*Michael Chambers**

VITALITY AND LOYALTY IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: RENEWING FORMS OR PERPETUATING THE MYTH?

Abstract
This article seeks to engage with the competing claims to loyalty and vitality in religious education in Australian Catholic schools. It argues that the dominant narrative of religious education in Australian Catholic schools has suppressed alternative stories and may not be the most appropriate narrative for contemporary debate about loyalty and vitality. One alternative story was proposed by William Duncan in Brisbane in 1850. Duncan's views on religious education can serve as an inspiration to religious educators in Catholic schools as they engage with new issues and seek vital and loyal forms of religious education.

Introduction

The nature and purpose of religious education in Catholic schools is contested. In the Australian context, religious education and evangelisation are central to competing claims. One claim argues that the task of religious education in the Catholic school is to lead students into the worship, beliefs, practices and ethics of the Catholic Church (English, 2004a, p. 43; 2004b, pp. 21-22; Rummery, 1975, p. 5). For some religious educators, this task perseveres in contemporary religious education because the Catholic school is, for some students, their only experience of Church. Consequently, Catholic schools are required to assume a *de facto* responsibility for a "church experience". This claim places great emphasis on the forms and understandings of catechesis in the school. A competing claim argues that schools cannot be quasi-parishes. Rather, this claim argues, schools need to continue developing their forms of religious instruction and catechesis (Rossiter, 1981a, pp. 24-25; 1981b, pp. 168-169; Rummery, 1975, pp. 136-142). Further to this claim, Australian Catholic schools are still developing their understanding of religious education theory and ecclesial documentation. The success of Australian Catholic schools hinges on their forms of religious education and evangelisation. This paper seeks to engage further with the arguments as a "sign of vitality and loyalty to the institution that is emerging" (Ryan, 2001, p. 227). In particular, it seeks to illustrate an alternative vision of vitality and loyalty that was proposed by colonial educator and reformer William Duncan in the 1850s and offers this as a possible stimulus for new forms of vitality and loyalty in contemporary religious education in Australia.

Vitality and Loyalty in Australian Religious Education 1844-1872

Vitality and loyalty in religious education have, historically, been measured by the number of students who remain faithful and communicant Catholics during and after their Catholic schooling. Moreover, this measurement of vitality and loyalty can be seen to originate with the debate about national and denominational systems of schooling in the early 1800s (Ryan, 2002, pp. 2-3). This measurement resulted in

the view that the primary function and purpose of religious education was to hand on the Catholic tradition to the extent that it sustained parish life. This view has perpetuated and remains dominant in Australia. It, too, has been the dominant view in other parts of the world (Wright, 2004, p. 181).

In 1844, the Parliament of New South Wales passed a bill to establish a system of education similar to that of the Irish National System. Although this bill was eventually abandoned, the debate about the system of schooling - National or Denominational - was firmly established. In the ensuring years the majority of Australian Catholics, specifically the Irish, were to resist the National system in favour of a Denominational system. Support for the Denominational system was founded on a fear of proselytism (that the National system would expose to Catholics) and a desire to protect and maintain Catholic identity. Whilst resistance to the National system has, through the passing of the years, become legendary and heroic, it has obscured other stories that sought to promote Catholic education and religious education in Australia.

This view of vitality and loyalty was also a consequence of the "insular and isolated" (Ryan, 2002, p. 3) state of Australian Catholicism. In some ways this insularity and isolation mirrored that of European Catholicism. In response to the threats of modern liberalism and the threats to the Papal States (*Risorgimento*) and the temporal authority of the pope, Pius IX promulgated the *Syllabus of Errors* in 1864. The *Syllabus* was a list of 80 condemned theses attached to the encyclical *Quanta Cura*. It condemned aspects of rationalism and liberalism and sought to uphold the authority of the papacy and the Church itself (McBrien, 1995, p. 1233). Molony (1969, pp. 110-115) argues that the *Syllabus* had minimal application to Australian Catholicism. Both the Australian clergy and laity were essentially passive and compliant to the universal hierarchy.

