejecting admissions applications are we displaying Gospel values?". However, Grace does not acknowledge that the difficult process of admissions is a necessary task for the Catholic headteacher, although not to be relished, one must accept that on a material and financial level the Catholic school cannot admit every prospective student. It is here that Grace displays a certain amount of tunnel-vision, the Catholic school has the faith at its heart, but similar to all other schools it must also deal with practical material concerns such as admissions, examinations and exclusions. It is the unfortunate reality for the Catholic headteacher that some students may not be able to benefit from the spiritual environment of the Catholic school, yet this is a practical matter and does not reflect a defunct moral credo from within the school's leadership.

Grace argues that the dilemmas of the Catholic headteacher are further compounded by a systemic marginalisation of Catholic leadership from wider professional development and public support. Grace discusses the neglect of the Catholic educator as a continued reflection of a wider "secular marginalisation" which fails to account for the importance of religious development[174]. Grace is a strong proponent of this theory of "secular marginalisation", it is a crucial reference point throughout his works on Catholic education; however, it is dubious to suggest that a Catholic headteachers do not receive support on the grounds of their position within the faith. Indeed, Grace's fixation on this notion of "secular marginalisation" is sometimes utilised without cause or great evidence. Grace argues that Catholic headteachers are removed from the wider body of educational leaders under the pretence that religious instruction is an innately private cause, one which does require external support. For Grace this is more than a secular marginalisation, but a fundamental desire to see Catholic schools as separate, other, institutions. Grace argues that the continued maintenance of rigid boundaries between faith and secular school is deleterious to both forms of education. Yet, one can easily see the difficulties in supporting both schools in the same manner as they have fundamentally different focuses and emphases given the very unique spiritual accent which drives the Catholic school compared to its secular counter-parts. It appears here that Grace is enforcing the notion of secular marginalisation where it is not especially necessary, nor central to the argument of Catholic leadership.

When analysing the demands placed upon the Catholic teacher both Grace and Sullivan consult the renowned work of Anthony Byrk in his foundational fieldwork study, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*. Byrk has featured across this paper and his continued input remains a testament to the depth and acclaim of his research. Although this research study was conducted in the United States,

---

[173] Grace, Gerald, *School Leadership: Beyond Educational Management*, Routledge, 1995, pg164 [192] Ibid. pg164

[174] Grace, Gerald, "Faith School Leadership: a neglected sector of in-service education in the United Kingdom", *Professional Development in Education*, 2009, Vol 35 (3) pg486

Byrk and his collaborators reveal critical insights into the nature of Catholic education, and the identity of the Catholic teacher, in the post-Vatican II climate. Grace focuses specifically on the unique "Catholic school effect" that emerged from Byrk's analyses, this effect is drawn from an inspirational spirit found within both the teaching staff and the ethos of the wider school[175]. Byrk reinforces Grace's argument that Catholic formation is by nature multi-dimensional and utilises a holistic approach to fully form the student as an emotional, intellectual and spiritual being[176]. Sullivan's use of Byrk's analysis hinges on his understanding of the inherent inclusivity of the Catholic school, Byrk's findings highlight a new diversity amongst Catholic teachers that counters previous claims of hierarchal elitism and exclusivism[177]. Crucially, Catholic teachers are found to be more in touch with contemporary culture and seek to share these experiences with their students. Sullivan praises the robust use of evidence found within Byrk's work as one of the most preeminent empirical studies of the Catholic school[178]. Indeed, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, argues that within American Catholic schools the aspirational spirit of the school is embodied by the educator, who thus becomes a critical component in the entire functioning of the school.

One must be cautious in stressing the centrality of the Catholic teacher as only a teacher and never a student. Sullivan highlights this in his analysis of the work of Blondel, the teacher should not give the impression of being fully "actualised" or "arrived", rather the Catholic teacher must always be open to continued growth and knowledge[198]. Indeed, in accordance with Catholic philosophy the living principle of knowledge is already within the pupil, the teacher's role is to stimulate the already present gifts found within the pupil[179]. This belief in the inherent potential of the student prevents Catholic teaching from becoming prescriptive or normative; the Catholic teacher is to take inspiration from the student, their nurturance should be supportive never tutelary. Conroy elaborates on this notion in his discussion of the "reflective teacher", one who seeks to ingest and experience the fullness of Catholic education[180]. Conroy employs the Aristotelian term, phronesis, to reinforce the Catholic teacher's focus on the cultivation of the good, phronesis is fundamentally an application of love on the part of the educator[201]. The centrality of goodness features heavily in the Vatican education document, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School,* which reasserts love as the primary purpose of Catholic teaching, "the teachers love their students, and they show this love in the way they interact with them … when students feel love they will love in return"[181]. Vatican
II stressed a spiritual unity in the pursuit of education, one in which love, and goodness creates a spirit of reciprocity in which both the Catholic teacher and student benefit from a shared spiritual nurturance.

As stated in the introduction to, *Catholic Schools on the Threshold of the Third Millennium*, the task of teaching is ultimately tied to the development of the human person. The very spirit of the human being guides Catholic education, and it is this human-centric philosophy which directs the holistic and apostolic approach adopted by the Catholic teacher. Indeed, love, nurturance and an apostolic spirit

---

[175] Byrk, Anthony, Lee, Valerie, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1993, pg11

[176] Grace, Gerald, "First and foremost the Church offers its educational service to the poor": Class, Inequality, and Catholic schooling in contemporary contexts, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2003, Vol 13 (1), pg40

[177] Byrk, Anthony, Lee, Valerie, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1993, pg72

[178] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg41

[198] Ibid. pg168

[179] Pring, Richard, "Has Education an Aim?", in Tucker, Bernard, *Catholic Education in a Secular Society*, Sheed & Ward, 1968, pg103

[180] Conroy, James, *Catholic Education: Inside Out, Outside In*, Dublin, 1999, pg74

[201] Ibid. pg75

[181] Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, Rome, April 7th, 1988, par 110

set the Catholic educator apart, both Grace and Sullivan in their respective works seek to define the very uniqueness of the Catholic teacher. The position of teacher is not to be considered a profession, but a spiritual vocation, it is this vocation, founded in the faith, which directly ties the Catholic teacher to the Church and imbues their work with Gospel values. The Catholic teacher is not to be a prescriptive educator, one bound by a series of systematic tasks and goals, instead through their lived experience of the faith they are to inspire their students. This is not the pursuit of perfection, nor is this the desire, the Catholic teacher is a continual work in progress and as discussed throughout this chapter their position is often constructed through a series of idealised proclamations. Grace and Sullivan discuss an ambitious prototype of the Catholic teacher, yet their arguments pivot heavily on theoretical notions of what it means to be a Catholic educator, largely drawn from the aspirational tone of the Vatican education documents. One must be careful in adopting a tone which is far removed from the practical difficulties and quotidian realities facing the classroom teacher and must be recognised as such.

