lumen vitae

international review

Communicative Competence
and Religious Education

by Kieran SCOTT

Assistant Professor of Religious Education and Theology,
St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N.Y. *

This study is the search for an adequate language form for discussion of education and religion in contemporary culture. In considering this topic, we are dealing with two of the key words in human speech and with two comprehensive concepts in human thought and practice. The two phenomena of religion and education permeate most aspects of our existence. Yet, this is largely unacknowledged and unnamed in our public world today.

The merger of religion and education has profound implications for our personal and public lives. This synthesis should appropriately be called religious education. Religious education is interpreted here as a particular and pervasive need confronting our society. It is offered as a test of the maturity of our culture, the health of our institutions, and the quality of our lives together.

This may seem an exaggeration for the words « religious education. » The claim is indeed overstated if the term is locked into the prevailing understanding associated with it. The term carries a burden of historical connotation [1] that links it linguistically to church affairs. This may discourage any attempt to search for a deeper and

---

* Kieran SCOTT was born in Republic of Ireland ; now United States Citizen. Undergraduate and graduate work at St. Patrick's College, Carlow, Ireland. Masters in Theology at New York Theological Seminary, New York. Doctorate in 1978 at Columbia University, Teachers College, specializing in Religious Education. Dissertation title « Public Religious Education : The Encounter of Education and Religion in Contemporary Culture. » Currently, Assistant Professor of Religious Education and Theology at St. Bonaventure University. — Address : St. Bonaventure University, Box 34, St. Bonaventure, N.Y. 14778, U.S.A. (Editor's note).

1. The term « religious education » has a checkered history in the U.S. In the early decades of the twentieth century, the term embraced « *general education.* » However, recent decades have restricted its meaning, for the most part, to religious instruction of children in church and synagogue settings.

wider meaning for the words. However, there is a richness, conciseness, and comprehensiveness rooted in the meaning of the words that no group can arrogate exclusively to itself. My concern is to demonstrate that the term « religious education » holds together an indispensable dialectic between religion and education, as they converge in a multiplicity of arenas and take on diverse forms in our social world.

This task calls for a retrieving and reclaiming of lost meaning embedded in each word. It requires releasing the words from their current political control [2] and placing them at the center of our public life. But the term will have to die to its old meaning(s) [3] before it can be reborn to a new significance. Some recent attempts to do that have not been completely successful. From one side, John Westerhoff attempts to spread the term out beyond « a schooling-instruction paradigm » to « a community of faith-enculturation paradigm. » [4] But an expansion of the area of involvement may not be a satisfactory solution and could, in fact, compound the problem. From the reverse side, Jean Holm [5] represents a British tradition of attempting to locate the term specifically within schools. She states : « The aim of religious education is to help pupils understand what religion is and what it would mean to take a religion seriously. » [6] Holm grants the Christian religion a central place in schools, although other religious traditions are also granted a hearing. Furthermore, an educational rather than an evangelistic approach to religious education is advocated. But the restriction of the term to an in-school activity

---

2. See Murray EDELMAN, *Political Language : Words That Succeed and Policies That Fail* (New York : Academic Press, 1977). Edelman demonstrates the power of bureaucratic institutions to shape reality and control our cognitive structures by means of linguistic labeling, classification, and definition.

3. See Barry CHAZAN, « ' Indoctrination ' and Religious Education, » *Religious Education* 67 (July-August 1972) : 242-253. Chazan states that religious education has the dubious distinction of being a priori associated with the concept of indoctrination.

4. John H. WESTERHOFF, *Will Our Children Have Faith ?* (New York : Seabury Press, 1976). Michael LAWLER attempts a similar paradigmatic shift in « Long Live Paradigms : Models of Religious Education, » *Religious Education* 69, 2 (March-April 1972) : 268-276.

5. Jean L. HOLM, *Teaching Religion in School* (London : Oxford University Press, 1975) and *The Study of Religions* (New York : Seabury Press, 1977).

6. Jean L. HOLM, *Teaching Religion in School*, p. 7. Similar positions are advocated by R. M. RUMMARY, *Catechesis and Religious Education in a Pluralistic Society* (Huntington, Ind. : Our Sunday Visitor, 1976) : 119-162. See also Charles MELCHERT, « What Is Religious Education ? » *The Living Light* 14 (Fall 1977) : 339-352. Melchert's definition restricts the term to *understanding* religion.

fails to adequately embrace the depth and comprehensiveness inherent in it.

The encounter of religion and education should logically be called religious education. But when these words converge in our culture, they take on a strange and restrictive meaning. The operative meaning of the term is confined to a church context and whenever it attempts to operate outside that sphere, it still is affected by and carries with it much of the church's language.

Religious educators are baffled as to their self identity today. [7] The community of discourse is in disarray, the field in dislocation, and the enterprise without a coherent directing theory. [8] A kind of « lazy pluralism » (Marcuse) has set in in which all terms are uncritically accepted [9] in a smorgasbord of linguistic options. What we currently name religious education lacks a public language form [10] to articulate the full range of religious and educational questions that can emerge under its heading. The restrictive operation of the term conceals rather than reveals its scope, meaning, and purpose. The words need freeing from their domestication in a single institution. And the public needs to be empowered to discover and name the religious education at the center of their public lives.

There are considerable risks, however, in attempting to reconceptualize and reimage the meaning of the term. The dangers are twofold : (1) the reaction could become anti-ecclesiastical ; (2) the term could acquire a vague and abstract meaning — devoid of concreteness and particularity. Both dangers can be avoided — with genuine care and a close eye on the practical. One can love the church and yet critique its political control and monopoly over certain language, thought, and practice. Likewise, the change in meaning of a term may allow it to have greater precision and, at the same time, a universal reference.

---

7. See John WESTERHOFF, « A Discipline in Crisis, » *Religious Education* 74, 1 (January-February 1979) : 7-15 and *Who are We ? The Quest for a Religious Education* (Birmingham : Religious Education Press, 1978).

8. See Berard MARTHALER, « A Discipline in Quest of an Identity, » *Horizons* 3, 2 (1976) : 200-215 ; Charles MERCHERT, « Hope for the Profession, » *Religious Education* 67 (September-October 1972) : 39 and « Theory in Religious Education, » in *Foundations for Christian Education in an Era of Change*, ed. Marvin J. TAYLOR (Nashville : Abingdon Press, 1976), pp. 20-29. I take the position in this study that religious education is best described as a *field* rather than a discipline.

9. John WESTERHOFF, « Risking an Answer : A Conclusion, » in *Who Are We ? The Quest for a Religious Education*, pp. 264-277.

