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**Introduction**
The Westminster Diocesan Archive is a treasure-trove of material.\(^1\) Portfolios from the early to mid-part of the twentieth century are loosely-catalogued therein. The connection between titles and content within the Archive is often tenuous and frequently misleading. This Volume, the second of this thesis, is a record of my fortnightly visits to the Archive over a three-year period to read the ‘educational’ portfolios of Cardinals Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin respectively.\(^2\) While snippets of this Archive have been published, this is the first time that the full scope of the educational portfolios connected with the **Education Act, 1944** has been made available and read in the order that these portfolios are lodged in the Archive.

Although in Volume One I used the ‘normative’\(^3\), ‘formal’\(^4\), ‘espoused’\(^5\), and ‘operant’\(^6\) voices, drawn from Theological Action Research\(^7\), to help organise, mediate and narrate the story of the Archive, in this Volume I have used normal conventions to either summarise individual portfolios (space-and-a-half) or replicate the text of significant correspondence, speeches and homilies (single-space) as lodged within the Archive. Some of the latter has been forgotten in contemporary discourse. A ‘Catholic’ narrative of education has emerged in England and Wales in the twenty-first century that often colonises civic principles and practices of education, paying insufficient attention to the primary theological, anthropological and political sources of denominational education. On the seventieth anniversary of the enactment of the **Education Act, 1944**, this Volume, aims to help retrieve some of the ‘Catholic’ memory that has been lost.

Before continuing I would be remiss if I did not express my thanks to the Diocesan archivists who assisted me in this endeavour. I acknowledge the care they show to the record under their charge and at the same time accept full responsibility for any editorial decisions made herewith.

---

\(^1\) That holds much of the national ‘Catholic’ Archive for England and Wales before the Second Vatican Council.


\(^3\) An enunciation of Church Teaching by the Magisterium in encyclicals and joint pastoral letters.

\(^4\) Often found in theological and educational treatises.

\(^5\) Interpretation of the Magisterium, theological and education treatises in the prevailing setting (found especially in correspondence and through other media).

\(^6\) Interaction between theology and politics, often leading to adaptive change.

What follows can be maddeningly repetitious and at times conflicted, while being simultaneously insightful and creative. This Archive records the interpretation and re-interpretation of competing theological, political and historical genres within and across ecclesial and civic constituencies in 1940s England and Wales.

To assist the reader of this thesis, references in this Volume are colour-coded in the same manner as they are in Volume One. References drawn from Bourne are in red, Hinsley are in green, Griffin are in brown, Godfrey are in blue and references of those documents either drawn from interregnums or those whose provenance is unclear are in black regardless of the catalogue reference. This Volume represents my Archival workbook. During my visits to the Archive, due to the paucity of natural light and for ease of reference, I adopted the practice, of emboldening the colour-coded index references in this record. I did not extend this practice of ‘emboldening’ to Volume I.

-cardinal william godfrey 1956-63
Cardinal Bourne 1903-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/109</td>
<td>National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/126</td>
<td>Catholic Education Council including history (1904-30 found in Bo 1/185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/159</td>
<td>Personal Speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also</td>
<td>catalogued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/183</td>
<td>Grants &amp; 1936 Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/184</td>
<td>1936 Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/188</td>
<td>1944 Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/189</td>
<td>1944 Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/190</td>
<td>After 1944 Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/191</td>
<td>After 1944 Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 5/90d</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bo1/184 Various Papers Relating to Education (Chiefly 1931 & 1936 Acts)

A fascinating briefing entitled in portfolio index “Non-provided schools (lengthy memo on position)”, was written for Cardinal Bourne [first document in AAW Bo1/184 portfolio]. Authorship is neither recorded nor dated. Through this rather rambling briefing we gain an insight into the hopes and concerns of the Catholic Community, those involved in the management of voluntary schools at a diocesan level and at a school level. Following on from the Hadow Report, the school leaving age was raised to 15 years old in the 1936 Act\(^9\); how would an expansion of the schools’ estate be funded (it was proposed in the Bill that a grant to assist voluntary bodies meet additional cost would be no less than half and no more than three-fourths "in so far as it relates to the provision of senior children – “Section 29 (2)(d) of Act of 1921- will not be further affected by the agreement ([Board of Education, Summary of Government Proposals, presumed 1931, AAW Bo1/184, page 3])"; leaving a potential bill of approx £1 mill. across the country), how would the rights of parents be protected, how would the character of voluntary schools within the Catholic tradition remain inviolate and how would the disproportionate number of ‘small’ senior schools be established?

Logistically “Catholic” senior schools in the country “ordinarily should have a two class entry, i.e. annual intake of approximately eighty children aged 11 plus, which provides, in a four-year course, a two stream senior school of approximately 320 children (2x40x4). A

\(^9\) Chapter 41, §. 1: “Subject to the provisions of this Act, the age fifteen shall be the age up to which byelaws under Part IV of the Education Act, 1921 (hereafter called “the principal Act”), shall require parents to cause their children (unless there is some reasonable excuse) to attend school (Education Act, 1936 [enacted 31st July 1936])".
three class entry (3x40) producing a three stream school of 480 children (3x40x4), is regarded by the Board of Education as the best educational unit (‘Proposal for the Re-organisation of the Catholic Schools of the Country, with Special Reference to Small Schools in Rural Districts’, [AAW Bo 1/183 Grants & 1936 Education Act – Title on Portfolio Education VII: Bill 1935-37, page1].” The Commissioners found support from The Catholic Teachers’ Federation in a resolution passed at the twenty-first Annual Conference of the Catholic Teachers’ Federation. “In view of the costly incidence of changes not contemplated at the time of the passing of the Act of 1902; the proposed raising of the school-leaving age; the provision of non-provided schools in the new housing areas, and the position of non-provided schools in slum areas scheduled for clearance, this Conference urges the necessity of grants from the Exchequer to the managers of non-provided schools (from page 2, The Catholic Teachers’ Federation, Claims to Further Aid for Non-Provided Schools, sent to Archbishop’s House, 5th July 1934’). Interestingly, they wanted this money sent from the Exchequer via the Board of Education to non-provided schools not through the respective LEA’s.

AAW Bo1/184 Various Papers Relating to Education (Chiefly 1931 & 1936 Acts)
There is a letter to Archbishop Hinsley dated 8th November 1935 from Stanley Baldwin, prime Minster. In it Baldwin agrees via LEA’s to make grants available to voluntary schools pro tem “for the purpose of raising the age and reorganisation, including in special circumstances grants in aid of new senior schools”, this provision he records is not retrospective “…With regard to the claim that Catholics should be allowed to open new all-age schools, especially in new areas, it does not appear to me that any change in the law is called for. As you know the Education Act 1921 already provides in Sections 18 and 19 the necessary machinery for determining whether a new school is necessary; and future cases will continue to be considered in light of the considerations there set out (page 1).” He also indicates that “any attempt to re-open the settlement of 1902 is impracticable (page 2).” Perhaps from this moment Hinsley realised that new educational legislation would be necessary. Hinsley received an equivalent letter of comfort from Clement Attlee, Leader of the Labour Party, dated 9th November 1935.

NB Founding Education Act for appointment of teachers in England refers to Education Act, 1902 where governors have the appointing authority re. teachers and in Scotland refer to Education Act 1918 “all teachers are appointed directly and solely by the Authority of each area. But all teachers must be Catholics and must be acceptable as such to the competent Ecclesiastical Authority (Memo on Appointment of Teachers – 16 – found in AAW Bo1/184 Various Papers Relating to Education (Chiefly 1931 & 1936 Acts, page
This issue of teachers appointment exercised the bishops in England and Wales in the minutes of a meeting of the Joint Committee held at Archbishop’s House, Westminster on Tuesday 11th February 1936 found in AAW Bo 1/183 Grants & 1936 Education Act – Title on Portfolio Education VII: Bill 1935-37 specific objection to the Bill was made by Lord Rankeillour concerning the faith of a headteacher of a Catholic non-provided school. He believed “that the Bill should provide for the Head Teacher of a Catholic non-provided school to be a Catholic and that other teachers should be Catholic in proportion to the number of catholic children in the school (pages 2-3).” A subsequent subscript reads “At a subsequent meeting of the Archbishops and Catholic Members of Parliament, held at Archbishop’s House, Westminster, on February 12th, it was decided to press an amendment for 100% “reserved” teachers in Catholic schools. It was passed unanimously that Colonel Sir John Shute should present the Catholic case in the House on the second reading of the Bill (page 3).”

The culture of the time seems alien to us, in terms of current equality and discrimination legislation, whereby the following advice to managers could be offered in the Catholic Education Council Minutes of 2nd March 1936: “The question was asked whether the LEA could refuse to ratify the appointment of a headmistress to a mixed all-age school. The answer was that the ‘gender’ of the candidate might in this case be considered an educational qualification; the boys and girls in the school being about equal, this was not a strong case for an appeal to the Board of Education and the Managers therefore decided to appoint a headmaster as suggested by the LEA (Catholic Education Council, Minutes of a Meeting of the Council, Caxton Hall, Westminster, London SW1 2nd March 1936 found in [AAW Bo 1/183 Grants & 1936 Education Act – Title on Portfolio Education VII: Bill 1935-37], page 4). However, concern over the costs soon to be incurred by the passing of the 1936 Act were considered more pressing as can be seen in the motion moved by Mr J. F. Parker at the Thirty-Second Annual General Meeting of the Catholic Education Council on 21st April 1936 found in [AAW Bo 1/183 Grants & 1936 Education Act – Title on Portfolio Education VII: Bill 1935-37] “That this Council respectfully advises the Hierarchy to initiate a campaign throughout the country in order to secure a permanent settlement of the Education question in England and Wales based on the ‘Scottish Education Act, 1918’. Lord Rankeillour suggested that the Motion should be re-worded so as to read as follows: - “That this Council respectfully advises the Hierarchy to take into consideration an attempt to secure a permanent settlement of the Education question in England and Wales based on the principles of the Scottish Education Act’ Mr Parker having accepted the wording suggested by Lord Rankeillour, Provost Mackin moved that consideration of the Motion should be deferred. Provost Mackin’s Motion was lost by `5
votes to 8. After further discussion, Mr. Parker's Motion, seconded by Sir Francis Anderton, was carried *nem con* (page 4)."

For the record, there was concern expressed in archival documentation over the rights of parents being properly recognised in clause 7 of the 1936 Act. (Confidential: Education Bill [1936] Amendments proposed to be tabled or supported by Catholic Members of Parliament found in [AAW Bo 1/183 Grants & 1936 Education Act – Title on Portfolio Education VII: Bill 1935-37]). An amendment was proposed in Parliament: ‘Clause 7, page 6, line 28, after “children” insert “whose parents desire them to receive the kind of religious instruction which is intended to be given in the proposed new school or…” page 3” This was lost in large part due to the response of officials at the Board of Education who perceived that the “proposed amendment is unnecessary since the words “will attend” relate, inter alia, to the new proposed senior school itself, and that, therefore, if the Board, surveying the district are satisfied that though there are no non-provided schools in it, there are enough ‘denominational’ children who will in course of time go to the proposed senior school, they could allow the agreement (page 4).

In the meantime the Catholic Education Council issued a Memorandum for the Guidance of Managers and Others with Regard to the Negotiation of Agreements under the Act together with Model Forms of Agreement: The Education Act, 1936 Building Grants from Local Education Authorities for Catholic Elementary Schools for Senior Children found in [AAW Bo 1/183 Grants & 1936 Education Act – Title on Portfolio Education VII: Bill 1935-37] “The Memorandum was written cognisant of the outcome of advice issued by the Board of Education after a Conference where representatives of the Local Education Authorities, the National Society and the Catholic Education Council took part (page 1).” The Memorandum recommended that the persons whom the Managers [Governors] should authorise to [conduct the negotiations and sign agreements] shall be:-

(1) A nominee of the Managers\(^{10}\).
(2) A nominee of the Diocesan Schools Commission.
(3) A nominee of the Diocesan Trustees (page 3).

This is as far as the Memorandum went beyond offering ‘common’ counsel.

**AAW Bo 5/90d Papacy**

\(^{10}\) The Managers could of course nominate one of their own number (Memorandum for the Guidance of Managers and Others with Regard to the Negotiation of Agreements under the Act together with Model Forms of Agreement: The Education Act, 1936 Building Grants from Local Education Authorities for Catholic Elementary Schools for Senior Children, page 3).
Nothing of interest, mostly papers connected with the peace settlement of World War I, relations between the Vatican and Italian State and records of State visits and correspondence between States and the Vatican (e.g. President Wilson & Lloyd George).

**AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]**

In the regulations that followed the enactment of the 1944 Act attention was paid to the religious education of pupils whatever setting they found themselves in. In the Statutory Rules and Orders 1945 no. 1076: Education, England and Wales Handicapped Pupils and School Health Service, para 26: “(1) Provision shall be made for every pupil so far as practicable to attend religious worship and receive religious instruction in accordance with the wishes of his parent. (2) No pupils shall be required to attend such worship or receive such instruction contrary to the wishes of his parent (as above [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954])."

Concerns of the middle classes concerning the quality and range of provision envisioned in the 1944 Act is captured in a report commissioned by the Catholic Hierarchy on Catholic Boarding Schools: “The Committee were confident, however, that the demand for schools of this type would steadily grow owing to the fact that Catholics in scattered areas would not be numerous enough to enable Catholic grammar Schools to be opened for them and because there would be increasing demand, for this type of school, from Catholic parents whose children had failed the Grammar School Entrance examinations but who did not wish to send them to a Secondary Modern Day School. (Report of the Secretary of the Hierarchy’s Special Committee concerning Boarding Schools and Grammar Schools to the Conference of Catholic Colleges on 6th April 1948, para 2 [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954])." Secondary Modern schools struggled to inspire the confidence of the middle classes and Catholic parents were no exception. Although there is no record in the Archives, perhaps intuitively, Catholic parents doubted there was sufficient money to fund Butler’s dream of a more practical curriculum for a tranche of pupils. A dream that some would say remains unfulfilled today.

In **AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]** there is a group of papers associated with the Cardinal Vaughan School and recording a range of issues concerning the school, its governance, its membership of the Association of Governing Bodies of London Aided Secondary Schools and negotiations between this body and the Department. Throughout curriculum, finance and control are common threads; the right of aided schools to establish and sustain their own character, appoint staff, admit and set their own school holidays. Between 1945 and 1950 there was a protracted discussion on
the length of School Holidays within London and the desire by the Local Authority to standardise school holidays across all areas of provision. Grammar School headteachers objected to this proposal arguing that older pupils needed longer holidays due to the intensity of their work. They also considered furloughs as opportunities for cultural enrichment for staff and pupils. In the words of Mgr Vance pupils “need time to live and to learn to live (Letter to Leonard Brooks esq. from Mgr John Vance dated 20th November 1945 [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954])].”

Grammar school pupils worked on Saturday mornings. Cardinal Griffin, forever practical, was interested to learn of the regime of homework for the boys at Cardinal Vaughan and wrote to I. J. Hayward, Chairman of the Education Committee on 30th November 1945 “I should like to make a special plea on behalf of the pupils who, in addition to the hours spent at school, have a great deal of educational work to do at home. I attended a grammar school myself and I realise that the work was fairly heavy and that long periods of holidays were essential [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]].” Such ‘skirmishes’ between aided schools and local authorities belie a narrative of competing models of anthropology and education. The correspondence found in the archives of Westminster, reads of a system fighting to protect its independence; this is best portrayed in a post script of a letter from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin dated 23rd July 1946 “The idea of paying teachers in a school like ours is not confined to London County. A case has just been referred to me from Middlesbrough: the startling suggestion was made that the Borough Treasurer should be treasurer of a Convent school and that he should thus be responsible for paying all the bills! It recalled to my mind old statements about ‘vipers and tunes’ (page 3 [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]).” Along with his successor, Fr. Reginald Butcher, who in a letter to Cardinal Griffin dated 28th February 1952 quoted from a reply he had received from the Education Officer concerning the admission of “out-county” admissions: “When the out-county allocations were made towards the end of last year, it was thought that it would be necessary to reduce the number of out-county pupils allowed at your school. Recent developments however show that it will be possible this year to restore your out-county allocation to six places. I must inform you however that it will probably be necessary next year drastically to reduce the number of out-county places allowed at many schools. This will be the subject of consultation with your governors at a later date (page 1, [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]).” It is with some satisfaction that Fr. Butcher reflects later in the letter “…it is clearly to be regretted that some of our Catholic schools have rushed ahead and have allowed the County Council to
assume authority over matters which it is not entitled to do under the 1944 Act (page 1, [found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]]."

The backdrop to such debates was a dialogue between the Government and the Church authorities over the payment of new and extended schools. In Cardinal Griffin’s letter to Mgr Vance, dated 24th March 1948 he writes: “I have explained several times to the Minister and the officials that we are unable to give any guarantee but that we would do our best [to pay]. The real difficulty is in filling up the forms, but we have now agreed that in each case the bishop of the diocese will countersign the form saying that he will do his best to see that the obligations are carried out (found in AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954])."

AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954
The late 1940’s and early 1950’s involved the buying of land and building of schools. While the Catholic community generally worked together, occasionally relationships were fraught due to competing pastoral needs. This dilemma is rehearsed in correspondence kept in this portfolio from a rather exasperated diocesan official, Canon W. J. Wood. He wrote to the Vicar General on 18th May 1950 about the proposed new schools to be built in Harrow-Wealdstone; he wrote “The Blue Nuns have come into possession of the Visitation Convent estate of over 40 acres but will not sell us sites for our schools. They do not want all the land for themselves and are negotiating for the building of 100 houses on their property. They say they will not have a school anywhere near the nursing home or hospital they intend to build. These sites earmarked for our schools in the plan of the county and our school planning is ruined by the obstinacy of these nuns (page 1, [found in AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954]).” While all resolved itself; it needed the intervention of the Archbishop.

Although this was a time of growth Canon Wood could be both protectionist and parochial. In a letter to Cardinal Griffin on 21st February 1953 he wrote “I am sure it is not wise to encourage Frenchmen (although Canadians) to think that they would be welcome to conduct schools for boys in England. As far as I know, the French Canadians have in their schools the French tradition of education and discipline and that is not acceptable [neither] to the fathers of English boys nor to the English authorities. We want English schools staffed for our English boys [found in AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954].” Clearly Cardinal Griffin, in response to Canon Wood’s letter, arranged for Brother Alexis (the Assistant General of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart) to visit Canon Wood. While during this interview Canon Wood learnt that the Congregation was intending to
send American Brothers. This proposal did not pacify Canon Wood; in a letter to Cardinal Griffin dated 9th March 1953 he wrote "it is as well to keep in mind what an American University degree amounts to. Apart from the three or four great universities like Harvard, Yale and Princeton, there is no tradition of scholarship in American Universities, and their degrees are not to be compared to university degrees over here. They are about the standard of intermediate arts and science." Not surprisingly in correspondence dated 24th June 1954 between Cardinal Griffin and Brother Alexis; Cardinal Griffin informs Brother Alexis “Monsignor Wood has now retired from his position in the Diocesan Schools Commission owing to ill-health." What is also apparent in this correspondence is the contribution made by Mgr Derek Worlock in calming troubled waters.

Humour and resilience is apparent in the correspondence found in this file. Parish priests were trying to meet the needs of their communities in a time of significant population-change and financial stringency while implementing the provisions of the 1944 Act. Fr. Thomas J. Fitzgerald writes to Cardinal Griffin on 18th March 1947 of his predicament

Hitler bowled my middle stump on the “junior” wicket when my lovely school in Lukin Street was demolished on St. Patrick’s Day 1945. Since then my poor darlings have been moved around like sacks of old potatoes to three (sic) different schools, before finally coming to earth at Heckford Street LCC School where, by courtesy of the LCC, we are allowed to use seven classrooms and a small hall. Notwithstanding this upheaval, every single child last year obtained a Grammar School Entry at the Common Entrance Examination proving, I think, that both kiddies and staff deserve that we should do all that we can to help them.

In 1948 a new educational bill came before Parliament entitled Education (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill: Explanatory and Financial Memorandum “1. The Bill deals in the main with technical points on which alteration or clarification of the law is thought, in light of experience, to be desirable (Introductory Paragraph Education (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill)." The draft amendments proposed by the Church were around Clause 4 to ensure at the age of 10 that Catholic pupils were not removed unilaterally by the Local Authority into a neighbouring non-Catholic senior school and around Clause 6 to ensure that when a Catholic pupil is being educated outside the Authority where his/her family is domicile that capitation follows the child; so that the receiving Authority is not disadvantaged. The Church in its dealings with the Board of Education seeks to protect the rights of parents beyond the aspirational.
What is of interest for present-day discussions re. Academies is the model trust deed for the two approved schools established in the time of Cardinal Griffin. The trust deed had to address the complex issue of land and buildings; and rehearse what would happen if Apethorpe Hall ceased being an approved school. The Treasury bought the property for £30,000.

What is also fascinating is that the need for Catholic examiners to mark Catholic religious knowledge papers at Schools certificate level was raised with Cardinal Griffin in a letter dated 18th November 1947 from John J Crewe, a non-Catholic, School Certificate Examiner in Religious Knowledge. Although the authorities at London University were not persuaded by the argument that only Catholic markers could mark Catholic papers, the University indicated that it “would be delighted, in principle to welcome a Catholic as examiner (Letter from John J. Crewe to Cardinal Griffin dated 8th April 1948, page 3, [found in Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954]).” John J Crewe speaking as the principal chairman for 1949-50 was equally pleased and went on in the same letter to the Cardinal to suggest that the Cardinal should nominate a person and that this nominee should apply for inclusion in the General Schools panel for 1949, and I will look after the rest and see that he is employed. Each chief examiner picks his “team” and I should be most pleased to use him. It is, however, especially important that he should be a good mixer with heretics, as he would be marking heretics’ papers. His Catholic standpoint would be especially valuable at the examiners’ meeting, where he would warn us of the possible pitfalls lurking in the papers (ibid, page 4).” In time Rev Dr E. Plowman was nominated and appointed. This is evidence that the Church, under Cardinal Griffin’s leadership, was learning to respond to the counsel proffered by lay people and becoming more successful in dealing imaginatively with civic authorities. Interestingly in Dr Plowman’s letter to Cardinal Griffin, dated 24th September 1948, he writes: “You may rest assured that I will try to exercise that prudence and discretion which association with non-Catholics in religious matters very often requires. I have it on very good authority [uncited] that the Board of Education contemplate a single national examination in the years to come, and therefore it would seem rather timely that some principle of Catholic representation on such bodies should be established (Letter from Rev Dr Plowman to Cardinal Griffin dated 24th September 1948, page 1, [found in AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954]).”

Found in AAW Bo1/192: Educational XVI Miscellaneous: 1949-1950
This folder comprises papers and correspondence between the Church and State over:
• the spiralling cost of establishing/expanding the Catholic schools’ estate;
• an administrative proposal by the Catholic Hierarchy to help defray operational costs associated with schools
• briefing materials for parish priests and parishioners concerning the forthcoming General Election of 1950 and the need to raise the issue of Catholic schools with candidates of all parties.

At this election, concern over how the Catholic community would pay for the rights gained in the 1944 Education Act would not only Catholic parents but their clerics and bishops. The Church and education became part of the political narrative of the day, especially with the establishment of new housing estates. Bishop Beck, Coadjutor Bishop of Brentwood, in correspondence with Mr. Tomlinson, Minister of Education, in May 1950 challenging nascent policy of the Department “that no new building, on purely denominational grounds, will be permitted [on the new estates] (Letter from Bishop Beck to Mr Tomlinson dated 27th May 1950, page 2, [found in AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954]).” Bishop Beck, now chairman of the Catholic Education Council, proposed a compromise. Since Catholic children were already in these new schools because there was no other provision; could they not pro tem be gathered together under the leadership of a Catholic teacher until permanent arrangements could be made for their education? At the heart of this response is an appeal to justice and the rights of Catholic parents to educate in a way they saw fit. The influence of Pius XI and XII still looms large in the consciousness of the Catholic community. At the time the rights of parents was also part of the wider political narrative. By 1950, the concern of the community was well put in a note of visit written after a delegation of Catholic parliamentarians accompanied by Bishop Beck went to see Mr Tomlinson. In the notes of the meeting it is recorded:

The deputation presented the case that, according to the procedure adopted by the Minister, in accordance with Section 15 of the Act, Catholic managers and Bishops were finding themselves in an impossible position. They were asked to sign pledges that they could raise the money required to meet their costs under Section 15 (3) (a) with the alternative that if they did not do so their schools were in danger of becoming classified as controlled schools… The minister suggested that it was no part of his duty to influence the Bishops in matters of conscience, but left the impression in the minds of several members of the deputation that the pledges or “guarantees asked for” in Form I8 schools would not seriously incommode his conscience were he in the position of the Catholic bishops. At one moment in the conversation it was suggested that the Ministry were prepared to construe “able” and “willing” as synonymous terms, and this was not completely denied…Parental Rights, Section 76: The minister recognised the importance of this section, and declared that he bore it in mind in making his decisions (Notes of an interview between catholic parliamentarians, Bishop Beck and the minister

11 Along with the provisions of the amending Acts of 1946 and 1948
(Mr Tomlinson] dated 20th January 1950, pages 1 and 2, [found in AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954]).
Cardinal Hinsley 1935-43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/10</td>
<td>Association of Convent Schools &amp; Training Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/27</td>
<td>Catholic Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/31</td>
<td>Catholics at non-Catholic Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/69</td>
<td>Elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/106</td>
<td>Catholic Teachers’ Guild/Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/112</td>
<td>Headmistresses’ Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/112 a</td>
<td>Education 1942-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 &amp; 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/152</td>
<td>National Union of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/162</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/181</td>
<td>Religious Instruction in Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/190c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/195</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/198</td>
<td>Home Office Approved [?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/200</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/200</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/200</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/200</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Found in AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3 A speech given by Cardinal Hinsley on 29th June 1939 entitled ‘The Key Position of the Christian Teacher in the Renewal of Order’ to LCC Teachers The Cardinal founded his speech on the adage of Quintilian: “Education is a mighty subject with many ramifications; fresh points come up every day, and the last word on it will never be pronounced (page 1).” He understood that “a training of youth, in which physical and intellectual development is divorced from a thorough moral and religious formation, is lacking in the essential of true education (page 1)” and was aware of the times he was speaking in “Teachers are faced with the task of preparing youth to play their part in the new order, not the new order of which Hitler raves but an order founded upon the principles of justice and reason, which we hope to see established after the war (page 1).” Hinsley’s speech is predicated on the belief that:

- pupils and teachers are members of three societies: the family, the Church and the State (page 2);
- that there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education12 (page 3);
- tracing the antecedents of Pius XI’s teaching that that Catholic education should be in Catholic schools for Catholic youth to Leo XIII’s thesis that “it is necessary not only that religious instruction be given to the young at certain times, but also that every other subject taught be permeated with Christian piety (pages 3&4).”13 The justification for this is seen in what was

---

13 Cf. Leo XIII, Militantis Ecclesiae (On Saint Peter Canisius), Vatican, 1st August 1897.
happening in Germany where the de-Christianising of education is almost complete replacing a systematic study of Christ and his virtues with “the aggrandisement of their country (page 4).” He goes on to comment “in place of Christianity they have [devised] ‘Germanity’; to this new deity of early Nordic blood they sacrifice souls of youth. And they seek to deck their idol in a Christian disguise - a parody I can only characterise as blasphemous (page 4)…The British way is to call for the cooperation of sincere Christian teachers, the Nazi way is to liquidate all such teachers (additional sheet between pages 4&5).

On page 6, Hinsley offers a vision of an alternative “Christian” society. “Christianity alone is the basis of an ethical and social system which is absolute, rational, objective and personal (page 6).” Each of these attributes come from God and paradigmatic to the human person. Consequently, Hinsley argues “we want our boys and girls to grow up citizens, upright and steadfast, in moral purpose. And such they will become only if they are trained in schools which impart definite Christian doctrine, and inculcate those firm and inviolable standards of conduct which are so treasured a part of our Christian heritage (pages 6&7).” To validate this Hinsley returns to the teaching of Plato and the early Church Fathers; teachers he avows “[do] not merely fashion lifeless materials; [they] mould living souls after a divine model. That model is Christ (page 7).”