However, there was one application of the *Syllabus* to Australian Catholicism, and that was in the field of education. This application was significant because it gave the Australian bishops a language and reference for developing their argument against the godless education of the colonies (Fogarty, 1959, pp. 474-475; Molony, 1969, pp. 111, 115). In 1869 in Melbourne the Australian bishops, at their Second Provincial Council, used three of the propositions of the *Syllabus* in their decrees to the Australian clergy so that they (the clergy) would have

sound principles of education (Molony, 1969, p. 110). James Murray, the Bishop of Maitland, cited the same propositions in his 8 December 1867 pastoral letter to the faithful of his diocese. Interestingly, Murray noted that had Pope Pius IX not released the *Syllabus* in 1864, one could easily imagine that the pope "had before his eyes the Public Schools Act [of 1866]" (Molony, 1969, p. 111). Matthew Quinn, the Bishop of Bathurst went so far as to locate his belief in Catholic education with his belief in the central tenets of Christianity:

> As I believe...in the Truth and in the Incarnation, so do I disbelieve in an infidel education, and as I would shed my blood sooner than relinquish my belief in the Trinity, so would I shed my blood for Catholic education. (cited in Molony, 1969, pp. 111-112)

To give Quinn due recognition, during the first 14 years of his episcopate and before the passing of the Public Instruction Act in New South Wales in 1880, there were established 33 independent Catholic schools in Maitland (Fogarty, 1959, pp. 238-240). The *Syllabus* was a timely document for the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Australia as it could be used to respond to the antagonism of the colonial governments and the education crisis that persisted for much of the latter half of the nineteenth century.

This crisis followed a half-century of cooperation between the church and the colonial governments. Ironically, one of the reasons for the colonial education acts was to avoid the sectarianism and denominational antagonism of Europe (Grundy, 1972, p. 2; Ryan, 2002, p. 3; 2006, pp. 25-27). Just as the *Risorgimento* had the effect of hardening the resolve of European Catholics and increasing the spiritual authority of Pius IX, so too, the antagonism sensed by Australian Catholics during the education crisis had the effect of stiffening their resolve against the colonial governments (Fogarty, 1959, p. 475). Haines (1976, pp. 70-71) does not understate the significance of this crisis for Catholics and their identity in Australia. He argues that the crisis contributed to a psychosis amongst Catholics that Nietzsche called *ressentiment*. This collective psychological state of mind was, admittedly, fuelled by Irish bishops and their agencies such as the Sydney Catholic newspaper, *The Freeman's Journal*. The bishops and the *Freeman* both played on the Catholic fear of proselytism. Religious and political manoeuvring around the question of education, Haines argues, had an effect on the psyche of Australian Catholics.

> When the new bishops pointed out to the laity that public schools were fraught with danger and that sacrifices would be necessary if they wished to preserve the faith of their children, they were operating from and enhancing both fear of proselytism and *ressentiment*. The same feelings were involved when the praises of the religious teaching orders were sung. (Haines, 1976, p. 71)

Education was the means by which Australian Catholics came to defend their identity and their rights. The political, religious and psychological implications of education, and specifically religious education, were to be significant.

Specifically, the issue at the heart of the resolve of Australian Catholics was religious education. There was never an argument about what was included in the secular education proposed by the colonies; the argument was about what was omitted (Fogarty, 1959, p.183). Catholic opposition to the secular education was based on the omission of Catholic teaching and practice. Archbishop John Bede Polding argued, in 1859, that the "inherent vice" of secular, free and compulsory education was its "sin of omission" (Fogarty, 1959, p. 184). Polding though, understood the dilemma of the colonial authorities when, in 1844 and in response to the finding that 50 percent of four to fourteen year olds were not receiving any schooling at all, he said that "while salvation was man's fundamental objective, the ability to read and write contributed greatly to its attainment" (Nairn, 1967).