10. Dwayne HUEBNER, « The Language of Religious Education, » in *Tradition and Transformation in Religious Education*, ed. Padraic O'HARE (Birmingham : Religious Education Press, 1979), pp. 87-111.

The problematic raised here, however, poses that the current language of religious education is tied to an ecclesiastical world, politically employed on behalf of that world, and, consequently, limits our power to name and converse with the many institutions involved in religious education. The result is a field held in captivity by church problems, [11] bound by denominational interests and defined intramurally. It is unable to open avenues of communication and to enter public discourse on the urgent religious and educational questions confronting the human race. At the heart of the problem is the fact that people tend to use the same words but in different semantic universes.

To unravel this confusion and perplexity that haunts the enterprise, we must first attempt to get behind the various languages operative in the field today. This can be executed best by dealing with a number of terms which capsulize the diverse discourses. The terms are *catechetics, Christian education, theology,* and « *the objective study of religion.* » The languages surrounding these terms emerge from various traditions, carry their own assumptions, and house their own interests. Words are wedded to particular perceptions and presuppositions about reality. Behind the words lie the ideologies that form the foundation of our perceptions, thought, and action. When the world mediated through the word or term remains undisclosed to speaker and listener alike, it interferes with or nullifies competent communication. It is important, then, to work our way through these terms, to unveil their historical roots, examine their current claims, and specify their relation to religious education. The words of George Orwell seem particularly apropos in our present state of linguistic disorder. « One ought to recognize, » he wrote, « that our present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end. » [12]

Catechetics

When we enter the world of catechetics (and all its cognates), we are entering a universe of discourse which is specifically Catholic. Those who are not a part of that semantic universe tend to find much of its language incomprehensible and many of its assumptions questionable. This is not always clear to those who are deeply immersed in the tradition.

The use of the term « catechetics » or « catechesis » [13] can be traced back to early Christian times. [14] The original sense of the word suggests handing down speech from the heights. This root meaning was applied to the act of informing and instructing by oral repetition. It is this basic meaning which is the foundation of its special usage in the Catholic tradition. During the second, third, and fourth centuries catechesis signified instruction for the Christian neophyte. This coincided with the development of the catechumenate [15] which involved preparation for baptism, baptismal initiation, and post-baptismal instructions. By the late fifth century, however, the catechumenate had begun a rapid decline, and, with its demise, the term « catechesis » fell into disuse. Oral instruction, participation in the liturgy, and communal experience remained the chief mode of transmission of the Christian tradition in succeeding centuries. The Reformation period goaded respective opponents to put « the message » into written (catechism) form, with a question-and-answer format to anticipate all likely objections. Prominent among the respective opponents were Martin Luther and Peter Canisius, whose catechisms dictated the form and content of religious instruction for centuries. A direct descendant of that mentality was the Baltimore Catechism. First published in 1885 and revised in 1941, the Baltimore Catechism remained the dominant text in Catholic religious education in the United States until the Second Vatican Council (1962 - 1965). [16]

---

11. On some similar (and special) problems confronting Jewish religious education see Michael ROSENAK, « The Task of Jewish Religious Education Philosophy, » *Religious Education* 73, 5 (1978) : 315-328.

12. George ORWELL, « Politics and the English Language, » in *A Collection of Essays* (New York : Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1946), p. 170.

13. Berard MARTHALER defines « catechetics » as « the systematic presentation or study of the nature, goals, means, and principles of catechesis. » « Catechesis, » he writes, « suggests oral teaching. In the sense that it passes on what has been received, it is thought of as ʼresoundingʼ and ʼechoingʼ a message. » *Catechetics in Context* (Huntington, Ind. : Our Sunday Visitor, 1973), p.35.

14. F.X. MURPHY, « Catechesis, 1 (Early Christian), » in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 3 (New York : McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 208.

15. See Mary Charles BRYCE, « The Catechumenate — Past, Present and Future, » *American Ecclesiastical Review* 160 (1969) : 262-273, and Michael DUJARIER, *A History of the Catechumenate* (New York : Sadlier, 1979).

16. Mary Charles BRYCE, « The Influence of the Catechism of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Widely Used Elementary Religion Textbooks from its Conception in 1885 to its 1941 Revision » (Ann Arbor : University Microfilms, 1970). See also Michael DONNELLAN, « Bishops and Uniformity in Religious Education Vatican I to Vatican II, » *Living Light* 11, 2 (1973) : 237-248. Donnellan interprets the replacement of the catechism with a directory (The General Catechetical Directory) as a major landmark of change within Roman Catholicism.

The contemporary catechetical movement, however, had its roots in central Europe at the beginning of the century. Basic questions with regard to methodology, content, and purpose were emerging in educational church circles in Europe. Traditional teaching methods and forms of presentation were brought under critique. A receptivity and openness arose to the insights of educational psychology and a new theology. These events sparked off an energetic catechetical movement, which began to have its major impact in the United States in the late 1950 s. [17] At this time the word « catechetics » (and its cognates) was reclaimed and reintroduced into church dialogue and academic discourse. The focus of the movement was pastoral and closely connected with evangelization. The new catechetics was influenced by ecumenism and it derived much of its substance from Protestantism. Preaching, scripture study, and liturgical renewal were the center of its concern. Through energetic leadership, a flurry of new activity, and International Study Conferences, [18] the movement gained momentum in the 1960 s. The Second Vatican Council had vindicated its founders and embraced its concerns.

However, by the 1970 s, some glaring contradictions were becoming apparent : the more successful the catechetical work, the more the field and its people tended to disappear. [19] Moran called for its reconstruction and redirection through immersion in an educational context, sensitivity to the new ecumenical situation, and the creation of a new church pattern. The challenge, however, seemed too threatening. During the last decade catechetics has turned away from education and turned toward ministerial, evangelical, and corporate works. My interest here is not an extended history but, rather, merely to give a sense of the transition under which the term has gone. To help in this endeavor, we turn to the current catechetical scene in the United States.

The *National Catechetical Directory for Catholics of the United States*, entitled *Sharing the Light of Faith*, [20] has as its purpose the

17. Berard MARTHALER, « The Modern Catechetical Movement in Roman Catholicism : Issues and Problems, » *Religious Education* 73, 5-S, Special Ed. (September-October 1978) : S-77-S-91. Marthaler conceptualizes the evolution of the movement in three distinct phases : (1) the search for a method, (2) concern for content, and (3) broadening of context.