Chapter Five: The Philosophy and Sociology of Education

Philosophy of Catholic Education – John Sullivan

John Sullivan's magnum opus, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, is a significant contribution to the nature and identity of the Catholic school; however, it is also a pivotal work in regards to a philosophical understanding of the mission of Catholic education. Sullivan responds to a serious lacuna in the study of Catholic education – the cultivation and elucidation of a distinct Catholic philosophy of education. Indeed, the concept of a unique Catholic philosophy of education has gripped Catholic educationalists such as Whittle, Carmody, McKinney and Walsh, who have collectively questioned the relationship between Catholic education and Catholic philosophy. Catholicism has a profound and historic relationship with classical philosophy, yet this must not be conflated as a specific Catholic philosophy of education[182]. Indeed, much of the difficulty encountered in defining a Catholic philosophy of education lies in its intersectional nature, one must first consult the profundity of Catholic theology and anthropology else one risks producing a diluted form of Catholic philosophy. Sullivan references the work of the eminent Catholic philosophers, Maurice Blondel and Von Hugel, to contextualise his assessment of a Catholic philosophy within education. Sullivan's analysis benefits from intelligent intertextuality and a sound understanding of philosophical principles, yet the thrust of his work comes from his own definition of a tripartite model of a Catholic philosophy of education: the holistic development of the human person, disciplinary autonomy and a contemporary understanding of the faith and culture synthesis. Sullivan builds on each of these notions and formulates a picture of a dynamic Catholic philosophy of education, one which is practical and malleable, not a dogmatic philosophy.

Sullivan begins his analysis of a Catholic philosophy of education by posing the question: why has this philosophy not been formerly formulated? If one is to advocate for a distinctive form of Catholic education this must, by necessity, be underpinned by a strong philosophical foundation[183]. McLaughlin and Pring echo this sentiment, "what is surprising is that despite the money and energy spent to build and maintain Catholic schools so little thought has been given to the philosophy of Catholic education?"[184]. It is necessary to contextualise the current academic canon before continuing

[182] Whittle, Sean, "Towards a Catholic Philosophy of Education: Moving the Debate Forward", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2014, Vol 6 (1), pg46
[183] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg75
[184] Pring, Richard, "Markets, Education and Catholic Schools", in McLaughlin, Terence, O'Keefe, Joseph, *The*

to assess Sullivan's own contributions to the discussion of a Catholic philosophy of education. Despite its perceived under-development by Sullivan key academics across a variety of disciplines have sought to elucidate on this phenomenon. One finds Sullivan too hasty to conclude that a Catholic philosophy of education has been a minor activity for the academy, his conclusion comes without credible evidence, indeed, specific attention has been given to the respective works of Bernard Lonergan and Karl Rahner. Lonergan and Rahner are not outright education scholars, but their discussion of a distinct Catholic philosophy is pivotal in understanding the wider notion of a Catholic philosophy of education. Brendan Carmody analyses the work of Lonergan, focusing on his notion of "self-transcendence", this philosophy is one that aims for full personal integration, Catholic education does not wish to pursue a philosophy simpliciter but a practical approach that focuses on the fullness of the student[185].Carmody's approach however has faced criticism from other Catholic educationalists such as Whittle and Walsh, who argue that Carmody's understanding of Lonergan is abstract and generalist. Crucially, Whittle clarifies the issue of terminology within Carmody's analysis.

> There is a Catholic philosophy of education and the philosophy of Catholic education. The first emphasises a distinct Catholic philosophy, the second avoids these assumptions and focuses on the way philosophy acts on Catholic education. There needs to be conceptual clarity[186].

Walsh continues this thinking in his deconstruction of what a Catholic philosophy constitutes, "this philosophy must be contemporary, informed by new learning not timeless learning"[187]. Walsh's use of the term "timeless learning" points to the classical understanding of Catholic philosophy based on the work of Aquinas, Newman and Maritain. Despite the influential status of these classical models, especially in regards to Thomist philosophy, it is necessary that a current Catholic philosophy of education reflects contemporary concerns.[188] Indeed, the reoccurring focus rests on a philosophy that is not defined by classical rigidity but is rather dynamic and porous, a philosophy that can respond to the changing state of Catholic education.

Sullivan argues that the convocation of the Second Vatican Council and its subsequent education documents must also be held accountable for the under-development of a concrete understanding of a Catholic philosophy of education[189]. Sullivan is specifically referencing the foundational education document, *Gravissimum Educationis*, which in the eyes of Sullivan: "does not constitute substantial building blocks for a Catholic philosophy of education"[211]. However, I find Sullivan too eager to neglect the contribution of the Vatican documents to a unique Catholic philosophy in education, Sullivan focuses specifically on the *Gravissimum Educationis*, yet he does not reflect on the entirety of the post Vatican II education documents. D'Souza is more useful in this regard, he argues that despite a Catholic philosophy of education not being espoused coherently in one document, the later breadth and diversity of the Vatican education documents does formulate a Catholic philosophy that is more incremental and heuristic[190]. Indeed, the most useful Vatican document regarding a Catholic philosophy of education is contained in, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*,

---

Contemporary Catholic School: Context, Identity, Diversity, London, 1996, pg69

[185] Carmody, Brendan, "Towards a Contemporary Catholic Philosophy of Education", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2011, Vol 3 (2), pg109

[186] Whittle, Sean, "Towards a Catholic Philosophy of Education: Moving the Debate Forward", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2014, Vol 6 (1), pg47

[187] Walsh, Paddy, "From Philosophy to Theology of Catholic Education, with Bernard Lonergan and Karl Rahner", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2018, Vol 10 (2), pg134

[188] McLaughlin, Terence, O'Keefe, Joseph, *The Contemporary Catholic School: Context, Identity, Diversity*, London, 1996, pg138

[189] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg75 [211] Ibid. pg75

[190] D'Souza, Mario, "Further Reflections on a Catholic Philosophy of Education", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2018, Vol 10 (1), pg6

which states that, "the Catholic school finds its true justification in the mission of the Church; it is based on an educational philosophy in which faith, culture and life are brought into harmony"[191]. Although this document forms the final portion of the Vatican documents it embodies and reinforces the precepts laid forth by the council's earlier editions. It is clear that Sullivan believes that a Catholic philosophy of education has taken a subsidiary position in the wider discussion of Catholic education, a position he believes to be detrimental for any composite consideration of what makes Catholic education distinct. The veracity of Sullivan's claim about this under-development is somewhat questionable, given the academic attention given to this subject and a wider reading of the Vatican documents.

Sullivan does not make an explicit reference to Lonergan or the wider academic discussion regarding a Catholic philosophy of education; however, Sullivan's philosophical grounding comes in his robust assessment of the collective works of Maurice Blondel and Von Hugel. Blondel, a 19th century French philosopher, aimed to assess the interplay between classical philosophy and contemporary Christian belief. Sullivan focuses on his work, *Histoire et Dogme*, which argues for a living tradition to be found within Catholic education. Sullivan provides a synopsis of the notion of living tradition: "a tradition that is meant not only to conserve but to discover"[192]. Blondel's work reinforces Sullivan's wider discussion of the challenge faced by Catholic education to balance its distinctive identity with an inclusive approach. Sullivan believes Blondel to have adeptly found a way around this difficult balancing act.