Hinsley ends his speech with a fourfold conclusion. Due to the nature of his audience; he rehearses once more the importance of the teacher in rebuilding society and establishing a new order offering a sacramental model of “the teacher” as the archetypal “good citizen.” (page 9) One annotation made by Hinsley on page 7 remains undeveloped but gives insight into his thinking post-War “surely we must all welcome reform; reform is the purpose and continuous aim of Church and school.” Perhaps he understood that an outcome of the current war would lead to change in society and the Church he led in England and Wales.

*Found in AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3 A Broadcast to the Eucharistic Congress in Wellington, New Zealand on the Occasion of the Centenary Celebration 2nd February 1940 by Cardinal Hinsley.* The place of education emerges in speeches given by Hinsley. In this broadcast he reminisces “you will not think it out of place if I recall also the New Zealand athletes – Your All Blacks…Would that peaceful cooperation and healthy competition of sport ‘Strife without slaughter and art without malice’ inspire the world of our times instead of the barbarism of warfare. May the days soon return when your All Blacks visit us once more. I salute the schools and colleges that bred such champions. May those schools and colleges continue to train men ready to work – yes, men proud to work with their hands, and to work in field and on farm; and may they
continue to educate girls to become worthy helpmates to the men – real home wives
devoted to house-work and happy mothers of bright families! The home and the family
create a lovely communion…I pray God to bless in a special manner your family life, for on
sound families is (sic) built up a sound and healthy nation (page 2).” Cardinal Hinsley
clearly saw education serving the family; here and in other speeches asserted the rights of
parents.

During the early-1940’s Hinsley was also attentive to the plight of the Polish community at
home and in exile. He re-assured them of their contribution to a war, not of their choosing,
of “right over might” (page 1).” [AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3 To the
Polish Nation on Easter Sunday 1940].

AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3 An Overseas Broadcast on Sunday,
2nd June 1940 by Cardinal Hinsley.

In this rather reflective address Cardinal Hinsley tries to articulate how the world ended up
at war. While making no explicit allusion to education; he is making judgments on the
formation of the individual and human person. “As St. Paul reminds us, the grace of Christ
gives to the faithful soul ‘the strength of the spirit which is might unto the inward man’,
making within ourselves a fortress that will never be stormed unless we yield to the column
of self-seeking evils in our own hearts. The chief of these internal traitors is PRIDE,
personal and national or racial – that false and disorderly impulse which would set man in
the place of man’s Creator. Against this the first line of spiritual defence is humility. This
humility is a ready acceptance of the truth that God and God’s interests always come first:
and this truth, where it is understood and accepted, duly orders every earthly concern
under the supreme command of the Divine Fatherhood of our Maker (page 6).”
Consequently, Hinsley in the tradition of Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII perceives a
system of education not founded on God as anathema - one only had to look to Germany,
and the rise of National Socialism, to see the peril of such an omission.

With the invasion of France in 1940, Hinsley began his sermon at Westminster Cathedral
on 16th June 1940 at 10.30 am Mass [found in AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also
catalogued Hi 3] with a personal reflection: “For the third time within my lifetime the soil
of that country is being ravaged and drenched in blood by an enemy without scruple and
without pity (page 1)”; yet he would in charity reflect later in the same sermon “The Nazi
youth, made drunk for success, are slaughtered for avowed pagan ideals (page 1).” Such
experience shaped his thinking, subsequent social policy and led to collaboration in the
field of education between Church and State. Throughout the War Hinsley won the
confidence of the State, and more importantly of Churchill, by supporting the war effort by rehearsing the spiritual Issues of the War. On Sunday 4th August 1940 he broadcast to the forces at 1.45 pm [found in AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued AAW Hi 3]. He began “you will understand if I speak my message to you out of the abundance of my heart, and in my straightforward if somewhat blunt English (page1).” Comparing their fight to that of the Archangel Michael against Lucifer Hinsley uses a parable from the Crusades to describe the soldier: “I like to think of the soldier as a knight of olden chivalry who laid his armour on the altar of God and spent his midnight vigil there beside it, striving to fit himself for his life’s grand work (page 2).” Yet Hinsley was aware that the soldiers listening to him may fall short of this ideal and face death within a few short hours. He wanted more than anything to give them hope and Christian consolation: “You know, as I know well, that you are weak of yourselves in the face of temptation…without [God] you can do nothing, but [He] will be your strength. Enrol yourselves as units under [God’s] command. [He] will pour out [His] spirit upon you. You shall be filled with the super-human fortitude of a true soldier of [His] Spirit (page 5).” In a talk given on the same day but as part of a series entitled The Spiritual Issues Of This War heard through The Networks of the National Broadcasting Company [AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued AAW Hi 3] Hinsley provides a spiritual justification for the war; arguing not for a return to the status quo, for he admits that “we have failed Christianity, not that Christianity has failed us or been found wanting (page 5).” He believed that “the dignity of the individual, the sanctity of the family [and] the happiness of youth” had been sacrificed through this “experiment of totalitarianism (page 5).” Hinsley could see much more “if the mechanised hordes of war-frenzied Nazis be permitted to overrun the free countries of the world (page 6).” Yet in his conclusion he would assert “But this I know, Christianity will finally triumph if we be true to its standard. Driven back into the Catacombs, Christianity will begin its saving work anew (page 6).” Interestingly for the Church and State, this spiritual assertion would mark a common endeavour that would lead to cooperation between Church and State beyond the war. Somehow in the midst of adversity churchmen and politicians learnt to trust each other.

Foyles Literary Luncheons: Luncheon in Honour of Free France. Speakers General De Gaulle & John Gordon esq., Chairman Cardinal Hinsley at the Grosvenor House, Park Lane, 9th January 1941 [found in AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued AAW Hi 3] Report supplied by T.C. Foley, 180, Fleet Street, EC4. Hinsley brought theology into the public space not only through his own words but by the adoption of his words and sentiments by others. Therefore, De Gaulle would speak freely at this lunch of the “soul of France” and more specifically “free France tries to merit that admirable dictum
of Cardinal Hinsley, [’]The spirit of France is not crushed; the spirit of Joan of Arc lives always and will conquer[’] (page 5).” Yet others, like John Gordon a veteran from the First World War, cautioned that mistakes made at the end of that war, should not be repeated and a more cohesive and just society should be built: “Rebuilding is going to be a difficult task. It may be that it will be a harder fight than even the war. The same old promises are already being made. I see in the newspapers that one of the things we are fighting for apparently is that there shall be a few more places for elementary boys in public schools. Isn’t it pathetic? (page 15)” From this loam would bloom the Green Book and eventually the 1944 Education Act.

Catholic Education Council, A Reply to the President of the Board of Education’s Attached Statement on Catholic Schools dated 22nd September 1943 [found in AAW Hi 3 [Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC]. This reply rehearses the need to place “the whole question in its true perspective. The responsibility for children belongs with their parents and not the State (page1).” This right is not diminished by either inadequate or absent parents. The CEC goes on “the State, in fact, exists to foster and protect the primary parental rights and to provide facilities from the common pool, to which all contribute, for the complete education of children according to the reasonable wishes of the parents. Hence in demanding schools where their children can be taught the tenets of their own religion by teachers inspired by their own Faith. Catholic parents are not asking for a favour but, on the contrary, demanding their clear and just rights (page 1).” The Council opined that it is unjust “that people who believe that education, which should be founded on religion in a Christian country, have to pay more for the schooling of their children than non-believers (page 1).” The debate in this exchange, other correspondence within and outside the Church and accounts of parliamentary debates, centred on the proportionate costs that Catholic community would be liable for in the forthcoming years; not only in the building and restoration of damaged schools but in meeting the running costs of ‘new’ Catholic schools. A detailed response from the CEC concerning potential brand-new schools - primary, modern, Grammar and Technical - which might follow the enactment of the 1944 Bill gives a fascinating insight into the concerns operative within the Catholic community at diocesan level. To date, Catholic grammar schools were often founded by religious orders who provided both capital and well-qualified teachers. This continued munificence was presumed by legislators but not by bishops.

The CEC took as a case study the Chislehurst Parliamentary Division with three thousand Catholic constituents (and ratepayers). There was only one elementary school that had been damaged “by enemy bombs”. This was partly rebuilt and extended to Board of
Education standards in 1938 at a cost of £3,500 with £2,600 still owed, with the refusal of the LEA to recognise the existing site, the St. Mary Cray parishioners had to now find and pay the full cost of another large school site and, in addition, pay 50% of the cost of the reconstruction of the school according to new standards. There is no Catholic school at Orpington, Petts Wood, Sidcup and Mottingham, though these rapidly developing districts require schools. If Catholic primary schools are to be built for Orpington and Petts Wood combined (page 2)” so the case study continues “[along with] Sidcup and Mottingham combined, they would have cost something like £16,000 each according to 1939 prices. In addition a senior school or schools will have to be provided. If only one such senior school (Modern) for the whole district is provided the cost will have been about £40,000. Altogether the Catholic constituents would have to find approximately £72,000 for their schools and at the same time to pay their full share in rates and taxes for the school of others (page 2).” The CEC went on also to address reservations over changes that the 1944 Bill would make to the provisions of the 1902 Act “regarding voluntary school children and so-called redundant schools (page 2).” As a consequence they raised the fear that Authorities may refuse to pay the running costs of new 'Catholic' schools “on the grounds that the children could be accommodated in Council schools (page 2).” The CEC believed that there were many dangerous possibilities for Catholic parents in paragraph 58 of the 1944 Bill.

In a letter from Rab Butler to Archbishop Griffin, dated 11th January 1944, he is sympathetic to the plight of the Catholic community but unyielding. However, Butler shares his confusion with the Archbishop: “I find some difficulty in contrasting the capital expenditure incurred by your community between the two wars with the Board’s estimate of some £10 million over the next 25 years. The estimates for the future owe much of their magnitude to the fact that improved standards are to be laid upon the interests concerned as a statutory necessity. Had many of the schools, not, alas, fallen so far behind, there would not be so many repairs, alterations or improvements to undertake to-day. I am the first to understand the human reasons for this situation and the sacrifices involved, but the fact is that our future figures have to take account of some considerable arrears (Reply from Rab Butler to Cardinal Griffin, dated 11th January 1944 [found in AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC], page 2). The estimates of the Board were significant less than the Church’s own internal approximations; in a paper dated 17th January 1944 entitled Estimate of Costs of Educational Reconstruction which would fall on the Catholic community under Para 56 (b) of the White Paper (Clause 95 of Bill) ref: AEH/WSB the authors calculated that to repair the current schools' estate would cost £22,050,000. This figure does not include interest
payments nor made provision for new schools. The figure was a multiple of existent demographic data which “covers 25% of [the] field on the basis of population and three diverse dioceses (page 1).” The multipliers presumed that “building costs [were] now 105% up on 1939 [and] repairs will cost 45% over pre-War when they can be executed ([found in AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC], page 1)."

There is a series of letters from diocesan bishops dated around 25th January 1944 in response to Archbishop Griffin’s note over his interview at the Board of Education. There is no note of this visit in the Archive; but the responses from the bishops refer to building costs and appointments. There is clearly much discussion over the merits of the Scottish system. Archbishop Williams comments in his letter dated 25th January 1944: “At present a teacher’s promotion depends on the goodwill of the parish priest; if the parish priest does not approve, the teacher is not appointed. The parish priest is often looking for an extra curate rather than for a good teacher, someone who will help in parish affairs; and the result is that many Catholic teachers do not seek places in Catholic schools, because they are more sure of promotion on merit than they are in Catholic schools, and because they don’t see why their promotion should be dependent on the favour of the P.P. (pages 1&2).” While the Bishop of Salford opines in his response to Archbishop Griffin, dated 27th January 1944, “As far as I am concerned, when this Bill passes, I propose to keep on agitating for the Scottish System, and I want to retain as much of our powers as possible, in order that we may have something to bargain with. I may be pessimistic, but I do not expect that the Bill will be much altered by a coalition Government and I fear that it will leave us in a position from which we must strive to emerge by agitation (page 1).” ([found in AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC])

There is an intriguing letter in the archive from Shane Leslie, dated 26th January 1944; the correspondent is clearly arranging lunch between the Prime Minster and newly appointed Archbishop. Winston Churchill suggested lunch. Leslie believes “this would be more agreeable to him as he does not want to discuss the Education Question having something rather serious on this mind this month [one can only presume preparations for D-Day]. The Secretaries say the time has not come for him to intervene in Education – at present it is in the hands of Parliament ([found in AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC], pages 1&2)."

AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42
This portfolio contains papers mostly from the time of Cardinal Bourne. The Archive records his encouragement and “fatherly interest (Letter from Mother Hutchinson, Secretary to the Conference of Convent Schools to Cardinal Bourne dated 12th February 1932 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42])” in the life and work of the Conference of Convent Schools and Colleges. He encouraged the Conference to respond positively to a request received from the National Association of Headmistresses that one of them address the Association’s June Conference (1932) on “The safe-guarding of individuality: 1. of the school and 2. of the child (a) in the training of character; (b) in intellectual discipline; (c) in out-of-school activities (Letter from Ethel Strudwick, President of the Association of Headmistresses to Mother Mary Anglea not dated [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42]).” This was to last no longer than fifteen minutes, to allow for questions. The first request was politely refused but after much persuasion, and a personal letter to Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U. of the Ursuline Convent, Forest Gate from Miss Strudwick, the lot fell on her to address the Meeting of the Headmistresses’ Association on 11th June 1932. Mother Mary’s treatise is a remarkable example of theological reflection in the public space and gives a fascinating insight into the mind of a Catholic educator in 1930’s. Her insights and principles still resonate; it is tragic that this talk did not receive a wider audience at the time.

“There are no problems of education older than those connected with its central task, the training of character – and none which have given rise to deeper and more constant thought (Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U., The Safeguarding of the Individuality of the Child in the Training of Character, 11th June 1932 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42]).” Mother Mary identified that the major fear facing her audience; the danger of what she called “the mass-production of character (page 1)” in larger educational communities. This had led in recent times to the development of “new education” with its characteristic doctrine of self-expression. Her treatment of this new movement is thorough, first, because she “cannot believe that the method of self-expression, carried to its logical conclusion, provides any real safeguard to individuality” valuable to the individual himself, or to society, and second, by placing the good or convenience of others as the only limit of its action, it ignores objective standards of right and wrong, and so must lead, if not to unrestricted egoism, at best to a weak humanitarianism. Moreover, it ignores the practical fact that the young child soon exhausts, not merely that which it has worth expressing, but that which it is able to express at all…The deepest fact, which is often ignored when character training is

14 The two objects of the Association were to: a. maintain the Catholic tradition and character of our schools in educational theory and practice and b. to facilitate the interchange of ideas and information on all school matters.
approached from the angle of self-expression, is the distinction between individuality and personality, and this distinction provides a clue to the solution of our problem.

The word individual (sic) refers strictly to a unit in a class of material things, and as applied to man stresses his psycho-physical aspect – his body, his temperament based on bodily functioning, his instinctive impulses reacting to the material world with which he is in contact through his bodily senses. But a person, in the metaphysical sense of the term, is ‘an individual substance intellectual in nature and master of his actions’ free from the entire mechanism of human nature. In other words its essence is in the human soul, capable of pure thought and free will, and each soul according to the belief which I hold, is a separate creation of God, sustained in life by Him and destined to an eternal good. Our task, then, in the training of character is to find means of developing, not so much individuality, which may lead to an eventual dominance of idiosyncrasy or egoism, but personality by the integration of character round the spiritual core of the person (Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U., The Safeguarding of the Individuality of the Child in the Training of Character, 11th June 1932 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42], pages 3-4).

The ethos of an effective school is summed up in a pithy sentence: “Courage is born in an atmosphere of trust[,] sincerity in that of truth, purity in beauty, and gentleness in love (Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U., The Safeguarding of the Individuality of the Child in the Training of Character, 11th June 1932 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42], page 6).”

Mother Mary’s developmental understanding of the child is astute. For while Mother Mary is confident of the transformative effect of the school, she is also aware that this formation is only part of the story and recognises that when a child comes to school “half the work of character training is done, and the main trends of disposition, fixed for good or ill. The previous training which the children have received as well as their original endowment, make it impossible for them to [be] forced into the same mould, and any attempt to do so will be injurious to the child, and result in superficial uniformity, if not in more or less open rebellion (Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U., The Safeguarding of the Individuality of the Child in the Training of Character, 11th June 1932 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42], page 7).” For within senior “school life falls the period of adolescence with its plasticity. The girl awakening to a clearer self-consciousness and a keener self-criticism grows in sense of personal responsibility, in discernment of higher values and in depth of spiritual aspiration. She is therefore more ready and more able to undertake the work of self-training. On the other hand, she is more in peril than at any other time of life of becoming the slave to conventional habits of mind and conduct, or of her own emotional desires…[Mother Mary goes on]…The adolescent girl needs understanding and judicious sympathy, but a lax standard is fatal to the growth and freedom of her personality as [a]n over rigid code of rules backed by the sanctions of reward and punishment (Mother Mary Anglea Boord
In conclusion Mother Mary observes: “The means by which personality may be safeguarded in the training of character may be summed up in the words addressed to the children in her school by the foundress of a modern educational order: ‘Be yourself, but make that self just what God wants it to be.’ From the very nature of the task, there are no rules for its accomplishment – it is an individual matter aiming at an individual end. It is the spirit that quickeneth and if the spirit in which the work is understood is based on a realisation of the high origin and eternal destiny of the child, there is little fear that the end will be misunderstood or the means to it misdirected (Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U., The Safeguarding of the Individuality of the Child in the Training of Character, 11th June 1932 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42], page 9).” In twenty-first century political discourse God may not be mentioned, but there is still a desire to cultivate within education a self-respect born of a common dignity that finds expression both within and outside of him or herself. The dialectic of individuality and personality continues.

It was not only members of religious orders who gathered to reflect on educational matters but lay teachers in Convent Secondary Schools were encouraged to do so by the bishops at their Low Week Meeting, 1940. In 1942 there is a memorandum to the Hierarchy from the Association of Lay Teachers in Convent Secondary Schools recording its first Annual General Meeting held at Campion Hall, Oxford in January 1942 and a subsequent meeting, at the behest of Cardinal Hinsley, of this Association and the Conference of Catholic Convent Schools and Colleges on 7th February 1942. Clearly, Cardinal Hinsley was keen to increase the capacity for dialogue within and across the Catholic community. While most of the matters recorded in this memorandum were operational. An interesting proposal was raised by the Association: “At the earliest opportunity a scheme of Courses of Lectures at University Centres, should be put into operation, to meet the need for providing Catholic teachers with a higher standard of general religious knowledge. We suggest that the scheme should take the form of a two-year Diploma Course, and a two-year Subsidiary Course for Graduates – the question of an Honours Degree Course in Sacred Studies attached to one of the Universities could be fully investigated after the war (Memorandum to the Hierarchy of England and Wales From the association of Lay
Teachers in Convent Secondary Schools, Low Week, 1942, [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42]).” What were being put in place, consciously or unconsciously, were the building blocks that would sustain Catholic educational provision after the War. I find it intriguing in this and other papers in the Archive; the utter and absolute belief by HMG and Hinsley that Britain and her Allies would win the War.

This is evidenced by the Board’s publication in 1942 of the ‘Green Book’ to a select minority. This publication elicited a response from the Conference of Catholic Convent Schools. In April 1942 the Executive of the aforementioned Conference wrote to Cardinal Hinsley urging caution in ongoing negotiations. The Executive noted that the majority of Grant-earning Catholic secondary schools belong to the direct-grant group and “according to the original plan outlined in the Government’s ‘Green Book’ Direct-grant schools, in the interests of educational variety and freedom were to retain their present position, but since it has been conceded that no school receiving public money shall charge fees the question has arisen of how the consequent loss of income to these schools is to be made good (Note from Association of Convent Schools (Association of Convent Schools, April 1942 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42]).)” This was particularly pressing since often the Catholic Secondary School formed an integral part of the Convent building “and has its scholastic and domestic organisation bound up with the life of the Community. It is impossible to interfere with one without affecting the other, and it is obvious that control of the School by an outside secular authority would be at best inconvenient and at worst disastrous (Association of Convent Schools, April 1942 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42]).” The Executive were suspicious of LEA’s and wanted to remain under the direct control of the Board of Education, receiving from the Board increased grants to compensate for lack of fees. Failing this, “that the appointment of teachers may be left in the hands of their Governing Bodies as at present constituted (provided that suitably qualified candidates are appointed) and that safe-guards against domestic interference by LEA’s or Directors of Education may be devised (Association of Convent Schools, April 1942 [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42]).”

On 5th June 1936 a discussion on “the Homework Problem” was led by Sr. Margaret Maria of the Sisters of Charity of St. Paul, Edgbaston [AAW Hi 2/10 1930-42].
AAW Hi 2/27 1938-40 - Joint Opinion on New Trust Deed for Catholic Senior Schools following on from 1936 Act

A letter was received from the Catholic Education Council dated 6th November 1939 and the agreement achieved that “the Board should assist Secondary Schools in meeting the expenses to which they have been put by reason of the war. (Letter to Archbishop Hinsley from Robert Matthew, Secretary to the Catholic Education Council dated 6th November 1939, [AAW Hi 2/27 1938-40], page 1).”

AAW Hi 2/69 1937-38

This portfolio contains papers concerning Archbishop Hinsley’s elevation to the College of Cardinals and Cardinal Hinsley’s election to the Athenaeum Club under Rule 2.

There is a fascinating exchange of correspondence in this portfolio between Lord Southwell and Cardinal Hinsley over the question of evacuation and the education of Catholic children in the provinces. On 9th May 1940 Cardinal Hinsley wrote to Lord Southwell reassuring him that Archbishop Amigo and he had visited the Board of Education and were assured “that the unity of our schools in Catholic neighbourhoods under our own teachers would be granted (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Lord Southwell undated but in pencil (9th May 1940, [AAW Hi 2/27 1938-40])).” He goes on “with regard to the reaffirmation of our principle ‘Catholic Schools under Catholic Teachers, with a Catholic atmosphere and under Catholic control,’ we are resolved to do our utmost to proclaim aloud this invariable basis or our policy (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Lord Southwell undated but in pencil (9th May 1940, [AAW Hi 2/27 1938-40])).” He wrote the above aware of the moves to establish a Royal Commission “on the teaching of religion in the schools of this country and especially on the religious training of teachers (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Lord Southwell undated but in pencil (9th May 1940, [AAW Hi 2/27 1938-40])).”

AAW Hi 2/31 1898, 1918, 1930, 1934-40 Catholics and non-Catholic Schools

Within this file we find the initial statement of the bishops on the above, dated 1905. This statement was republished in its entirety after their Low Week Meeting, 1918. The content is captured in the first sentence: “We desire to call the earnest attention of all Catholics to the grave departure from Catholic teaching and tradition, and to the very serious dangers to the Catholic faith and spirit, which are involved in the placing of Catholic children, of whatever class in life, in non-Catholic schools (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/31 1898, 1918, 1930, 1934-40 Catholics and non-Catholic Schools], page 2).” In part this was because of the belief that religion lay at the heart of the curriculum and should not be marginalised. As put
poetically in a talk entitled “Catholics and the Public Schools” given by Fr. John Norris (Oratory) 1898:

There is first the danger to the boy’s faith: and the danger is both positive and negative. He will, of course, be excused attendance at chapel and prayers and all direct religious instruction, but, in the nature of things, he cannot be excused very ‘positive’ [or porous] religious instruction. All day long, all through the school year, he will be under the influence of a powerful solvent, as sure and effective as the action of weather on various kinds of stone. In the classroom he will be under men of various views, one high, another low, a third broad, one will be rationalistic, another materialistic, and all will have little respect for the faith of one or two little Catholic boys they may come across. They will not of set purpose interfere with a boy’s faith – I trust not and believe not – but, even if that is secure, they are but men after all, and you cannot expect that they will guard their words and avoid expressing their opinions for fear of the one boy in their class. It is too much to expect that they should even think of it at all; and if a man is an earnest teacher, he must in a thousand different ways impress his own mind on to the mind of his youthful pupil: Ex abunda

It is apparent from the correspondence and paperwork in this file that Cardinal Bourne reserved the right of giving Catholic parents permission to send their children to non-Catholic schools to himself. Cardinal Hinsley in a letter, from his Private Secretary, dated 23rd September 1935 delegated this power to Fr W.J. Wood “except in any question of doubt when His grace wishes you to refer the matter to him (Letter from Private Secretary to Fr. W.J. Wood [AAW Hi 2/31 1898, 1918, 1930, 1934-40 Catholics and non-Catholic Schools]).”

AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40
In this file there is a couple of interesting papers from Cardinal Bourne’s time. The first, is from the “Board of Education. Proposals for Aid to Non-Provided Schools: for the purposes of re-organisation and raising the school age which were considered by a Conference [Between Church Leaders, Officials and Ministers, LEA’s and Teachers’ Organisations]

15 (For) out of an abundance of the heart, the mouth speaks.
held at the Board of Education on 13th and 14th January 1931.” In Appendix C of this short paper all the representatives present, apart from the Free Church representatives, thought that the amended proposals could be “presented to their various interests with a likelihood of acceptance (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40], page 2).” It is fascinating how there is an echo of current educational reform within the proposals as amended by the Conference16. Especially points 1, 2 and 3:

1. Local Education Authorities may make arrangements with Managers of non-provided Schools which are required for purposes of re-organisation or for raising the school, leaving age.
2. Associations of schools may be constituted in the area of any Local Education Authority representative of the Managers of the schools of any particular Denomination and of its Church Authorities. Such Associations may be authorised to make agreements under this Section on behalf of their constituent Managers and to act for the Managers in every other respect under this Act if so desired by the Managers.
3. Such agreements are to be made between Local Education Authorities on the one hand, and, on the other, Associations of schools or Bodies of Managers of individual schools. Throughout the proposals the word “Managers” means either Associations of Schools or individual Bodies of Managers (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40], page 5).

This Appendix goes on in points 8-12 to rehearse who teachers are in the employment of and the place of reserved posts within non-provided schools and points 13 and 14 the provision of religious education in provided and non-provided schools (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40], pages 5-6).

The second is, an undated single page, written by the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales in which they enunciate “principles which underlie the Catholic attitude on Education [AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40].” This paper is written on the occasion of the forthcoming General Election to help Catholics act in “conformity with Catholic teaching [AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40]”:

1. It is no part of the normal (sic) function of the State to teach (sic).
6. The teacher is always acting in loco parentis, never in loco civitatis, though the State, to safeguard its citizenship, may take reasonable care to see that teachers are efficient.
7. Thus a teacher never is, and never can be a civil servant, and should never regard himself or allow himself to be so regarded. Whatever authority he may possess to teach and control children, and to claim their respect and obedience, comes to him from God through the parents, and not through the State, except in so far as the State is acting on behalf of the parents.

---

16 The Catholic Church was represented by Cardinal Bourne, The Archbishop of Cardiff, Mr. F.N. Blundell, D.L., J.P. and Mr. J. Scurr, M.P.
The model operative hints at the First Synodal Letter of Westminster, made more explicit, by the incomplete and undated response from The Archbishop of Westminster (same paper used by Hinsley in a letter dated 1938) in response to a letter from the Bishop of Shrewsbury (not in the Archive) in which Westminster refers to the Education Act, 1936 on page 5: “If we cannot succeed in our proposals for re-organisation in certain cases, then we should allow our schools to remain exactly and precisely as they are under [the] Principal Act...We can stay were we are providing we watch the future of those schools carefully, making them efficient enough to satisfy good reasonable Catholic (sic) parents. This is perhaps heroic for us and for the parents, but heroism is needed to show we will never surrender or consent to barter over children’s souls. See Westminster Synods and appeal to parents against sending sons to Eton and Harrow. We yield only to ‘force majeure’ as the German Catholics ([AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40]).”

There is significant debate post-1936 over how “Catholic” senior schools, especially, should be staffed and concern within the Hierarchy that its common and unified voice on this issue, may be lost. Resolution of this debate, which often accounts for little more than static in the wider educational debate surrounding capital and plant would become necessary by 1944; would any compromise be principled or piecemeal? The Bishop of Salford would write in his letter to Archbishop Hinsley on 10th February 1937:

The Bishops once decided that we should insist upon 100% Catholic teachers in our schools. Is anyone giving way on this point? I do not know and I don’t suppose you know. But if one gives way we shall have to give way eventually.

It seems to me that we are going through an important crisis in Catholic Education and a meeting of the Hierarchy once a month at least is the only way to meet it ([AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40]).

Even with this proposal it was hard to establish and maintain a common line in the face of demographic change, increase in the school leaving-age and an enlargement in the number of teachers required across the Catholic system.