18. See Luis ERDOZAIN, « The Evolution of Catechetics, » *Lumen Vitae* 25 (1970) : 7-31.

19. Gabriel MORAN, « Catechetics, R.I.P., » *Commonweal* 18 (December 1970) : 299-302.

20. (Washington, D.C. : United States Catholic Conference, 1979). For a current analysis of this document, see Mary Charles BRYCE's « Sharing the Light

establishment of norms, guidelines, and practical directives for the catechesis of all Catholics in the U.S. at all age levels and in all circumstances of life. Extensive consultation went into formation of the document. [21] The result is a comprehensive statement of the nature, scope, purpose, and means of catechesis. The term « catechesis » is now expanded [22] to embrace the total process of « maturing in the faith. » It « refers to efforts which help individuals and communities acquire and deepen Christian faith and identity through initiation rites, instruction, and formation of conscience. » [23] Catechesis becomes a lifelong process for the individual, taking a multiplicity of forms, nurtured in numerous arenas and, in the final analysis, a constant and concerted pastoral activity performed by the whole church community. The directory sets catechesis within the framework of *pastoral ministry*. As a form of « ministry of the word, » it aims to foster the dispositions and nurture the attitudes leading to a deepening of one's religious affiliation and faith. There are few dimensions of church life that remain untouched by this new interpretation. In fact, catechesis has become an all-inclusive hermeneutical principle and process in the Roman Catholic church's self-understanding.

Sharing the Light of Faith has brought together and incorporated the best catechetical insights over the last thirty years. The document is rich in many respects. It shows an appropriate sensitivity to the formative influence of the total environment in people's lives. The central significance of the family in religious nurture is noted. The developmental character of « the life of faith » is acknowledged, along with particular tasks and methods appropriate for the principal stages of growth. And the naming of new ministries (and the church as a ministerial community) could have fundamental implications for the practice of church life.

However, my reservations with the directory and contemporary catechetics revolve around three major issues : language, church

of Faith, Catechetical Threshold for the U.S. Church, » *Lumen Vitae, 34*, 4 (1979) : 393-407.

21. Wilfrid H. PARADIS, « A Precedent Making Project in the Catholic Church : The Preparation of a National Catechetical Directory, » *Religious Education, 70*, 3 (May-June 1975) : 235-249.

22. This broadening in meaning of the term follows the lead of the *General Catechetical Directory* (Washington, D.C. : United States Catholic Conference, 1971). See Berard MARTHALER's commentary, *Catechetics in Context* (Huntington, Ind. : Our Sunday Visitor, 1973). Note also *To Teach as Jesus Did : A Pastoral Letter on Catholic Education* (Washington, D.C. : United States Catholic Conference, 1973).

23. No. 5, p. 3.

pattern, and education. The linguistic world of catechetics is decisively ecclesiastical and narrow in context. It is a self-enclosed religious world which utters a language that has no currency outside ecclesiastical circles. This intramural focus hinders its public viability. Its language form lacks communicative competence in the public forum. The linguistic nature of catechetics, as an intact universe of discourse, place obstacles in its path to conversation with other religious [24] and nonreligious traditions. Its ability to probe the religious and educational questions of our time is severely curtailed by a parochial and introverted self interest. Effective public discourse today requires an empowering public language that cuts across barriers (sexual, religious, nonreligious, etc.) and has universal implications. Dwayne Huebner observes : « We need a public language, as we need public buildings, public gardens, public transportation, public ceremonies. These public spaces, public means, public occasions provide grounds upon which we meet. They are the grounds for community. The public resources position us in our meetings with others. They offer orientation as we observe others work and listen to them speak. They give us direction as we do things together. » [25] It is this lack of a common language, in which to converse and « hear » each other, that cuts off much catechetical work from the daily experience of people. It needs linguistic bridges to link it to current societal (religious and educational) issues.

Contemporary catechetics receives its identity from a church institution and an ecclesiastical pattern back against which it fails to bring adequate critical reflection. [26] Bureaucratic structures and hierarchical control of the interpretative process remain unchallenged. The contradiction between the process of human development («maturing in faith ») [27] and the current church *form* is unrecognized or unacknowledged. An evangelistic undercurrent and an unreconstructed missionary mentality is part of established theory and prac-

---

24. Rabbi Marc H. TANENBAUM, commenting on the *General Catechetical Directory,* has noted how « the use of language is such that Judaism and the Jewish people are completely eclipsed or negated. » See « A Jewish Response, » *The Living Light* 3, 3 (1973) : 94-104. While the *National Catechetical Directory* attempts to correct this flaw (par 77), Jews, I believe, will remain uneasy with the document's claims and unsympathetic to its language.

25. Dwayne HUEBNER, « The Language of Religious Education, » in *Tradition and Transformation in Religious Education,* p. 90.

26. See Chapter IV, « The Church and Catechesis. »

27. Chapter VIII, « Catechesis Toward Maturity in Faith. »

tice. [28] However, the work and goals of catechesis, directed at the initiation and socialization [29] of people into the church, has arrived at a time when the present church pattern is being called into question. The *form* and *force* of socialization within the prevailing church structures needs continued and responsible challenging. If catechetics is to participate in this work and contribute to the creation of an alternative church form, an examination of some of its basic premises would seem to be in order.

The recent shift in catechesis to an expanded paradigm was motivated by a desire to go beyond a schooling model and to give greater priority to adults. This change of paradigm, however, has taken the enterprise outside an educational framework. It intentionally resists identification with education (and religious education). But this resistance has been costly. Religion, and religious issues and concerns, need to be placed today in an interactive (educational) framework of critical intelligence. This setting is needed to avoid the pitfalls of fundamentalism and fanaticism. When religion is placed in an educational context, it can make a decisively positive contribution to personal development and the quality of public life. However, the decision of catechesis to define itself in relation to church ministry limits its content and vision. There is a bureaucratic political power built into this semantic world, and words like ministry, faith, evangelization, etc. are rather well controlled within this ecclesiastical setting. They may not be sufficient for opening the church to public discourse and probing the issues of religious education today.

In sum, the terms « catechetics » and « religious education » cannot be used interchangeably. The former is limited and restricted to an ecclesial semantic world, whereas the latter has the ability to house the full range of religious and educational questions and concerns emerging in contemporary culture.

Christian Education

The Protestant counterpart to « catechetics » is « Christian education. » The term is relatively recent in its current meaning but now firmly established. Any continued use of the term cannot ignore the historical connotations embedded in it. At the beginning of this

---

28. Par. 34 and 35. See also Berard MARTHALER, « Evangelization and Catechesis : Word, Memory, Witness, » *The Living Light* 16, 1 (Spring 1979) : 33-45.