> Blondel claimed to point a way forward which avoided the pitfalls of those who fixed the Church in a restricting and narrow immobilism, and also escaped the dangers stemming from those who yielded too much to contemporary scholarship[215].

A contemporary Catholic philosophy of education cannot bear the weight of classical thought if it is to serve the present needs of its students and educators. Sullivan effectively argues that the concept of an ever-evolving living tradition is central in the maintenance of a Catholic philosophy within education. The writings of Baron Friedrich von Hugel also draw the attention of Sullivan in his elucidation of Catholic philosophy; Sullivan acknowledges that von Hugel is not considered a central authority within the field of Catholic education, yet his work on integral human formation is crucial in understanding the purpose of a Catholic philosophy of education[216]. Von Hugel as an esteemed polymath respected the autonomy of academic disciplines, Von Hugel stressed that a life within the faith also required one to train and cultivate non-religious disciplines[193]. Indeed, the richness of a Catholic philosophy is dependent on this fusion of disciplines, whether they are found in the faith or in culture.

> Catholicism will have to recognise, respect, love and protect the non-religious levels and complexes of life, as also coming from God as occasions, materials, stimulations, necessary for us men towards the development of our complete humanity, and especially of our religion[194].

Sullivan utilises the writings of Von Hugel to describe a Catholic philosophy of education that is altogether transformative, one which seeks to acknowledge and incorporate the depth of human learning whilst striving to develop the spiritual, intellectual and emotional capacities of its students.

---

[191] Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, Rome, April 7th, 1988, par 34

[192] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg163 [215] Ibid. pg164 [216] Ibid. pg93

[193] Von Hugel, Friedrich, *The Mystical Elements of Religion, as studies in Saint Catherine and her friends*, Cambridge, 1908, pg59

[194] Von Hugel, Friedrich, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion: second series*, London, 1926, pg238

Sullivan reflects on this argument in his summation of Catholic education's interconnectedness: "integral to a Catholic philosophy of education is a belief that the different areas of the curriculum have relative autonomy and yet a mutual interdependence"[195]. Sullivan is not new to this interpretation, indeed he uses the classical work of Augustine to further evidence the primacy of interconnectivity: "all subjects must be surveyed in the light of being connected with one another … they cannot be understood except in the light of those interconnections"[196]. It is this interdependence that produces a Catholic philosophy of education based on the synergy between subjects and the synthesis of faith and culture.

Sullivan's own interpretation, and definition, of a Catholic philosophy of education is founded on the above discussion of subject autonomy, a contemporary appreciation for culture and the focus on a rounded holistic approach to the human person[197]. However, in the spirit of interconnectedness Sullivan stresses that these three themes must be held together in a unified approach, there is to be no hierarchy nor separation, each must exist in balance to the other[198]. Sullivan acknowledges that the task of unifying these prioritises presents a certain challenge to the Catholic educator.

> It is not easy to see how these three can be held together, since they emphasise different priorities: the first emphasising the individual, the second focusing on academic subjects of study while the third underlines the importance of religion in the conduct and interpretation of life[199].

Sullivan's acknowledgment does not however contain any reference to how this could be mitigated, practical resolutions to this mounting work load are not discussed or are subsumed under theoretical analyses. Another difficulty in the matter of articulating a specific Catholic philosophy of education is that this interpretation is based on a specific interpretation of the relationship between nature and grace and humanity and divinity[200]. Sullivan acknowledges that Catholic philosophy in itself is not prescriptive nor normative therefore there are multiple avenues through which one could view how Catholic philosophy acts on the educational enterprise. Indeed, the issue of interpretation and terminology has contributed to the underdevelopment of this field of enquiry, there is not as of yet a concrete model to assess the existence of a Catholic philosophy of education; however, this does not mean that such a philosophy does not already exist.

Sullivan's discussion of a Catholic philosophy of education is a nuanced addition to the current scholarship focusing on the distinctive nature of Catholic education. Sullivan's own conception of a unique Catholic philosophy of education values the interdependence between faith and culture, a synergetic relationship between history and contemporary discovery. For Sullivan the main stalwart to the elucidation of such a philosophy has been the issue of theoretical clarity, it is easy for over complication to reign, especially given the variance to be found in Catholic philosophy. Indeed, the wider issue is also one of theological clarity, how a contemporary Catholicism desires to interweave biblical scholarship, theology and philosophy. It is clear that a Catholic philosophy of education requires more academic attention, yet these steps are already being taken and this chapter has criticised Sullivan's premature dissatisfaction with the pre-existing research into a distinctive Catholic philosophy of education.

---

[195] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg90
[196] Saint Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, Clarendon Press, Translated by R.P.H Green, 1996, pg142
[197] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg91
[198] Ibid. pg91
[199] Ibid. pg85
[200] Ibid. pg85

Sociology of Education – Gerald Grace

Gerald Grace grounds his understanding of Catholic education within the sociology of education discipline, a research field that applies classical sociological frameworks to the understanding and function of education[201]. Grace's discussion of the sociology of education consistently pays homage to the parent discipline of sociology, especially in Grace's use of the preeminent functional sociologist Émile Durkheim. Grace does not however focus specifically on the theoretical perspectives enshrined in the sociology of education including concepts such as symbolic interactionism, phenomenology and conflict theory. Grace's focuses more on sociological praxis, an approach that distinguishes his research from the wider canon of educational sociologists such as Olive Banks and Ivan Reid whose respective works focus on the theoretical function of education within societal structure. This distinction is primarily the result of Grace's sustained critique of the contemporary state of the sociology of education which Grace believes to have fallen victim to a "secularisation of consciousness", one which has removed all considerations of the religious from the field. Indeed, Grace argues that all concepts of religious enquiry have become passé; however, this relegation is not only prejudicial in nature but extremely detrimental to the entire sociological field. Grace's argument straddles both the sociology of education and the sociology of religion; this interdisciplinary approach does add veritable nuance to Grace's work, but on occasion this breadth does forfeit a certain profundity and clarity to his analyses.

Grace's most significant contribution to the discussion of Catholic education within the sociology of education is found within his 2004 article, *Taking Religions Seriously in the Sociology of Education*, Grace here argues that academics, both in the Western world and internationally, must seek to move beyond a "secularisation of consciousness paradigm"[202]. In my previous chapter, Secularisation, I discussed Grace's concerns regarding the advance of secularisation as an affront to the maintenance and development of a specific Catholic identity in education. Grace continues to pursue the notion of a "secularisation of consciousness" within Western academia and makes specific claim to the failures of sociological thinkers to confront this advance.

> Sociological analysis which elides a religious dimension not only presents an over-simplified view of social relations in the "modern West", but is also fails to make an authentic engagement with many socio-cultural and educational situations internationally where God is far from dead[203].