Interestingly in this file, in a letter to Cardinal Hinsley dated 10th January 1940 from Christopher Hollis of Burns, Oates & Washbourne concerning a growing recognition “from several sources that there is at present a grave lack of adequate scripture text books for Catholic boys and girls at the school certificate stage (Letter from Christopher Hollis of Burns, Oates & Washbourne to Cardinal Hinsley dated 10th January 1940, ([AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40], page 1)).” In Cardinal Hinsley’s response, six months before the start of the Battle of Britain on 10th July 1940, he fully approves “of the scheme proposed by Messrs Burns, Oates & Washbourne to publish a series of Scripture Text Books. (Letter from
Cardinal Hinsley to Christopher Hollis of Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 11th January 1940, [AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40], page 1 and only goes on to make suggestions concerning the editorial board. He sought no editorial supervision; something his successors from the 1970’s onwards did not hold fast to. Even with Cardinal Hinsley’s commitment to securing schools that Catholic parents could send their children to and learn about faith and morals founded on objective right and wrong; he did not consider that the operational management of resources should fall into his bailiwick.

AAW Hi 2/106 1936-40, 1944 Catholic Teachers’ Guild

In this file is an undated paper written by The Catholic Teachers’ Federation giving a brief overview of the place of Catholic education in the educational provision of the early twentieth century: “The withdrawal of the Runciman Bill was the last of the four Bills in the two years, 1906-1908, to attempt to revise the 1902 Act. All had failed, but at the same time they came too near success for Catholic teachers to beget false hopes or relax their vigilance. Like the Jews of old the position of the Catholic body in the building of Catholic education was the trowel in one hand and the sword in the other (The Catholic Teachers’ Federation, Past: Present: Future:, [AAW Hi 2/106 1936-40, 1944 Catholic Teachers’ Guild], page 2).”

In a publication in this portfolio entitled ‘Guild of Catholic Teachers: Proceedings. First Annual Issue 1934-35’ Fr. W.E. Brown, Chaplain to the Guild, writes a foreword. In it, we read Brown’s commentary on the “function of the teacher”. This threefold function consists of: “First[ly].… the teacher must give instruction; secondly, he must make learning attractive; and thirdly, he must turn the will of the pupil to desire to act on the instruction and make it his own (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/106 1936-40, 1944 Catholic Teachers’ Guild], page 7).”

Brown believes that “by setting forth the third duty of a teacher that St. Thomas most clearly goes beyond the theory of those who would treat the pupil as a lump of plasticine to be fashioned by the master. The Catholic writer of the thirteenth century already recognised that the pupil was a human personality whose own mind and whose own will must make the teaching his own. In another part of his Summa Theologica St. Thomas returns to this point, reminding his readers that the business of the instructor is only to assist and help the learner’s mind which is itself the principal agent in acquiring knowledge. St. Thomas, then, would have condemned as false the doctrine which treats the child as a machine to produce calculations or opinions at the correct moment. And equally he would have found insufficient the doctrine which treats pupils as anonymous, a
batch of human natures, of whom so much percent can be brought up to the standard of knowledge set in public examinations. For the antiquated scholastic the pupil was not mere human nature but a human person, with his own mind and will to seize and make his own the knowledge which the teacher can put in his way. And no doubt for this reason St. Thomas never thought even of discussing how to teach children, but always discussed how one master can teach one child (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/106 1936-40, 1944 Catholic Teachers’ Guild], page 7).” In quoting this passage verbatim; one senses the prevailing educational mood of the time and how educators had been influenced by Aquinas, were wary of the role of the State in education, the influence of contemporary political models of totalitarianism (both left and right) and the consequences of the industrial revolution.

In response to a letter written by Canon Wood on 19th May 1938 concerning the Catholic Teachers’ Guild, Cardinal Hinsley responds:

3. I suggest that the Guild could contribute valuable assistance to the Bishop of Clifton who has been authorised by the Hierarchy to form a Commission for the extension and revision of the programme of Religious Instruction, especially in view of re-organisation and the raising of the school-leaving age. The Teachers’ Guild in Scotland is doing such work by authority of the Bishops (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Canon Wood, 21st May 1938, [Hi 2/106 1936-40, 1944 Catholic Teachers’ Guild]).


The following decision was made by the Education Committee and adopted by the full Council:

(a) That candidates for appointment to non-provided schools as reserved teachers (as defined by the Education Act, 1936), and, in relation to the duties of the post to which they have been appointed, teachers recognised as reserved teachers in non-provided schools, be excepted from the operation of regulation 177, relating to the religious opinion or beliefs of teachers and candidates for appointment as teachers; and that the Council be recommended accordingly.

The Committee went on to offer guidance on the appointment of a headteacher of non-provided schools with the context of an expansion or establishment of a new senior school. The most significant decision is (d):

(d) That, until further order, as exceptional cases within the meaning of rules 700 (d) and 703, headteachers of non-provided schools maintained by the Council be regarded as eligible for consideration in connection with the appointment of a reserved headteacher to a newly established non-
provided school for senior children which is to be associated for the purposes of organisation with their respective schools, provided that no such headteacher shall be considered if his or her appointment to the post in question would constitute a promotion.

**AAW Hi 2/112 1930**

This portfolio comprises correspondence over the make-up of the Headmasters' Conference and Mgr Vance’s proposed motion “That this Headmasters’ Conference is of [the] opinion that a separate and independent Headmistresses’ Conference for Nuns, similar to the Headmistresses’ Conference for the girls public schools in England, would be a suitable arrangement for the future (enclosed in a letter to Cardinal Bourne from Mgr Vance dated 21st March 1930 [AAW Hi 2/112 1930])."

**AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43**

This portfolio emerged half way through my reading of the Griffin Archives. There is a fascinating pamphlet issued by London County Council entitled: “RELIGIOUS EDUCATION A Message to London Teachers.” While the pamphlet refers to administrative decisions concerning the provision of religious education, in the fourth paragraph it turns to the importance of assemblies for whole-school life:

…There is, however, one point to which the Council attaches special importance and which I must bring to the notice of teachers. This is the value to the school life of a well-conducted daily assembly for the purpose of an act of simple and reverent corporate worship. I know that such assemblies do take place in almost every school – but not quite in all and sometimes not on every day of the week. Sometimes there are special reasons; there are, for example, schools in which a daily assembly of the whole school is physically impossible and the restrictive conditions cannot be removed till victory enables us to turn our resources to constructive effort. But in regard to other schools, I am to express the hope that a daily assembly will become an unchanging rule.17 I hope, too, that before very long schools which feel the need for concrete suggestions and advice will have further help in making the morning assembly as beautiful and impressive as possible (E.G. Savage, Education Officer, London County Council, “RELIGIOUS EDUCATION A Message to London Teachers”, November 1942 [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).

Mr Savage sees this custom of assembly as following in a fine tradition of English men: “in those past ages the greatest of England’s sons from Alfred onwards to Drake and Nelson were notable not only for their steadfast adherence to the faith that upheld them but for their public expression of the fact (ibid, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43], § 2).” As early as 13th October 1937, representations were being made to Archbishop Hinsley about

---

17 This aspiration would be enshrined in the 1944 Act.
the need for a national “Catholic” syllabus in Religious Instruction. In a letter from the Bishop of Northampton to Archbishop Hinsley, dated 13th October 1937 he writes:

I. I have received the following from Fr. H. Drinkwater, Secretary to the Board of Diocesan Inspectors:

that the Board submit to the Hierarchy the advisability of drawing up a National Syllabus of Religious Instruction, as for Infant, Junior and Senior Schools, and ask them to appoint a Commission to consider it! (sic)

This motion was passed at the meeting of the Board on April 28th 1937 [AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34]).

This portfolio gives an insight into Cardinal Hinsley’s appreciation of the importance of education in the life of the Church and Society in 1942; most illuminating are two papers. The first a Statement on Education by the Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales in November 1942; this is a verbatim replica of Cardinal Hinsley’s letter to ‘The Times’ dated 31st October 1942 (below). Aspects of the Atlantic Charter have become part of the Church’s narrative:18

The air is full of discussion on reform of education. On this great question of reconstruction of the national system of education there are three points which we Catholics desire to be kept in mind. (1) The freedoms of consciences of all must be respected: Mr Roosevelt has made it clear that this is one of the four great liberties for which we are fighting. (2) Next we stoutly maintain that in the past we have proved our determination to promote the progress of education, and while, we cling to our principles, we are confident that justice done to us will not obstruct the advancement we all desire in the future. (3) The Catholic body in this country comes mostly from the workers and from the poorer section of the community. We are a minority. Therefore our Catholic parents have a special claim for fair play, especially from any and every party or group that professes to uphold the just claims of workers and the rights of minorities.

The future of our Catholic schools is of vital concern to us. We do not yet know what changes may take place in the administration of the national system since no official proposals have been made public by the Government. But clearly and decisively our elementary schools, numbering 1,260, and containing before the war some 400,000 children, must and will remain Catholic. They were built by us out of the poverty of our people, who at the same time also paid their rates and taxes like other people. While continuing within the national system our schools should receive equal

---

18 The sixth point of the Atlantic Charter, 14th August 1941, a joint statement by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill of their mutual goals for the post-WWII world, states: after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
treatment with other schools, since the general demand now is that there be “equal opportunity for all.” No equal opportunity will exist for a minority who are saddled with extra and crushing financial burdens because of their definite religious convictions and because they cannot accept a syllabus of religious instruction acceptable to the many. Furthermore, our schools for higher education, built by Catholics, whether they receive grants-in-aid or are entirely independent because built by and maintained by their founders, shall not be subjected to the undue control of the State or be victims of expropriation of any sort.

We adhere unswervingly to the principles repeatedly stated by the Catholic hierarchy of this country on the Christian education of youth, principles authoritatively expounded by Pius XI in the Encyclical “Divini Illius Magistri.” We emphatically repeat that we are convinced that no political party will seek to or be able to set at naught the respect of the British people for the rights of minorities.

A. CARDINAL HINSLEY, Archbishop of Westminster. On behalf of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to The Editor of The Times, 31st October 1942, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).

19 A part response to this Statement, the Cardinal’s letter to Mr Butler, dated 3rd November 1942 (below) and Cardinal Hinsley’s letter to The Times, 31st October 1942, (also below) can be seen in a letter to Cardinal Hinsley from R. A. Butler from the Board of Education, Alexandra House, Kingsway. London W.2, 4th November 1942, parts of the letter kept in the Archive, have been underlined in pencil:

My dear Cardinal,

Thank you very much for your letter. You are correct in supposing that our proposals were not definitive (sic) and therefore not intended for the public, and you have been right to consider them confidential, as indeed the Anglican hold them to be.

I did not quite know what significance to attach to your Eminence’s published letter in the “Times”, since I had had no considered answer to the proposals, which I put before the deputation led by the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark some little time ago, and I presumed that you were still considering them. I shall look forward to receiving the reaction of the Hierarchy to the proposals as soon as you are ready (sic).

Meanwhile, it is good of you to send me an account of your reasons for writing the public letter at this stage. In my view – as you have seen from the Government proposals – you need not fear that it is the Government’s desire to cause any uneasiness to your people.

It is our desire to do our best for your schools within the framework of one homogeneous plan. There is no doubt that the plan, which I have discussed now with all the other interests involved, has been generally well received, and I hope that in the light of future talks it may be found to meet your views.

Meanwhile, I retain the most pleasant memories of our previous conversations and look forward to our future co-operation in assisting the forward march of educational reform.

Yours very sincerely,

R.A. Butler [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].
This statement was incorporated into a Pastoral Letter by Cardinal Hinsley for Advent 1942. In this Pastoral Letter we read an additional political commentary which gives an insight to Hinsley’s understanding of the status quaestionis facing society:

…We must resist to the last any system of state absolutism such as in other lands [that] captures the bodies and souls of its children, thus usurping the rights and responsibilities of the parents. We find it difficult to suppose that any party in this country would dream of such an invasion of the family. But we must never cease to stress the dangers that threaten us the homes and hearths of our land. Catholic parents, see to it that your children are brought up at home and at school in a Catholic atmosphere; see to it that they are guarded against the evil influences and practice which prevail on every side in these days when incentives to vice are multiplied and many necessary restraints are removed. The future of our Catholic schools is of deep concern to us all…(Westminster Pastoral Letter, Advent 1942, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43], page 9).

A letter was also sent from Cardinal Hinsley to Mr Butler at the Board of Education, Alexandra House, dated 3rd November 1942:

My Secretary has told me of your message to me through your secretary by telephone this morning.

My letter to ‘The Times was sent on the supposition that an answer had been sent, or was on the point of being sent, by the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark, according to the decision of the Hierarchy last Thursday20, to your

20 The relevant Acta of the Annual Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, held on Thursday, October 29th 1942, reads:

4. It was agreed that the already existing informal Committee become a permanent body and that the following be added to it:

(a) the Archbishop of Liverpool and the Bishop of Clifton to be the representatives of the Hierarchy along with the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark and the Bishop of Lancaster;
(b) two representatives – one secular, one regular – of the Conference of Catholic Colleges;
(c) two representatives of the Association of Convent Schools;
(d) the Bishop of Pella, Lord Southwell, Lord Rankilour and Sir John Shute as representatives of the Catholic Education Council;
(e) one Catholic Labour Member of Parliament;
(f) the Hon. Mrs. Bower and Mr. Jack Donovan;
(g) one representative from the Federation of Catholic Teachers.

The following “terms of reference” were agreed to regarding this Committee:

(a) to form a deputation to the Board of Education to state definite decisions of the Hierarchy;
(b) to keep Catholic M.P.s and other friendly Members of Parliament informed of our determinations and to keep us informed of developments in the political sphere;
(c) conferences to be held with M.P.s on decisions taken by the Bishops;
(d) the function of this Committee is to be advisory.
confidential (sic) letter to him. I purposely used the words “made public” because we understood that the proposals made by you to the Archbishop-Bishop and his Committee were confidential. Am I right, therefore, in concluding that your proposals were not absolutely definite and therefore were not intended for the public? I would also note that the same view of your proposals being confidential was taken by the Anglicans.

My letter to ‘The Times’ was intended to allay the uneasiness of our people who have been very much disturbed by the Resolution of the T.U.C. at Blackpool. We were anxious that no fiery agitation should have the opportunity of flaring up through misunderstanding.

Assuring you of my confidence and good-will (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Mr Butler, 3rd November 1942, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43])."

Also of interest in a letter of Cardinal Hinsley to the Anglican Bishop of Chichester on 6th November 1942 is the twofold reason he believes that the Government will not adopt the Scottish system of education in England because of:

a) Finance
b) The different conditions prevailing in Scotland where there are – practically – only two denominations ([AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).

In this portfolio, there is a hand-written note from Lord Rankeillour, dated 28th November 1942, from Herons Ghyll, in which we gain an insight into Major Morton’s role in negotiations. Under the title “Very Confidential” Rankeillour writes to Cardinal Hinsley:

My dear Lord Cardinal,

I had a long and interesting talk with Major Morton yesterday. He confirms my view as to Mr Butler that (1) he is very well disposed but (2) that he definitely rejects as impracticable anything on the Scottish lines. I gather however that the idea of the Government bringing all (sic) schools up to date by one big capital payment as part of “National Reconstruction” is not impossible and I suggest that we direct our energies to that end.

Then there is the question of future repairs. Logically they too ought to be paid for wholly out of public funds. Dogmatic religion will be paid for in Council schools and why not our dogmas in our own? Politically, however, is this possible, and, if not, how much can we concede?

5. it was resolved

(a) that formal acknowledgement of Mr Butler’s be sent by the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark on behalf of the Hierarchy, and that the Minister be requested to arrange to meet the augmented Committee;
(b) that meanwhile the original Committee should continue to act and represent the Bishops in negotiations with the Board;
(c) that the augmented Committee begins to operate (under the Archbishop of Liverpool) as soon as it is decided to send a deputation to the Board of Education to state the definite decisions of the Hierarchy ([AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).
Theoretically we could make a lot of teaching fit in with the lines, if not the form, of the proposed syllabus – e.g. the Fundamental Necessary Truths”, the Commandments, Bible History etc. but could we arrange this so as to be able to say "we will pay for what is special to ourselves but not for what you (sic) get gratis.” If we cannot say this perhaps we might agree to an amount proportionate to the school hours taken up by our religious teaching. I think it would be about 12.5%

Could we come to a provisional understanding, I think we could get to know when the matter was going to the Prime Minister so that we could approach him personally at the right moment. He too is well disposed but of course he is terribly engrossed and I don’t suppose that the technique of education is one of his lines.

There are two other matters on which I think we must be careful – (1) that “bringing up to date” really includes everything necessary and (2) that our statistics are as accurate as the uncertainties of the time allow. I am not happy about the estimates sent in from the Diocese to Robert Matthew. Have they been tabulated and checked by experts? It might be disastrous if they were knocked out by the authorities at the Board.

I need hardly add that if your eminence wishes to see me again I will gladly come to Archbishop’s House or Hertfordshire.

Believe me, my dear Lord Cardinal

Ever sincerely yours,

Rankeilour [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

In a copy of ‘The Catholic Teacher (Organ of CTF)’, dated November 1942, which appears in this portfolio. A letter from Cardinal Hinsley to a private correspondent is reproduced, with permission. It is difficult to be certain of the letter’s provenance. Yet the assertions made by the Cardinal if authentic, prepare the way for Griffin and must have caused the Government grave concern:

I have always looked upon Trades Unions as the champions of Labour interest. And I have heard much from Trade Unionists about “equality of opportunity.” With amazement now I hear that the T.U.C., or certain representatives of Labour – are bent on robbing a large section of Labour (sic) – Catholic workers – of the most treasured possessions, their schools built out of poverty during years of self-sacrifice, and further that those Labour delegates are determined to deprive the children of Catholic labourers of such “equal opportunity.” It won’t (sic) act. Catholics pay taxes like other people. They have also built their schools out of their own pockets. Catholics like Garland, V.C., Paddy Finucane, Erskine Esmond V.C., Adam Wakenshaw V.C., have died for the liberty of the land and other Catholics of the same kidney are fighting and dying for the same cause. Do the T.U.C want to Nazify the country for which such men give themselves.
The T.U.C. shall not pull that off… (‘The Catholic Teacher (Organ of CTF)’, November 1942, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43], page 6).

The second, a new syllabus of Religious Instruction; even in the midst of war, there is proposed innovation to the method followed and revision of the religious education syllabus proposed for Catholic schools. This is evidenced by Hinsley’s preface to ‘Suggestions for Teachers for those using the New Syllabus of Religious Instruction in Westminster and Southwark’, dated 16th March 1942. On page 2 Hinsley writes:

**Nova et veteran** (*sic*). – The old everlasting truths of revelation can be taught in a fresh manner and with a new outlook. The new methods indicated in these “Suggestions” avoid the disagreeable drudgery of the past and using the latest methods employed in secular teaching, give a new interest to this all-important subject in the school curriculum and aim at making religion enter deeper in to the lives of children.

We clearly recognize that there is more than information needed; the whole atmosphere of the school must be penetrated with the sweetness of faith. Our training of youth is a **formation** (*sic*), the making of athletes for the contest of life. We are not satisfied till. as St. Paul says, Christ be formed in the souls entrusted to us. The life of Our Lord must be the centre and focus to which our endeavours to mould His “little ones” are directed. Therefore the importance of the teaching of Holy Scripture becomes evident for the written word of God, interpreted by His Church, treats wholly of Him who is “the way, the truth and the life” in terms that no human literature can improve because the inspired authors chose them under the impulse of the Holy Ghost. Holy Scripture is the Word of God.

Finally the real, true, substantial presence of our Divine Lord in the Sacrament of the Altar makes the Mass to the eyes of faith Bethlehem and Nazareth and Calvary. This is the reason why these “Suggestions” stress the teaching of the late Holy Father and of Pius XII that the knowledge and love of the Mass should be the foundation upon which the spiritual life can best be built. Now, when rampant disunion and hatred have shown the dire need of some bond of peace, the Holy Eucharist, which pre-eminently unites the true Vine with His members, becomes more than ever a vital fount whence the earth may be renewed [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

The bishops of the time were very aware of the danger of disunity *ad intra* and *ad extra*, aware of how some outside the Catholic community were willing to make mischief and suggest that Catholics were ‘naturally’ disloyal. This thesis the bishops railed against, as exemplified in a Pastoral Letter written by the Bishop of Lancaster for Lent 1942 entitled “The National Youth Movement”:

The Holy Father is constantly praying for the coming of the day when all his children may once more be reunited in the bands of love as befits the sons of God redeemed by the Precious Blood of Christ. All good Catholics are united with the Common Father in that prayer. Deeply as they detest the wickedness, the ruthlessness and the aggression of the Nazi warlords, they
will never so far forget the teaching of Our Lord as to descend to a hatred of their enemies [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

For Hinsley and his fellow Catholic Bishops faithfulness to the Church and communion with Catholics, whether ally or foe, along with loyalty to the Crown was sustainable. Catholics, as in recusant times, remained the King’s good servants but God’s first. Yet this Eucharistic covenant had been breeched by excessive nationalism and militarism without the proper religious and moral instruction of children or the young; leading to the corruption of a generation in Germany. Whatever social and educational settlement would occur in England and Wales after the war, the Catholic community while respecting the rights of the State was also mindful the rights of Catholic parents and would fight to protect both. This is captured in an undated aide mémoire, in response to the Green Book, marked ‘Strictly Private & Confidential’ entitled Catholic Education After The War; in it we find the following ‘Prefatory Note’:

Catholics are glad that England is determined to preserve Religious Teaching in all state Schools. To secure Catholic teaching for their children of all classes they have made immense sacrifices, particularly since 1870, when the first Education Act was passed. They recognise that Minorities, which cannot conscientiously fall in with the general National system of Religious Instruction, do create a problem of considerable difficulty for the Country and Parliament. Until 1936 it was not lawful; for public money to be spent on sites or buildings of Voluntary or, as often called, Denominational Public Elementary Schools. Their legal designation is Non-Provided Schools. But the Education Act, 1936, made it lawful for Local Education Authorities to make grants to Managers of Non-Provided Schools up to 75 per cent of the cost of sites and buildings for Senior Schools. In 1939 Liverpool Corporation obtained from Parliament a Private Act enabling them to provide Senior Schools for Catholic children subject to a portion of the outlay being met by way of rent by the Catholic Church.

The Scottish Education Act, 1918, solved the problem in that country. All Denominational Schools became Local Education Authority Schools, but with satisfactory safeguard for distinctive Religious Teaching ([Catholic Education After The War, AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43], page 1).]

In response to the need for Modern, Grammar and Technical Schools respectively, the Bishops proposed the establishment of Catholic institutions within these categories arguing in all cases that “wherever a real need exists for a Modern School [read any type of new school] for Catholic children, we suggest that it should be provided – site, building and equipment- out of public funds ([Catholic Education After The War, AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43], page 3).” The Bishops also proposed that “transport to the new Modern School [as above] should be provided out of public funds for any distance above a minimum of approximately one mile [ibid].” Concerning ‘Technical School’ this one concession was made: “Where, however, the number of Catholic children does not justify
the erection of a Catholic Technical School, and where, in consequence, Catholic children will be obliged to attend the public Technical Schools, we waive our objection to our children attending such schools provided always that adequate facilities are allowed for the teaching of their religion. By this proviso we mean that our children at such public Technical Schools should be taught their religious faith by one of our clergy or by an accredited Catholic teacher at agreed times (ibid, pages 3-4).” This aide mémoire is annotated in pencil with sections crossed out; so it is difficult to know, with certainty, the detail of what was shared with Ministers in light of the Green Book. However, the above is found in other documentation.

There exists an undated aide mémoire written by officials in the Board of Education rehearsing the Catholic Church’s response to the proposals found in the Green Book. It is entitled ‘Board of Education: The Dual System and the Archbishops’ Five Points, Outlines of a Scheme’. The paper is marked ‘Strictly Confidential’. Pencil annotations found in the same hand as above are in the margins. It begins by outlining two assumptions:

1. That the present classification of elementary and higher education will be replaced by a tripartite classification as under:-
   (a) Primary education, covering full-time education up to 11 +.
   (b) Secondary education, covering full-time education between 11+ and 18+.
   (c) Further education, covering other full-time or part-time education.

2. That all schools which cater for children of compulsory school age will have to comply with a minimum standard in respect both of school premises and the education provided in them [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

While the above assumptions do not cause any written marginal response; the eighth objective did:

8. To bring the inspection of Religious Instruction in Council Schools within the purview of H.M. Inspectors – the following annotation is ascribed: (Apostles/Unless our R.I.’s are recognised as official inspectors) [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).

Religious education in Catholic schools should remain denominational. This was non-negotiable and the creeping locally-agreed homogeneity concerning the scope and content of religious education would be resisted. In the mind of the Bishops, settlement of this curriculum issue and affordability of estates’ management could not be separated. This concern is captured in ‘Minutes No.3: Green Book Discussions: Bishops Committee of the Catholic Education Council [with the Board of Education], dated Tuesday, 25th November 1941.’ Present for the Catholic Church: Lord Southwell, Chairman of the Catholic

1. the character of religious instruction to be given in the schools;
2. the appointment of teachers;
3. the provision of adequate buildings (page 2).

Most of what follows is familiar to the debate apparent in other parts of the Archive apart from the admission of Butler and handwritten marginal note:

The President next referred to the Catholic difficulties in regard to the provision for post-primary education and said that the Board's principal aim was to secure and guarantee equality of opportunity for all children* [In the margin there appears the following handwritten note: “Identity or…uniformity”] ...The important thing was to differentiate between the aim of securing equality and the problem of capital expenditure. Further, there was no intention of reversing previous policy. It must be remembered that the 1936 Act was of limited duration and was intended as a stimulant to reorganisation. The deputation would understand that he could not give an immediate answer to the suggestions put forward by Mgr. Traynor. The Liverpool Act had been introduced to meet the peculiar position of Liverpool, and any idea of extending the application of the principle underlying that Act would have to be considered in the light of national opinion about grants for denominational bodies. The President told the deputation that there was not at present any question of formulating a major educational measure, and he could give no indication as to when legislation might become practicable (page 4).

The thinking of Dr. Oldham inspired a treatise given by William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Annual Meeting of the National Society on 3rd June 1942. Temple believed that the country needed to “recover a real philosophy of education (page 5).” When he asked a serving headteacher what his confreres would see as the common end of education, he replied “There is only one thing upon which any large number could possibly agree, and that would be the largest number of certificates and the highest possible number of credits (page 5).” Temple is disheartened by this paradigm and on the fifth page he goes on to say: “As Dr. Oldham has put it: We have learnt that the purpose of education is not the matter taught, but the person who has to learn it. We are concerned with teaching persons rather than the subject matter, but we have at the same time apparently ruled out of court all enquiry concerning the nature and destiny of personality.
We are concerned in training people: we never ask what kind of thing people ought to be. That is a hopeless position (page 5).” Although Hinsley would agree with Temple's analysis of the problems facing the education system. The response of the Anglican and Catholic communions would begin to diverge. Interestingly, when educational policy is bereft of a clear philosophy, the default position is often measuring its effectiveness through examination success. However, it would wrong to think that the Anglican position was uniform. In a “Statement on Religious Education Issued to All Incumbents”, The Association of Church School Managers, Church Schools Emergency League, Church Union, Mothers’ Union and National Clergy Association asserted that the following points should be incorporated in the forthcoming Education Bill:

(a) Parents shall have a statutory right to have their children educated in accordance with their religious faith.
(b) In areas, in which the size of the local community and the wishes of sufficient parents warrant it, there shall be, either under a system of dual or unified control, e.g., the Education (Scotland) Act, 1918, both denominational and non-denominational schools provided and fully maintained at the public expense.
(c) In single-school areas, in which the school has hitherto been of a denominational type, the status quo shall be maintained unless a substantial majority of parents of the children for the time being attending the school desires otherwise.
(d) All teachers appointed to staff a denominational school shall be such as are approved as regards their religious belief and character by the authorities of the denomination concerned.
(e) In areas, in which denominational schools are not available, provision shall be made, on the analogy of the Secondary schools (section 72 of the Education Act, 1921), for the children of such parents as desire it to receive in the school at least once a week denominational teaching and training in worship from those qualified by belief and practice to give it (Enclosure to “Statement on Religious Education Issued to All Incumbents” [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).