29. Berard MARTHALER, « Socialization as a Model for Catechetics, » in *Foundations of Religious Education,* ed. Padraic O'HARE (New York : Paulist Press, 1978), pp. 64-92.

century, religious education became an established field of study and inquiry. In 1903 the Religious Education Association was founded in Chicago with its chartered purpose (as formulated two years later) « to inspire the educational forces of our country with the religious ideal ; to inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal ; and to keep before the public mind the ideal of religious education, and the sense of its need and value. » [30] The founders [31] were an outstanding group of mainline Protestant leaders and educators. They were motivated by a desire to unify and broaden the nation's understanding of religious education, particularly through an educational reform of the Sunday School and the preservation of moral and religious perspectives in the public school. John Dewey was a keynote speaker at its first convention. [32]

Spurred by the twin influences of progressive education and liberal theology, the movement displayed an optimism with deep social concerns and broad religious interests. George Albert Coe's *A Social Theory of Religious Education* [33] and Harrison Elliott's *Can Religious Education Be Christian* [34] could roughly act as bookends to mark off and characterize its first distinctive period — the progressive era. In many respects, it can be said that religious education during these first few decades tended to spread out into a kind of vague amorphous generation beyond all denominations. [35] People wanted to be religious in a general way but not in any particular sense. A « common faith, » it was suggested, bound people together. [36]

30. *Proceedings of the Third Annual Convention of the Religious Education Association* (Chicago : Religious Education Association, 1905), p. 474.

31. See Boardman W. KATHAN, « William Rainey Harper : Founder of the Religious Education Association, » *Religious Education*, Special Ed., 73, 5-S (September-October 1978) : S-7-S-16.

32. John DEWEY, « Religious Education as Conditioned by Modern Psychology and Pedagogy, » in *Proceedings of the First Annual Convention of Religious Education Association,* February 10-12, 1903, pp. 60-66. Reprinted in *Religious Education* 66, 1 (January-February 1974) : 6-11.

33. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917).

34. (New York : Macmillan, 1940).

35. As representative examples see George Albert COE, « Religious Education as a Part of General Education, » *Religious Education Association, Proceedings First Convention, 1903,* pp. 44-52 ; Frederick TRACY, « The Meaning of Religious Education, » *Religious Education* 17 (February 1922) : 3-8 ; William Clayton BOWER, « A Curriculum for Character and Religious Education in a Changing Era, » *Religious Education* 25 (February 1930) : 127-133. For Coe, religious education « *is* general education. » Tracy understands it as a process of facilitating « personality development. » And Bower identifies it as « character education. »

36. See John DEWEY, *A Common Faith* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1934).

This led to a down playing of the particularity and distinctiveness of one's religious tradition.

But the events of World War I and the collapse of idealism in Europe signaled a counterattack. A reaction came within the Christian church itself — a reaction against the reduction of the Christian life to one religion in the general category of religion. In the 1930 s the effects of this counter-offensive were felt in the United States with the impact of a neo-orthodox theology. Neo-orthodoxy was concerned with the specificity of the Christian tradition and the transmission of its belief systems. It insisted that Christianity is based upon « a revealed word » : a pure message beyond human experience. Inspired by the new theology and challenged particularly by H. Shelton Smith, [37] religious educators were now urged to reexamine their (liberal) theological foundations and to redirect their work by reclaiming their distinctive Christian roots. One of the implications of this theological reconstruction was the emergence and self-conscious embracing of the term « Christian education » in Protestant circles. [38] Christian education, in effect, became the educational *method* to apply neo-orthodox theology. And educational *techniques* and related sciences were put at the service of « proclaiming a message of salvation. »

The net effect, however, was the escape of « Christian education » out of the *educational* mainstream. It acquired an understanding of itself as a theological discipline, [39] a branch of pastoral theology, and was assigned to the practical life of the church — especially the church-school. The rise of Nazism and World War II would only strengthen this trend and hasten its exit from an educational context. The term « Christian education » reigned supreme in Protestant church-schools and seminaries in the United States — and continues to do so to this day. Attempts were made to broaden the term and

37. *Faith and Nurture* (New York : Scribner's Sons 1941). Smith's long awaited book had been preceded by his warnings in « Let Religious Educators Reckon with the Barthians, » *Religious Education* 24 (January 1934) : 45-51.

38. See for example Lewis SHERRILL, *The Rise of Christian Education* (New York : Macmillan, 1944) and Kendig B. CULLY, *The Search for a Christian Education — Since* 1940 (Philadelphia : Westminster, 1965).

39. See Kendig B. CULLY, *op. cit.* ; Randolph Crump MILLER, « Christian Education as a Theological Discipline and Method, » *Religious Education* 48 (November-December 1953) : 409-414 ; D. Campbell WYCKOFF, « Religious Education as a Discipline, » *Religious Education* 62 (September-October 1967) : 387-394. Wyckoff suggests that Christian education is a special case of religious education within the field of practical theology.

extend its implications. [40] But, substantially, it retained its close ties to neo-orthodoxy. The interchange of terms « religious education » and « Christian education » became common parlance. However, this casual interchange of words had pervasive implications in the form of political control.

In recent years, the traditional framework of « Christian education » has been challenged, particularly by John Westerhoff, but the term retained. Westerhoff's point of departure is the observation that we have become victimized by a schooling-instruction paradigm and bound by its limits. [41] He directs our attention to the broader educational context in church, namely, its worship, congregational life, social action, etc. Christian education is now defined as a deliberate and systematic « faith enculturation » process of the community enabling people to evolve Christian lifestyles. [42] The aim is to shift our attention from school to community locus, from child to adult focus, and from individual to communal concerns. [43] The new paradigm is an eclectic attempt to link education (broadly defined) with a liberation mode of theology. [44]

---

40. C. Ellis NELSON, *Where Faith Begins* (Atlanta : John Knox Press, 1967) ; « Is Church Education Something Particular ? » *Religious Education* 67 (January-February 1972) : 15-16 ; « Our Oldest Problem, » in *Tradition and Transformation in Religious Education*, op. cit., pp. 58-72.

41. John H. WESTERHOFF, *Values for Tomorrow's Children : An Alternative Future for Education in the Church* (Piladelphia : Pilgrim Press, 1970).