It is within this article that Grace argues for a return to the classical sociological canon, particularly the work of Durkheim and Weber whose early contributions to the sociological bedrock stressed religious acknowledgement. Émile Durkheim focused on the variety of forces that shaped social reality, his research did not aim to reveal religious truth but rather how religious belief informed the human condition and thus influenced societal structure[204]. Durkheim has played a central role in this paper as an authority continually utilised by Grace to illustrate the fundamental significance of religion within society. I find this quote from Durkheim to accurately synthesise his argument: "Thus it is seen that whatever has been done in the name of religion cannot have been done in vain: for it is necessarily the society that did it, and it is humanity that has reaped the fruit"[205]. Durkheim stresses that religion, God and deities of all denominations are symbols of society and the human condition, thus it is a grave error to diminish the importance of religious research given its social centrality.

---

[201] Banks, Olive, *The Sociology of Education*, London, 1976, pg1

[202] Grace, Gerald, "Taking Religions Seriously in the Sociology of Education: going beyond the secular paradigm", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 2020, Vol 41 (6), p47

[203] Ibid. pg47

[204] Peckering, William, Miller, SF, *On Durkheim's Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Routledge, 1998, pg6

[205] Durkheim, Emile, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, London, 1915, pg420

Grace also perceptibly notes that the "secular consciousness" paradigm only serves Western academic circles, internationally it is false to suggest that secularisation is advancing with the same pace or that religious practice is close to losing its social pre-eminence[206]. It is not expected that all sociologists of education must themselves practice the faith, or in any way be religiously inclined, however it is necessary to appreciate religious authority regardless of personal preference. Indeed, Grace advocates that if the sociology of education is to continue as a legitimate field of enquiry it must not fall victim to easy polemics or prejudicial exclusion[231].

Grace continues this line of argument in his article, *Educational Studies and Faith-Based Schooling: Moving from Prejudice to Evidence-Based Argument*, here Grace critiques the remedial use of assertion and counter-assertion in research concerning faith-based education. This article concerns a variety of disciplines, including but not exclusive to the sociology of education, Grace argues that wider forms of educational research have also failed to acknowledge the significance of faith-based education across the globe.

> Significant studies of globalisation and educational policy struggles in education, school effectiveness investigations and school leadership analysis take place as if the existence of faith-based schooling systems are peripheral to the central questions being raised[207].

I am directly using Grace's preferred phrasing of "faith-based schooling" within this specific article, although Grace is firmly situated within the study of Catholic education his critique of current social disciplines takes on a more macro scope to include the wider provision of faith education. Grace acknowledges that this wider question of faith-based education is crucial to the security of Catholic education specifically as the largest international provider of faith education[208]. Despite the early pessimistic tone of Grace's article, it is clear that research into faith-based education can have a prosperous future if academics begin to diversify their field of enquiry whilst remaining sensitive to the full spectrum of educational provision across the globe. This future requires systematic inquiry: "to combat ignorance and prejudice about how different forms of faith-based schooling actually operate in the contemporary world, systematic inquiry is necessary"[209].

Grace does not continually refer back to the sociology of education; however, Grace concerns himself directly with the relationship between Catholic education and the issue of social cohesion. Indeed, Grace is not oblivious to easy use of sectarian tensions in Northern Ireland as a way of attacking the supposed divisive nature of faith-based schools. What Grace hopes to achieve in his comments regarding Northern Ireland is to show that one example of societal division does not discredit the status of faith schools, and equally that faith schools in Northern Ireland are not the cause of ethnonationalist tensions. One such example of the over-exaggerated use of schools in Northern Ireland comes from Richard Dawkins, a known religious critique, Grace uses his writings as an exemplar of a misguided critique of faith education.

> Why do people in Northern Ireland kill each other? It is fashionable to say that the sectarian feuds are not about religion, the deep divides in the province are not religious, they are cultural, historic, economic … but (if) Protestant and Catholic children ceased to be segregated throughout their school days, the Troubles in Northern Ireland would largely disappear[210].

---

[206] Grace, Gerald, "Taking Religions Seriously in the Sociology of Education: going beyond the secular paradigm", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 2020, Vol 41 (6), p52 [231] Ibid. pg52

[207] Grace, Gerald, "Educational Studies and Faith-based Schooling, moving from prejudice to evidence-based argument", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 2003, 51 (2), pg150

[208] Ibid. pg150

[209] Ibid. pg160

[210] Dawkins, Richard, "No Faith in the Absurd", *Times Educational Supplement*, 23rd February, 2001

Dawkins over-simplified, and largely reductive, synopsis of the role of education in perpetuating sectarianism in Northern Ireland relies heavily on a one-dimensional understanding of communal tension. The issue with Dawkins is that he is not an educationalist, and Grace's use of his arguments do not shed any constructive light on the position of Catholic schools in particular. It is clear that Grace wishes to defend his field and has been drawn into this complex argument to refute such polemics, yet Grace's investiture in this academic debate stems from a desire to exonerate faith schools from an assumed guilty status rather than to posit a nuanced historical perspective. Grace does not claim to be a historian, nor is he, his reference to the educational situation in Northern Ireland originates from a sociological perspective that argues for schools to be understood as reactionaries to sectarian tensions rather than fundamental instigators. Grace's critique of Dawson still remains valid, indeed any reader can recognise the hyperbole of Dawkins' claims, but I think it is important to stress that Grace is not the primary authority on education in Northern Ireland nor ethno-nationalist discrimination within the Northern Irish state. This inclusion is very much an example, and not a fundamental motif of Grace's research. In this light, one may instead turn to the educational historian, Tony Gallagher, who has conducted extensive research regarding separate Catholic and Protestant schools in Northern Ireland, his analyses affirm that supposed tension in separate education is symptomatic of sectarian prejudice, rather than the root cause[211]. Gallagher's academic corpus concerning education in Northern Ireland posits that all schools in the state have a role to play in working towards peace, and that each does not symbolise a continuation of violence by its mere existence[212]. One must also appreciate that the Northern Irish context is not representative of the wider position of faith education across the United Kingdom.

So far it seems that Grace's arguments surrounding this subject appear more aligned to the sociology of religion rather than that of education. The academic focus of the sociology of religion, especially in the 20th century, has been on religion's loss of significance within institutional life and at the level of individual consciousness, matters that continually draw Grace's interest[213]. I acknowledge that for Grace there is a certain difficulty in remaining consistent in one's disciplinary approach, especially given the sociology of education's apparent religious apathy. Grace is required to consult both religion and education in the wider field of sociology to elucidate his point that faith-schools are being chronically under-represented and misrepresented. Yet, it is strange that Grace does not self-identify as a sociologist of religion, his focus on education is apparent, but is lacks consistency and continually relies on his over-emphasised argument regarding a "secularisation of consciousness" theory. Indeed, the sustained fascination regarding the progress of secularisation within sociology errs heavily into the remit of the sociology of religion at the cost of a deeper understanding of its effect on education.