In a letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Hinsley dated 5th February 1943 in which he records his appointment as one of the Conference of Catholic Colleges “two representatives on the Hierarchy’s new education committee under the chairmanship of Archbishop Downey (page 1).” He goes on to opine “I have only to add that a number of distinguished headmasters of non-Catholic schools are of the opinion that, while Butler is overwhelmingly impressed by the N.U.T., the permanent officials of the Board are overwhelmingly impressed by the Local Education Authorities! The same is said widely among Conservative M.P.s (page 4).”

Correspondence between Mr. Butler and Cardinal Hinsley became more detailed in February and March 1943.
Butler wrote to the Archbishop of Liverpool a detailed, four-page, single spaced letter, dated 8th February 1943 of which there is copy in the Archive. He thanked the Archbishop for the recent meeting with him and his accompanying committee on 3rd February 1943. The style of the prose used by Butler in this correspondence is more guarded than that which appears in letters between Butler and the Cardinal and Churchill and the Cardinal. Butler comes to the heart of the issue in the fifth, sixth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth (a), fourteenth and sixteenth paragraphs:

...Thus there is and can be no dispute between us on the all-important issues of religion for which you stand. Equally in the matter of secular education I am encouraged to know of the firm desire of yourself and your colleagues that the children in Roman Catholic Schools shall be denied no opportunities that are offered in other schools and that your schools shall play their full part in the educational re-construction and advance which public opinion demands and the ensuring of which is the purpose of the further help that I am aiming to give to the non-provided schools.

In fact such differences of opinion as remains narrows itself to the doubt in your minds when you came to see me whether the help that I can offer will suffice to enable you to put and keep your schools up to the standard which modern conditions require. It is a matter of ways and means, and I would be no more satisfied than you with an offer which had no hope of achieving the objects which you and we alike desire.

...To come to the plan as I explained it to your deputation. Whereas the 1902 Act left the denominations with the responsibility of the upkeep of the premises and of the full cost of alterations and improvements, the Local Authority undertaking the expenses of fair wear and tear and maintenance, it is now suggested that any voluntary school which can provide 50 per cent. (sic) of the cost of repairs, alterations and improvements shall receive a 50 per cent. (sic) grant from the Exchequer for these purposes. I explained that this grant would not be available for the building of a new school, but that there was no reason why a denomination should not, after the usual Notices procedure, build a new school if they so desire out of their own resources.

I anticipated you telling me that this placed the Roman Catholic community in an impossible position in regard to the completion of reorganisation. To meet this difficulty I explained that I proposed to resuscitate the clauses of the 1936 Act whereby Local Education Authorities would be empowered to make grants for the provision of non-provided schools for senior children. I defined the proposals which would qualify for this grant in the following terms:-

Where proposals were made to a Local Education Authority in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of the Education Act, 1936, not later than September 1st, 1938, but such proposals have not been executed, the Local Education Authority for the area may, notwithstanding the provisions of Sub-Section (3) of that Section, enter into an agreement with the person or persons making the proposals, or their successors, in accordance with the provisions of
that Section, and a grant may be made in accordance with that agreement.

I undertook to consider the position where Authorities showed themselves reluctant to make grants in cases which qualified under this definition, and I told your deputation that I understood that this arrangement would involve some three quarters of the Roman Catholic senior children…

So far as concerns the provision for the senior Roman Catholic children, the effect of my proposals, would I hope, be to limit the Roman Catholic Community’s share of making the necessary provision to 25 per cent. (sic) of the total, the grants from the public funds amounting to the other 75 per cent. (sic) of the cost. You will realise that these new reorganised schools when built would not need much expenditure by way of repairs and improvements. They would, however, be eligible for the continuing 50 per cent. (sic) grant for such maintenance of the fabric as is required from time to time, and, when need arose, for repairs, alterations and improvements.

…The Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark touched in his letter to me dated 11th January upon the possibility of the Roman Catholic schools surrendering to the Local Education Authority the appointment of teachers if this would enable the Government to raise their offer of grant. In our discussion I recalled that so far as concerns 1936 Act grant cases the appointment of teachers would pass to the Local Education Authority with provision for reserved teachers. I felt optimistic that the generosity which Local Education Authorities had shown in the past in the matter of the proportion of reserved teachers would be a continuing feature of their agreements with bodies of Managers. I intimated that I would like to see how this policy developed in practice. Indeed it was usually wise when instituting reforms to proceed by degrees (Letter from Rab Butler to the Archbishop of Liverpool, 8th February 1943, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).

In an additional note dated also 8th February 1943 Butler informs the Archbishop of Liverpool that the subject of Direct Grant Schools remains “at present under consideration by Lord Fleming’s Committee and I cannot at this stage make any statement about it. I understand that you will be forwarding me a paper on the subject of these schools (Reprographic Note from Rab Butler to the Archbishop of Liverpool, 8th February 1943, [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43]).”

During this time Hinsley had moved abode to Hare Street House, Buntingford, Herts., where he would die. On 15th February 1943, Hinsley wrote to Butler:

My dear Mr. Butler,

I am sorry to trouble you. But I want to remove an unfortunate misunderstanding that has arisen.

It seems that at the meeting which you held recently with our Catholic representatives on the schools question, some of the members of the deputation gathered the impression that I had expressed the conviction that the Government were doing all they could do to meet our case.
In our conversations I certainly conveyed to you my appreciation of your good will and of your sympathetic attitude towards us in our immense difficulties. I also told you that I realised the complexity of your task. This, however, is not the same as an approval of what the Government is actually doing or proposing to do in regard to our problems.

As I told you, our conversations were purely informal, and I thought I made it clear that I could not speak officially without the unanimous consent of my fellow-Bishops. My esteem for you and my confidence in your good-will do not conflict with the united voice of the Catholic Body respecting the terms of the Government as made known to the deputation. I feel I must make my position clear to all the members of the deputation who have been left with the wrong impression. I am therefore sending a copy of this letter to the Archbishop of Liverpool, Chairman of the Deputation. I shall also be grateful if you on your part will kindly bring the matter to the notice of your own Department which may likewise have misunderstood.

I ask you to allow me definitely to state my personal position:

1) In justice (sic) we are entitled to receive equal treatment with the richer section of the community. Our present difficulties, our debts for school buildings, our defects, are due to the inequalities of the past which condemned us to compete with the provided schools in respect of buildings and equipment. This unfairness was inflicted on Catholic rate-payers and tax-payers because of their consciences, because they could not accept a programme of religious instruction agreeable to more wealthy fellow citizens. Now we are asked to make sacrifices beyond our means for the perpetuation of the same unfair system.

2) We are still willing to make sacrifices for conscience sake, but there is a limit. For the sake of their children, poor Catholic parents ought not to be asked to impoverish their families or to surrender their title to Social Services which are enjoyed by others. We are ready to agree to arrangements respecting the appointment of teachers and to the question of single-school areas, provided the religious training of our children is duly safeguarded.

3) Your financial proposals are inadequate. We consider the extreme need that arises or will arise in consequence of the dispersal of populations, of the creation of new areas in the rebuilding of our country, of the war damage to schools, of the commitments of [the] 1936 Act, will necessitate assistance all round (sic). We seek nothing but what is set down in black and white in the law of the land, and we want nothing that is not granted to others. I have an assurance in writing from Lord Reith that in the planning scheme our (sic) needs for educational and social work will be fully recognized (sic).

4) To me and to all who are associated with me in this vital question, it seems that the attitude of the Board of Education

---

21 It is evident from the Archive, in a rather formal letter, dated 12th February 1943, from Archbishop Downey to Cardinal Hinsley that Downey had seen this letter in draft beforehand and suggested some amendments.
regarding the provision of the new schools means that we are ultimately to be squeezed out of the National System. In the new areas we shall not have the facilities for the education of our children which others are given to their hearts content out of funds to which we also contribute. We want to do our part in a free country for the true welfare of a free people. Catholics from these islands and from various parts of the great Commonwealth of Nations have given and are giving their full share to the victory in war. There will be no increase of enthusiasm if it becomes evident that we in this country are not to be treated as fully deserving citizens when peace returns.

My conclusions are the following:

(1) In full agreement with the Deputation that awaited in you and with my fellow-Bishops, I do not accept as an Agreed Bill one which discriminates between citizens and citizens by distributing public funds so as to favour the religious convictions of one section and to penalize those of another part of the community.

(2) We are most anxious to avoid a revival of old controversy at this time of crisis but I and those with me with whom I wholeheartedly associated regard Agreed Syllabus religion as distinctively denominational as any Church programme of spiritual instruction. If the British Communists or others were to bring in even the secularist solution denominationalism would not be eliminated. It would be introduced in its worst form of materialism or irreligion.

(3) We ought to have the right to establish new schools where the Catholic population justifies and demands them. Recognition should be due to such schools and adequate assistance from public funds.

I apologise for this long letter. It is important that you should know my position. I beg you not to cite my friendly conversations with you as if they were in any way approval of the terms of the Agreed Bill. I repeat that they were no more than an expression of my appreciation of your good-will and kind attitude.

Yours very sincerely,

(Signed) A. Cardinal Hinsley [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

On 17th February 1943, Butler replied to Hinsley on Board of Education notepaper but from 14, Belgrave Square, London SW1:

My dear Cardinal,

I have to thank Your Eminence for your letter of the 15th February, which makes your personal position quite clear to us in the Government and reinforces the attitude adopted by the delegation at the opening of our Conference on February 3rd last. You will be aware that I enlarged on the Government proposals to this deputation, and I understood that they would consider what I had said. I on my side am meanwhile looking into the points
they raised, among which is the big issue to which you refer in your letter, namely, the provision of new Roman Catholic schools in centres of population which have shifted from the area in which they used to reside.

If I understand aright, you would still wish me to give proper consideration to the point of view put before me by the deputation, and that your letter is not intended to check that process or to ignore the magnitude of the financial provision which I explained could be made available to the Roman Catholic community, if the 1936 Act be reopened in the manner which I described. In this connection I would invite your attention to the previous section 8(2) of that Act, which was expressly designed to meet those large scale movements of population, the educational facilities for which cause you concern.

Let me now come to the question of the misunderstanding which has prompted you to write to me as you have done. I have consulted the full account taken of the meeting of February 3rd and cannot find any language used by myself which could bear out the interpretation which certain members of the deputation appear to have placed on it. I did not mean to be other than courteous in referring to the conversations which I had had with you and the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark. My references were intended to show that the Government has no desire to give bad treatment to the Roman Catholic community, and that no question of doctrine or liberty of religious teaching arises between us. If it was felt on February 3rd that I had been attempting to go further, it is a great pity that reference was not made to this misunderstanding on that occasion, since this was a private deputation of your friends and the matter could have been cleared up at once. In fact, in spite of public statements made by others, many of which have been unfair to the point of view which I represent, I have schooled myself to the strictest reticence. On no occasion have I either spoken in public or made private statements which could compromise your position. Nor have I led my Cabinet colleagues to misunderstand the situation as you described it to me at our first interview. I shall tell them at the first opportunity of the letter which you have written to me, and I feel quite certain that they will confirm what I say here.

The misunderstanding, if there be one, appears therefore to be on one side only. I and my advisers are well aware that the only solution which would be wholly acceptable to you would be one under which the State bore the whole cost – capital and maintenance – of all Roman Catholic schools present and prospective. I noted from the very first that you would not wish this fundamental change to be accompanied by any alteration in the present liberty under which you gave your religious instruction, and that, while ready to discuss a revision of the system of appointing teachers, you would wish all the teachers in your schools to be Roman Catholics.

I have always told you, and those with whom I have talked, that such a solution of our problems would be quite unacceptable to the other interest concerned.

I have also said that my scheme is applicable to Roman Catholics and Anglicans alike. I cannot admit that, under my proposals, those for whom you speak would not receive equal treatment with other members of the community. In fact the reopening of the 1936 Act, to which I have referred, would be far more advantageous to your people than to the Anglicans, for
reasons which are well known and which are none other than creditable to your community.

It only remains for me to assure Your Eminence that the contribution of Roman Catholics in these islands and various parts of the great Commonwealth of Nations is fully appreciated by the Government. We have throughout desired to translate into practical form that goodwill towards your community to which you kindly refer. But it would be deluding you if I were to propose a plan which ignored the realities of the present situation in the country, which derives from past history and which cannot be changed in a day.

I can assure you that I will never attempt to represent your kind appreciation of the spirit in which I face my task as approval of the means by which I try to help you.

Since I should like the members of the deputation to be reassured as to the manner in which I interpret my trust, I am sending a copy of this letter to the Archbishop of Liverpool, asking that the members of his deputation should be informed of its contents.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) R. A. Butler [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

In the middle of this portfolio is a hand written note to Mr. Churchill from Mgr. Valentine Elwes, Private Secretary, dated 17th March 1943, time 8.30 am, from Hare Street House, Buntingford, Hertfordshire:

Dear Mr. Churchill,

I am sending this up to you at once. His Eminence the Cardinal was feeling so much better yesterday & this letter to you was drafted for his signature. I purposely did not ask him to sign it last night thinking that it would be better to leave that exertion and possible cause of worry till the morning. As you will have heard the Cardinal died very suddenly at 7.20 this morning. The letter he had intended to sign therefore goes to you unsigned –

Yours sincerely,

Valentine Elwes
Private Secretary [AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

Cardinal Hinsley on 16th March 1943, the day before his death, had drafted the following:

My dear Prime Minister,

You know that I am seriously ill. I love my Catholic children & I feel the greatest anxiety for our Catholic schools. It is in your power to give these little
ones equal opportunities with others in the country. I beg you to do your best for them.

Left unsigned

[AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43].

AAW Hi 2/152 1920-24
This portfolio comprises correspondence addressed to Cardinal Bourne asking for his support for two Conferences that of the National Union of Teachers (letter dated 28th January 1920 [AAW Hi 2/152 1920-24] and The National Union of Students dated 25th April 1924 which was organising an “Imperial Conference of Students” in London and Cambridge from 18th July to 31st July 1924. What is of interest, on the letterhead, is the appearance of the name of one of the Vice-Presidents, namely, RA Butler (Vice-President, Cambridge Union Society) [AAW Hi 2/152 1920-24].

AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40
It is apparent in papers contained herewith, the Church’s suspicion of Church-State relations where this relationship no longer had the equivalence born of Statehood: “The free intercourse of the Pope with the outer world by means of correspondence has also on more than one occasion been tampered with, and the Civil Government which forty years ago professed itself so eager to maintain ecclesiastical authority of the Holy See, has persistently shown itself to be hostile to religion by trammelling if not abolishing religious education in many parts of Italy, by encouraging free thought – which on the Continent spells socialism, atheism and even anarchy – and in various other ways proving that it has no intention of carrying out the promises made with so much show of zeal and sincerity by the usurping element of 1870-1 (unauthored, The Papacy & The “Temporal Power”, undated, [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40], pages 3-4).” This paper goes go to reinforce this point by recalling the words of the Archbishop of Westminster at Brighton in 1906:-

It is of sovereign importance to Catholics all over the world that the Supreme Pastor of the Church should be absolutely independent in the exercise of the authority Divinely entrusted to him. To this end he must not be subjected to a temporal ruler, lest the temporal interest of that Ruler should be made to interfere with his spiritual authority, and thus lessen his influence and independence in dealing with the world-wide religious interests that are committed to him (unauthored, The Papacy & The “Temporal Power”, undated, [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40], page 4).

and rehearsing the transient nature of democratic mandate the author continues:

It is the creation of that most unstable thing, a fluctuating Parliamentary majority. The power that made it can unmake it tomorrow, and this is all that is offered to the Holy See and to the Catholics of Christendom in place of
Temporal Power which was the safeguard of the Pontifical Independence amid all the changes which have transformed the face of Europe. Can we wonder, therefore, that Pius IX and Leo XIII and Pius X have never ceased to declare that the present position of the Papacy is unsatisfactory and abnormal, and most detrimental to the sacred cause of which it is the highest embodiment? (Taken from a speech by the Archbishop of Westminster at Brighton in 1906, quoted in unauthored, The Papacy & The “Temporal Power”, undated, [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40], page 5).

This perceived political transience explains the Church’s concern over securing independent governance of Catholic schools and attaining permanence in addressing the rights of Catholic parents. In this way, the issue of “Temporal Power” was no longer being rehearsed at the Flaminian Gates but in the precincts of Victoria and Whitehall. However, with the threat of war alliances between the Church and state were formed as can be seen from the text of the telegram below. It was sent from Leicester Square Post Office on 15th April 1939 at 10.27pm:

TST 12568 9.55 EWELL TS 42
URGENT = CARDINAL HINSLEY CATHEDRAL HOUSE WESTMINSTER SW 1 =

WILL YOUR EMINENCE PLEASE TELEPHONE THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE TO HIS HOLINESS THE POPE. WILL YOUR HOLINESS PLEASE BROADCAST FROM THE VATICAN TODAY (sic) MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT INTERPRETING IT INTO ALL LANGUAGES =

LLOYD22 83 KINGSWAY/LONDON + [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40].

22 Records show a W. J. Lloyd was registered there working for the ‘Anglo-American Asphalt Co.’, Windsor House, 83 Kingsway House. Archbishop Hinsley received several similar pieces of correspondence encouraging the Holy Father to take the lead in praying for peace. In his responses Hinsley is both empathetic and reticent not promising too much as in his letter of 17th April 1939 to Sir James:

Thank you for your letter (original not in Archive) of 16th inst. I much appreciate your desire that our Holy Father should seize the opportunity of President Roosevelt’s message to Herr Hitler to issue a call to all the interested nations to abandon their armaments race and settle their differences by peaceful discussion. But I feel that it would not be for me to make such a suggestion as I am sure that the present Holy Father, with his wide experience of foreign affairs and with all the information which he has available, is doing all that he prudently can to avert a catastrophe in Europe [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40].

The suggestion Hinsley did make via His Eminence Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani, Cardinal Vicar of Rome, in the face of heavy lobbying from the Archbishop of Canterbury over the possibility of the Holy Father making Whitsuntide, 1939, a time of “special prayer to the Holy Spirit that at this critical time in the world’s history God may give the right spirit to the nations, to their rulers and their people’s (Letter from Archbishop Hinsley to His Eminence Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani, Cardinal Vicar of Rome, dated April 20th 1939, [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40], page 1).” The Archbishop of Canterbury suggested that this should be “a call to his own people, and also all Christian people.” On page 3 of his letter Hinsley registers most
The remainder of this portfolio comprises correspondence concerning the forthcoming war and the need for prayer, under the leadership of the Holy Father, across the denominations.

**AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34**

This portfolio comprises ‘The [Religious Education] Syllabus for Infant Schools’ written by Canon Wood and sent to Cardinal Hinsley on 20th April 1940. The aims of teaching religion captures much of the sentiment of Hinsley’s preaching at the time and the hope of good’s triumph over evil and the teaching of objective right and wrong. In the introduction Wood comments: “In the Encyclical ‘Divini Illius Magistri’, Pius XI defined the aim of Christian Education as ‘to co-operate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian, that is to form Christ himself in those regenerated by Baptism according to the emphatic expression of the Apostle ‘My little children, of whom I am in labour again until Christ be formed in you’ [AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34].” This finds expression in the ‘aims of the infant course’, namely, “The main aim of the Infant School Course should be to give the children a simple knowledge of God, Our Lord and His Mother and to help them say simple prayers enlightened by this knowledge. The personal love and care of God for each one of them should be a feature of all teaching. No attempt should be made to burden their minds with elaborate explanations of doctrine or practice. Teaching should be simple and direct to suit the simplicity of their minds. (‘The [Religious Education] Syllabus for Infant Schools’ written by Canon Wood and sent to Cardinal Hinsley on 20th April 1940 [AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34]).

In additional papers in this portfolio, the associated work of revising the junior syllabus and senior syllabus are included. The enunciated aims reveal an understanding of both clearly his reticence. Ecclesiological tribal loyalties would still trump well-meaning ecumenical endeavour and Hinsley’s wisdom of reading the signs of the times and the prospect of war. For Hinsley perhaps the importance of showing the loyalty of Catholics to the State was more important than supporting the Archbishop of Canterbury:

Since the Novena in preparation for Pentecost begins on May 18th. For the reunion of Christians, it might be possible for the Holy Father to reply that a special Novena of prayers to the Holy Ghost is made every year, and that he desires this year a distinct intention to be included in the Novena for peace among all peoples and nations, further that he (the Holy Father) exhorts all who bear the Christian name to join with us in this crusade of prayers “Facientes veritatem in caritate” (Letter from Archbishop Hinsley to His Eminence Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani, Cardinal Vicar of Rome, dated April 20th 1939, [AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40], page 3).
education and religious education: “The aim of the Junior School should be to ensure that the child leaving school at eleven will have a clear, if simple, understanding of the main doctrines and practices of the Church, a knowledge of its chief ceremonies and observances, a clear understanding of the principles which distinguish right from wrong but, above all, a vivid knowledge of the Person of Our Lord, of His Life and His Doctrine, so that His Love may supply what the intellect fails to understand (Report on the findings of the Commission for the revision of the Syllabus of Religious Instruction for the Archdiocese of Westminster, [AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34], § 4).”

The report continues “For the Senior School, the aim will be to equip the school-leaver as far as possible for his after-school life. This will necessitate a rather more informed knowledge of Christian Doctrine with some elementary Apologetics, a practical knowledge of the application of Moral Principles, some knowledge of Catholic Social Teaching and of Catholic Action in the world. To achieve this the course must strive to make the child think for itself and have a living interest in the life and work of the Church…Church History should again deal with personalities rather than events but in the Senior School, the personalities should be selected so as to present the life of the Church in triumph or trouble through the saints whom God raised up to achieve these triumphs or help these troubles (Report on the findings of the Commission for the revision of the Syllabus of Religious Instruction for the Archdiocese of Westminster, [AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34], § 5).”

The promise for a careworn society and a stricken Church was that God would not abandon His people but send saints to lead them out of the darkness of war. Education was central to the war effort because it gave hope for the forming, or reforming, of a true and perfect Christian world. Intuitively, people of the time understood that this regeneration was spiritual, moral, social and cultural. Hence the words of the subsequent Act in 1944: “it shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their powers extend, to continue towards the spiritual, mental and physical developments of the community (Education Act, 1944, Part II,7).”

Found in this Portfolio Bourne from AAW Hi 2/181– Mainly – Syllabus for Religious Instruction in Schools & Question of Catholic Teachers Receiving their Training in a University 1928-34

Operational difficulties in supplying sufficient Catholic teachers in response to the expansion of Catholic schools were not confined to the 1940s. The record of a resolution of the Association of Catholic Training Colleges passed at a meeting held at Saint Charles’s College Kensington, on 2nd March 1923 illustrate dormant tensions: “The
members of the Association of Catholic Teaching Training Colleges respectfully beg to call the attention of His Eminence the Cardinal and of all the Members of the Hierarchy to the grave and increasing danger to the Catholic Faith in this country arising from intending Catholic teachers receiving their professional training in a University or University Department rather than in a Catholic Training College. [There follows a paper entitled The Question Of Catholic Teachers Receiving Their Training In A University]. In this paper the following conclusion is made. It is difficult to identify either its provenance or date, however, the following conclusion is made (and marked by a pencil in the margin):

The second way in which the situation could be improved is by all Catholic Teachers being required, as a condition of their acceptance in a Catholic school, to present a certificate showing that they have

(a) followed a definite course in Religious Knowledge;
(b) Received some training in the teaching of their religion; for example, that they have given religious lessons in a Catholic school or in Sunday or night classes under supervision (‘The Question of Catholic Teachers receiving their Training in a University’, [found in Bourne from AAW Hi 2/181 – Mainly – Syllabus for Religious Instruction in Schools & Question of Catholic Teachers Receiving their Training in a University 1928-34], page 3).

The anxiety over ‘religious’ capacity rehearsed above, in this portfolio, exercised Bishops, in one form or another throughout the last century leading to the establishment of the Catholic Certificate in Religious Studies (CCRS) in recent times. Two issues prevailed in 1929 and up to the present day in public discourse within the Catholic community: How could the Catholic community be sure that teachers knew the faith and were formed in the faith? The parallel debate over who was competent, the diocese or school, to evaluate either or both is still alive.

This portfolio also comprises papers dated 8th April 1929 attending to the need to draw up a religious education syllabus, and inspection thereof. This proposal was sought by the Joint Conference of Catholic Schools and Colleges in response to the “The considerable slackness, uncertainty and not a little grievance. Attention to religious teaching in secondary schools has not kept pace with their enormous growth (Letter from Mgr [Francis] Gonne, Secretary to Joint Conference of Catholic Schools and Colleges, to Archbishop Bourne [found in this Portfolio Bourne from AAW Hi 2/181 – Mainly – Syllabus for Religious Instruction in Schools& Question of Catholic Teachers Receiving their Training in a University 1928-34]).” Correspondence on this issue continues and involves the Archbishop of Birmingham in a letter to Bourne dated 27th June 1933; in which he takes the side of the Association and the concessions made by it.
Along with the text of a talk by Lord Irwin, President of the Board of Education on 21st January 1933 at a Conference called by the Bishop of Ripon entitled: “The Place of Religion in Education”. The talk gives a fascinating insight into the mind of the Government concerning education:

It is a great mistake to think of Education as of some mechanical process – akin to factory production – in which output depends upon a highly organised machine, running so many hours a day. For Education is that which is the outcome of teaching given to human beings; and however, much you may standardise your teaching, you can never standardise humanity, which is as essentially varied, as are the intangible and often quite incalculable forces from which it takes its root.

It is a mistake no less grave to regard Education as concerned only with the reasoning powers of children. Most of our strongest motives of life have little or nothing to do with reason, as it is commonly or consciously apprehended; and if we appeal only to reason, we resemble the most wonderful orchestra playing before an audience that is deaf. They will know by their reason, and by their study of the programme, that music is being played; but the composition makes no appeal, and it matters nothing what the piece may be.

Love, laughter, sorrow, anger, courage, severance, sympathy.

All these, that are the elemental things of human life, are supra-rational; and it is not the least of Education’s purposes to teach human beings to be masters and not slaves of them.

This indeed is vital to good life, and depends ultimately to very limited degree upon any intellectual process or book-learning – but rests, I fancy, rather upon that intangible environment and setting of life, which implants a certain scale of values, encouraging the growth of good motives and discouraging the growth of bad (pages 5 and 6).

In a letter to Cardinal Hinsley from Lord Halifax dated 4th June 1935, following on from a conversation during the previous week, the issue of how new Catholic senior schools might be funded is addressed. In this letter Lord Halifax opines:

...As regards building grants for new schools, I recalled that they were particularly suspect with Nonconformists, and that Sir Charles Trevelyan’s proposals had been limited to building grants for existing schools. I said that I felt that the distinction between enlargement and alteration of an existing school and the provision of a new one was unreal and difficult to defend, and I hoped that it would be possible to extend building grants to new schools, where it could be shown that there were junior schools able to send forward to them an adequate supply of children.

I added that in my view the hope of such a proposal proving tolerably acceptable would be greatly improved if some sort of time limit for grants were imposed. Politically this was important, because it should do much to meet the desire of Nonconformists that grants should be limited to meet a
particular emergency. Educationally there was something to be said for a time limit because it might be expected to act as a lever for securing that suitable accommodation was available by any appointed day which might be prescribed by an Act passed for raising the school age. You were I think inclined to agree that a suitable time limit might not be unreasonable.

I ought perhaps to say again – what I did say when we discussed these things – that what I have written here is not a Government pronouncement of policy, but merely an endeavour frankly to let you see how my mind is working. And I said that I had no objection to your mentioning our conversation to a few of those with whom you are most immediately in contact, provided that it was understood that our conversation was to be regarded as strictly confidential.

(AAAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], pages2-3)."

AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196

In a letter from Archbishop Hinsley’s secretary to Mr Blundell, Secretary to the Catholic Education Council, dated 24th October 1935, he records in point three “the questionnaire unanimously decided upon at the Bishop’s meeting to be put to all candidates in the forthcoming General Election consists of the following single question:

Are you in favour of giving grants towards the building of non-provided schools to enable them to meet the increased requirements of the Board of Education with regard to reorganisation, new schools and the possible raising of the school age? [AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196].

In the Memorandum of Evidence Submitted by the Association to Consultative Committee: Board of Education23, a copy of which was enclosed in a letter from Sr Catherine Moffat to the Archbishop of Westminster dated 22nd December 1935, the Association record its concern:

Education must concern itself to-day with the child, first as a person, singular, apart, himself: secondly as a member of a family in its special environment: thirdly as a future member of civil Society. The overlapping and often conflicting claims of these spheres of activity must be met and reconciled. This will yield the solution to the first problem with which we are faced: to what purpose do we educate?