42. John H. WESTERHOFF, *A Colloquy on Christian Education* (Philadelphia : Pilgrim Press, 1972). See especially Chapters 7 and 9 ; *Generation to Generation* (Philadelphia : United Church Press, 1974, Chapter 2, and *Will Our Children Have Faith* (New York : Seabury, 1976), Chapter 3. In a more recent essay, Westerhoff refers to Christian education as any education engaged in by Christians « in which our faith influences our educational efforts » (in « Risking an Answer : A Conclusion, » op. cit., p. 266). Paul HIRST convincingly argues against this position : « The idea that there is a characteristically or distinctively Christian form of education seems just as much a mistake as the idea that there is a distinctively Christian form of mathematics, of engineering or of farming. » See « Christian Education : A Contradiction in Terms ? » *Learning for Living*, 11, 4 (1972) : 6-11.

43. For a good summary and critique of Westerhoff's writings, see *The Resurgence of Religious Instruction* (Notre Dame, Ind. : Religious Education Press, 1977), pp. 151-169, and « Two Scholarly Views on Religious Education : Lee and Westerhoff, » *Lumen Vitae*, 32, 1 (1977) : 7-44, by Didier-Jacques PIVETEAU and J. T. DILLON.

44. Malcolm WARFORD moves into a somewhat similar paradigm — employing the critical educational methodology of Paulo Freire. *The Necessary Illusion : Church Culture and Educational Change* (Philadelphia : United Church Press, 1976). See also J.C. WYNN, *Christian Education for Liberation* (Nashville : Abingdon Press, 1977).

In spite of the best efforts at reconstruction and reform, Christian education today remains weighed down with many of the restrictions and limitations previously noted in catechetics. Its problems are linguistic, ecclesial, and educational. Discourse takes place in a field where words are politically (ecclesiastically) controlled and intramurally defined. There is no way the word *Christian* can embrace the diversity of *religious* expression in contemporary United States. The Christian tradition has a unique contribution to make to religious education. [45] However, a free and easy interchange of terms is intolerable and insensitive in our current religious situation. The term « Christian education » is a block to interreligious dialogue today and excludes the introduction of an adequate public language to open up communication in our public world. Its perspective turns the mind of each denomination upon itself and leaves untouched the prevailing church pattern of power and classification. Recent attempts to critically reclaim the term leave unchallenged its linguistic inadequacies and the historical presuppositions built into it. [46]

One can legitimately suspect, I believe, that the unsolved problem of « Christian education » is inextricably tied to the question George Albert Coe raised some fifty years ago : « Shall the primary purpose of Christian education be to hand on a religion or to create a new world ? » [47] I am not sure that that question has been confidently answered to this day. However, I do feel assured that a creative response can only be worked out in a larger context, under the term « religious education, » where the full scope of religious and educational questions is allowed to emerge.

---

45. See Maria HARRIS' insightful essay « Word, Sacrament, Prophecy, » in *Tradition and Transformation in Religious Education*, op. cit., pp. 35-57.

46. Thomas GROOME, « The Critical Principle in Christian Education and the Task of Prophecy, » *Religious Education* 72 (May-June 1977) : 262-272 ; « Christian Education : A Task of Present Dialectical Hermeneutics, » *The Living Light* 14 (Fall 1977) : 408-423 ; and « Christian Education for Freedom : A 'Shared Praxis' Approach, » in *Foundations of Religious Education*, ed. Padraic O'HARE (New York : Paulist Press, 1978), pp. 8-39 ; « Shared Christian Praxis, a Possible Theory/Method of Religious Education, » *Lumen Vitae* 31, 2 (1976) : 186-208 ; « The Crossroads : A Story of Christian Education by Shared Praxis, » *Lumen Vitae*, 32, 1 (1977) : 45-70. See GROOME's forthcoming *Christian Religious Education : Sharing our Story and Vision* (New York : Harper & Row, 1980).

47. George Albert COE, *What Is Christian Education ?* (New York : Scribner's Sons, 1929), p. 29.

Theology

The need to attend to the term *theology* arises on two fronts : first, the ever-recurrent debate in the field with regard to the relationship of theology to catechetics/Christian education/religious education ; and second, the question of the viability of the term itself.

The way religious educators connect to theology has been an issue since the inception of religious education as a field of study. [48] At the turn of the century, the first generation of (Protestant) religious educators embraced a liberal theology and wed it to modern psychology and a progressive pedagogy. This synthesis laid the foundation for the initial vitality of the field. However, by the late 30 s and early 40 s the previous optimism had dissipated and new concerns revolved around the distinctiveness of the Christian tradition and a recognition of the sinfulness of the human condition. These concerns were expressed theologically in the form of neo-orthodoxy, and religious educators (read « Christian educators ») turned in its direction for inspiration and guidance. [49] In the 1950 s Randolph Crump Miller reinforced the link with his proposal that theology be « the clue » [50] to Christian education by undergirding it and providing a backdrop for its work.

On the Roman Catholic side, the catechetical movement in this century was initially a form of protest against an « intellectualized theology. » Josef Andreas Jungmann's book, *The Good News Yesterday and Today*, [51] had broken new ground with its pastoral (theology) approach and gave the catechetical movement an orientation it has not lost to this day. Jungmann's work and ideas were

48. See Norma H. Thompson, « Current Issues in Religious Education, » *Religious Education* 73, 6 (November-December 1978) : 611-626, and Ian P. Knox, *Above or Within : The Supernatural in Religious Education* (Mishawaka, Ind. : Religious Education Press, 1976). Knox demonstrates the influence of various theological metaperspectives on some leading religious education theorists.

49. For representative examples see Knox, *Above or Within*, Chapter 4, and Harold William Burgess, *An Invitation to Religious Education* (Mishawaka, Ind. : Religious Education Press, 1975), Chapter 4.

50. Randolph Crump Miller, *The Clue to Christian Education* (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950). See also a similar position advocated by James C. Logan, *Theology as a Shaping the Church's Educational Work* (Nashville : Board of Discipleship, United Methodist Church, 1974).

51. Joseph Andreas Jungmann, *The Good News Yesterday and Today*, ed. Johannes Hofinger, S.J. (New York Sadlier, 1962). First published under the title *Die Frohbotschaft und unsere Glaubensverkündigung* (The Good News and Our Proclamation of the Faith), in 1936.

effectively disseminated by Johannes Hofinger [52] and became the basis for kerygmatic and salvation history [53] movements, which were very influential in the 1950 s and early 1960 s. Liberalism had a rebirth of sorts in Roman Catholicism in the 1960 s, but it never attained a solid footing in established catechetical circles, where a (neo)orthodox spirit predominated. In the current state of theological pluralism, however, Protestant and Catholic religious educators freely participate in the diversity of options available.