Grace's review of the current academic literature continually returns to a crucial deficiency in evidence regarding not only the status of Catholic education, but wider faith-based schooling, this lacuna is both the result of a secular marginalisation as well as a prejudicial attitude towards religion within Western academia. Indeed, Grace refers to the over-usage of the educational situation in Northern Ireland as an ill-evidenced way to criticise faith-based education as symbolically violent or responsible for engendering communal division. However, Grace's assessments are not overtly pessimistic, he looks to both the future and the past as a way of rectifying the current diminution of faith schooling. The future of Catholic scholarship within the sociology of education demands systematic inquiry whilst cultivating a renewed respect for traditional sociological precepts which acknowledge the centrality of religious influence. The veneration of Durkheim is the most pertinent

[211] Gallagher, Tony, "Faith schools and Northern Ireland", in Gardner, Roy, Lawton, Denis, *Faith Schools, Consensus or Conflict*, Routledge, 2004, pg58
[212] Gallagher, Tony, "Shared Education in Northern Ireland: school collaboration in divided societies", *Oxford Review of Education*, 2016, Vol 42 (3), pg364
[213] Clarke, Peter, *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, Oxford University Press, 2011, pg3

here, Grace refers to Durkheim's foundational work to highlight the primacy of religion in the foundation of social institutions, including education. Grace is persistently aiming to recover a new school of thought within the sociology of education, one which promotes a religious perspective, not for the sake of academic nuance nor diversity, but to provide a full and robust rendition of education's interaction with all societal processes. Grace's collective research valorises the creativity of a religious outlook within academia, one which does not over-galvanise secular or materialist monopolies within sociological research. Indeed, one acknowledges that Grace is fighting a difficult and complex battle to evangelise a predominantly secular sociological field. However, Grace's persistence and rigour only further highlights the growing requirement for sociology to look beyond its religious apathy, a bias that stunts the very dynamism of a field intent on uncovering the multitude of faces underpinned contemporary education.

Conclusion

This paper has functioned as a critical qualitative analysis of the respective works of Gerald Grace and John Sullivan, yet it also serves as a reminder of the outstanding contribution both of these academics, and Professors respectively, have made to the field of Catholic education. I hope that my work constitutes a valuable edition in the corpus of academic research concerning the unique nature and mission of Catholic education by reinforcing and inter-contextualising the seminal work of these preeminent Catholic thinkers. Grace and Sullivan's arguments do not inherently mirror each other, but their research does rhyme, especially in regard to the nature and purpose of the Catholic mission in education.

Comparison is a methodological structure that hinges on relationships; how does one entity relate to another? Are causal links between authors a sign of shared understanding or the inherent intertextuality of academic research? The utility of comparative studies comes from a certain level of compatibility, it is this compatibility which makes the research feasible and ultimately profitable. Despite their differing disciplinary backgrounds, it is easy to appreciate the compatible nature of Grace and Sullivan as scholars dedicated to the defence and maintenance of Catholic education. My analysis has functioned as an enmeshed comparison, each chapter gives equal weight to the academics and seeks to analyse how each author responds to crucial stimuli in Catholic thinking including theology, anthropology and Vatican II doctrine.

The elucidation of Catholic mission provides the forward momentum for the academic's most significant works, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, and, *Mission, Markets and Morality*, each seek to define the unique characteristics intrinsic to Catholic education. Mission is the centripetal force in Sullivan's explanation of the dialectic between distinction and inclusion, here mission symbolises the evangelising imperative of the Church, to disseminate Gospel values and reaffirm Christ's ministry on earth[214]. The missionary thrust of the Catholic school has acquired an even greater pertinence at the turn of the millennium, Sullivan argues that fidelity to mission is central in maintaining the survival of the Catholic school in a new diverse educational environment. Crucially, Sullivan and Grace return to the central concept of love within the mission of Catholic education. Their recovery of this notion is not only refreshing, but especially apt in an academic field that is often intent on over-theorising. Love cannot be empirically quantified or assessed, it is a spiritual holy substance, the love found within the Catholic school is ultimately drawn from Christ's love for his people. Love is a classical and foundational aspect of Catholicism; Sullivan recovers the work of St Augustine to reify love as the first example of educational practice: "there is no way of entering into

[214] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive,* Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg123

truth without love". Love and truth represent a holy partnership in the mission of the Catholic school, love prevents education becoming utilitarian or materialistic, it is the entity which brings God back into the heart of the school.

Grace and Sullivan are the ideal academics to analyse within the wider conglomerate of Catholic educationalists because they consider a wealth and depth of classical and modern sources. Indeed, the deep referential nature of their work, whether that be to contemporary scholars in their field or historic authorities, nuances their own distinctive conclusions. Grace is especially adept at this form of academic corroboration, Grace is a strong proponent of the work of US Catholic scholar, Anthony Byrk, whose seminal work, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, sought to reassert the centrality of the common good in American Catholic schools. Although Byrk is working in a different geographical locus, Grace acutely recognises the cross-overs with Catholic education in the UK, how a policy of openness prevents the Catholic school from becoming parochial or constrained[215]. Indeed, Grace's most utilised term in his research concerning educational secularity, "secularisation of consciousness", is borrowed from the work of Michael Gallagher, who similar to the style of Grace, argues that Western academia has become religiously apathetic[216]. Compared to Sullivan, Grace prefers to reference contemporary academic peers; however, his main source of sociological inspiration dates back to the foundational work of Emile Durkheim. *The Social Reality of Religion* argues that religion was the primary instigator of societal structure, that collective shared belief systems engendered a sense of societal order and control. Grace argues that the current sociology of education has removed all considerations of the religious amongst society, this apathy runs counter to foundational research into early societal structure which was very much predicated on religious influence. Grace's deep referential record reinforces prevalent issues within the academic literature, crucially a recurring belief that religious study is antiquated and redolent of a conservative era. Over the course of his work one sees that such arguments are not only presumptuous, but innately prejudicial, and that the marginalisation of religious concepts only impedes on the credibility and intersectionality of the sociological fields.

Sullivan in a manner reflective of his philosophical preference draws on more classical and historical references to aid his argumentation. Sullivan introduces one of the most prolific theologians of the classical era, St Augustine, whose conception of education was grounded in notions of happiness, spiritual fulfilment and love. Augustine functions as an exemplar of Sullivan's understanding of education, one that is holistic and focused on the entirety of human development. This is reinforced in Sullivan's critical focus on Maurice Blondel; Blondel was an avid pupil of Augustine's work and through his scholarship of Augustine Blondel configured the idea of a malleable living tradition within Catholic teaching. Sullivan's approach to these authorities' re-centres his treatment of the balance between distinction and inclusion, indeed each reference reaffirms the duality of Catholic education, its simultaneous ability to cultivate a unique spiritual character whilst extending its teaching to all those susceptible. Sullivan's writing on living tradition offers a useful insight into how philosophical tradition in Catholic education has changed; tradition is no longer an ossified concept reflective of classical times, instead it is dynamic and consultative, it seeks to bridge a dialogue with the outside world.