A national system widely and truly planned, with ‘longranged’ (sic) vision, will, if it is to justify itself, presuppose a unity without uniformity. It must constitute a living organic whole capable of internal growth and development, and of fine and easy adjustment to changing conditions. This presents the second problem a practical and more difficult one of ways and means.

23 Text of the Reference from the Board of Education for Consultative Committee: “To consider and report upon the organisation and inter-relation of schools, others than those administered under the Elementary Code, which provide education for pupils beyond the age 11+: regard being had in particular to the framework and content of the education of pupils who do not remain at school beyond the age of about 16+ [AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196].“
We would ask for a new character of liberty in Education, wherein first things are first (sic). Part politics, finance, industry and commerce are already strangling our national education. The youth of to-day runs the risks of a more sinister and far-reaching exploitation of mind and soul, than any that took place before the Factory Acts were passed. As a nation we have an intimate understanding of childhood and adolescence; we possess too a permanent Board of enlightened and experienced experts in education, yet their thought and inspiration is to be found chiefly in official handbooks and pronouncements, whereas it should be evident in the Schools. Have we exploited to the full these two great national assets? It would seem not (page 1).

...Four things are wanting in our educational policy: a just sense of values, vision, continuity, and a reasonable measure of stability. In the work of reconstruction now in hand lies a great opportunity, and be it said a great danger. Under the stress of pressing economic problems we are drifting towards a more completely commercialised and industrialised education. Shall we be justified in two generations hence?

This reservation would find expression in less than a generation with the outbreak of another World War. As an aside, it is interesting to note the matriarchal nature of such educational discourses. Within the Church, during the 1930s in the Archives, the underlying principles of education are often rehearsed by female religious whereas theological principles and concerns over “Temporal Power” left to the domain of clerics and bishops. While such a paradigm may seem blunt, it reflects the complementary yet distinct response of both genders to the previous war: the former seeing the promise of future peace in the person the latter in the dominion of territory. The one is ethereal the other tangible:

Free Access to Education
We would plead for a wide and generous application of the principle “Secondary education for all;” and “higher education for all who will take it”. It is a principle for which the Catholic Church has stood since the days of Bede and Alcuin, and is even now applicable in her own schools and seminaries, where recruits make their way on their merits (page 5).

On a separate torn sheet (marked 11) (AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo1/185] Education CEC 1935-37 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]) the work of the Council (presumably the CEC) is summarised as follows:

1. It acts as an advisory body to the Hierarchy on all matters affecting Catholic elementary and secondary schools and training colleges.  
2. It contributes towards the maintenance of nine training colleges for Catholic teachers. Saint Mary’s College, Strawberry Hill, the training college for men teachers, is the property of the Council, which is responsible to the Hierarchy and the Board of Education not only for its

24 Red pencil mark highlighting this paragraph in the margin.
efficiency and well-being, but for expenditure not covered by grants and fees.

In a letter to the Archbishop Hinsley dated 12th October 1935 from the Bishop of Nottingham he writes “it has been proposed (notably by the Bishop of Pella) that the Scottish system is desirable for England. This is extremely doubtful even if it were practicable: which it is not today. In a recent visit to Scotland I had a conversation with the Archbishop of Glasgow concerning the Schools in Scotland. We know, of course that extreme care was taken before the new system was finally adopted and that permission from Rome was secured. But the Archbishop assured me that the Catholic authorities would not have accepted the system unless they had been compelled to do so for financial reasons. On the whole it seems (at present) to work well but His Grace agreed that under the new system the priests have not the same control as formerly over their teachers or their children, and this appears to me to be a serious symptom. As regards the teachers a Guild has been formed which is to some extent effective in counteracting the effects of their appointment by a public authority (Letter from the Bishop of Nottingham to Archbishop Hinsley, [AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], pages 2-3)."

Catholic Education Council Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive Council of the Council held on 30th October 1935. Several resolutions were passed one building on another. Mgr. Cronin’s resolution captures the sentiment of what went before:

That in the opinion of the Council no settlement of the education question will be acceptable which does not secure the present statutory rights of managers of non-provided schools, especially in the appointment and dismissal of teachers, except as part of a permanent national and satisfactory settlement ([AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37, page 4.found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

In a p&c paper written by Mr F.N. Blundell, JP chair of the Catholic Education Council, dated 19th December 1935, entitled Education Proposals of the Government at the General Election, 1935: Memorandum by the Chairman he records in § 11:

On December 13th 1935, the Hierarchy passed the following resolution: -

While we have not the terms of the Education Bill before us,

1. We welcome the Government’s proposals, so far outlined, as a step in the right direction.
2. But we are not satisfied as regards:-
   (a) the temporary and limited nature of the proposed grants,
   (b) their permissive character, and
   (c) the suggested alterations for the appointment of teachers
The second part of the resolution seems to exercise members of the Council. Blundell earlier in this paper in § 8 (c) in response to “A declaration that all Catholic teachers should “be reserved”” notes “this demand is believed to be conceded ([AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37, found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 3).” Throughout these notes is a desire for a national settlement and reticence concerning local determination at a LEA level.

Subsequently, at a meeting of the Council held on 7th January 1936, the following resolution was carried unanimously (as recorded in the “Catholic Education Council Report to be presented to the Annual Meeting on April 21st 1936 found on pages 3-4 [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196]).” Namely,

That the Catholic Education Council respectfully submit[s] the following representations to their Lordships the Bishops:-

1. The Council reaffirm the Resolutions passed in 1931 with reference to the White paper of that year (Cmd. 3786) and in particular urge that no concession as to the appointment of teachers should be entertained except as part of a permanent national and satisfactory settlement.
2. The Council consider that a settlement might be reached on the basis of the present proposals only if:-
   (a) Adequate provision were inserted in the Bill regarding all aspects of the position of new schools on the termination of the “limited period” with reasonable and continuing grants in respect of expenditure not contemplated in 1902, e.g., re-organisation, the extra school year, nursery schools, extra playground accommodation, outlay on new schools, particularly in new housing areas and re-conditioning of black-listed schools.
   (b) Powers were retained in the Bill to enable the Board to make direct grants in cases in which the LEA unreasonable refuse[s] to exercise its permissive powers.
   (c) The appointment of teachers were made on the recommendation of a mainly Catholic body, recognised by the LEA.

The role of the Council was different from the CES. Rather than being an Agency of the Bishops’ Conference, as now, it was a freer-standing Council of bishops, nominated lay people and diocesan representatives entering into respectful dialogue with the Hierarchy on key educational matters. The Council was not quasi-policy making but a forum where proposed policy could be discussed and tested.

In a letter from Archbishop Hinsley to Mr Robert Mathew, Secretary of the Catholic Education Council, dated 20th July 1937, we read the Archbishop lay down clear boundaries:
If I understand the Margate proposal rightly, the LEA offer 75% to the Catholics for a Senior School, but on condition that we agree to send our children from other decapitated Catholic schools to LCC or other non-Catholic schools.

Emphatically I refuse to enter into any such agreement. From the start I stated more than once to Lord Halifax and to Mr. Stanley that we could not agree to the children of Catholic parents being forced or enticed to attend non-Catholic schools. This is a statement of principle.

If we are compelled to send our children to non-Catholic schools we may submit to ‘force majeure’, but we can never consent to bargain away the rights of Catholic parents for temporal or monetary considerations [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].

In his reply, Robert Mathew’s, dated 24th July 1937, concurs expressing his thanks for the clear manner in which the Cardinal states he does not agree “to the children of Catholic parents being forced or enticed to attend non-Catholic schools as a concession in order to enable an Agreement to be entered into between Managers of Non-Provided Schools and the Local education Authority under the 1936 Act [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].” However, the Council found it difficult to hold this line, as exemplified in a Resolution of its Executive meeting dated 30th November 1937 which was ruled out of order at its subsequent meeting due to voting irregularities concerning those allowed to vote. The resolution was shared with the Cardinal with a commentary of why and how it was “quashed.” It read:

Where a general settlement with a Local Authority is endangered by failure to agree upon a scheme for small isolated schools, it may be necessary, where no otherwise educationally satisfactory solution can be reached, to contemplate the sending of Catholic Senior children to Council Senior Schools – subject to such safeguards as to religious instruction as can be agreed upon between the Local Authority and the Diocese [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].

Such a policy represents well the position taken by the Anglican Communion. However, within the Catholic Church, under the leadership of Cardinal Hinsley, the pragmatists would not win the day. He reminds Mr Mathew’s in a letter dated 22nd March 1938 of “the unanimous Resolution passed by the Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales in October 1935 while the Education Bill, 1936 was still under consideration [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].” Namely, “We can never consent to the children of Catholic parents being either forced or enticed to attend non-Catholic schools [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].” He points out that this resolution was read by Lord Halifax and his successor Lord Stanley. Archbishop Hinsley concludes “Therefore, the Executive of the Catholic Education Council will, we are confident, adhere firmly to this essential principle, which is a
fixed point in the official regulations of the Catholic Church [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196]."

The nature of the collaboration between the Hierarchy and the Catholic Education Council is recorded in a letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Mr Mathew, dated 13th May 1938. It was written after the recent Low Week Meeting of the Hierarchy requesting that Mr Mathew arrange a meeting between the President of the Board of Education with the Archbishops, Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary of the CEC concerning the "[Catholic Church’s] difficulties in carrying out the requirements of the 1936 Act [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196]." Cardinal Hinsley believed that:

these difficulties arise owing to the attitude and demands of Local Education Authorities who easily yield to the opposition against the rates being spent on non-provided schools. The Government could urge Local Education Authorities to make arrangements to help non-provided schools, expressing its strong (sic) recommendation and declaration that this was part of the purpose of the 1936 Act. Some authorities will not give us an answer at present, because they are waiting to see whether the Central Authority will take a firm line with Liverpool. If such strength is not shown in this case, the Education Act of 1936 will be a dead letter in many parts of the country: other Local Education Authorities will imitate Liverpool [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].

Cardinal Hinsley, in the same letter, goes on also to rehearse concerns over demographic change from the countryside to the cities with the impact on rural Catholic primary schools along with transport costs [AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in AAW Box Hi 2/191-196].

AAW Bo 1/26 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]
It is difficult to imagine if Cardinal Hinsley could envisage in his letter of 13th May 1938 that a greater block to the building of non-provided schools would be the outbreak of the Second World War. In a letter from Mr. Cleary of the Board of Education to Robert Mathew, dated 23rd September 1939, he writes:

We are now informed authoritatively that it will be difficult if not impossible, for the next 12 months at any rate, for local authorities or managers to obtain materials or labour for any new buildings as there is already an acute shortage of both for the Service programmes, to which the system of control is bound to give priority. Even after that period only the most urgent cases could be considered, and the question of priority in competition with direct war requirements would have to be faced. The position then is that though there is no embargo on new school buildings the hard facts of the situation
have to be recognised, and they carry with them the improbability of any school building being possible save in the most exceptional circumstances.

In these circumstances it is clear that some proposals for voluntary senior schools which would otherwise have materialised, will fail to do so owing to the provisions of section 8 (3) of the 1936 Act. The President does not think the remedy is to be found in prescribing now any extension of the date of September 1st, 1940, referred to in that section…

In these circumstances the President thinks that the best course will be to review the whole position after the war, and he would then give sympathetic consideration to the possibility of legislation to meet cases which have failed to materialise for causes beyond the control of the promoters or the authorities. The President authorises me to say that you may take this letter as an assurance, which he is prepared to repeat in Parliament, that this will be done [AAW Bo 1/26 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196].

This correspondence was forwarded to Cardinal Hinsley with a covering letter from Robert Mathew dated 26th September 1939. The Cardinal replies on 28th September 1939 “I agree that you should wait for details from the Board of Education. But I suggest that you send a short note to the Bishops stating that on my recommendation you have been in touch with the Board of Education unofficially and will send round word when anything definite is forthcoming [AAW Bo 1/26 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196].

AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]

There is a copy of a note of visit, dated 25th May 1939, to the Board of Education from the Archbishop of Birmingham and the Bishops of Shrewsbury, Hexham and Newcastle, Leeds and Menevia. The note of visit does not indicate when the meeting took place and which officials or Ministers from the Board were present. However, A.R. Ainsworth of the Board, writes in a subsequent letter of clarification “I am given to understand that some members of the deputation which was received by the President on May 25th have interpreted certain remarks made during the discussion as an official pronouncement that it is open to Local Education Authorities to defer signing agreements under section 8 of the Education Act 1936 with the promoters of voluntary senior schools to as late a date as May 1st 1940. If such a misapprehension exists I think it would be as well that it should be corrected as soon as possible (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).” Cardinal Hinsley in a handwritten comment on the note of visit indicates that the deputation went to the Board of Education to seek extension to arrangements and grants for the establishment of proposed voluntary senior schools:
[The group] asked the Board to have the time extended so that the date now fixed for provided schools (31st December 1943) should also apply to non-provided schools.

They replied that this would mean new legislation, and they thought there was no chance of such legislation.

We suggested that the 1936 Act nowhere says that our schools must be ready by September 1st 1940. They agreed that it is not explicitly mentioned in the Act, but they said that this is clearly the intention of section 8, subsection 3. They promised to give a generous interpretation of the time within which the schools must be built, and suggested that any Agreements made between the LEAs and RC managers during the next twelve months would be admitted by the Board as within the meaning of the Act.

We then put before them some of the difficulties with which we have to contend in the dioceses of Hexham and Newcastle, Shrewsbury and Leeds in England, and in Menevia and Cardiff in Wales. These difficulties arise from the unwillingness of LEA’s to help us under the Act, or in particular instances their refusal to pay the cost of transport…They answered that they had done their best in some of these cases to persuade the LEA, but had been unsuccessful.

They ask us to let them know the number of Catholic senior schools which would fail to materialise owing to the fact that they cannot be ready by September 1940 (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196).

As mentioned above this note of visit is followed by a letter of clarification to Robert Mathew, dated 2nd August 1939 (a month before the outbreak of World War II), from A.R. Ainsworth of Board of Education:

The discussion at the meeting was informal and various possibilities were alluded to; no doubt the 1st May was mentioned, and there are no doubt cases in which agreements could properly be signed as late as that date. But the Board’s view of the correct interpretation of section 8, sub-section 3 of the Act is, as was stated during the discussion, that an Authority should not enter into an agreement unless at the time of signing it they are satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect that the works will be completed not later than August 31st,1940…the satisfaction of the Authority must be a bona fide satisfaction (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196).

However during this time Cardinal Hinsley was not occupied only with the machinations of LEA’s but, in Westminster, his patience and that of his officials, was being tried by members of religious orders. Most particularly Fr. Gouffé of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart25, who in a letter from Fr Thomas FitzGerald (one of the aforementioned officials) to Cardinal Hinsley, dated 11th August 1939, portrayed Fr. Gouffé as “labouring under a strong sense of grievance (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in Box AAW Hi

25 Rector of Saint Albans.
"2/191-196)" concerning the proposed Senior Top to the existent school at Saint Albans. Fr. Gouffé’s objection to this proposal was that “apart from the hardship of adding to the existing liabilities of the parish, it was not fair that the Order should be constantly financing debts on properties that were all vested, as to ownership, in the Archdiocese (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).” The response from Cardinal Hinsley to Fr. FitzGerald, dated August 15th 1939, indicates that the Cardinal had not lost his sense of humour in the midst of his exasperation:

Best thanks for your excellent letter on the Gouffé-imbroglio at St. Albans (Did I not say publicly that eloquence grew spontaneously at Willesden Green?). Eh bien, I enclose a copy of my letter to the Provincial of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart.

The Canon Law does not allow Religious to be in charge of Parishes, except in special cases and by special permission. Would that we had none of them in our parishes! The souls of children are of more importance than the interest of any Order (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196])."

AAW Bo 1/187 Education XI 1942-43 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]
Within this portfolio there is a complete and readable copy of the ‘Declaration by the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales on the subject of Education’. Seven principles are enunciated and it is dated Low Week, 1929. Papers concerning Ilford CPA and arrangements for education of Catholic children during the war years are also lodged in this portfolio.

AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]
While the first part of the above portfolio comprises papers which are mainly undated and generally without authorship, they collectively embody the marshalling of the Catholic argument regarding the 1944 Act.

In an undated briefing paper entitled ‘Some Further Notes on the Financial Question’ five substantive points are made. These are either recorded verbatim or I have summarised the main points using normal conventions:

1. It should be kept in mind that the debt charges for schools are only one part of the heavy parish commitments. The Catholic Church is not an endowed Church in England and Wales. Thus, the whole educational debt must be viewed in the light of the existing all round charges for Churches, Presbyteries, Parish Halls, and the Parochial Life. The permanent commitments and loan charges in respect of these must be met irrespective of the enormous debts that will be incurred for our part of the Government’s new education proposals.”
2. In this point the author rehearses the generosity of the Catholic community in responding to significant need. Recalling the Earl of Lytton’s comment in September 1941 on the charitable giving of Catholics “The Churches of this country have so far raised £58,000 for the Duke of Gloucester’s Red Cross and St. John Fund, and of this sum the Roman Catholic Church has contributed no less than £10,000.”

3. “Some equitable way must be found of removing a considerable part of the burden proposed by the Education Bill for the Catholic Body.”

4. “The suggested concession of 100% for the Special Agreement Schools: The number of Catholic Special Agreement Schools is strictly limited. In the Debate on the White Paper the President of the Board of Education gave the figure as 289. This number is fixed. Whatever aid is given, not a single school can be added to that number. There is therefore, no question of creating new difficulties either for Local Education Authorities or for Free Churchmen…It is a question of granting relief by a single concession [of the full 100%] once for all. It is not a concession that can recur” much to the dismay of the author who sees this potential solution as “a small act of compensation to the Catholic body in return for the sacrifices and the contributions they have made for the public education services of the country.”

5. “The increase of the maintenance contribution from 50% to 75% in the case of Catholic Schools under clause 95: Here we ask for minority concessions to put us on something like equal terms with others.

The Anglicans have, through their spokesmen, made it plain that they can in conscience make use of both aided schools and controlled schools for their children. The Catholic spokesmen have made it equally plain that only aided schools can be used by Catholics with a good conscience. This means that Anglicans can conscientiously benefit in some cases by maintenance up to 100%, and in other cases up to 50%. Probably an all round average figure of benefit for them will be in the neighbourhood of 75%.

We ask that this average figure of 75% be conceded to the Catholic body as an equitable arrangement for equal treatment in the matter of maintenance (AAW Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

The portfolio also comprises a confidential note of meeting, again undated with no evidence of authorship, which records a meeting that took place between the author and the President of the Board of Education the morning following the Second Reading of the Bill. Mr Butler was accompanied by Mr. Chuter Ede and Sir Maurice Holmes:

5. In the opinion of the President the best way to open a door for further financial concessions lay in an authoritative and clear expression by the Hierarchy that an increase measure of public control could be accepted by the Catholic body. He thought we would be wiser to retain our full independence and pay the price. But it was for us to decide, and for us to say what amount of independence we could forego.
6. Mr. Chuter Ede suggested that we might agree that we do not require all the teachers in our schools to be Catholics, and in particular that we would not insist that teachers of ‘special subjects’ (e.g. domestic science and woodwork) must be Catholics. He also suggested that we might agree that all appointments of our Catholic teachers be made by the Local Education Authority without the obligation of obtaining the consent of the Managers; the appointments to be made from the Bishops’ list of approved Catholic teachers; the Bishops would, so to speak, issue a ‘certificate’ to an approved Catholic teacher and this would entitle the teacher to a place on a list. A teacher’s name could be removed from the list by the Bishops for adequate reasons.26

In the same portfolio there is an aide-mémoire that has no authorship entitled ‘The Education Bill’ with a pencil annotation of N.D. on the top right hand corner. It states at the beginning that “the following notes may be of assistance in preparing your people for an approach to their Member of Parliament (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb), The Education Bill, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 1). Although there are ten points made within the paper ranging from issues to do with ‘Special Schools for children suffering from disabilities’ to the ‘Powers of Management’ and ‘The Agreed Syllabus’27 what is of particular interest are the first three points concerning the rights of parents, namely:

1. In the Bill there is no explicit recognition of the rights of parents concerning the establishment of new schools.

In the 1921 Act, which is in force at the moment, one of the criteria by which the Board of Education was bound to be guided in deciding whether a proposal for a new school should be admitted or not, was the “wishes of the parents”. Thus, in this matter, at the present day, “the wishes of the parents” have an explicit legal status.

The Education Bill proposes to repeal the 1921 Act. And nowhere in the Bill is explicit legal recognition given to the wishes of parents in this matter. This is a serious menace.28 It means that if Catholic

26 It is through the nature of how this debate was resolved that one may see the four voices coming into play. The bishops moved from a situation of insisting resolutely on a staffing establishment that was Catholic to one where all posts apart from ‘Catholic’ ones were not reserved. It is a situation whereby ecclesiology succumbs to realpolitik at a time of systemic growth. What principles governed decisions made by the Church on the one hand and Politicians and Bill Managers on the other?

27 It is interesting how in these Archives record tensions that resonate with the modern reader; commenting on the method adopted for drawing up agreed syllabuses locally the author(s) opine: “There is then to be a kind of Standard religion with admittedly no divine origin or sanction. It will lead to the widespread dropping of Christian principles (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) ‘The Education Bill’, page 3, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

28 Attempting to address this “menace” has been at the heart of much subsequent amending legislation Restoration of the rights of parents to determine the nature of their child’s education is recognised in Church Teaching (Council and Papal), the 1925 Judgment of the US Supreme Court and the Human Rights Convention. Addressing their disenfranchisement is at the heart of the current ‘Free School’ debate and yet the Church seems strangely silent.
parents want a new nursery, new primary schools, new Senior schools, new Technical schools, new Grammar schools, within the national system, they have no assurance that their wishes will be a factor in the decision reached by the Minister of Education. The sole explicit criterion named in the Bill is whether the Local Education Authority has “sufficient schools for the area”; and the Minister ultimately decides “as he thinks fit”

2. In the Bill there is no explicit recognition of the rights of parents concerning the continuance of existing schools.

By the “Necessity of Schools Act 1933” our existing schools with 30 or more children, could not be closed unless accommodation was found for the children in a school “of the same denominational character and reasonably accessible.”

The Education Bill proposes to repeal this Act.

Clause 12 of the Education Bill declares “Where a Local Authority intends to cease to maintain any auxiliary schools (our schools are named auxiliary schools) they shall submit proposals for that purpose to the Minister...give public notice of the proposals in the prescribed manner.” Certain defined persons, amongst whom parents are not named, “may submit to the Minister objections to the proposals...any proposals submitted to the Minister may be approved by him after making such modifications therein, if any, as appear to him to be desirable.”

No definite criteria are stated by which the Local Education Authority and the Minister must be guided in this matter of the closure of existing schools.

3. In the Bill there is no explicit recognition of the rights of parents in the matter of the transference of senior children from an all age school to a senior school.

There were legal safeguards both in the 1921 Act and in the 1936 Act.

The 1921 Act (s.34) provided that the distribution of children for the purpose of separating Junior and Senior pupils should be in schools of the same denominational character as the schools from which the children were moved.

The 1936 Act required the raising of the school-leaving age to 15 and consequent re-organisation. But the State gave help for the necessary improvement of existing schools or for the provision of new Senior Schools. And, in the latter case, the new Senior schools were to be of the same denominational character as that which the children previously attended.

Both the 1921 Act and the 1936 Act will be repealed by the Bill.

The State in responding to the Catholic Church on educational matters has not appreciated always this elemental memory: the school is at the service of the home.
According to the Bill, “A Local Education Authority shall have regard to the need for securing that primary and secondary education are provided in separate schools.” (Clause 8), “If the Local Education Authority are satisfied that any school which is for the time being organised for the provision of both primary and secondary education ought to continue to be so organised...make provision for its continuing to be so organised during such a period as they think necessary” (Clause 10). The Minister may modify as he considers desirable...approve the plan...and issue an Education Order... and make provision (Clause 11) as to which schools if any shall for the time being be organised for the provision of both primary and secondary education.

Here again the existing criteria by which the Local Education Authority and the Board were legally bound are to be abolished (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) 'The Education Bill', [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 3).

Notes in this portfolio of possible amendments to 1944 Bill and financial implications of proposed funding models. In one note and paper from Joseph, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, in a subsection entitled Certain Principles of Catholic Policy reminds the reader in 2 (iv): “The teacher is always acting in loco parentis, never in loco civitatis, though the State may take reasonable care to see that teachers are efficient (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) Catholic Education After the War, found in [AAW Box Hi 2/191-196], page 2).” The concern that the authority of the State may stray into areas beyond its competence is rehearsed in several of the papers found in this portfolio. What is frustrating is that many of the papers are undated and their provenance is unclear. The following paragraph comes from one such paper; however, the concern expressed is clear:

There will, however, be widespread concern, and even alarm, that a Bill designed for peacetime reconstruction is marred by requirements which perpetuate the most indescribable type of wartime restriction of personal freedom, restrictions of the kind that have been dutifully tolerated in wartime but which in peacetime will be repulsive to a people that has faced war and destruction for the sake of their homes and their freedom, restrictions of the kind that our nation bluntly associates with the names of Hitler and Nazism. We refer to the proposals that the effective decision as to the specific kind of schooling to be chosen for every child in our country is to rest, not with the parents of the child but with State Officials. We see the gravest dangers in proposals such as this, and we conceive it to be our duty to oppose them. Undoubtedly there are unworthy patents whose children the State must justly and adequately safeguard. But such parents are the exception. Most parents in England and Wales are not unworthy. Parents are normally and naturally fitted, as State Officials are not, by their parental relationship, parental affection, parental interest, and parental responsibility, to have an active and effective voice in the schooling and vocation of their children (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).
The Church managed successfully in this debate to face inward, enunciating theological principles re. the rights of parents, and outward, asserting that without a fair settlement these rights would remain unrealised. In a paper entitled, To Improve The Education Bill: Catholics should now, the unnamed author recognised the danger, as he or she saw it, of the rise of common schools in individual phases by default. Under point 3 the author wrote: “provide a room or rooms in or near every infants’ school for the under-fives. This will be most convenient as the older children can bring the little ones to the nursery school. There is a decided danger that Nursery Schools may become “common” schools (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) To Improve The Education Bill: Catholics should now, found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 1).”

In this portfolio there is also a one-page paper entitled School Site and Playing Fields which defines associated land and maintenance responsibilities as envisaged in the 1944 Bill.

In a letter to Sir Kingsley Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer, dated 17th October 1941, two points of disputation are raised in light of a Memorandum prepared by some officers of the Board of Education (unfortunately a copy of the Memorandum did not survive in this Archive):

1. The present proposals would make our all-age schools liable to decapitation by the LEA at will.
2. The Roman Catholics would only be able to have Secondary Schools if the entire cost of the site, building and equipment were found by the Church; that is to say the 75% grant under the 1936 Act would be withdrawn.

An interesting paper by A.C.F. Beales, dated 26th October 1941, seems to go beyond its title concerning religious education by describing the different schools’ systems across Europe beginning with the assertion:

There are in the Western world two, and only two, complete statements of an educational philosophy. One of these is that of Marxist Communism, embodied in the Constitution of the Soviet Union (1936), and operative throughout the USSR, and (until recently modified) in Mexico. The other is the Encyclical Divini Illius Magistri of Pope Pius XI (1929), whose principles are in operation to varying degrees in Holland (until May 1940), Eire, Portugal and certain other countries (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) Some Notes on Religious Education, found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 7).

Historical landmarks in the provision of schools in Holland:
1. 1801 – Napoleon’s Constitution – complete State control – private (‘voluntary’) schools forbidden
   Climax of agitation, till

2. 1857 – Voluntary Schools may be established if State’s permission is first secured in each case.
   Growth of voluntary schools, Protestant and Catholic, till

3. 1889 – obligation to secure State’s permission repealed
   Voluntary Schools increase more rapidly than State schools - till.

4. 1920 – Full equality of status by law (art.192 of the Netherlands Constitution) – State schools and Voluntary schools EQUALLY supported out of the rates.
   Result – equality of treatment reduces the temperature of religious difference.
   Working well till German invasion of May 1940 (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb), Some Notes on Religious Education, found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 7).