For the most part, throughout our history, there has been an unquestioned assumption that the health and future of religious education is bound to the future of theology. [54] The only variation has been the school of theology followed. It is not an exaggeration to say that the story of religious education has, in effect, been the story of an educational *method* in the service of the prevailing theology. The result has been the subservience of catechetics/Christian education/religious education to the discipline of theology. This historical fact has politically controlled the conceptualization of theory within the field, given professionals in academia an inferiority complex, and restricted the activities of practitioners.

In practice, theology (and theologians) have controlled the symbols of our religious imagination, supplying the terms, metaphors, and meanings for our work. Gabriel Moran notes the problem : « The ecclesiastical language of religious education is governed by the relation of theology (including the Christian Scriptures) to catechetics/Christian education. Nothing is allowed into the ' content ' of catechetics/Christian education unless approved by theology. The main thing to be studied about the ecclesiastical form of religious education is the meaning of theology. » [55] This situation has largely

52. Johannes Hofinger, *The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine* (Notre Dame, Ind. : University of Notre Dame Press, 1962).

53. See Mary C. Boys, « Heilsgeschichte as a Hermeneutical Principle in Religious Education » (Ed. D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1978).

54. This position has recently been advocated by Sara Little, « Theology and Religious Education, » in *Foundations for Christian Education in an Era of Change*, ed. Marvin J. Taylor (Nashville : Abingdon Press, 1976) : 30-40 ; Berard Marthaler, « Catechesis and Theology, » *Proceedings : The Catholic Theological Society of America* 28 (1973) : 261-270 ; Randolph Crump Miller, « Theology and the Future of Religious Education, » *Religious Education* 72, 1 (January-February 1977) : 46-60 ; and « Continuity and Contrast in the Future of Religious Education, » in *The Religious Education We Need*, ed. James Michael Lee (Mishawaka, Ind. : Religious Education Press, 1977), pp. 38-39.

55. Gabriel Moran, « Two Languages of Religious Education, » *The Living Light* 14 (Spring 1977) : 8.

gone unchallenged,[56] with the result that the field of religious education has been captive to theological/ecclesiastical language and limited in its content and scope.

These remarks are *not* meant in any way to disparage theology (or theologians) or to suggest that religious educators in our churches (or other public agencies) can neglect the Christian past, its sacred writings and symbolic life. Religious educators working, for example, within the Christian tradition would be irresponsible to ignore this material or fail to use it for the enrichment of people's lives. At issue here, however, is a simple linguistic distinction between the *religious* and the *theological,* but a distinction nevertheless, not easily admitted in church discussion due to political control. I wish to anchor my analysis again around the questions of language, church form, and education.

The prevailing tendency to interchange the words religious/theology indicates little awareness of the religious as (1) a *wider* field and (2) having a *variety of different* expressions than theology. The word « religious » is a term capable of embracing all the ultimate questions and concerns arising in contemporary civilization. It has a conciseness and comprehensiveness to it that allows all people (Christian, Jew, Hindu, etc.) to claim it as their own and meet in ecumenical dialogue under its canopy. On the other hand, theology, *historically,* is almost exclusively a Christian term.[57] Some people have worked to expand its meaning and to bring in a broader variety of activities under its heading.[58] However, I doubt that the term can be shaken loose from its deep association with Christian

56. James Michael LEE has consistently rejected the determinative role of theology in religious *instruction*. See *The Shape of Religious Instruction* (Mishawaka, Ind. : Religious Education Press, 1971), pp. 245-257 ; *The Flow of Religious Instruction* (Mishawaka, Ind. : Religious Education Press, 1973), pp. 20-27. My criticism of theology and its role differs in kind and substance from Lee's. For a critique of Lee's position see Padraic O'HARE, « The Image of Theology in the Educational Theory of James Michael Lee, » *The Living Light* 11 (Fall 1974) : 452-458.

57. On problems related to Jewish uses of the term « theology » see Samuel SANDMEL, « Reflections on the Problem of Theology for Jews, » *The Journal of Bible and Religion* 33, 1 (1965) : 101-112.

58. For two representative examples see David TRACY, *Blessed Rage for Order : The New Pluralism in Theology* (New York : Seabury, 1975), and Robert McAfee BROWN, *Theology in a New Key* (Philadelphia : Westminster, 1978). Tracy distinguishes between fundamental theology (« philosophical reflection upon the meanings present in common human experience and language, and upon the meanings present in the Christian fact » (p. 43), and dogmatic theology (as a confessional discipline). Brown focuses his work on liberation themes and advocates Christian solidarity with the oppressed.

traditions and divested of its connotations. Of equal importance is the fact that many contemporary religious groups want no share in the word « theology. » For them, the word and the world (paradigm of consciousness) has lost its credibility. They pursue their religious interests and insights through alternative means and modes of consciousness (e.g., arts, literature, spiritual disciplines, rituals, etc.). Christian sensitivity demands, I believe, that the term « theology » not be indiscriminately imposed upon those who do not identify with it.

There are problems, however, inherent to theology that need correction if it is to play a *part* in opening up religious perspectives and contribute to religious education. In spite of recent reform and revision, the majority of theological thought and discourse is caught into a highly technical, academic, and esoteric mode of expression.[59] This semantic world has lost its roots in human experience[60] and lacks existential import to move people in their lives. This criticism is not anti-intellectual. Rather, it is an expression of concern about the division of labor between professionals and practitioners. Stated another way : my concern is an *educational* concern for a public language that allows people to « pass over » in dialogue into the lives of others and to « come home » more human.[61] This educative potential of theology rests on the reconstruction of a viable public language that opens up conversation across religious and nonreligious lives, and rings true to what people feel and know in their depths.[62] This would enable theology to relinquish its tendency to prop up current patterns of power and class in our churches, and allow it to

59. See Carl L. RASCHKE, « The End of Theology, » *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 46, 2 (1978) : 159-179. Raschke critiques theology for its representational thinking and its proclivity for « referring to the divine as an ' object ' that can be re-presented and manipulated in accordance with the structures of the expressing subject » (p. 170).

60. This criticism is also made by Tom DRIVER in *Patterns of Grace : Human Experience as Word of God* (New York : Harper & Row, 1977). The method of story and journey are some constructive attempts to come to terms with this problem in contemporary theology.

61. The terms « passing over » and « coming home » are John DUNNE's. See *A Search for God in Time and Memory* (New York : Macmillan, 1967) ; *The Way of All the Earth* (New York : Macmillan, 1972) ; and *The Reasons of the Heart* (Notre Dame, Ind. : University of Notre Dame, 1978).