Rapprochement with the world of human culture is a shared point of investigation for Grace and Sullivan, it is exemplified in their expertise and refined scholarship regarding the convocation of the Second Vatican Council. The corpus of Grace and Sullivan's work is focused on the early 2000s, a period in which Vatican doctrine was still being digested by Catholic scholars and the reverberations

[215] Grace, Gerald, "Faith School Leadership: a neglected sector of in-service education in the United Kingdom", *Professional Development in Education*, 2009, Vol 35 (3) pg486

[216] Gallagher, Michael, "New Forms of Cultural Unbelief", in, Hogan, Padraig, Williams, Kevin, *The Future of Religion in Irish Education*, Dublin, 1997, pg23

of its teaching was still very much in debate. Grace and Sullivan are true disciplines of Vatican II theology; however, as my chapter regarding the Council and its educational focus has elucidated, both academics focus primarily on the later Vatican education documents. Grace is especially concerned with the 1977 edition, *The Catholic School*, Grace claims this document to be the "defining mission statement for contemporary Catholic education"[217]. Grace's adoration for this document in particular reflects his sustained focus on the common good within Catholic education, a dedication to the service of others, it is to be the "leaven of the Christian world"[218]. I have questioned Grace's overt focus on, *The Catholic School*, especially given his critical neglect of the primary Vatican education document, *Gravissimus Educationis*. One must be cautious in perceiving the *Gravissimus Educationis* as a weak document, rather it is a document with a deep profundity, it argues that an apostolic spirit is inherent to the functioning of the Catholic school. Critically, the *Gravissimus Educationis* embodies an aspirational spirit which imbues the later Vatican education documents. I understand Grace's draw to, *The Catholic School*, yet often times this fixation seems misaligned without a concerted appreciation for the source of its inspiration.

Sullivan focuses on the philosophical changes wrought by the convocation of the Vatican Council and what this means for the elucidation of a specific Catholic philosophy within education. It is here that Sullivan considers the philosophical model adopted by the Church prior to Vatican II, one that was innately self-protective and borrowed heavily from notions of cultural retreatism and insularity[219]. Sullivan believes the Council to have introduced a new theology from below, one which is unconstrained by the weight of Church hierarchy and instead seeks to create a climate of cocreationism rather than one of instruction. Sullivan argues that the Council were aware of the Church's philosophical stagnation, especially in regards to the supremacy of Thomist thought, in response the Council transitioned to a dynamic philosophical tradition one associated with ressourcement theology and co-creationism. It is clear that Sullivan desires philosophical clarity from the Church, especially in the elucidation of a distinct Catholic philosophy of education. Sullivan, rather too hastily, criticises the Vatican's educational documents as failing to aptly define a unique Catholic philosophy of education. Yet, one need only consult the entire body of educational documents to find a more implicit definition of a Catholic educational philosophy. Indeed, the Council's onus on a synthesis of faith and culture signals a crucial cornerstone of a contemporary Catholic philosophy which seeks to place education in its cultural context, and not within a religious vacuum.

Sullivan's ruminations on the changing state of Catholic philosophy and theology could well require an individual paper in their own right, and I have been hesitant to overtly focus on Sullivan's macro philosophical analysis. However, these inclusions should not be ignored in the wider context of Catholic education, a distinct philosophical identity, like the concept of mission integrity, are foundational elements within the Catholic school. Sullivan makes inroads into a continuing source of debate for Catholic scholars: what philosophy should the Church adopt in the contemporary era? One may see this question as innately tied to the possibility of a biblical revival, a return to Scriptural influence or ecclesiology. Yet, if education is the primary tool for the evangelisation of the world it must be included as crucial component in the wider debate surrounding the nature of Catholic teaching in the modern world. To understand the complexity of this debate, and indeed Sullivan's elevated analysis of Catholic philosophy, requires a sufficient understanding of the mechanisations of the Catholic Church.

---

[217] Grace, Gerald, "Aggiornamento thinking and principles in practice" in Whittle, Sean, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Routledge, 2016, Chapter 1, pg14

[218] Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977, par84

[219] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, pg9

Sullivan is an academic whose intended audience is fellow Catholic believers and Catholic scholars, this is not to say that his research is unintelligible to a non-Catholic readership; however, Sullivan's research in comparison to Grace's wider scope, very much hinges on a readership affiliated and comfortable with Catholic scholarship. Indeed, audience is the crucial distinction between Grace and Sullivan; Grace directly concerns himself with the position of the Catholic school amongst wider society, this sociological framework necessitates a style of research which looks outward to include the diverse groups that may not be affiliated with Catholic teaching. However, one must acknowledge that the task of extending Catholic philosophical debate to a diverse audience would be an extremely difficult task. Sullivan's work is not parochial for favouring a Catholic readership, rather it allows Sullivan to focus on depth, rather than breadth and context, a factor that adds critical nuance to his research and prevents over-dilution. Indeed, both academics write and research in a manner that is reflective of their disciplinary training, I do not believe one style is inherently more effective than the other, nor is this thinking useful to the wider discussion of Catholic education.

Grace and Sullivan as scholars of Catholic education do not utilise Scripture in their arguments, favouring a biblical understanding that is more ecclesiastic and philosophical. The presence of Scripture in their work, or lack thereof, does not however present an issue for an understanding of their research. Indeed, in the wider corpus of literature on Catholic education other scholars, principally McKinney, have effectively utilised Scripture to advance their understanding of the distinctive character of Catholic education. One must also acknowledge that although Scriptural reference offers a biblical profundity to one's argument, it is difficult and a rather onerous task to refer to Scripture when one is not comfortable in its usage or academic application. I believe if Grace and Sullivan attempted to utilise Scripture simply for its inclusion only and on an ad hoc basis it would only dilute and confuse the direction of their research. Grace and Sullivan are cogent examples of interdisciplinary Catholic scholars, but they cannot represent every field, neither can they include the full gamut of Scripture, ecclesiology and theology.

The question of interdisciplinary breadth is an important one; however, one must remember the practical boundaries of the researcher, and how realistic their conclusions are outside of the respective theories they utilise. The chapter, *The Catholic Teacher*, focused directly on the physical and material exaction of Catholic teaching through the apostolic vessel of the Catholic educator. The basis of this chapter was to assess how Grace and Sullivan respond to the implementation of Catholic teaching at its grass roots level: the classroom, the governing board, parents and the headteacher. Grace and Sullivan recognise the complex series of pressures placed on the Catholic educator to embody both the spirit and mission of the school whilst completing the necessary logistical matters tied to the function of the school. Sullivan defines the teacher as a "living witness", one who must "walk their talk" and embody the faith in both their personhood and profession[220]. The teacher is thus tasked with embodying an imperfect human spirit and the holiness of Christ's message. One must here question the feasibility, and crucially the difficulty, for the Catholic educator, especially one who has not had formal religious training, to fulfil such a task. Lay educators now make up a significant majority of the Catholic teaching body, and both Sullivan and Grace acknowledge their importance as the "new faces" of Catholic teaching. Yet, for a lay educator who must simultaneously straddle culture and faith, it is easy to see why such demands appear theoretically feasible but practically insurmountable. Indeed, it is within this chapter that a certain theoretical idealism is found within both Grace and Sullivan's writing; of course, an aspirational spirit is commendable, but caution should be favoured when determining the workload and exactions placed on the educator.