Other forms of vitality and loyalty: William Duncan's *Lecture on National Education*

It is a mistake to think that the idea of religious education as an educational pursuit is a recent phenomenon. Whilst Gerard Rummery has been recognised as the first to differentiate between religious instruction and catechesis in Australia (Rummery, 1975, pp. 134-145; Ryan, 2006, p. 227), the idea that religion should be treated in ways similar to other curriculum areas is not new. In fact, arguments such as these can be found in the debates of the 1800s.

Such a view was proposed in 1850 by William Augustine Duncan. Duncan was a Scottish Catholic who came to Australia in 1837 as a teacher but later worked as a newspaper editor in Sydney and as a customs officer in Brisbane. He had little time for apathetic laity and did not side with the dominant Irish clergy in their opposition to the National system of schooling. He saw the dangers of sectarianism and secularism and thought that, through the National system, the potential of these dangers could be minimised (Haines, 1976, p. 137; Ryan, 1997, p. 14). Duncan delivered a lecture in defence of the system at the School of Arts in Brisbane in 1850 (Duncan, 1850). In his *Lecture* he espoused an alternative to the denominational model that was preferred by the majority of Irish-sympathetic Catholics. Essentially, he advocated a National system of education including a form of religious education that was common to all students. In what today might be called ecumenically visionary, Duncan argued that all students could be taught the core and shared Christian tenets. He defended the system's innate mechanisms for avoiding proselytism and infidelity. Duncan also argued that, in such a system, scriptural education was possible and, where the system was employed in other parts of the world, it was approved by both Catholic and Protestant archbishops. The transcript of his lecture runs to 23 single-spaced pages.

To be sure, Duncan's view of education and religious education was rejected by most Catholics for religious

reasons. Specifically, the prime religious reason was a fear of proselytism (Haines, 1976, pp. 4, 70-71). However, political suspicion and suspicion generated by nationalist sensitivity, both intrinsically related, were also reasons why Duncan's views were rejected. Politically, the Irish believed that Irish educational policy was implemented to maintain Catholic poverty and illiteracy. Also, they "had been conditioned to expect that any government-sponsored system of education would involve a direct attempt to win their children from the traditional religion" (Haines, 1976, p. 4). This belief and conditioning did not wane upon arrival in the colony. Nationalistically, the Irish – clergy and laity – could not free themselves from their memory and experience of the system in their homeland (Fogarty, 1959, pp. 176-177; O'Farrell, 1992, pp. 101-103). Irish patriotism tended to generate action and reaction "from the heart, not the head" (O'Farrell, 1992, p. 69).

Duncan's views though, were not well-received. In fact, "to the Catholic mind [they were] pure delusional" (Fogarty, 1959, p.189). However, it can be argued that the degree to which they were delusional was based more on nationalist and political grounds than religious grounds. Duncan discussed his own loyalty to the Catholic tradition in his *National Lecture*:

> I admit, however, that there are religious doctrines of great importance that are not taught in the school-books published by the Board. I am not an Indifferentist on this subject; my creed is longer, I believe, than the creeds of most of you; and if I thought that the teaching were to end here, I, for one, would not be here this evening to recommend the system to your notice. (Duncan, 1850, p. 10)

In supporting the system, he also noted other supporters from within Catholicism:

> But you may ask me, how am I to deal with my own Church in this matter? – Am I not afraid of the thunders of the Vatican against this so-termed Infidel system? I have no such fear, Ladies and Gentlemen. There are, undoubtedly, Roman Catholic bishops and clergymen who are strongly opposed to the system, from the same mistaken motives as others; but I shall show you that we have some of the best of them also with us. (Duncan, 1850, p. 14)

Amongst those who supported the National system, Duncan included Daniel Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, the Right Reverend Dr Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, and Nicholas Wiseman who was later to become Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal (Duncan, 1850, p. 14). Clearly, Duncan located his views on the National system within the parameters of loyalty to his Catholic faith.