62. William JOHNSON predicts that « Western theology of the next century will address itself primarily to dialogue with the East. » At the same time Johnson is convinced that we do not as yet have an adequate theological vocabulary to enter fully into such a dialogue. See *The Inner Eye of Love* (New York : Harper & Row, 1978), pp. 9-10.

act as a liberating force in people's lives. In this endeavor, however, theology needs some outside help, namely, the domain of education.

Theology has a glaring educational problem. The problem is *not* simply the lack of an educational *method* to transmit its « content. » Rather, the difficulty is a lack of a wider educational *context* in which to look at itself and its claims in relation to other competing perspectives. This process will not come easy and could heighten the points of tension between the two. However, there is no viable alternative. Theology needs an educational context to enable it to be self-critical, [63] to examine its basic claims and the word itself. This would allow theology to shed itself of ideological distortions, have emancipatory *educational* interests, and reestablish its work on new religious foundations. [64] This reconstruction may more appropriately be named Christian studies.

In this regard, Norma Thompson observes : « When one sits in a class which includes Roman Catholic, Protestants of many theological persuasions, Jews, Buddhists, and sometimes others, one wonders if there is any meaningful usage of the term, ' theology, ' because it is so related to Christian thought. » [65] In like manner, Gabriel Moran writes, « The first and obvious question for theology is the appropriateness of the word theology. The word has pretentious connotations of speaking for God or about God. For the purpose of articulating a Christian position it is not obvious that the word theology is either necessary or helpful. » « At least, » he continues, « anyone using the word theology ought to be sensitive to the fact that many people are immediately suspicious of the claims inherent to the word. » [66] A renaming of this important work could alleviate some current con-

63. For representative examples of « Critical Theology » see Charles DAVIS, « Theology and Praxis, » *Cross Currents* 2 (Summer 1973) : 154-168 ; « Toward a Critical Theology, » in *Philosophy of Religion and Theology*, ed. James W. McCLENDON, JR. (Missoula : University of Montana, 1975) : 213-229 ; Edward SCHILLEBEECKX, *The Understanding of Faith* (New York : Seabury Press, 1974), pp. 124-155 ; Gregory BAUM, *Religion and Alienation* (New York : Paulist Press, 1975), pp. 193-226 ; and David TRACY, *Blessed Rage for Order*. In a critique of some current forms of liberation theology, Schubert OGDEN notes : « The vast majority of theologies have been, in effect if hardly in intent, Christian ideologies, in the precise sense of rationalizing the prior claims of the Christian witness instead of critically inquiring as to their meaning and truth, » in *Faith and Freedom* (Nashville : Abingdon, 1979), p. 33.

64. See Gabriel MORAN, *The Present Revelation : The Search for Religious Foundations* (New York : Herder & Herder, 1972).

65. Norma H. THOMPSON, « Current Issues in Religious Education, » *Religious Education* 73, 6 (November-December 1978) : 613.

66. Gabriel MORAN, « Two Languages of Religious Education, » *The Living Light* 14 (Spring 1977) : 8.

fusion and indicate a shift to a less arrogant and more open public posture.

In sum, « theology » can no longer assume to control religious discourse in contemporary society. The term could legitimately designate one paradigm for understanding (the *Christian*) religion. What it cannot do, however, is supply *all* the metaphors, models, and meanings for the « new religious consciousness. »

« The Objective Study of Religion »

The final section focuses on the term « the objective study of religion. » The selection of this term allows the opportunity to examine *one* component of religious education, namely, *religious studies*, and to unravel some of the issues involved.

Religion is an ingrained part of our national life in the United States. Historically, the nation and its people have been lured by religious dreams and lived under religious ideals. For better and worse these effects have spilled over into our frontier spirit, space programs, foreign policy, national holidays, communal experimentations, and current liberation movements, etc. An understanding of the religious phenomenon and religious traditions, then, is indispensable for an edequate comprehension of our culture. It is an educational necessity and one means to promote cultural awareness. Religion, then, ought to be *taught* and *studied*.

The public sector of education is an obvious place to engage in religious studies. In spite of the widespread contrary assumption, this study of religion is constitutionally acceptable [67] in public schools in the United States: On the college and university level, a considerable number of programs have been initiated during the last decade or so. [68] However, little progress has been made at the elementary and secondary school levels. Efforts are being hampered here by an unsure search for an appropriate form. The root of the problem here is linguistic, due to the inadequate terms controlling discourse on the topic.

67. Abington v. Schempp ; and Murray v. Curlett, 374 U.S. 203, 1963.

68. See for example *Religion in Public Education* (New York : Paulist Press, 1974), Part III, ed. David E. ENGEL ; *Religious Education* 67 (July-August 1972), Part II ; *Teaching about Religion in Public Schools* (Niles, Ill. : Argus Communications, 1977), ed. Nicholas PREDISCALZI and William COLLIE ; and Barbara SUYHART, « The Academic Teaching about Religion : A Teacher Education Program at San Diego State University (in process), » *Religious Education* 71, 2 (March-April 1976) : 202-213.

Two phrases inevitably emerge in the literature on religion and public schooling : « the objective study of religion » and « teach about religion. » In terms of clarifying the discussion, it is doubtful if this phraseology can aid the advancement of this sector of religious education. It is misleading, miseducational, and has an anti-ecclesiastical tone.

The term « the objective study of religion » has its roots in the nineteenth century. The critique of religion was in full swing and many of its critics wanted to get out from under theology and have the freedom to examine religion scientifically. They wanted to make it clear to academia and the church that the study of religion in the university was independent of external ecclesiastical control and governed by its own criteria. This move was successful and served its purpose. However, it also brought its problems. In reaction to church domination, this new science claimed total neutrality and scientific objectivity. Consequently, its language displayed an attitude of « antiseptic observation. » This shows up today in much of the literature on religion and public education.

If the meaning of the word « objectivity » is to be uninvolved in the subject and to present « the bare facts » uncolored by human interests, that is impossible [69] — and not educationally desirable. If, on the other hand, objectivity means to transcend one's own individual standpoint and, by the power of sympathetic imagination, to present one's own world and the world of others in a fair, balanced, and sympathetic manner, then objectivity is demanded in any teaching-learning situation. Philip Phenix wisely notes, however, that this posture is better named and interpreted as *disciplined intersubjectivity*. [70] There is no neutral point : only a commitment to uninhibited interaction and inquiry in which understanding is sought. Disciplined intersubjectivity excludes proselytizing or dogmatic platforms, and includes any perspectives or domain for consideration and investigation.