It is within this mode of understanding that one must appreciate Grace and Sullivan as academics who do not know it all; in spite of their prolific status within the research field of Catholic education one

[220] Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000, pg110

cannot expect them to function as omniscient authorities for the entirety of their subject. Crucially, they are academics of their time, the period I am directly referencing is the turn of the millennium. It is essential that an appreciation for this time constraint is acknowledged as many of the points and issues raised by Grace and Sullivan have been further deconstructed and analysed in the past decade. It is at this point that I will draw attention to further work that has been critical in the field of Catholic education which has emerged in the past few years. Both Stephen McKinney and Sean Whittle have been especially prolific in their continued research into Catholic education, the former focusing principally on the Scottish context with an attuned ear to the position of the Catholic school in the 2010s. In 2016, Sean Whittle produced a collaborative work on the legacy of Vatican II titled, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Whittle aims to deconstruct the reception of Vatican II thinking decades after the Council's convocation. It is useful to consider the work of McKinney and Walsh in conjunction with that of Grace and Sullivan as they represent the wider corpus of work concerning the place of Catholic education and the post Vatican II climate. I did not intend for this work to be a completely isolated study of Grace and Sullivan, it is beneficial to note how other prominent academics have contributed, and still continue to contribute, to this field of study. Indeed, the breadth of Catholic scholars attests to the health of this body of research as an academic field that has drawn a wide pool of interdisciplinary contributions.

I acknowledge that despite the depth of my analysis into Grace and Sullivan there is still fertile work for further research to be conducted into these two academics. One may question the future of Catholic exceptionalism, especially given the rising popularity of Catholic schools, and how these may alter the mission of Catholic education in the future. Secondly, Grace and Sullivan make a series of arguments that are conducive to a wider comparative study of other forms of faith-based educations in the UK. Indeed, a Christian perspective is the central focus of my work; however, one may look wider to compare how Jewish, Muslim and Seik faith schools have favoured alongside their Catholic counterparts. Indeed, I find this to be an extremely useful investigation to consider, Catholic schools offer the greatest provision of faith-based education in the world, yet several of the obstacles they face in a growing secular climate simultaneously impact all schools who teach in accordance with a specific religion or faith. An inter-faith study may yield profitable results regarding the assumption within Western academia that, "God is dead", or that faith-based education is no longer a popular alternative to mainstream state schools. It is my hope that this comparative paper has stimulated such questions not only regarding the significance of Grace and Sullivan's contributions, but the place and position of Catholic education in the wider setting of faith-based schooling.

During the research and writing of this paper, across the academic year 2021-2022, an edited collection by Sean Whittle titled, *New Thinking, New Scholarship, and New Research in Catholic Education – responses to the work of Gerald Grace*, was published. In a similar fashion to the contents of this paper, Whittle and a series of other renowned scholars in the field of Catholic education including, Stephen McKinney, Paddy Walsh, and Richard Pring, assess and applaud the contributions made by Gerald Grace to the academic field. James Arthur, in the opening chapter to the volume, accredits Grace with the wholesale expansion of research into Catholic education stating: "his contribution to Catholic Educational Studies in the UK has no equal in modern times"[221]. Of course, this collaborative work focuses solely on Grace's contributions and therefore does not mirror the comparative structure of this paper; however, I wanted to draw attention to the contributions made by John Sullivan in regards to Grace's legacy within the field. John Sullivan, in his chapter, "Graceful Listening and Educational Rhetoric", pays homage to Grace's academic stamina, and crucially his persistent defence of the faith.

[221] Arthur, James, "The Calling of Gerald Grace" in, Whittle, Sean, *New Thinking, New Scholarship, and New Research in Catholic Education, responses to the work of Gerald Grace*, Taylor & Francis, 2022, pg9

> He is someone whose work stands between the living tradition of Catholic faith and contemporary educational policy developments in order to interpret one to the other and to build bridges between them … He offers realism in service of fidelity, resourced by tradition but not restricted by it. He combines a stout defence of Catholic education with a ready acknowledgement of its shortcomings. He demonstrates that faith can be expressed credibly in an academic register[222].

Throughout this paper I have made no attempt to posit who of Grace and Sullivan is more important, or who has made more of a contribution to the field, I find such a line of enquiry to be reductive and falsely competitive. Indeed, it is this above quotation from Sullivan which reifies the importance of considering scholars together, each inspires and reinforces the other. Sullivan has clearly taken inspiration from Grace's body of work, and commends his ability to suffuse academic writing with a fidelity to the faith. The interconnection between these scholars, and the larger field of Catholic education, attests to a sense of collectivism amongst an academic field that has previously been disregarded and jettisoned from the larger academy. It is in this regard that the significant contributions made by Grace and Sullivan are not only academic indices, but a veritable lifeline for the survival of the field.

The main connection between Grace and Sullivan is their focus on spiritual recovery, whether this entails a re-engagement with Catholicism's evangelising imperative, protection of the Catholic school as a form of counter-cultural witness or returning to a more direct philosophical and theological understanding of the faith. Indeed, across each chapter of this paper I have aimed to illuminate this notion of spiritual recovery as the centripetal force which drives both of these academics to reinvigorate the field of Catholic education. Grace and Sullivan are a testament to the strength of interdisciplinary research, their nuanced analyses engage with formative thinkers across several fields to reinforce their principal focus on Catholic education. It is clear that without the contributions of these seminal authorities the field of Catholic education would not have benefitted from such robust and multi-directional research. My research has aimed to both honour, analyse, and critique the research of Grace and Sullivan with the intention of uncovering the multidimensional nature of Catholic education. Grace and Sullivan over the course of their academic careers have laid a solid foundation for future researchers in their field, indeed, it is their lasting gift to us that they have provided such fecund ground to continue honouring the central position of Catholic education within the Catholic faith.

[222] Sullivan, John, "Graceful Listening and Educational Rhetoric", Whittle, Sean, *New Thinking, New Scholarship, and New Research in Catholic Education, responses to the work of Gerald Grace*, Taylor & Francis, 2022, pg43

Bibliography

Arthur, James, *The Ebbing Tide*, Gracewing, 1995
Banks, Olive, *The Sociology of Education*, London, 1968
Berger, Peter, "The Good of Religious Pluralism", *First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life*, No262, April 2016
Blondel, Maurice, "Histoire et Dogme", *Les Premiers Ecrits de Maurice Blondel*, Paris, 1956
Brown, Callum, *Becoming Atheist: Humanism and the Secular West*, Bloomsbury, 2017
Brown, Callum, *The Death of Christian Britain*, Routledge, 2001
Brown, P, "Education, Meritocracy and the Global War for Talent", *Journal of Educational Policy*, Vol 24, 2009, pg377-392
Bruce, Steve, *"The Sociology of Late Secularisation Social Divisions and Religiosity",* The British journal of Sociology, 12/2016, Vol 67 issue 4, pg613-631
Bruce, Steve, *God is Dead: Secularisation in the West*, Oxford, 2002
Byrk, Anthony, Lee, Valerie, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press,1996
Berger, Peter, *The Social Reality of Religion,* Penguin Books, 1973