At the end of this paper is an Appendix including his Lecture notes from ‘Lecture 4: Church and State in English Education’ and a summary of Divini Illius Magistri. The former offers a fascinating contemporaneous commentary on the ‘Essence of the Dual System’, different demographic pressures within the Anglican and RC communities and diverse concerns over re-organisation. Namely:

The Dual system means the co-existence of the older, denominational schools, helped from public funds, with the newer undenominational schools, entirely provided out of public funds. Problems arising:-

1. How to deal with existing schools? Mainly an Anglican problem. Is solving itself by (a) transfer of Anglican schools to the State (decline from 11,552 in 1904 to 8,380 in 1938), and to (b) agreed syllabuses, leading to the decline also in Nonconformist Schools (from 1401 in 1904 to 308 in 1938).
3. Reorganisation (under the Hadow Report of 1926) – Danger of denominations losing their children to a State post-primary school at age of eleven. (N.B. Reorganisation equally necessary in Junior Schools?). Result – relief given in Act of 1936. This is the climax of proposals for modifying the dual system. All contain one principle in common – transfer of denominational schools to LEA’s in return for guaranteed “religious instruction” on two days a week. See Fisher Act debate of 1917-18.

29 Text of Article 192 of Netherlands Constitution, 1920: “(3) Public education shall be regulated by law, every person’s religious views being duly respected.” And “(6) Elementary private general education corresponding to the prescriptions of law, must be put on a parity of position with public education, as concerns its provision out of public means. By law shall be fixed the term upon which secondary and preparatory higher private education shall be assisted out of public moneys (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb), Some Notes on Religious Education, found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], pages 7 and 8).”
While the Anglican Communion was willing to compromise the Catholic Community was not. Read the problem of “atmosphere” of school – see Canon Drinkwater in Year Book of Education 1933, p.371 ff (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb), Some Notes on Religious Education, Appendix, found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], pages 1 and 2).

Bishops’ Committee of the Catholic Education Council, Tuesday, 25th November 194130: Minute 34: Green Book Discussions (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb), found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196] the author of this note is not recorded, but by its outlook, it was probably written by someone on the CEC)

The Bishop of Pella within this document provides a useful summary of the history of legislation affecting non-provided schools in his lifetime: “There had been the Act of 1891, which had instituted fee grants, and the Act of 1897 which provided further grants for voluntary schools and exempted their premises from rates: the 1902 Act had laid upon Local Education Authorities the obligation to maintain non-provided schools and this had been carried forward into the 1918 and 1921 Acts. The 1936 Act had authorised grants in building up to a maximum of 75 per cent of the costs of the new buildings needed for senior pupils in connection with the raising of the school age to 15 and with reorganisation schemes (pages 1 and 2).” The Bishop of Pella went on to identify three issues of concern with the Green Book proposals; these would dominate consideration of “these or any proposals”, namely:

1. The character of religious instruction to be given in the schools.
2. The appointment of teachers.
3. The provision of adequate buildings.

The Bishop of Pella referred to the negotiations which had led up to the Scottish Education Act of 1918, in which he had taken part as Delegate to the Holy See; The Secretary of State for Scotland and the officials of the Scottish Education Department had taken the line that the Government would give the Catholics religious safeguards if they would allow the Local Education Authorities to be master in their own province (page 2). Until 1902 the Bishop of Pella believed that “the Anglican and Catholic Churches had a common platform in regard to their schools. Subsequent developments had accentuated the differences

30 Those present included on the Church side for the Catholic Education Council: Lord Southwell (Chairman of the Catholic Education Council), the Rt Rev Lord Bishop of Pella, the Rt Rev Mgr. Canon Vance, the Rt Rev Mgr Traynor of Liverpool, the Revd J. F. Milroy (Representative of the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle on the Catholic Education Council), Sir John Shute, MP; Mr J. F. Parker (Representative of the Bishop of Southwark on the Catholic Education Council) and Mr Robert Mathew. On the side of the Board of Education were the President, Parliamentary Secretary, Secretary, Mr. Cleary and Miss Goodfellow.
between the denominations, however. So many of the Church of England schools were the only ones serving a district and were attended by a substantial proportion of non-conformists. In many areas “agreed syllabuses” in religious instruction had been adopted in Church of England as well as the council schools. The Catholics with the intimate link between religious teaching and their schools, had, therefore, felt, in a way in which the Church of England could not do, the requirement under the 1936 Act in regard to the reservation of teachers. From the Catholic point of view this constituted what might be described as a negative “test for Teachers” and seemed to put Cowper Templeism in a preferential position to denominational teaching. The statutory force given to the Answ By-law in Section 13 of the 1936 Act was no adequate compensation for the reservation of some of their teachers (page3).” The Secretary intervened and attempted to assuage the Bishop’s concern, explaining that under Section 72 of the 1921 Act denominational right of entry was already secured. Consequently “the question of withdrawing children from these schools need not, therefore, arise (page 30).”

Concerning the Green Book, Mgr. Vance noted that “The Parliamentary heads of the Board had changed so frequently but the permanent officials, whose views were expressed in this document, continued in office and the Catholic Education Council Committee were dismayed to find these officials’ views so unfavourable to their cause (page 4).”

The President of the Board commented in his response that “the important thing was to differentiate between the aim of securing equality and the problem of capital expenditure (pages 6-7).”

AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]

In this portfolio there is a fascinating undated handwritten note, presumably by Cardinal Hinsley, which begins “This meeting is perhaps the most critical of our generation (page 1).” It seems to be either a crib sheet for, or personal note of, one of two meetings of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales on 14th-15th April 1942 and/or 24th June 1942 respectively. The first took place at St. Edmund’s College, Ware and the second at Archbishop’s House, Westminster. Towards the end the author lists the “the maximum we wish to obtain by negotiation and the minimum we will accept (page 1).” The following list is made:

1. Thanks to Archbishop Amigo.
2. Maximum we wish to obtain by negotiation 50-50 insufficient – in justice we should have equal treatment. Could we press for 75% as in 1936 – and try to live on this minimum.

4. Single schools areas – surrender? on conditions a. withdrawal of children from Syllabus teachings b. right of entry into ours and into others.

5. New schools – vagueness. Right to have new schools in new areas resulting from town-planning and/or dispersal of populations.


In a personal letter, dated 16th September 1942, marked ‘Private’ from the President of the Board of Education to Archbishop Amigo Butler writes:

...I have accordingly attempted to work out a homogeneous plan comprising the following two alternatives.

Under the first alternative the arrangements would be on the following lines:-

(a) The obligation of the Managers in regard to repairs, alterations and improvements to pass to the Local Education Authority.

(b) The appointment of teachers to pass from the Managers to the Local Education Authority, subject to what is said below about the appointment of reserved teachers and of Head Teachers.

(c) Agreed syllabus instruction to be given.

(d) Agreed syllabus instruction to be supplemented by not more than two periods a week of denominational instruction, to be given by reserved teachers to those [children whose] parents desire it.

(e) Reserved teachers to be appointed to such an extent as may be necessary for the denominational teaching referred to in (d), it being remembered that it will be permissible to give religious instruction at any hour of the day, instead of, as at present, at the beginning or end of the school meeting.

(f) The Head Teacher should not normally be a reserved teacher, but the Managers should be consulted: such consultation might take the form of the selection of the Head Teacher by a Committee of five persons, three representing the Local Authority and two the Managers.

Under the second alternative, the plan would be as follows:-

In cases where the Managers desire to retain their existing powers in regard to the appointment of teachers and the giving of denominational instruction, they should be allowed to do so, provided that they are able and willing to meet within a strictly limited time 50 per cent of the cost of repairs and of such alterations and improvements as may reasonably be required by the Local Education Authority. In such a case the remaining 50 per cent would be met by a direct Exchequer grant to the Managers."
The President of the Board goes on to write "I realised at our meeting (presumably with CEC) that your needs and desires could not be met under alternative 1" and argued that alternative 2 represented "a considerable improvement (A copy of personal letter to Archbishop Amigo from the President of the Board of Education, 16th September 1942, AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb), found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 2).

It is apparent that the backdrop of the "Education Question" both within and outside the Catholic community is multi-faceted as evidenced in a letter to Archbishop Amigo from Canon Wood, copied to the Cardinal. The letter addresses teacher appointments and concerns over the quality of student-teachers drawn from religious communities. It is dated 24th October 1942:

In view of the meeting of the Bishops on the Education Question this coming week may I address myself to your Grace on the one question of the appointment of teachers? The alternative scheme offered by Mr Butler seems to me one that we could accept and it leaves our control of the schools, when we have brought them up to the requirements of the LEA, unchanged. On this I wish to comment.

I note further that he proposes to revive the Education Act of 1936 and to allow us to take advantage of the agreements we made with various LEA’s whereby we were to receive up to 75% of the cost of our senior schools. We surrendered the right of appointment of teachers in those schools. If the 1936 Act is revived we shall have the appointment of teachers in the junior schools but not in the senior schools (Letter from Canon Wood to Archbishop Amigo entitled “Education Question”, dated October 24th 1942, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb)] found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 1).

May I suggest to Your Grace that it will be in many ways to the advantage of the schools if the appointment of teachers in all our school[s] is taken out of the hands of the Managers for the following reasons; Wood then proceeds to identify eight reasons raising concerns over the competence of Managers to make such appointments.

He, however, acknowledges that this would result in placing “our schools” entirely under the educational control and direction of the LEA saving only the teaching of the Catholic religio[nn]. He posits that the teachers should be appointed “by the Education Authority and the proportion of Catholic teachers should be the same as the proportion of Catholic children on the roll of the school. The head teacher should always be Catholic. This is the scheme arranged with the LCC and Middlesex for the schools of the Westminster diocese (Letter from Canon Wood to Archbishop Amigo entitled “Education Question", 24th October 1942, page 2, AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

The reason Canon Wood came to this conclusion could be because of the concerns expressed in this letter and elsewhere in this portfolio over the general quality of student-
teachers drawn from religious orders as observed during recent inspection visits to Saint Charles Teaching Training College, originally in Ladbroke Grove:

For several years past on my annual visit to Saint Charles’s Training College I have been troubled by the low standard of the nun-teachers who were in training. Mother Fincham, the Principal, presents the inspectors with a list of all the student teachers and they have been classified according to their teaching ability: A plus, A, A minus; likewise B and C. In most years there are some twenty nuns of various religious orders in training. Usually none of them is placed in Grade A, very few in Grade B, and the majority in Grade C. Now these nuns, according to the present mode of appointing the teachers in our schools, will ultimately be the head teachers and they are mostly Grade C teachers. I respectfully submit that the present mode of appointment of teachers perpetuates a system whereby our schools are largely under the control of inferior teachers. Dr Winham has been with me on the last two visits to St Charles’s College (now at Cold Ash near Newbury), and each year we have viewed the prospect with alarm. We have talked about it to Mother Fincham who entirely agrees that the present way of appointing our teachers is detrimental to the educational interests of our children. They don’t (sic) get a fair deal because of the present method of appointing the teachers (Letter from Canon Wood to Archbishop Amigo entitled Education Question, 24th October 1942, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb)], found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 2).

In an Interim Report entitled ‘The Dual System’ and published by The National Society (The Central Council of the [Anglican] Church for Religious Education) in October 1942. The National Society recognises that where Managers are unable to fulfil their legal obligations in respect of repairs, alterations and improvements there will need to be a greater subsidy along with a “wider measure of public control”. To this end, The National Society proposes the following arrangements:

a. The obligation of the managers in regard to repairs, alterations and improvements to pass to the Local Education Authority.

b. The appointment of teachers to pass from the managers to the Local Education Authority, subject to what is said below about the appointment of reserved teachers and of head teachers.

c. Reserved teachers to be appointed to such extent as may be necessary for the giving of the denominational teaching referred to in paragraph 6 above [cf. para 6: An agreed syllabus adopted by a Local Education Authority should be used in all Church of England Non-Provided Schools and not only in those in single school areas…Managers must be free to supplement such syllabuses by a specifically Church syllabus, and at times when this is done facilities on the school premises should be given for the further use of the agreed syllabus or for the teaching of the tenets of other Christian denominations to children whose parents desire it.]

31 These are a direct copy of the first two points of the first alternative proposed by the President of the Board Of Education to Archbishop Amigo dated 16th September 1942.
d. The Society holds that the most effective way of securing the continuous character of the school is that the head teacher should be a reserved teacher. There is, however, a strong feeling among teachers and members of the Free Churches that the subjecting of some 10,000 head teachers to a denominational test is inequitable. The Society recognises the force of this objection, but would be bound at least to stipulate that in appointments of head teacher-ships some method of consultation between the Authorities and the managers be established so as to secure that such appointments were in no way unacceptable or inimical to the aims of the school (The Central Council of the [Anglican] Church for Religious Education, The Dual System, The National Society, October 1942, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb)], found in [Box Hi 2/191-196]).

It was proposed that this report be received by the Autumn Session of the Church Assembly, 1942 and approved. There is no record in the portfolio as to whether this came to pass. However, there is an emerging consensus between the Anglican Church and State; on occasion in wording that is indistinguishable. No wonder the Catholic Hierarchy became chary and this may account for the famous meeting at Archbishop’s House Southwark, recorded in Lord Butler’s autobiography, in November 1942. As Moloney, rightly comments Butler's record of this visit constitutes a masterly vignette:

My records state that ‘after much sounding of the bell a sad looking, rather blue faced Chaplain let me in and we climbed a massive palace stair to the first floor where the Archbishop was sitting, fully robed, in a small room overlooking the ruins of Southwark Cathedral. His window was wide open on his left hand so that he could at once take in the tragic picture of the ruins and inhale the chilly morning air.’ The Archbishop asked immediately we had sat down what I had come to see him for. I obliged by informing him; but it was not an auspicious beginning. He said that a 50% grant was not sufficient and that he saw no chance of agreement with the politicians. He said that if I had belonged to his community he would have suggested that we should pray. I said I would be very ready to do so since I was also a churchman.

This interview indicated the nature of the head-on collision with the Roman Catholic Church ([Butler, The Art of the Possible, page 106]).

In a letter to The Times, 31st October 1942, Cardinal Hinsley writes:\footnote{Attached to the carbon copy of this letter is a handwritten note which reads:

During the last days of Cardinal Hinsley and the interregnum Dr. Downey (Archbishop of Liverpool) issued statements and we did not always get copies.

I have an idea something was issued after Low Week but I have no copy from Liverpool.

If Bishops’ Acta are available a glance at it should show if anything is missing.}

\footnote{Attached to the carbon copy of this letter is a handwritten note which reads:

During the last days of Cardinal Hinsley and the interregnum Dr. Downey (Archbishop of Liverpool) issued statements and we did not always get copies.

I have an idea something was issued after Low Week but I have no copy from Liverpool.

If Bishops’ Acta are available a glance at it should show if anything is missing.}
Sir,

The air is full of discussion on reform of education. On this great question of the reconstruction of the National System of education there are three points which we Catholics desire should be kept in mind.

1). The freedom of consciences of all must be respected: Mr. Roosevelt has made it clear that this is one of the four great liberties for which we are fighting.

2). Next we stoutly maintain that in the past we have proved our determination to promote the progress of education, and, while we cling to our principles, we are confident that justice done to us will not obstruct the advancement we all desire in the future.

3). The Catholic body in this country comes mostly from the workers and from the poorer section of the community. We are a minority. Therefore our Catholic parents have a special claim for fairplay, especially from any and every party or group that professes to uphold the just claims of the worker and the rights of minorities.

The future of our Catholic schools is of vital concern to us. We do not know what changes may take place in the administration of the National System since no official proposals have been made public by the Government. But clearly and decisively our elementary schools, numbering 1260, and containing before the war some 400,000 children must and will remain Catholic. They were built by us out of the poverty of our people, who at the same time also paid their rates and taxes like other people. While continuing within the National System our schools should receive equal (sic) treatment with other schools since the general demand now is that there be “equal opportunity for all (sic).” No equal opportunity will exist for a minority who are saddled with extra and crushing financial burdens because of their definite religious convictions and because they cannot accept a syllabus of religious instruction agreeable to the many. Furthermore our schools for higher education, built by Catholics, whether they receive grants-in-aid or are entirely independent because built by and maintained by their founders, shall not be subjected to the undue control of the state or be the victims of expropriation of any sort. We adhere unswervingly to the principles repeatedly stated by the Catholic Hierarchy of this country on the Christian education of youth, principles authoritatively expounded by Pius XI in the Encyclical “Divini Illius Magistri”. We emphatically repeat that we are convinced that no political party will seek to or be able to set at naught the respect of British people for the rights of minorities.

Your obedient servant,

Archbishop of Westminster
On behalf of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales

In the following year (1943) as it became apparent that the Bill would be laid before Parliament, individual bishops and dioceses sent papers to Westminster and prayed for a just resolution.
In the Archives there is much reference to the Birmingham Memorandum as providing a possible platform to bring about consensus across the Hierarchy. Unfortunately, there is not a copy of this Memorandum in the Archive. However, in papers from Birmingham there is an **advisory note of proposed Grants to Aided and Special Agreement Schools not in single-school areas** and a suggestion in the last point of the digest of a way forward concerning equitable funding regimes:

(1) Running costs and repairs – as in the Bill.
(2) Transfer to a new site or substitution for an older school under an order from the Minister – the replacement cost of the old school on its old site, plus a grant, where appropriate, under (3) or (4).
(3) Completing Hadow reorganisation and raising the standard of Church schools to the average of County schools in their districts in 1939 – as in the Bill (i.e. 50% of the cost of adaptation or of building a new school, or 50% to 75% in the case of special agreement schools).
(4) Capital expenditure on improving the standard of education beyond the level reached on the average in the County school in 1939 – 100%, subject to a maximum total grant for the whole of Great Britain designed to ensure that grants to (say) Catholic schools should not exceed the contribution of Catholic ratepayers and taxpayers to public expenditure of this kind.

The *Ad Clerum* from Northampton, dated 14th January 1943, proposed a novena of prayer between Tuesday 18th January and Wednesday 26th January 1943. Believing, in the words of Bishop Leo “if, as of old, prayer is made without ceasing by the Church of God (cf. Acts xii, 4), we may confidently rely on the goodness and power of God to enable us to meet the future whatever may be the outcome of the present crisis (paragraph 1).” In paragraph 5, because of the Education Bill, priests were exhorted to keep accurate records of the Catholic “population in general and...of children in particular.” An indication of tension in the Catholic community is apparent with the closing two sentences of paragraph eight: “We hope to send you in a few days an analysis of the Bill, which should be the basis of these new approaches. The formulation of any precise amendment is, of course, a matter for authority and not for the Catholic Parents’ Association.”

In a final sheet in this portfolio entitled The Following Statement has been issued from Archbishop’[s] (sic) House, Westminster it is announced that “as an extension of the Catholic Education Council and of other Catholic educational organisations, the Hierarchy of England and Wales has decided to form a Council fully representative of parents, teachers, Members of Parliament and of School Conferences” under the Chairmanship of the Archbishop of Liverpool with nominated representatives from the Bishops, Conferences of Catholic Colleges, Association of Convent Schools, Catholic Education Council, Conservative Party, Labour Party, Parents, Catholic Teachers’ Federation. The terms of reference for this group were enunciated as follows:
a. To form a deputation to the Board of Education to state definite decisions of the Hierarchy[;]
b. To keep Catholic M.P.s and other friendly Members of Parliament informed of our determinations and to keep us informed of developments in the political sphere;
c. Conferences with M.P.s on decisions taken by the Bishops;
d. The function of the Committee is to be advisory (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb)), found in, [Box Hi 2/191-196], 6th February 1943).

The message, found elsewhere in this Archive, of the Government’s confusion and the need for a single ‘Catholic’ voice had got through. While this co-ordinating group was weakened by the absence of Westminster, it does represent a proto-expression of subsidiarity and communio.

AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box Hi 2/191-196]
The Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales met on 24th August 1943 in London and issued a statement entitled [a] Declaration of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy on the Schools Question; at this time the Hierarchy on such matters was being led by Richard Downey, the Archbishop of Liverpool. Operational detail overwhelms the Church in its dealing with HMG within the interregnum, before the appointment of Griffin to Westminster. Officials and Ministers were often left bemused and a little frustrated:

Now that the White Paper on Educational Reconstruction is before us we wish once again to state the Catholic position

Not only as good citizens, but also as loyal upholders of the Catholic tradition, we desire to be in the forefront of educational progress. We therefore welcome the bold and comprehensive scheme of reconstruction described in the White Paper. But we regret to find that according to its provisions we shall still be penalised for our conscientious convictions. We readily grant that an effort has been made to mitigate the injustice under which we have suffered in the past. The provisions of the 1936 Act are to be revived; revised proposals will be permissible in certain conditions; a 50% grant from the Exchequer will be available for alterations and improvements to our schools, including the re-building of a school in appropriate circumstances; and the same maintenance costs already enjoyed by Elementary schools will be available for our Secondary schools under prescribed conditions. There is also a promise of much needed aid for transport.

...We have used the ugly word “penalised”, and we hasten to justify it. Catholics are under statutory obligation to send their children to school. It is against their conscience to send them to any but Catholic schools. But in order to have Catholic schools they must, in addition to the rates which they pay, make a further contribution to the cost of education. As the late Cardinal Hinsley wrote: “While continuing within the national system our schools

33 At the bottom of the sheet the following comment is made within parentheses: (Extracted from The Tablet, 6th February 1943.)
should receive equal treatment with other schools, since the general demand now is that there be ‘equal opportunity for all’. No equal opportunity will exist for a minority who are saddled with extra and crushing financial burdens because of their definite religious convictions and because they cannot accept a syllabus of religious instruction agreeable to the many (Letter to The Times, October 31, 1942) (Declaration of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy on the Schools Question, 24th August 1943, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in [AAW Box Hi 2/191-196], page 1).

At the October Meeting (19th-20th October 1943), the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales were joined by Rab Butler, Mr Chuter Ede and Sir Maurice Holmes. The minute of the meeting reads:

Mr. Butler pointed out that the Government had always stated its intentions frankly, though it had not always been given credit for its good intentions; in particular, he referred to the agitation among the Fighting Services.

He deplored extremes of statement. He did not refer to the utterances of the Hierarchy. He claimed that there were so many conflicting views and interests on the subject of education; it followed that we could not expect to obtain all that we wanted. The same applied to the Anglicans and Free Churchmen.

Those who desired special denominational teaching should be prepared to contribute towards it.

The wishes of parents were going to be considered. Indeed, their expressed wishes would be a vital ingredient in deciding the character of the schools.

Our offer to surrender the appointment of teachers was difficult to accept as it was conditioned by the demand that they must all be Catholics. He felt that the real difficulty between us was a financial one. On the question of the cost under the 50% proposal, he estimated that our loan charges would amount to about half a million pounds. He fully saw our difficulty of an unlimited liability.

Much of the increase in costs was due to the imposition of higher standards of education. If this item were left aside, could we not arrive at a clear figure per place which we could afford? In other words, could we not between us (the Government and the Catholic Body) arrive at a “ceiling”, i.e. a sum per place, underneath which we should find the money, and over which we should be relieved of the cost?

He would also much prefer to deal with larger units than parochial Boards of Managers. Was it possible to have a Central Diocesan Body to deal directly both with the Government and with Local Authorities? As to the question of “New Schools”, he proposed to widen the term of “replaced schools” so as to include shifted populations, town-planning, and new factory sites.

He answered questions:

(1) Is there any hope for really new schools? It seems almost impossible.
(2) Why not leave this to the choice of parents? He found it difficult to get agreement for this with the Anglicans and Free Churchmen.

Mr. Butler ended by expressing his hope that we could arrive at a business deal.

The Chairman (Liverpool) thanked the Minister and his colleagues for their kindness in coming to confer with the Bishops.

Agreed that the Archbishop of Liverpool, the Bishops of Clifton, Hexham and Newcastle, and Salford, and Bishop Myers form a negotiating committee to arrive at “the ceiling”.

The next morning, the following is recorded:

1. Further consideration of Mr. Butler’s proposals. Agreed to having a central Diocesan Committee, each Bishop to arrange this in his own way.

4. The “ceiling” Committee agreed to meet in the first week of November. Meanwhile each bishop might sound [out] his advisers in confidence. The reactions to the proposal should be sent to Bishop Myers.

6. Agreed that the Archbishop of Liverpool’s Address be recast by him into the form of an Advent Pastoral to be read in all dioceses (October Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, 19th-20th October 1943, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box Hi 2/191-196], pages 2-3).

On reading the minutes of the above meeting; one can understand the tenor of Rab Butler’s response to the Bishop of Northampton, dated 21st October 1943:

I had hoped there would be an opportunity of dealing at our meeting on Tuesday with the point you put to me in your letter of 6th October. The answer to your question is that the 50 percent. grant under paragraph 56B of the White Paper would be available towards the provision of new buildings in substitution for the temporary Roman Catholic Infant School at Corby. The same would be true of the proposed new Junior School if that School is held to be necessary and is recognised by the Board as a Public Elementary School under Section 19 of the Education Act, 1921. I think the difficulties of the type you mention at Luton may be eased by our proposal to empower Local Education Authorities to act in an agential capacity and acquire sites compulsorily for non-provided schools.

Another problem which I know is a very real one for the Roman Catholic community will be assisted by our requiring Local Education Authorities to supply information about their transport arrangements so that it will be possible to deal with cases where transport facilities for Roman Catholic children are being unreasonably withheld (Letter from Rab Butler to the
A copy of this reply, from the Board of Education is in the Westminster Archive; whether out of respect for the late Cardinal Hinsley or in the hope of a new incumbent.

The promised Joint Pastoral Letter written by the Archbishop of Liverpool offers an encyclopaedic examination of the Church’s position concerning education. The fourteen-page letter addressed the following areas:

- a. Extension of Public Control
- b. Unfair Differentiation
- c. Impossible Financial Burden
- d. Brand New Schools
- e. Three Principles
- f. A Plea for Simple Justice

Even the most ardent of parishioners, must have been overwhelmed by the information provided; a clear case of when more meant less.

The three principles referred on pages 11 to 13 underline, one, the rights of parents: “wherever there exists a body of parents of the same religious denomination, with children sufficient in numbers to occupy a school building, such a school should be built, fully maintained and staffed by the right type of teacher at the public expense and the denominational character of the school should be preserved. Two, the right to equal opportunity, recognising that such a right “must be acceptable to the recipient. To offer opportunity on conditions known to be unacceptable is really to deny opportunity. Agreed-syllabus teaching is acceptable to the majority, but it is useless to Catholics. Those who can conscientiously accept such teaching are given one hundred percent aid; those who cannot accept such teaching are penalized financially.” Three, the rights of partners in the educational field, and how the rights of parents, as recognised in the 1921 Act, are being substituted by “the wishes of the Local Education Authority, the wishes of the National Union of Teachers and the wishes of the Free Churches (Joint Pastoral Letter of the Hierarchy of England and Wales on the School Question, Advent 1943, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).”

Griffin, the new incumbent, would find support both inside and outside the Catholic community. In a letter to him by John S. P. Mellor, written after the announcement of his translation to Westminster, Mellor urges Griffin to rally his supporters. Mellor writes:
Not from anything Butler has said, but from general aspects, I would describe his position like this. He wants to be as generous as he can be to Church Schools and at the same time has to pull off a compromise of some sort. If the case for the Church Schools is not strongly supported in the Commons, it will not be too easy for him to uphold what is helpful in the Bill, let alone make further concessions. If, therefore, a number of those sympathetic with the Church Schools sit back and say “Oh! But we don’t want to embarrass Butler by having a scrap”, they will defeat their purpose and embarrass Butler very much by their inaction.

We must at least provide a counterblast to the Non-Conformist and N.U.T spokesman in the debates. If we put up a better fight than the other side, it would make it very much easier for Butler, by way of amendments in Committee or in Report, to offer some further concessions to the Church Schools...I hope, therefore, that John Shute will be able to get something going (to include non-Catholic Members) in time at least for the Committee Stage (Letter from John S. P. Mellor to Bishop Griffin, 26th December 1943, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], pages 2-3).