For Duncan, loyalty did not equate to deference to the majority Irish view. Rather, he equated loyalty with truth (Haines, 1976, p. 137), the promotion of lay action in the Church (Haines, 1976, p. 137; O'Farrell, 1992, p. 101), the pursuit of justice (O'Farrell, 1992, p. 69) and with

moral uprightness (Duncan, 1850, p. 8). He complemented his sense of loyalty with a disdain for secularism and proselytism. He was a man of intellect, of faithful conviction and had a desire for egalitarian development in the colonies. He was neither "conformist or unaggressive" (O'Farrell, 1992, p. 67) and this put him off-side with many of the Irish clergy and laity. Because of this, his ideas about religious education were destined not to be embraced by the majority.

Nevertheless, Duncan held this view and in holding it he was not alone. Others to disagree with the Magisterium, Australian hierarchy and the *Syllabus of Errors* on this issue included lay people such as "J.H. Plunkett, Roger Therry...and Edward Butler" (Molony, 1969, p. 110). However, the dominant view prevailed. That is, it was understood that "the ordinary teacher must be competent to teach religion; if he were not, then he was not fit to be entrusted with the education of children" (Fogarty, 1959, p. 189).

It seems that Duncan saw possibilities in a distinction between catechesis and religious instruction – a distinction that was not to gain ecclesial documentary status until well over a century later in the Congregation for Catholic Education's (1988) *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*. A religious instruction designed in ways similar to other subjects and shared by all students could be one of both vitality and loyalty.

Competing Arguments

There are some parallels between the competing arguments of Duncan and the majority Irish in the period 1844-1872 and the competing arguments that persevere in the present day. Many Australian Catholic religious educators maintain an argument for the retention of catechesis in the classroom religion program (Ryan, 1998, p. 3). In what has become almost a cliché in Australian Catholic schools, many religious educators argue that the school is for many students their only experience of Church. Seemingly, the religious educators who argue this case feel compelled to duplicate in the school, at least in part, the roles and functions of the parish.

The reasons for these arguments and feelings are not clear. It is possible that these religious educators are faith-filled people, active in an ecclesial community and understand evangelisation to be a sharing of their Christian faith. They accept the evidence that suggests that fewer students in Catholic schools have an active connection with a parish (McLaughlin, 2000, p. 86) and consequently, believe that their task is to take *de facto* responsibility for the faith development of their students.

Another reason, perhaps a more feasible reason, is that these religious educators have been taught, persistently and earnestly, what Ryan (2001, pp. 218-221) calls the dominant mythic narrative of the creation of Australian Catholic schools. This narrative, "rehearsed by respected general historians and influential opinion leaders over a long period of time...has been taught to those initiated

into the cause of Catholic schools and chanted, almost as a mantra" (Ryan, 2001, p. 218). It contends that,

> Catholic schools have prevailed against the most formidable opposition imaginable – the powerful secular colonial legislators and rival Church opponents. The heroes of this tale of survival – bishops, priests, sisters and brothers – have been able to fend off the wicked and powerful opposition. (Ryan, 2001, p. 218)

Ryan argues that, according to this narrative, Catholic schools have a twofold purpose. The first purpose is for social acceptability within a secular world and the second purpose is for the formation of members of the Church (Ryan, 2001, p. 218).

Their understanding of religious education may have been formed significantly by this narrative: their own religious education in school was perhaps dominated by this narrative; their parish, at times, may have adopted this narrative; the "Catholic ethos" of their school apparently assumes this narrative. So grand is this narrative that other ideas cannot compete. Loyalty and vitality, then, are measured by the abilities of these religious educators to provide students with an experience of Church.

For many religious educators this understanding of loyalty and vitality is troublesome. Many are uncertain of how to provide contemporary school-aged people with an experience of church. For some, this was not part of their university training; for others, they have minimal experience of church themselves. Whilst some religious educators may silently question the appropriateness of the dominant narrative, it remains publicly beyond question. Sometimes, the difficulty of its task and the enormity of its reputation conspire so that it is paid little more than lip service in schools.