The second term « teaching about religion » is taken from a Supreme Court ruling [71] and enjoys wide usage in educational circles. [72] The term is counterposed to the phrase : « teaching of

religion. » « Teaching about religion » intends to convey the sense of objectivity ; while the « teaching of religion » assumes sectarian advocacy and affiliation. The standard procedure today is to employ this *legalistic* distinction and to presume the terms are adequate in an *educational* context. The distinction makes for good legal policy but does not lend itself to good educational philosophy and discourse. Moran observes : « The phrase ' teaching about religion ' creates an artificial notion of objectivity and gives the language of ' teaching religion ' to many people who indoctrinate rather than teach. » [73] It may be beneficial, then, if the terms « the objective study of religion » and « teaching about religion » were left aside in favor of an educational language befitting an educational setting.

The appropriate thing to do with religion, therefore, in our public schools and universities, is to *teach* it. The teaching, like any subject, should be competent, critical, and understanding. This will not fracture the principle of the separation of church and state. Rather, it will uphold the educational integrity of our public school and allow religion and the religious to be a maturing force in students' lives.

In church and synagogue settings, religious studies should operate with the same educational spirit and function with similar academic methods and standards. They should be characterized by an honest critical comparison of all religious traditions so as to guarantee the integrity and freedom of the educational process. This study *within* religious traditions needs « an adequate rhetoric » [74] if it is to open authentic dialogue and move us toward mutual understanding. This is *not* a call for a homogeneous language form or a neglect of the specific symbols and semantic world expressive of distinct religious traditions. Rather, the position outlined in this essay respects the rights of particular communities of faith to construct their own specific terminology and to develop language forms (e.g., liturgical, catechetical, etc.) that honor their uniqueness and consolidate their identity. [75] In fact, fidelity to truth and to the religious adventure

69. See Jurgen HABERMAS, *Knowledge and Human Interest* (Boston : Beacon Press, 1971). Also for a critique of scientifique objectivity, cf. Michael POLANYI, *Personal Knowledge : Towards a Post Critical Philosophy* (Chicago : University of Chicago, 1959).

70. Philip PHENIX, « Religion in Public Education : Principles and Issues, » in *Religion in Public Education*, op. cit., pp. 57-74.

71. Abington v. Schempp, *op. cit.*

72. Representative example see Claire Cox, *The Fourth R : What Can Be*

Taught about Religion in the Public School (New York : Hawthorne Books, 1969) ; Margherite LA POTA, « Religion : ' Not Teaching ' but ' Teaching About, ' » *Educational Leadership : Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum* 31 (October 1973) : 30-34 ; and Paul WILLS, « An Approach to Teaching about Religion in the Public Schools, » *Religious Education* 66, 2 (March-April 1971) : 145-148.

73. Gabriel MORAN, « Two Languages of Religious Education, » p. 13.

74. Raimundo PANIKKAR, *The Intra-Religious Dialogue* (New York : Paulist Press, 1978) : xiv.

75. For representative examples of the distinctiveness of specific religious languages see Paul RICŒUR, « The Language of Faith, » *USQR : Union Se-*

beckons us to rediscover and reclaim our own religious roots and rhetoric. It is through, with, and in our particular communities of faith that we are allowed to see the universal truth beyond our own traditions. My concern here, however, is to guard the educational integrity of the study of religion in *all* educative settings so that the educational process will facilitate the formulation of intelligible religion. This meeting of religion and education (in the form of religious studies) does not exhaust their encounter in our culture. It is, however, one important component of religious education. But, for its own health, it needs interaction with other forms and diverse expressions of religious education.

This study has been an examination of the language currently operative in religious education. The investigation focused on some key terms closely tied to the identity of the field. Through the educative work of linguistic discrimination and critique, I attempted to uncover the meaning of these terms and their relation to religious education. My observation has been that the terms catechetics/Christian education/theology/« objective study of religion » are ecclesiastically governed : the first two directly by theology ; the latter in reaction to it. The language lacks communicative competence in the public world and restricts religious education in its search for an identity.

Religious education is the logical and appropriate name for a field that embraces educational and religious concerns. The term allows us to stand Janus-faced : looking back to our origins and forward to undreamt possibilities. The challenge now is to take the words seriously, with a kind of precision and comprehensiveness that the words deserve. This will allow religious educators to reconceptualize their work, name the multiplicity of arenas where it can be found, and rediscover a new identity and constituency.

minary Quarterly Review, 28, 3 (Spring 1973) : 213-224 ; « The Specificity of Religious Language, » *Semia*, 4 (1975) : 107-148 ; and David TRACY, *Blessed Rage for Order : The New Pluralism in Theology*, pp. 119-145, 204-236.

Religious Instruction
In the Belgian Official Schools
A Twenty-Year-Old Educational Agreement

by Maurice SIMON

*Professor in the Theological Faculty of the Catholic University of Louvain**

Over the past fifteen years, the Church's hierarchy has several times expressed its concern to ensure that the Christian education of all the young baptized is carefully attended to, whether or not they go to Catholic schools. I am thinking here of Vatican II's *Declaration on Christian Education,* in which the Council Fathers state : « The Church is keenly aware of her very grave obligation to give zealous attention to the moral and religious education of all her children. To those large numbers of them who are being trained in schools which are not Catholic, she needs to be present with her special affection and helpfulness. » [1] I am thinking, too, of the *General Catechetical Directory,* published by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy in accord with the conciliar decree on the pastoral office of bishops : the Directory invites the Episcopal

* Born in Le Rœulx (Belgium) in 1928, Maurice SIMON entered the Major Seminary of Tournai in 1948 and was ordained priest of that diocese in 1952. Having taken his doctorate in theology at the Catholic University of Louvain, he served for four years as a parish curate in Ath. In 1959 he was appointed Vice-President of the O.D.E.R. (Diocesan Religious Education Office) and taught at the Higher Institute for Religious Studies, Charleroi, till 1967. Since 1965, he has been lecturing in the Theological Faculty of the Catholic University of Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve). His recent publications on catechesis include : « Vatican II et le mouvement catéchétique, » in the *Revue théologique de Louvain,* 1978, pp. 52-82, and « Trente ans de catéchèse d'adultes, » in *Catéchèse,* 1978, pp. 491-504. — Address : rue Joseph Sneessens, 29, B-1350 Limal (Editor's note).

1. *Gravissimum educationis momentum* (28-10-1965), no. 7. The Declaration goes on to say : « This she does through the living witness of those who teach and direct such students, through the apostolic activity of their schoolmates, but most of all through the services of the priests and laymen who transmit to them the doctrine of salvation... » (from *The Documents of Vatican II,* Chapman, 1966).