Calhoun, Craig, *Rethinking Secularism*, Oxford University Press, 2011
Carmody, Brendan, "Towards a Contemporary Catholic Philosophy of Education", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2011, Vol 3 (2), pg106-119
Catholic Bishops of England and Wales, *The Common Good in Education*, 1997
Clarke, Peter, *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, Oxford, 2009
Congregation for Catholic Education, *Catholic Schools on the Threshold of the Third Millennium*, Rome, 28th December 1997
Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School,* Rome, April 7th, 1988
Cooper, Davina,"Strategies of Power: Legislating Worship and Religious Education" in Lloyd, Maya, *The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities*, Basingstoke, 1997
Copson, Andrew, *Secularism: a very short introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2019
D'Souza, Mario, Further Reflections on a Catholic Philosophy of Education, *International Studies in Catholic Education*, Vol 10, 2018, pg2-14
Dale, Roger, *The State and Education Policy*, Open University Press, 1989
Dawkins, Richard, "No faith in the absurd", *Times Educational Supplement*, 23rd February, 2001
Dawson, Christopher, *Religion and the Modern State*, Sheed & Ward, 1935
Dunn, Ross, "The Making of a National Curriculum: The British Case", *The History Teacher,* vol 33, 3, 2000, pg395-398
Durkheim, Émile, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, London, 1915
Flynn, G, Murray, P, *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology,* Oxford University Press, 2014
Franchi, Leonardo, Convery, R, *Reclaiming the Piazza III*, Gracewing Publishing, 2021
Gallagher, Michael, "New Forms of Cultural Unbelief", in Hogan, Padraig, *The Future of Religion in Irish Education*, Dublin, 1997
Gallagher, Tony, "Faith schools and Northern Ireland", in Gardner, Roy, Lawton, Denis, *Faith Schools, Consensus or Conflict*, Routledge, 2004

Gallagher, Tony, "Shared Education in Northern Ireland: school collaboration in divided societies", *Oxford Review of Education*, 2016, Vol 42 (3), pg362-375

Grace, Gerald "Educational Studies and faith-based schooling: moving from prejudice to evidencebased argument", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 2003, 51(2), pg149-167
Grace, Gerald, "Aggiornamento thinking and principles in practice" in Whittle, Sean, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Routledge, 2016
Grace, Gerald, "Catholic Schools and the Common Good: what this means in educational practice", *Professional Focus Series*, 2000, No 2, pg2-10
Grace, Gerald, "Class, Inequality and Catholic schooling in Contemporary Contexts", *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2003, 13 (1), pg35-54
Grace, Gerald, "Faith school leadership: a neglected sector of in-service education in the United Kingdom", *Professional Development in Education*, 2009, 35(3), pg485-494
Grace, Gerald, "On the International Study of Catholic Education: why we need more systematic research", *International Studies in Catholic Education,* 2009, 1(1), pg6-14
Grace, Gerald, "Realizing the Mission: Catholic approaches to school effectiveness", in Slee, Roger and Tomlinson, *Sally, School Effectiveness for Whom?*, Taylor & Francis, 1998
Grace, Gerald, "Renewing Spiritual Capital: an urgent priority for the future of Catholic education internationally", *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2010 2(2), pg117-128
Grace, Gerald, "Taking Religions seriously in the sociology of education: going beyond the secular paradigm". *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 2020, vol 41, No 6, pg859-869 Grace, Gerald, "The State and Catholic Schooling in England and Wales: politics, ideology and mission integrity", *Oxford Review of Education*, 2001, 27 (4), pg489-500
Grace, Gerald, *Catholic Schools: Mission, Markets and Morality*, Routledge, 2002
Grace, Gerald, O'Keffe, Joseph, *International Handbook of Catholic Education*: *Challenges for School Systems in the 21st Century,* 2007
Grace, Gerald, *School Leadership: Beyond Educational Management*, London, 1995
Grace, Grace, *Faith, Mission and Challenge in Catholic Education: the selected works of Gerald Grace*, Routledge, 2016
McKinney, Stephen, Sullivan, John, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Farnham, 2014
Whittle, Sean "What might a non-confessional theory of Catholic education look like?", *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 37:1 pg93 -102, 2016
Hastings, Adrien, *A History of English Christianity 1920-1990*, SCM Press Philadelphia, 1991
Haughton, Rosemary, *The Catholic Thing*, Templegate, 1980
Hirst, Peter, "Religious Beliefs and Educational Principles", *Learning for Living*, 1976, Vol 15 (40), pg155-157
Kelty, Brian, "Towards of Theology of Catholic Education", *Religious Education*, 1999, Vol 94, pg6-23
Mandler, Peter, *The Crisis of Meritocracy: Britain's Transition to Mass Education since the Second World War,* Oxford University Press, 2020
McLaughlin, Terence, "A Catholic Perspective on Education", *Journal of Education*, 2002, Vol 6 (2), pg121-134
McLaughlin, Terence, *The Contemporary Catholic School: Context, Identity, Diversity*, London, 1996
Nichols, Kevin, *Refracting The Light*: *Learning the Languages of the Faith,* Veritas Books, 1997
Peckering, William, Miller, SF, *On Durkheim's Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Routledge, 1998
Philips, Robert, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics,* Continuum Publishing, 1998
Pope Paul VI, *Gravissimus Educationis,* Declaration on Christian Education, Rome, October 28th 1965
Pring, Richard, "Has Education an Aim?", in Tucker, Bernard, *Catholic Education in a Secular Society*, Sheed & Ward, 1968

Pring, Richard, “Markets, Education and Catholic Schools”, in McLaughlin, Terence, O’Keefe, Joseph, *The Contemporary Catholic School: Context, Identity, Diversity*, London, 1996
Ratzinger, Joseph, “On the Understanding of the “Person” in Theology”, in Miller, Michael and O’Connell, *Benedict, Dogma and Preaching: applying Christian Doctrine to daily life*, Ignatius Press, 2011
Rowland, Tracey, *Catholic Theology*, Bloomsbury, 2017
Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, March 19th 1977
Saint Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, Clarendon Press, Translated by R.P.H Green, 1996
Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001
Sullivan, John, *Catholic Schools in Contention*, Veritas Publications, 2000
Taylor, Charles, *The Secular Age*, Cambridge, 2007
The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools: witnesses to faith*, Rome, October 15th, 1982
Von Hugel, Friedrich, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*: second series, London, 1926
Von Hugel, Friedrich, *The Mystical Elements of Religion, as studies in Saint Catherine and her friends*, Cambridge, 1908
Walsh, Paddy, “From Philosophy to Theology of Catholic Education, with Bernard Lonergan and Karl Rahner”, *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 2018, Vol 10 (2), pg132-155
Whittle, Sean, *New Thinking, New Scholarship, and New Research in Catholic Education, responses to the work of Gerald Grace*, Taylor & Francis, 2022
Whittle, Sean, Towards a Catholic Philosophy of Education: Moving the Debate Forward, *International Studies in Catholic Education*, Vol 6, 2014, pg46-59
Whittle, Sean, *Vatican II and New Thinking about Catholic Education*, Routledge, 2018
Whitty, Geoff, Menter, Ian, “Lessons of Thatcherism: educational policy in England and Wales, 1979 - 1988”, *Journal of Law,* 1988, Vol 16, pg42-69
Williams, Kevin, “Teaching, Learning and the Curriculum” in McKinney, Stephen, *Education in a Catholic Perspective*, Taylor & Francis, 2013