Whilst religious instruction may indeed be part of the forming of Church members, it is not explicitly apparent in this dual purpose. It is possible that a contemporary religious educator, unfamiliar with, for example, William Duncan's arguments for an "enlightened system of education" (Duncan, 1850, p. 4) and a "superior elementary education" (Duncan, 1850, p. 7) that makes "no attempt...to influence or disturb the particular religious tenets of any sect of Christians" (Duncan, 1850, p. 7), may relegate a religious instruction of vitality, rigour and loyalty to lesser importance than the two purposes of the dominant narrative – despite the suggestion that these two purposes may be less imperatival in Catholic schools today (Ryan, 2001, p. 218).

An alternative argument holds that the contemporary Catholic school is limited in its capacity to provide students with an experience of Church. Certainly, this argument contends that the school is very limited in its ability to duplicate the experience that is offered by a parish. Just as the two purposes of the dominant myth do not "possess the same force as they once did" (Ryan, 2001, p. 218), so too should Catholic schools be wary of their capacity to 'recruit for the parish'.

Ecclesial Documents of Religious Education and Catechesis: A Source of New Forms and Understandings

The documents of the church can be of assistance to religious educators when they consider the nature and purpose of religious education in contemporary Catholic schools. Increasingly in Australia there is a growing awareness of the distinction between catechesis and religious instruction. This distinction was first given documentary status in the Congregation for Catholic Education's (1988) document, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School:*

> There is a close connection, and at the same time a clear distinction, between religious instruction and catechesis, or the handing on of the Gospel message. The close connection makes it possible for a school to remain a school and still integrate culture with the message of Christianity. The distinction comes from the fact that, unlike religious instruction, catechesis presupposes that the hearer is receiving the Christian message as a salvific reality. (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1988, para. 68)

The document then elaborates on the aim of each process:

> The aim of catechesis, or handing on the Gospel message, is maturity: spiritual, liturgical, sacramental and apostolic; this happens most especially in the local Church community. The aim of the school, however, is knowledge. (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1988, para. 69)

In 1997 the Congregation for the Clergy promulgated *The General Directory to Catechesis.* It, too, addressed the relationship between catechesis in religious instruction: "Special consideration is given to the relationship between catechesis and the teaching of religion in schools, since both activities are profoundly inter-connected, and, together with education in the Christian home, are basic to the formation of children and young people" (Congregation for the Clergy, 1997, para. 60). Then, with reference to *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School,* this document again noted the distinction between the two processes: "The relationship between religious instruction in schools and catechesis is one of distinction and complementarity: 'there is an absolute necessity to distinguish clearly between religious instruction and catechesis.'" (Congregation for the Clergy, 1997, para. 73). In Australia, this "absolute necessity" requires more time.

In describing initiation as a principal function of the ministry of the word, this document makes another distinction between Christian education in families and religious instruction: "[catechetical forms of initiation include] the catechesis of children and of the young, which of itself has the character of initiation. Christian education in families and religious instruction in schools also have an initiatory function" (Congregation for the Clergy, 1997, para. 51). Religious educators can surmise from this that "Christian education in families", which

would seem to be catechetical, is different from religious instruction in schools.

Two apostolic exhortations from John Paul II also provide stimulus for religious educators when they consider the nature and purpose of religious education. Both exhortations acknowledge the presence of students who are not Catholics in Catholic schools. This is a reality to which Australian religious educators are becoming more and more familiar. In the first exhortation, *Ecclesia in Africa,* John Paul II notes that "Catholic schools are at one and the same time places of evangelization, well-rounded education, inculturation and initiation to the dialogue of life among young people of different religions and social backgrounds" (John Paul II, 1995, para. 102). These words of John Paul II pose a significant challenge to those who submit to the dominant narrative. Clearly, a "dialogue of life among young people of different religions" requires more than traditional Christian catechesis. Indeed, catechesis in this context could fairly be understood as an imposition of moral violence (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1988, para. 6). The second text, written specifically to the Australian situation, alerts teachers (and by association, parents and pastors) to one challenge of contemporary religious education: "Where parents from these religions [Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism] enrol their children in Catholic schools, the Church has an especially delicate task" (John Paul II, 2001, para. 25). Here again, Australian religious educators are reminded that the students in their classes come from a variety of religious traditions. Subsequently, the traditional purpose of catechetical formation in a singular Christian tradition for all students has less currency. At the same time, the demands for a vital and rigorous religious instruction become more pressing.

Given this context, it remains possible for religious instruction in Australian Catholic schools to be vital and loyal to the Catholic tradition. Indeed, this was the argument of William Duncan over 150 years ago. It is not the aim of this paper to suggest what is vital and loyal in religious education. However, it is the aim of this paper to suggest that vitality and loyalty in religious education can be found in forms that differ from the dominant narrative of religious education in Australian Catholic education. These forms have been proposed and explored in the past, even in the infancy years of Australian religious education. As Australian religious educators become more familiar with church documents on religious education, the demands on education set by ecclesial and educational authorities, and changing student enrolments they are required to look for new forms of religious education and catechesis. These new forms can be found outside the traditional narrative of religious education in Australia.

It is also important that religious educators and Catholic schools do not abandon catechesis. For catechesis remains an important task for religious education in the school (Ryan, 1998, p. 6). This has been a consistent claim of Church documents on religious education and catechesis (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1988,

para. 69; 1997, para. 11; Congregation for the Clergy, 1997, para. 74; Vatican Council II, 1965, paras. 2, 8). However, whilst ever catechesis is equated to religious instruction and whilst ever catechesis is uncritically considered the primary or sole task of religious education, it is less likely that it and religious instruction will be exercised with vitality and loyalty by teachers in Catholic schools (Moran, 1991, p.252).

This distinction requires religious educators to reflect on their understanding of each process as enunciated by the *Congregation for Catholic Education*, the *Congregation for the Clergy* and by religious education theorists. However, when the dominant narrative perpetuates in Australia the distinction between catechesis and religious instruction, if it exists at all, is vague and ambiguous. Religious educators, if they are to make sense of this distinction, will need to disconnect themselves from the false piety of the dominant narrative.

Further, it seems that John Paul II, in two of his apostolic exhortations, was cognizant of new issues that confront religious education - a cognizance that is yet to be fully realised in Australia. Religious educators in Australia are becoming aware of new challenges in their task: these include the enrolment of students who are not Catholics and students who are not Christians in Catholic schools, situations where the majority of students in a class or school are not familiar with parish life and the increasing inability to make assumptions about the religious knowledge and awareness of these students. Clearly, the dominant narrative does not fit with this new paradigm.

The task of preparing and presenting a vital and loyal religious education is difficult enough. Assumptions by religious educators that they can assume the roles and functions of the parish as well, only serve to cloud the tasks of religious education and contribute to Moran's (1991, p. 252) fear that religious instruction will be anything but vital and that catechesis will not be particular enough. Catechesis in this assumed situation risks a proselytising function which, of course, would be anything but loyal. On the contrary, unwillingness on the part of schools and religious educators to share in the roles and functions of the parish does not equate to disloyalty. It is not the task of the school or the school religious educator to petition for religious observance on Sunday. That is the task of the diocese and individual parishes. School religious educators can provide professional and loyal service to the church when they consider the tasks of religious instruction and catechesis systematically and provide appropriate time and resources for those tasks.

Conclusion
The history of religious education in Australia has elevated a particular view of its creation to the status of what Ryan calls the "dominant mythic narrative". However, behind this narrative lie other stories of vitality and loyalty in religious education. William Duncan proposed one such story in 1850 in Brisbane. Although his vision for religious education did not eventuate, it can serve as an inspiration to religious educators today as they seek new forms of vital and loyal religious

education in Australia. Contemporary religious education in Australia is still developing and still responding to new challenges. This development and these challenges reveal that the dominant narrative may not provide the best form to serve religious education in the future. Religious educators will need to look to alternative narratives in finding the best forms of religious education that are vital and loyal.

References

Congregation for Catholic Education. (1988). *The religious dimension of education in a Catholic school*. Retrieved 2 January, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/c catheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_198804 07_catholic-school_en.html

Congregation for Catholic Education. (1997). *The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium*. Retrieved 2 January, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/c catheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_270419 98_school2000_en.html

Congregation for the Clergy. (1997). *The general directory for catechesis*. Retrieved 21 December, 2006, from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/c clergy/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_17041998 _directory-for-catechesis_en.html

Duncan, W. A. (1850). *Lecture on national education*. Brisbane: James Swan.

English, G. (2004a). Religious education in a time of crisis: Letting a field of previously unconsidered possibilities appear to us. *Journal of Religious Education, 52*(1), 43-50.

English, G. (2004b). That was then, this is now: Religious education pedagogies in Australian Catholic schools. *Journal of Religious Education, 52*(4), 20-25.

Fogarty, R. (1959). *Catholic education in Australia 1806-1950*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Grundy, D. (1972). *'Secular, compulsory and free': The education act of 1872* (Vol. 5). Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Haines, G. (1976). *Lay Catholics and the education question in nineteenth century New South Wales: The shaping of a decision*. Sydney: Catholic Theological Faculty.

John Paul II. (1995). *Ecclesia in Africa*. Retrieved 5 January, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_ex hortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_14091995_ecclesia-in-africa_en.html

John Paul II. (2001). *Ecclesia in Oceania*. Retrieved 5 January, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apo st_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_20011122_ecclesia-in-oceania_en.html

McBrien, R. P. (1995). *Encyclopedia of Catholicism*. New York: HarperCollins.

McLaughlin, D. (Ed.). (2000). *The Catholic school: Paradoxes and challenges*. Strathfield: St Pauls.

Molony, J. N. (1969). *The Roman mould of the Australian Catholic church*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press.

Moran, G. (1991). Understanding religion and being religious. *Professional Approaches for Christian Educators, 21*, 249-252.

Nairn, B. (1967). *"Polding, John Bede (1794-1877)"*. Retrieved 19 December 2006, from http://www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/biogs/A020300b.htm

O'Farrell, P. (1992). *The Catholic church and community: An Australian history*. Kensington: New South Wales University Press.

Rossiter, G. (1981a). The gap between aims and practice in religious education. *Word in Life Journal for Religious Education, 29*(1), 24-28.

Rossiter, G. (1981b). Stifling union or creative divorce: The future relationship between catechesis and religious education in Catholic schools. *Word in Life, 29*(4), 162-173.

Rummery, R. M. (1975). *Catechesis and religious education in a pluralist society*. Sydney: E.J. Dwyer.

Ryan, M. (1997). *Respectable citizens and better Catholics: Maintaining Catholic schools in Victoria 1872-1885*. Wentworth Falls: Social Science Press.

Ryan, M. (1998). The general directory for catechesis: Implications for religious education in Australian Catholic schools. *Word in Life Journal for Religious Education, 46*(3), 2-6.

Ryan, M. (2001). Mythic foundations of Australian Catholic schools: Assessing the heritage for religious educators. In M. Ryan (Ed.), *Echo and silence: Contemporary issues for Australian religious education*. Katoomba: Social Science Press.

Ryan, M. (2002). Religious education in Australian Catholic schools: Three historical snapshots. *Journal of Religious Education, 50*(3), 2-6.

Ryan, M. (2006). *Religious education in Catholic schools: An introduction for Australian students*. Melbourne: David Lovell.

Vatican Council II. (1965). *Gravissimum educationis (Declaration on Christian education)*. Retrieved 2 January, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_c ouncil/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_gravissimum-educationis_en.html

Wright, A. (2004). *Religion, education and post-modernity*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

*Michael Chambers is a lecturer in the National School of Religious Education, Australian Catholic University, McAuley Campus, Brisbane. He can be contacted on: m.chambers@mcauley.acu.edu.au.