In a letter dated 3rd January 1944; Sir John Mellor qualifies his letter of 26th December 1943 in a reply to a letter written by Griffin to him of 30th December 1943: “I am quite willing that you should show my letter to the Bishops. I would like, however, to make it quite clear that I did not intend any adverse reflection upon the Roman Catholic Members of Parliament. On the contrary they appear to be the only Members who, so far, have taken concerted action in the interest of the Church Schools (Letter from John S. P. Mellor to Bishop Griffin, 3rd January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 1).” In a personal letter written by Rab Butler to Archbishop-elect Griffin dated 3rd January 1944 he writes: “…I should like to assure you that I shall at any time be at your service to discuss any matters which may be of interest to you. I had heard from the Apostolic Delegate that he would like me to lunch with him and meet you. If such an occasion can be arranged, I shall look forward to seeing you. If at any time you would care to call at 14, Belgrave Square, it would be a pleasure for me to discuss matter with you (Letter from Rab Butler to Bishop Griffin, 3rd January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).”

On 5th January 1944, the following letter was published in the name of Archbishop-elect Bernard Griffin and the other Ordinaries of England and Wales. If nothing else, Griffin brought both succinctness and clarity to the ‘Education question’ which must have been a relief to politicians, officials and his newly acquired flock alike:

While we welcome the general provisions of the Bill for the reconstruction of the national system of education we wish to make clear that we have never accepted, do not accept, and never shall accept the Bill as it now stands. We
hope that modifications may still be made to meet our objections, among which we would particularly stress the following:-

1. The absence of explicit recognition of the rights of parents concerning the establishment and continuance of schools.
2. The excessive influence of State officials in the determination of the type of school to which a child must be sent.
3. The intolerable injustice of the proposed financial conditions, which would make it impossible for the Catholic body to meet their obligations under the Bill.

It is our sincere conviction that it would be for the lasting good of the nation if the sovereignty and freedom of conscience were given practical and official recognition in Mr. Butler's Bill.

We stand by that conviction and we would welcome the co-operation of all who agree with us. But we must face the realities of the situation, unpleasant as they may be. The Bill has passed its First Reading. The Anglican and Free Church leaders have publicly agreed to accept it. They have not expressed any conscientious objection to the Agreed Syllabus. We have consistently done so. Not by choice, but perforce, at this critical moment we stand alone as a religious minority. As such we ask for minority treatment in accordance with English practice and tradition. On many occasions, as for example in the Peace Treaties of 1919, England has shown herself to be a powerful and prominent protector of religious minorities in other countries, especially in the matter of education. All we ask is that an English Catholic minority may, under the same protection, be enabled with freedom of conscience to enjoy, as the equals of their fellow-countrymen, the full measure of educational reform.

Finally, whatever the issue, we shall do our best to keep pace with any national advance in the educational system, but we shall never surrender our schools (Letter from Hierarchy of England & Wales following their meeting at Archbishop's House, Westminster, 5th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196])."

One of the most intriguing pieces of paper in this portfolio is a letter written to Archbishop-elect Griffin by Bishop David Matthew dated 5th January 1944. In this note he gives his opinion of the Catholic M.P.s he has had dealings with, commenting on page 1: “The Cardinal asked me to keep in touch with them from 1937 (A. P. Herbert's Divorce Bill) till 1941 (War Damage Act). That was our last meeting. The Hierarchy took over the dealings with the M.P.s over the Education Bill (Letter from David Mathew to Archbishop-elect Griffin, 5th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).” The following pen sketches are most revealing:

Commander BOWER (Cons); husband of Henrietta Bower.
Lord C. CRICHTON-STUART (Cons); excellent Catholic, honourable man, most generous to Catholic causes, a completely silent member.
A. DENVILLE (Cons): educ. Ushaw, producer of touring companies, theatre lessee, practising Catholic, lightweight.
W. J. EDWARDS (Lab); experienced trade union politician, naval stoker, sound reliable Catholic, new to the House.
Col. A. EVANS (Cons); former chairman of British Totalisator Manufacturers Conference gives public support to Catholic views
E. L. FLEMING KC (Cons); I know nothing of this MP.
R. GRANT-FERRIS (Cons); from Birmingham.
Sir P. J. HANNON (Cons); from Birmingham.
Pierce Loftus (Cons); owner of East Anglican breweries, good honest man, firm Catholic.
D. G. LOGAN (Lab); a Catholic wind bag more wind than bag.
Captain McEWEN; a member of the Government, therefore cautious, a Scotsman the heir to a very great mercantile fortune, a recent convert, Catholic wife, keen Old Etonian, sons at Eton.
J. McGOVERN (ILP); you know his record.
Dr H. B. MORGAN (Lab); practising Catholic, I think rather a difficult customer.
J. P. MORRIS (Cons); an MP serving with the forces.
W. A. ROBINSON (Lab); an important Trade Union figure, does not take any action in Catholic matters.
Sir J. SHUTE (Cons); respected as a wealthy Liverpool cotton broker, a poor speaker not very audible. Friend of Abp of L.
R. R. STOKES (Lab); ardent Catholic, tremendous fighter, detests the Prime Minister.
J. J. Stourton (Cons); divorcé, remarried, sits till next election for strongly Catholic Salford constituency.
J. Tinker (Lab); staunch old Lancashire Catholic, deeply respect Trade Union figure.
Col. WICKHAM (Cons); I fancy a convert, rather dim

I understand that Wing Commander JAMES MP, has been lately received into the Church.

(Of these I believe Shute, McEwen, Robinson and Tinker carry most weight with their respective parties. I have met them all except Edwards, Fleming, McGovern, Morris and Robinson) (Letter from Bishop David Mathew to Archbishop-elect Griffin, 5th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).)

Garnered with this information, and with the encouragement of the Hierarchy, Archbishop-elect Griffin would write to Colonel Sir John Shute MP on 6th January 1944 asking him “to invite the members [of both Houses]” to a meeting on the educational Bill after the recess. Griffin goes on to suggest: “I shall be free after the Enthronement ceremony on January 18th 1944, and I am wondering whether you would be good enough to get in touch with the Catholic members of both Houses and to meet at a place suitable to you all. I presume this will be at the House, and I will hold myself in readiness for January 19th, 20th, or 21st. Will you please let me know as soon as possible if you are able to convene a meeting and tell me the day and time you have chosen… I take this opportunity of thanking you for the very kind help you have given to us for such a long period (Letter from Archbishop-elect Griffin to Colonel Sir John Shute MP, 6th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).”
On the 7th January 1944 Archbishop-elect Griffin, following up a prior letter from the Archbishop of Liverpool dated 17th December 1943 concerning the Memorandum of the meeting at the Board of Education, 24th November 1943, wrote to Rab Butler as follows:

…The Hierarchy [has] asked me to send the following:-

(1) The minutes by Sir Robert Wood make it appear that schools which do not qualify for the 75% grant or less from the L.E.A. under the revived 1936 Act, will qualify for 50% grant from the Exchequer, even though their re-organisation involves the building of new schools for the seniors. We should like this point made quite clear, for there is a danger that the L.E.A. would withhold their grant because 50% of the cost would come from the Government under the new Bill, whereas under the 1936 Act, they would have to contribute one half of the 75% out of the rates.

(2) Any estimate of future burdens on Catholics is incomplete unless it takes cognizance of all phases of “Educational reconstruction”, including nursery schools – even though not compulsory – technical schools and grammar schools, and even young peoples’ colleges.

(3) Even without these considerations, the Board’s very conservative estimate of £9,850,000 capital expenditure over the next twenty-five years is more than three times the capital expenditure which the Catholic community in England and Wales had to face during the twenty-four years between the two wars (c.f. Joint Pastoral p.8 in fin\textsuperscript{34}). The old injustice is obviously very much aggravated.

(4) The Hierarchy, in considering your explanatory Memorandum (Sec.21.i. Aided schools, at the end of the first paragraph) which reads “This grant may similarly be given towards premises of schools provided in substitution for one or more existing schools” would like the following added: - “The same grant may be given for brand-new schools as distinct from the above.”

(5) In order to meet the crushing financial burden which Catholics would have to meet if the proposals of 50% under section 95 of the Bill were accepted, the Hierarchy proposed that 100% be allowed for special agreement schools and 75% for alterations to existing schools; or alternatively, that the 50% could be accepted, provided that the cost to us should not exceed £20 per place for primary and £25 per place for post primary schools (Confidential Letter from Archbishop-elect Griffin to Rab Butler, 7th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

On this day [7th January 1944] Griffin also wrote to all the Bishops beseeching them to initiate a novena of prayer in their dioceses:

\textsuperscript{34} This reference refers to the following calculations, namely “…In the Liverpool Archdiocese alone it meant during the 24 years intervening between the two wars, the sum of £625,000 (£500,000 for new elementary schools and school-places, and £125,000 for alterations, etc., not involving new places). As the Liverpool archdiocese has one-fifth of the Catholic school population of the country (80,000 out of 400,000), and as we may reasonably assume that other dioceses over the same period have done as much for elementary education, a simple sum of multiplication gives the total for the Catholics of this country during 24 years as £3,125,000 or just over £130,000 per annum (Joint Pastoral Letter of the Hierarchy of England and Wales on 'The Schools Question', Advent 1943, page 8).” These figures are predicated on equivalent land, material and labour costs across England and Wales which is improbable.
I understand that Parliament re-opens on Tuesday January 18th, and apart from the date being that of my enthronement, it will be the beginning of a session on which may depend the future of our schools.

I suggest that we have a novena for our schools in honour of our English and Welsh Martyrs, to commence on January 18th, and that permission be given for Benediction every day, and the faithful, and the children, be invited to receive Holy Communion as often as possible during the novena [the following was annotated by Bishop Griffin “but especially on Sunday January 23rd when there may be] Exposition of the Most Blessed Sacrament from the last Mass until the afternoon or evening Service”.

If you approve I shall expect no reply, but shall notify the Catholic Press in time for Sunday, the 16th, of the Hierarchy’s wish to have the novena (Letter from Archbishop-elect Griffin to fellow bishops, 7th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

The bishops concurred; while some, like the Archbishop of Liverpool, used the occasion to write a ‘Pastoral Letter’ including “prayers for our schools”:

Come, O Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of Thy faithful, and kindle in them the fire of Thy love.
V. Send forth Thy Spirit, and they shall be created,
R. And renew the face of the earth

Let us pray

O God, Who has taught the hearts of the faithful by the light of the Holy Spirit, grant that, by the gift of the same Spirit, we may be always truly wise and ever rejoice in His consolation. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen.

O Mary conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee (3 times)

St Joseph our Protector, pray for us.

Martyrs of England and Wales, pray for us (Letter from the Archbishop of Liverpool to all Religious and Clergy of the Diocese, Feast of the Holy Family, 9th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

Within the portfolio, there is evidence of Archbishop-elect Griffin, seeking the views of politicians concerning the likelihood of sympathetic amendments to the Education Bill. In correspondence between Richard O’Sullivan and Geoffrey Hutchinson KC, MP, it is apparent that “the President will not budge on the Bill as it now is. It is as if the President were being held to his bargain with others (Letter from Richard O’Sullivan to Archbishop-elect Griffin, 13th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196])."
A letter dated 13th January 1944 appears in the portfolio from Councillor N. W. Burns, Chairman of the Westminster Diocesan Council Catholic Parents’ Association. The letter is addressed to “Dear Sir” with a pencil annotation “Copy to all MPs”. It is difficult to identify if the annotation is written by the author of the letter, Archbishop-elect Griffin or a member Griffin’s office. The text of the letter follows:

Dear Sir,

As you are aware the Education Bill, 1943, will shortly receive its second reading.

The Catholic Parents’ Associations throughout the Archdiocese of Westminster welcome the proposals in the main, but feel it their duty to inform you, before the second reading, that should the Bill go through in its present form, a grave injustice will be done to their children. It will make impossible the future existence of Catholic Schools, both primary and secondary. The continued existence of all denominational schools is contingent upon the finding by the parents of a sum equal to 50% of the cost of remodelling or rebuilding our existing schools and 100% for new ones.

The estimated cost of remodelling an elementary school for 600 children, will be no less than £24,000 – and perhaps as much as £36,000. The Catholic population of England and Wales is mainly composed of working class people, who already have a debt on most of their schools. They will now have the burden of raising huge additional sums.

Should they be unable to do, the Bill provides for the taking over of the schools by the Local Education Authority and Catholic Religious Instruction being allowed for only two periods a week.

Mr. Butler informed the House that he had not been able to concede the full demand of those who desire complete liberty of conscience. To Catholic Parents religion is fundamental to the proper education of their children. It is a principle for which they have fought and made great sacrifices in the past and they cannot and will not, at this stage, betray the supreme dictates of conscience.

We ask for and trust that we will receive your support for our claim for justice and equality, on behalf of our children, and to this end we shall be happy to provide you with any further details or information you may require.

Meanwhile would you be good enough to favour us with an acknowledgement of this letter (Letter from Councillor N. W. Burns, Chairman of the Westminster Diocesan Council Catholic Parents’ Association, to unclear, 13th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

35 Whether this is to the whole House of Commons or Catholic MPs only is unclear.
At this delicate stage of negotiations the need for unity was recognised as paramount. This letter from the Bishop of Salford, dated 20th January 1944, is common and perhaps reflects some of the tensions present during the interregnum:

With reference to the suggestion that the Catholic Education Council should prepare amendments for the Committee stage of the Bill, I would suggest that these amendments should be in the hands of the Bishops as soon as possible, in order that they might comment on those amendments and make additions. Our people desire to be in a position to ask their M.P.s to support amendments on behalf of Catholic Schools, but I think it inadvisable that different amendments be suggested from different diocesan bodies, as it would lead to confusion; whereas, if we had one set only of amendments on which we were all agreed, I think it would be advisable, as I have said, to issue a rough copy of the Catholic Education Council’s amendments and then, having allowed a few days for a reply from the Bishops, the Catholic Education Council having considered the suggestions, and having adopted them or not, as they consider fit, should forward the complete set of amendments to each Bishop so that he might advise his clergy accordingly. The Catholic Education Council very probably will forward to each Bishop the number of copies he requires for his diocese (Letter from Bishop of Salford to Archbishop Griffin, 20th January 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

In Griffin’s letter to all bishops dated 2nd February 1944 it is clear that he followed the operational advice suggested by the Bishop of Salford concerning the drafting of the amendments. Griffin writes:

Yesterday we had a further meeting of the Members of the Catholic Education Council and Catholic M.P.s to draft the amendments, and I enclose a copy of these amendments which have been tabled today. The Members explained that these should be put in immediately as there is always the option of changing them and also of withdrawing them. You will notice that we have purposefully left out any amendments of the financial clauses of the Bill because it was thought unwise to add anything until we know what will be the result of our negotiations with the Board (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to all

---

36 In this letter Griffin writes in the first three paragraphs:

The Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle and I had an interview at the Board of Education on Monday. We had a promise from Mr Butler that the rights of parents will be secured in the discussions during the committee stage.

With regard to the financial clauses of the Bill, the President discussed with us the possibility of a privileged loan. He explained that the Government was not in favour of a loan free from interest, but that he would meet his colleague again and would let us have the final proposals on Monday next, February 7th, when we hope to have a further interview.

The suggestion of the 100% grant for the 1936 schools was not ruled out, but it was felt that the amendment asking for 75%, on the aided schools would not be accepted (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to all Bishops, 2nd February 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [AAW Box Hi 2/191-196]).
On 7th February 1944 Robert Mathew of the Catholic Education Council wrote to Archbishop Griffin concerning Secondary Schools and enclosing a copy of a Memorandum prepared by the Liaison Committee of the Representatives of the Association of Convent Schools and the Conference of Catholic Colleges (This memorandum seems to have been shared with the Board of Education in 1943 and was subject of a letter sent by Rab Butler to the Archbishop of Westminster on 26th March 1943). The section on Technical Schools is interesting and belies the desire for universal “Catholic” education:

(a) We claim the right of the Catholic Body to their own Technical Schools, wherever the number of Catholic children is sufficient.

(b) In cases where the number of our Catholic children is not sufficient, we claim that they by legislation should be granted the statutory right to specific religious instruction in their own faith at non-Catholic Technical Schools during school hours and further, appropriate facilities for the practice of their Catholic faith (e.g. attendance at Mass on Holy Days of Obligation).

(c) We suggest that Multi-lateral Schools up to the age of 16 should be considered. There might be a combination of Grammar and Technical, or Modern and Technical, or possibly all three.

Records of earlier and contemporaneous literature show that the Church through her religious orders was committed to increasing access to Catholic education in conventional and non-conventional ways. So we read in [Canon] George V. Hudson, Mother Geneviève Dupuis, Foundress of the English Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul, the Apostle, 1813-1903, London, Sheed & Ward,1929, pp. 125-126:

[Mother Geneviève Dupuis] was placed by Dr. Tandy in charge of the poor school at Banbury. She was fortunate in having a fine building, designed by Pugin, and built at the same time as the church. But the difficulty was that the children for the most part did not come to school. Mother Dupuis made a list of the children of the parish. One by one she visited the children and their parents. She became a familiar figure in the streets of Banbury. Even in the severest weather she was seen trudging the lanes of the surrounding villages. Her zeal was extraordinary. The knowledge she gained convinced her that few, if any, of the older children could come to school held in daytime. She determined to open a night school. It was an immediate success. Not only the children of school age, but many of their older brothers and sisters attended; glad to have this opportunity of instruction. It is evident that the success of a night school depends on the personality of the teacher. That Mother Dupuis did so well is proof that she won the confidence of parents and children. The practice she then began became the normal practice of her sisters in all parts of England till compulsory attendance was enforced in 1870.

To Mother Dupuis teaching was an apostolic work. All her life she insisted on the educational fitness and proficiency of the Sisters she sent to teach. At the same time she impressed upon them that educational proficiency by itself was of little value. That for a teacher to be successful she must have a deep realisation of the spiritual dignity of the child, and a genuine love for the children. “Love,” she said, “is the first principle of success.” She would always encourage her Sisters who were teaching by recalling this truth “Show a mother’s love and anxiety for the little ones of Christ.”
(d) Transport: the provision of transport should be made obligatory ([AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

Rab Butler wrote to Archbishop Griffin on 8th February 1944:

Thank you for your letter of 5th February. At this stage I cannot go further than we have done in our conversations and correspondence, upon which you may perhaps be able to draw in talking the matter over with the Bishops. I will keep you informed of any developments that occur in the near future. You will realise, however, that the financial clauses will not be taken for three or four weeks and that therefore we have a certain amount of time.

Your M.P.s are certainly at liberty to put down financial amendments, but judgment on whether such a course would be wise depends upon consideration of the nature of the amendments themselves, and of that I am sure you are the best judge.

I can have left you in no doubt as to the impracticability of altering the general basis of the settlement, though we do want to do our best to see that your liability is spaced out and that things are so arranged that the opportunities for which the Bill provides are made more readily available for your children (Letter from Rab Butler to Archbishop Griffin, 8th February 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

Griffin informs the Hierarchy that another meeting is scheduled with the Board “Monday next” and proposes a meeting of the Hierarchy “if we receive favourable proposals” on the following Wednesday (9th February 1944).

He writes to his fellow bishops on 4th February 1944:

I saw Mr. Butler again last evening. His suggestion is that the Bill remains as it is with regard to the financial clauses but that we should be allowed to borrow money from the Government at the same rate as local authorities. This would mean that if the Government accept this suggestion we could have long-term loans of 40 years at the rate of about 4% to include interest and repayment of capital.

I consider that it will now be necessary to hold our meeting here on Wednesday next, February 9th, at 10.30 a.m. Lunch will be provided at St. Ermin’s Hotel (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to all Bishops, 4th February 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

There is no record of the proposed meeting neither in this portfolio nor in the Diocesan Archive. Apart from correspondence concerning a subsequent meeting from R. R. Stokes, MP dated 11th February 1944 (dictated 10th February 1944) [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]):
I was depressed beyond words at the meeting tonight 10\textsuperscript{th} February. Unless we can have a definite indication of what the Hierarchy are prepared to accept in principle it seems to me perfectly useless to ask Catholic Members of Parliament to go ahead and fight. I equally appreciate the difficulty of telling everybody what is in your mind, but at least you must trust one or two of us, and I suggest that at your own selection you impart what you really do mean and leave it to us to see what we can do on the floor of the House. As we are at present, so far as I can judge you will get absolutely nothing out of the Bill and the whole thing will be botched despite the fact that there is a very considerable body of opinion in support of giving us at least 75\% of the financial requirement in exchange for some limited concessions, the extent of which I have already defined.

Notice for Press Association on Education Bill dated 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 1944 [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]:

The Catholic Hierarchy wish it to be known that:-

1) the Scottish System or similar system is acceptable as was declared in the Joint Pastoral Letter of Advent 1943;
2) they have offered to relinquish the appointment of teachers as in the Scottish System in return for a comprehensive settlement but the Government have never made any counter offer to this proposal;
3) in the absence of any counter offer they have asked as an alternative for
   a) 100\% Grant on 1936 Act Schools, and
   b) 75\% Grant on the Aided Schools
   or the equivalent by means of interest free or low-interest loans.

In May 1944 the Board of Education published Principles of Government in Maintained Secondary Schools. Below I have copied five paragraphs numbers 3, 4, 10, 13, part of 15 and 21 respectively:

3. The recasting of the education system under the Education Bill extends the term "secondary" to include all schools for senior pupils. This will bring into the same administrative field a very large number of schools of a different character and different traditions from the present Secondary Schools. The development of a coherent and consistent way of life for this greatly increased number of schools of varying origins and conditions will not necessarily be on uniform lines. The Bill, indeed, recognises this fact by requiring the Minister, in exercising his function under Clause 16, to have regard to all the circumstances of the school and the manner in which it has been conducted heretofore.

4. Another important change is the classification of schools into categories of County, Controlled, Special Agreement and Aided Schools. Hitherto schools have been divided into provided and non-provided schools, and one implication of the change is that the powers and duties of the local education authority and the governors need to be clearly defined in each case. To some extent this is done in the Bill itself; in other respects it is left to the articles of government. But it must be recognised that any
division of functions laid down in the articles of government is subject to the overriding provisions of the Bill for each class of school.

10. **Constitution (sic):** All secondary schools are to be governed by governing bodies specially constituted for the purpose. In the case of county schools the governing body is to consist of such number of persons appointed in such manner as the local education authority may determine; in the case of auxiliary schools the governing body is to consist of such number of persons as the Minister may determine, subject to compliance with the prescribed proportions of foundation governors and of governors appointed by the local education authority.

13. **Grouping (sic):** Clause 19 provides for the grouping of schools under a single governing body and there can be no doubt that, with the great increase in the number of secondary schools, such grouping will frequently be necessary. In some cases the schools of a particular foundation or of a particular denominational character will most conveniently be grouped together, and it should be noted that an auxiliary school cannot be grouped with another school without the consent of the governors. Usually, however, there will be solid advantages in grouping schools on a geographical or regional basis, schools of all types finding a place in an individual group. In this way experience will be brought to bear on the problems of self-government in the newer types of secondary schools, while community of interests, sharing of teaching staffs and transfer of pupils between various types will be facilitated. Some fear has been expressed that under such an arrangement the individual character of each type of school might tend to be blurred, and the suggestion has been made that a nucleus of governors might be formed for the group with one or two additional members for each separate type of school, who would attend only when the affairs of their particular school were being considered.

15. **Teaching Staff (sic):** In aided schools the functions of the local education authority and the governors in regard to the appointment and dismissal of teachers are to be regulated by the articles of government, subject to certain mandatory or discretionary rights reserved to the local education authority and governors.

21. **[Admission of Pupils] Procedure (sic):** The abolition of tuition fees in all maintained schools will call for a re-examination of the method adopted for deciding the type of secondary education which individual pupils are to receive. It is important that the wishes of parents should continue to be taken into account, and effect given to them, in so far as this is compatible with the attainments and promise of their children and with the claims of other children. The local education authority alone will have all the data on which to reach a decision on these matters and the ultimate responsibility for deciding which type of secondary education an individual pupil should follow must therefore rest with them. It is, however, generally agreed that the governors and the head master or head mistress should play an essential part in the selection of all pupils for their particular school. While it is not possible at present to dogmatise on methods of procedure, in regard to which a variety of views have been expressed, it is possible to indicate two solutions upon one or other of two lines according to the nature of the area concerned.
In the more compact type of area the local education authority might undertake centrally the task of deciding the broad type of education for which individual children are suited. Account would have to be taken of school records, teachers’ reports and the parents’ expressed wishes. When a decision on this question had been reached, parents should be free within reasonable limits to choose the particular school of the appropriate type, which they desire their children to attend and governors should be given an opportunity of expressing any views they might have as to the admission of pupils desiring to enter their school.

Alternatively, in more scattered areas the local education authority might refer pupils on leaving the primary schools to a district board consisting of the heads of primary and secondary schools of the various types, assisted by one or more representatives of the local education authority. This board, on the basis of schools records and other available information (including the parents’ wishes), would advise the authority both on the general type of education most suitable for the child and on the particular school to which, subject to any views expressed by the governors, he or she should be admitted (Board of Education, Principles of Government in Maintained Secondary Schools, May 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196].

In this portfolio there are two memoranda entitled A Proposed New Training College for New Teachers to be run by the Jesuits and The Need For More Catholic Training Colleges For Men Teachers respectively. In the latter, on page 5 the logistical challenges of the new Act are spelt out:

1. The present annual deficiency of about 400 trained Catholic teachers is made up largely by the employment of non-qualified teachers. But it is vitally important to realise that this source of replacement will be impossible under the new Act. Therefore, it must be accepted that at least 1,000 Catholic teachers should be qualified each year to meet even the present need.

2. This figure of 1,000 will need to be considerably increased in order to meet the requirements of the new Act and to supply extra teachers needed for the raising of the school age, the reduction of the size of classes and the provision of adult education.

3. Since it was estimated that these new requirements for all the schools taken together would mean the annual provision of about 16,000 qualified teachers from all the training colleges, the proportionate quota to be provided by Catholic training colleges should be about 1,800 to 2,000 newly qualified teachers each year- i.e. more than three times the output from the existing Colleges (unauthored, The Need for more Catholic Training Colleges for Men Teachers, 1944, [AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44], found in, [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).

This portfolio contains notes of comfort and memoranda of understanding to various Catholic politicians concerning financial aspects of the 1944 Bill and promises of a just settlement re. loans. Interestingly, these are not from the Board of Education but officials from the Ministry of Economic Warfare, Berkley Square House, Berkley Square.
In a letter from Rab Butler to Cardinal Griffin, 25th July 1944, he addresses the issue of funding directly:

Thank you for your letter of 18th July on the question of loans to managers and governors.

I can assure you that the Government are in sympathy with the general sense of the amendment which Lord Rankeillour moved at the Report stage of the Bill; indeed, that is clear from the statements which I myself made on this subject during the Committee stage in the House of Commons.

There is no hidden significance in the use of the phrase “on the same sort of basis as the local authorities”. I would point out that it would have very considerably lessened the usefulness of the facilities offered to managers and governors in the Loans Clause if the Bill had provided that loans were to be made on the same conditions as loans are made to local authorities, for such provision would have implied that the managers and governors would be required to offer security equivalent to that required of local authorities through the rates. The Government realised that it would not normally be possible for managers and governors to comply with such a requirement and that in consequence the extent to which managers and governors would be able to take advantage of the loan facilities would be very much restricted. They accordingly adopted a different arrangement and, by making the loans available under provisions which do not imply this requirement, they have, as you will appreciate, placed managers and governors at an actual advantage in this respect as compared with local authorities in the matter of raising loans.

I will consider whether it would be practicable to make any general statement about the administration of the loan facilities under the Bill. Meantime I can give you an immediate assurance that the inability of managers and governors to offer security equivalent to that which local authorities are required to offer will not stand in the way of their borrowing money at favourable rates of interest: and, further, that in the terms for loans for work of a similar character there will be no differentiation against the managers of a small primary school as compared with the governors of a large secondary school. I cannot attempt to anticipate what will be the actual rates of interest chargeable in the post-war years on these loans any more than I can anticipate what will be the rates of interest on loans to local authorities. I can, however, say quite definitely that it is intended that in cases where a loan is granted to managers or governors the rate of interest will be more favourable than the managers or governors could obtain from banks, insurance companies and other similar sources, and that it will be akin to that applicable to loans to local authorities.

The Loans Clause is an entirely novel provision and we have no experience to guide us as to its administration. You can, however, be sure that, consistently with the Minister’s due responsibility to Parliament in the administration of public money, the Government intend to operate it so that it will be of real practical benefit to those whom it was expressly designed to help, and I feel confident that the sceptical attitude which I am sorry to see from your letter that some of your people are adopting will not be justified by
Griffin’s private secretary sent a letter on 27th July 1944 acknowledging receipt thanking Rab Butler “for the clear and satisfactory explanation which you have given him.” and acknowledging, in a hand written note, receipt for a copy of “the Fleming Committee’s Report.”

**AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40**

This portfolio comprises papers concerning the provision of places on Approved Schools for Catholic boys and girls. The responsibility in HMG lay with the Home Office and a different set of officials led by S.W. Harris and The Rt Hon Sir Thomas Moloney (for the Church).

In a letter from Mr Henderson at the Home Office to Cardinal Hinsley, dated 15th November 1935, a capacity issue in Catholic Approved Schools is raised. What is apparent, in this correspondence and elsewhere, is the expectation from the State that the most appropriate setting for Catholic boys and girls, sentenced by a Juvenile Court to time in an Approved school, is to serve that time in a Catholic school. During this time the average period of detention was two-and-a-half years. Capacity issues were heightened when part of St. Joseph’s School, Manchester, was closed down by the Secretary of State. Although this decision was reviewed, according to Mr. Henderson, it was upheld:

In the first place the lack of adequate space for recreation would be an almost insuperable obstacle to the reception of a larger number of boys. The school is situated in a crowded area, and has no playing fields. The paved yard has to serve this purpose for the 200 boys already in the School, except on one half-day a week they are able to use pitches in a park some distance away. To admit the additional 80 boys who might be placed in the unused block would restrict the opportunities for the existing 200, while the yard space would have to be still further limited by taking up part of it for additional W.C. accommodation, which is already barely sufficient for the present number of boys in the school…Finally, from the point of view of health, the incidence of infectious disease among the boys at St. Joseph’s is already higher than in the great majority of Approved Schools, a state of affairs which it is hoped to improve by a better redistribution of the boys in the dormitories available, including in the disused block (Letter from Mr. Henderson to Cardinal Hinsley, 15th November 1935, [AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], pages 1-2)

In a briefing letter from The Rt Hon Sir Thomas Moloney to Cardinal Hinsley, 19th October 1938, he describes the sitz-im-leben as follows:
It was contemplated by the system now in operation that every Catholic child committed to an approved school should be sent to a school of his own Faith but in recent years the number of places available has not been sufficient to meet the demand with the result that some Catholic children are now in schools not usually catering for Catholics; some are kept in remand homes awaiting vacancies for six months or even longer; and some are discharged by magistrates though obviously in need of institutional treatment because a school could not be found. On the other hand the Home Office is aware of the difficulty of always having vacancies available as juvenile crime, especially in boys, may come in waves difficult to overtake, while in recent years the accommodation available for girls has either exceeded the demand or has been readily procurable when required (Letter from Moloney to Cardinal Hinsley, 19th October 1938, [AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], page 2).

Later in the letter, Hinsley presumably, scores a line with an exclamation mark in the margin of the following paragraph:

The Home Office wish to suggest for the consideration of the Bishops that preparations should be made for the establishment of another Catholic school of 100-125 places that can be put into operation immediately, if and when the need arises (sic) (Letter from Moloney to Cardinal Hinsley, 19th October 1938, [AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], page 5).

Moloney summarises a Home Office Investigation as follows:

I. Boys

(a) Seniors (15-16)
Situation easy at present, but one additional school may well be necessary. Nothing has been done towards providing it.

(b) Intermediate (13-14)
Two schools necessary. The Christian Brothers have undertaken to provide them and if they can do so in reasonable time the Home Office will be satisfied.  

In a Home Office Memorandum enclosed in a letter from S.W. Harris to Sir Thomas Moloney dated 25th July 1938, the following observation on capacity within the Order of the Christian Brothers to respond to this need is made:

The need for speedy action has been pointed out to the Order of the Christian Brothers and it is understood that they are negotiating for other premises to replace St. Joseph's, [Manchester]. (in the previous paragraph serious concerns are recorded over this establishment identifying the unsuitability of the premises among other causes which “led to grave moral troubles, as a result of which the Secretary of State has had to prohibit further admissions” in the previous years it had been admitting above its certified number and “boys were at the last Inspector's visit discovered sleeping in the sick room (page 2).”) This means that they are now trying to find not one but two new Intermediate Schools. Some of their difficulties are financial, but others, and not the least, are those connected with staff. It is the opinion of the Inspectors that the Order is finding the greatest difficulty in producing men competent to handle the boys in approved schools. The provision of the new senior school (St. Benedict's School, near Reading, opened in the Summer of 1937) has drained them of good men and there is a danger that the provision of two more schools will be
(c) Junior (under 13)
The new school (St. Peter’s, Gainford) will, it is expected, meet the case, but another school for 60-100 may prove necessary and, if so, will be wanted urgently. No steps yet taken for this purpose.

II. Girls

They are fully provided for and the schools are not filled to capacity.

The response of Cardinal Hinsley is revealing. He begins by apologising that Sir Thomas’ papers were received too late to be placed on the agenda of the meeting of the Hierarchy on October 25th. However, having consulted with some fellow bishops they agreed that:

the question of approved schools for R.C. boys should be entrusted to a small Committee with yourself as Chairman. This Committee, through you, might approach the Home Office and get some definite assurance as to ways and means of running other such school or schools as may be required; re-armament, social services, reorganisation of elementary schools, refugees from Germany and Austria, Spanish relief – where will the demands on the resources of a small and poor part of the community end? In July 1938 approximately 100 of the 340 underprovided “Approved” places were attributable to the shortage in Roman Catholic Intermediate and Junior Schools (Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Moloney, 5th November 1938, [AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], page 1).

In a paper dated 2nd April 1942 whose authorship is unknown but entitled Approved School Accommodation Needed for Roman Catholic Boys, March 1942, we read in the first paragraph:

1. Although there are in England and Wales eleven Roman Catholic Approved Schools providing accommodation for over 1,300 boys, there are about 270 Roman Catholic boys awaiting admission to Approved Schools and the number admitted to undenominational (sic) schools is over 100. The boys awaiting admission are for the most part detained in Remand Homes, where they cannot receive the same training and attention as in Approved Schools, and the waiting period may be anything up to 6 months or even more. These boys are divided fairly evenly between the three classes – junior, intermediate and senior – and there is urgent need of an additional school in each class ([AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], page 1).

beyond their powers. The employment of lay teachers would alleviate the staffing difficulty to a great extent but not the financial difficulty, and it might be advisable to consider whether there are no other shoulders on which the burden of producing the urgently needed new schools can be laid (Letter from S.W. Harris to Sir Thomas Moloney, 25th July 1938, [AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40], page 2).

Such capacity pressures were evident within the Catholic ‘Approved’ sector and ‘Non-provided and Aided’ sector post-1936. It was one thing to achieve ‘rights’, but quite another to actualise them.
On 2nd April 1942 there is also in this portfolio a letter from S.W. Harris to Sir Thomas Moloney on the issue of Catholic Approved Schools. Although it is likely that the above paper issued from the same source, the paper is on a different size with no clear provenance; so one is only left to surmise:

My dear Sir Thomas

I am sorry to tell you that the position of Approved School accommodation for Roman Catholic boys is still very unsatisfactory. I am told that there are no less than 270 waiting in Remand Homes, some of them for a considerable time. You will know how unsatisfactory this is. To avoid very long periods of waiting in Remand Homes, we have seen no alternative but to send some Roman Catholic boys to non-Catholic schools; this again you will regard as unsatisfactory [AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40].

AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School

In a letter to Cardinal Bourne dated 28th June 1929, Mgr Vance writes “Seeing that I have been inundated with applications from very promising young boys during the last week – some of them are Junior County Scholars who have done more than ordinarily well – I again looked round the building to see if anything could be done to provide one further classroom. I need not worry your Eminence with the details but such a room has been found. In order to use this new classroom another door must be broken though into the adjoining house and standing accommodation by the cloak rooms on the ground floor provided for the boys. This second point can be met by removing the existing cloakrooms on the ground floor which have long been a source of discontent to us. All the cloakroom accommodation for the boys can then be distributed on different floors throughout the building and this will be a distinct advantage both for the dispatch of business and discipline (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne, 28th June 1929, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School]), page 1).” Permission was granted “provided that the Governors are not expected to find any money (Reply from Cardinal Bourne, 30th June 1929, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1).”

In response to a decision from Dr. Malone Barrett, a concerned parent, who had decided to remove Shelley, his son, from The Vaughan School before he entered sixth form due to the lack of facilities for physical exercise. Mgr Vance writes to Cardinal Bourne on 3rd April 1930 “This absence of suitable ground and open air for the boys is for me literally a grave anxiety, in fact at the moment my only anxiety concerning the school, and when I think that there is a large house at the corner opposite us with well over an acre of ground which we could buy for a 21 years lease for about £7,000 I really sometimes wonder if nothing could
be done (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne, 3rd April 1930, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1)." The following note in the file is frustrating since although dated it is not signed “My dear Headmaster, I have no doubt that the house in question could be purchased if the L.C.C. would regard the mortgage charge and the sinking fund for £7,000 as a legitimate liability of the school and provide for them in their maintenance grant; or if you can suggest some other means of raising the annual sum required. I have done so much for the school personally that I can do no more, and the Governors certainly could not find the money (Following Note Dated 5th April 1930, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School])."

Progress on the access to Catholic education, and formalising thereof, in the early years of the twentieth century was often through informal contact. Mgr Vance made efforts in the late 1920s and early 1930s "to get the London authorities to accept the School Religious Certificate Syllabus, recently set up by the Catholic Headmasters, as a subject for the London Matriculation (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne, 20th May 1932, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1)." In a letter dated 20th May 1932 Mgr Vance writes to Cardinal Bourne: “…in a letter marked “Strictly Personal and Confidential” from the Dean of Kings College, the Dean indicates that the matter has come before the University Board of studies in theology. He writes “No objection was raised by the Board of Studies on the grounds of principle, either to the inclusion of the subject itself, or to the appointment of an ad hoc examiner, and I do not think it likely that any such objection will be raised at a latter stage, though this is possible (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne, 20th May 1932, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], pages 1-2).” He adds “I ought to make it clear that a somewhat prolonged process has yet to be gone through before the whole matter is definitely and officially settled, but there is no doubt that one of the most critical stages was passed yesterday with the greatest facility (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne, 20th May 1932, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 2)."

In a letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne submitting the accounts April 1930 to March 1931 for the Cardinal’s signature Mgr Vance writes on the second page “The schools premises in Holland Park Avenue which Your Eminence and I visited last autumn are still for sale, and there is nothing in the whole building that I covet so much as the Hall which could easily be made into a beautiful chapel for the boys; and to think that the whole is going for the value of the land on which it is built alone, makes of it to us nothing short of a Naboth’s vineyard (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne, 5th June 1931, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 2)."
On 26th to 29th November 1934 inclusive Mr Leonard Brooks led a team of ten inspectors, including himself, in a general inspection of the Vaughan School. The team began by acknowledging the contribution made to the school by the recently deceased Cardinal Bourne acknowledging his great interest in the affairs of the school and the way he followed “its progress with keenness and appreciation (London County Council: Inspection Report of The Vaughan School, Kensington: 26th-29th November 1934, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1).” The team found the standard of education always satisfactory and often very good given the constraints of the plant. Due to the latter boys followed a restricted, predominantly classical liberal education in which prominence was given to Classics and History. The inspectorate noted the school’s commitment to teaching these subjects as well as possible. While successful in this endeavour, a consequence of such an emphasis is that the school did not provide an adequate curriculum “to meet the needs of boys to whom the classical bias of the school presents difficulties (London County Council: Inspection Report of The Vaughan School, Kensington: 26th-29th November 1934, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1).” Under the subtitle ‘Premises’ the County inspectorate make the following comment “It is probable that the other much needed improvement (gymnasium, handicraft room, library, art room etc) are impossible of attainment on the present very restricted site, and, if this should prove to be the case, it is hoped that the governors will be able to make the necessary additions by the acquirement of house property in the immediate neighbourhood of the school. There can be no doubt that increased accommodation is the chief need of the school (London County Council: Inspection Report of The Vaughan School, Kensington: 26th-29th November 1934, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1).”

In the first meeting of the Governing Body in 1935 agenda item 2 is “The Chairmen to ask the Headmaster for a brief report concerning the Playing Fields i.e. explaining the financial decisions.” This is the first meeting with Archbishop Hinsley as Chairman – there is no supporting documentation in the Archives apart from attached ‘Balance Sheet dated 31st March 1935, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School]. Returning to the inspection report the following judgement was made concerning games:

The organisation of the games is good and reflects great credit to th[o]se concerned. The school is divided into two sections, one of which visits the playing fields on Wednesday afternoons and the other on Saturday afternoons. Every boy plays games unless excused by the doctor.
The field is one of some six acres and great difficulty is experienced in catering for the number of boys who play. As an illustration, there is only room for two cricket practice pitches after providing for the games and these naturally become very worn. The provision of concrete pitches covered with matting would do much to remedy this defect, as such pitches would permit unlimited play.

Whilst school matches are played, and played with success, the major effort is primarily directed towards ensuring that all the boys play, irrespective of their skill. A school athletic sports meeting is held each year. Fencing has also been introduced.

The headmaster is to be warmly congratulated on the determined effort he has made to ensure that his boys are physically educated, and in his effort he has had loyal backing from members of the staff concerned. Much has been accomplished, and it is confidently expected that in the future still further development will take place (London County Council: Inspection Report of The Vaughan School, Kensington: 26\textsuperscript{th}-29\textsuperscript{th} November 1934, [Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 10).

There is no reference in the report as to who owns the field apart from the rather euphemistic acknowledgement of the “determined effort” made by Mgr Vance “to ensure that his boys are physically educated.” Conspiracy theorists may link this phrase to agenda item 2 and wonder.

Correspondence within this portfolio records the nature of the relationship between Church and State and how the Local Authority, in this case the L.C.C., sought to ensure Catholic schools were more publicly accountable in matters of governance and management. Mgr Vance, in his role as Chairman of the Governing Body at Sacred Heart Hammersmith, wrote to Cardinal Hinsley on 23\textsuperscript{rd} June 1936 to report on a meeting between Mrs Lowe, Chairman of the Education Committee of the London County and “the Chairmen of all the Governing Bodies of Grant Aided Secondary Schools” in which she suggested that “a condition of grant in future [might be] that no Headmaster or Headmistress in such schools should be appointed by the Governors until the approval of the London County had been sought (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Hinsley, 23\textsuperscript{rd} June 1936, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 1).” Mrs Lowe went on according to Mgr Vance to assure those present that the Authority only “wished to deal with [the] purely educational side” of appointments and that that the Authority was mindful that it needed “to respect all Trust Deeds and Contracts (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Hinsley, 23\textsuperscript{rd} June 1936, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], pages 1-2).” Mgr Vance was not convinced commenting while he was assured of the good intentions of Mrs Lowe and her confreres he also noted that the proposal emerged “when the Socialists have a majority, and when quite a number of the said Socialists have strong feelings about the Headships
of schools being in the hands of Nuns (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Hinsley dated 23\textsuperscript{rd} June 1936, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School], page 2). Mgr Vance is clearly wary of an unintentional precedence being set under the guise of competence.

During the war the buildings of the Vaughan remained undamaged and operated as a First Aid Post for the Royal Borough of Kensington (The Vaughan Magazine, Easter 1949, Retrospect – first publication of magazine after the war - AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School). During the war there was dispute between the Vaughan School and their Jesuit landlords at Beaumont that caused Cardinal Hinsley to intervene and Fr. Mangan, SJ, the Jesuit Provincial, to write a rather exacerbated aside in his letter dated 17th December 1940 “Speaking to your own private ear, I cannot help feeling that had he [Fr. [Joseph] Welsby who oversaw transfer of VEC to Heythrop during the war years] been in charge of the troublesome B.C.-V.S. business we should have had peace and good will long ago (Letter from The Jesuit Provincial to Archbishop Hinsley, 17\textsuperscript{th} December 1940, [AAW Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School]).
Cardinal Griffin 1943-56

In this portfolio there is the first suggestion of the establishment of schools with an ecumenical character (Catholic and of C. of E.) An untitled and undated paper on this topic is written by John Todhunter of 89, Elizabeth Street, London SW1; he is attentive to the difficulties facing the Catholic community post-1944: “as seniors and juniors must have separate schools it is going to be very difficult to find numbers to begin new [Catholic] schools in the smaller places.” This problem is exacerbated in the author’s mind by the need to provide differentiated technical, grammar and secondary modern schools. He

39 Articles in Sunday Times & Sunday Express referenced but not indexed.
rehearses the necessity of transport, the extending of maintained ‘Catholic’ boarding, and
the possibility of a supplementary solution to fill the gap:

By a happy chance the New Act has made an alteration in the law of Charities
as affecting schools which points to [this] supplementary solution. Curiously
enough it has always been a possibility in the case of new (sic) schools
founded with new money (sic), but it was a possibility that was not likely to be
noticed except by a person who had day to day familiarity with these matters.
What I have in mind is an aided school provided jointly by the Catholics and
some other religious body i.e., in practice, the Church of England. It would
always have been legal to do this, but only since the E. A. 1944 can it be
done in a case where there is an existing modern trust for Catholic or Church
of England educational purposes: as that is the position in nearly every case
where the question could arise, it is only to-day that the question can take
practical form. This result is achieved (unexpectedly) by Section 86 (i) of the
E. A. 1944 which provides that the Endowed Schools Act may be applied to
any endowment whose objects include the giving of religious instruction at a
voluntary school so as to make the endowment available for the religious
body concerned to take part more effectively in the statutory system of
education. The Endowed Schools Act gives the Minister extremely wide
powers of making schemes to regulate charities comprising schools, and as
one mode of enabling a religious body to participate more effectively in the
statutory system is that it should co-operate with another body, it is obviously
within the scope of the section to make a Scheme on the lines which I set out
below. One point must be borne in mind: it would be illegal to make such a
Scheme (where it is necessary to have recourse to para 86) in such a form as
to abolish, water down or amalgamate any system of religious doctrine
which the existing trust requires to be taught. This has been decided already
in a case in which it was ruled that there would be no power to reduce Church
of England Religious Instruction to agreed syllabus religious instruction for the
purpose of enabling a Church of England endowment to be used in co-
operation with the Nonconformists. It cannot be a means of enabling the
Church of England to participate in the statutory system, to abolish a Church
of England interest (untitled and undated paper by John Todhunter, [AAW Gr
1/21c Education (Miscellaneous) 1944-47], pages 3-5).

Todhunter then examines discrete learning environments (i.e. separate blocks) proportion
of ‘Catholic’ staff, trusts, instruments and articles of governance and the objections of such
a supplementary solution:

(1) It might give rise to implications – which though unjustified would be
undesirable – in the case of certain extreme Anglo-Catholic parishes.
These are very few; for an Anglo-Catholic person in an ordinary parish
hardly makes a thorough going Anglo-Catholic Parish.

(2) It might be thought that such a school would tend to promote mixed
marriages. The answer to that seems to be in considering what this plan
is an alternative to: it is the alternative to small groups of Catholics
spread among non Catholic schools as individuals, a position which is
more likely to promote mixed marriages than this plan where there will
be a cohesive Catholic unit in the school.

(3) It might be said that the small Catholic Unit will be swamped by the
larger non-Catholic unit. It seems to me the answer is again the same –
the alternative is a few individual Catholics at large in a secular school. My personal belief is the contrary: it is that if the Catholics – Governors, teachers and children – behave themselves as truly good Catholics, so far as being swamped they will influence the others greatly for the good, and I believe that numerous conversions may ensue (untitled and undated paper by John Todhunter, [AAW Gr 1/21c Education (Miscellaneous) 1944-47], pages 3-5).

It is not surprising that Cardinal Griffin gently places this proposal into the long grass. The Church was not ready ecclesiologically or educationally to engage in such ecumenical endeavours. He was leading a community that was beginning to restore its estate of bombed churches, expand its stock of schools and contend with significant population movements. No wonder in a letter to Mr. Todhunter, dated 5th February 1946, he wrote: “I am sure you understand that I cannot commit myself but I think it would be very useful if you sent a copy to the Bishop of Clifton and then I could talk the matter over with the bishops about the suitability of our bringing it up for discussion (Letter from Cardinal Griffin to John Todhunter, 5th February 1946, [AAW Gr 1/21c Education (Miscellaneous) 1944-47]).”

In this portfolio, there is an undated two-page paper entitled: “Executive Committee of Association of Education Committees”. It is hard to ascertain whether this paper is a copy of the minutes, or the notes of an unnamed attendee, however, what is apparent from this paper is that LEA’s were attempting understand the rights contained in the Education Act, 1944:

V. Rights of parents. Section 76

Discussions going on still on the “draft” circular sent by the Ministry of Education for consideration of the Advisory Council of Education.

The main points agreed on in formal conferences so far:-

a) Local Education Authorities may define catchment areas of schools.

b) Choice of school at 11 plus is the ultimate right of the Local Education Authorities. Parents’ views may be considered but they may not prevail against the views of the L.E.A.

c) There will be little fight on religious grounds.

d) Boarding: Parents may express a wish but it may not prevail unless the Local Education Authority concurs.

The main points still under discussion:-

e) Transport: Ministry favour a definition that Local Education Authorities should pay the distance 1 hour (sic) from home to school where parents choose the school. This is being fought in favour of a distance equal to the normal catchment area of
The final sheet of interest in this portfolio is a carbon copy entitled *L.C.C. Articles of Government for Secondary Schools: Government of Secondary Schools*. Once more this is undated, provenance unknown and no author is attributed. What is of interest if the fountain pen cross in blue ink again points (3) and (5):

(3) that the articles of government should provide for the Council’s education officer (or his representative) to be present at meetings of the governors at which heads of schools are selected and that the Council should have a right to veto an appointment;

(5) that the articles of government should ensure that the Council is in a position to secure interchangeability of assistant teaching staff and their appointment from a pool ([AAW Gr 1/21c Education (Miscellaneous) 1944-47]).

**AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48**

In the papers found in this portfolio, we see the journey in Griffin’s life from bishop with oversight of the well being of Catholic young people in the Archdiocese of Birmingham to Archbishop of Westminster.

The first paper is a confidential copy of a “Report of Conference, from my shorthand notes”, undated. However letters around this paper would suggest that the Conference took place on 7th January 1944 in a Committee Room at the Education Department. The author notes:

The Conference was opened by the Chairman of the Public Health Committee. Councillor Grosvenor explained that he hoped the Education Committee and the Public Health Committee might in the future work together on the subject of Health Education so as to maintain continuity of purpose, and so as to combine teachers wherever it seemed desirable (Report of Conference, from my shorthand notes, [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48], page 1).

As elsewhere in this Archive, adults were clearly concerned about the moral and physical wellbeing of young people who had experienced the war from their classrooms and the disruption to their education.

Dr. Mackintosh (Public Health side) stressed the need to arrive at proper sex instruction through biology and physiology, each at the right stage of the education. Proper sex instruction she thought would do much to decrease delinquency and Venereal disease, and of course unhappiness, but she did not agree that the adolescent should be taught sex education "neat" (Report
Mrs Murtagh opined

...If the two Committees were to work together then the Education Committee would be obliged to accept when outlining their curriculum such subjects as nutrition, parentcraft, good housewifery, elementary economics for boys, and even citizenship (Report of Conference, from my shorthand notes, [AAW 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48], page 1).

Attached to this report is an additional paper entitled 'Memorandum on Health Education' by Helen Murtagh, again undated. Parts of paragraphs 6, 7, 9 and 23 are of particular relevance. It gives, especially in the last paragraph cited, an insight into how civic society expected the Church to be involved in the development of public policy. Why does this invitation now seem atypical? What has happened to the public space?

6. ...This [education] must be extended in the adolescent so that at physical maturity there is a precise recognition of the creative process which involved the founding of a family.

7. In relation to the adolescent it is unsound to regard health education as being merely a matter of science or of biology – it is unsound to regard such education as merely medical. There are also moral issues in relation to self-control, considerate and right behaviour.

9. It is clear therefore that Health Education falls into two categories:-
   a. Health Education for the child, which is the province of the Education Authorities.
   b. Health Education for the young adult, which is the province of the Public Health Authority.

In the paper the author goes on to look at provision under these two categories. In Part B the author recognises that “it will be some time before the present young boy and girl receive an adequate health education but it need not stop when they leave school.” The author recognises that the adolescent or young adult of today “have received little or no guidance in health matters. It is proposed lectures are given to this group in “Large stores, Factories, Clubs and Youth Organisations” across the following topics:

   Nutrition;
   Physical Development; e.g. the value of fresh air, sleep, proper clothing and hygiene;
   Mental Development;
   War against Disease;
   Advanced Parentcraft; e.g. the care of the sick child;
   House Management;
   Local Government in relation to health;
Learning to live in a Community.

It is here that the place of the Church is recognised:

23. Beyond seeing that its Teachers are individuals of integrity and Christian background the responsibility of the Public Health Authority is limited. It is therefore of primary importance that the Churches should be aware of a scheme of this kind which may need the co-operation of the Theologian, for matters concerning moral issues are quite outside the province of the teachers. It therefore seems essential that Theologians should be prepared to examine the lectures and be satisfied that they conform to high standards (‘Memorandum on Health Education’ by Helen Murtagh Report of Conference, from my shorthand notes, [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48], pages 2, 5 and 6).

The letters of Helen Murtagh to Cardinal Griffin give a fascinating social commentary on Britain in the mid-1940s. In a letter dated 19th June 1944 she writes: “His Grace here [Birmingham] is being very kind to me and most helpful. I have told him of the statistics which I managed to see by getting in the back door of [the University of Birmingham Statistical] Department. Our illegitimacy figures in Birmingham show that one quarter of the births are from married women. Imagine as high as one quarter ( [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48], page 3).” While it is difficult to substantiate this statistic; what is of interest is the perception held by Mrs Murtagh. In a letter dated 5th October 1944 Murtagh writes “Dr L. G. Housden, the man who wrote The Responsibility of Parents came as my guest here last week. He is on a Committee called by Mr. Butler and Mr Willink, which is sub-rosa. This Committee is trying to bring the home together and...wom[e]n back into the home.” There is an intimate relationship developing between home, health and education within public policy. Murtagh continues “I took Dr Housden to Fr. Hudson’s Homes, where we had a magnificent show from Fr Flint and Mother Anastasia. The doctor was now gone to stay with Fr Whittaker[,] or is it Whitfield, a Jesuit in Liverpool with a M. D. degree. Dr Housden is a Children’s Specialist and the observation visits included all the City could show him, the Children’s Hospital with Professor Parsons, and Bentley Heath. Mother Elizabeth was grand, I could not get the doctor away. He said he simply could not get over the fact that a Nun was so good at her job and he was going to tell Mr Willink about it ( [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48], page 5).”

In a letter to Archbishop Griffin from Mrs Helen Murtagh dated 11th February 1945 she writes:
Now one more piece of information. Will you be looking out for the advertisement of a scheme which mad hats are proposing – National Marriage Guidance Clinics? Now this is being taken up here by the Citizens Society, and I think the British Legion is in it as well. The men coming back are to be told how to forgive unfaithful wives, how to approach their women and how to be married again.” All the above seems to suggest that the men have been chaste paragons of virtue during the war years. “I hear that 500 cases have to be dealt with by the Citizens Society, and I hear that a member said ‘if only the religious bodies will keep out of it and let us help the men by explaining they need not sink themselves, and they can space their family.’ I don’t believe in marriage guidance clinics, people will ask their trusted family doctor, their priest, clergymen or best friend, why go to a clinic[?] I know that we are having the second round of married women in the P.H.D. [Public Health Department] disgusting as it is, but I hold the view that men must not be hoodwinked and thrust back into marriage unless there is a spiritual adjustment, telling them that contraceptives are the best until they are sure their women are clean is to me filthy. Now if these Clinics are set up by Voluntary Organisations they will die, but if set up in P.H. Departments they will go on. Some P.H. Departments think it ought to come their way…

I am in touch with His Lordship Bishop Bright, who is as quick as anyone can be regarding implications when it comes to Local Government. He writes to tell me that the choice of Teachers in the schools after the war will be awful, and that C.3. men British and vaccinated, are all the qualifications needed. Thank goodness we have the right to choose our own Teachers even if it is at such a high price (Letter from Mrs Helen Murtagh to Archbishop Griffin, 11th February 1945, [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48], pages 3-4).

On 19th May 1945, the same correspondent writes to Archbishop Griffin apologising for not responding to his letter and paper to her more swiftly. The paper is entitled The State of the Parent In Relation To The Child. Mrs Murtagh describes the points made by Archbishop Griffin as being “comprehensive and good” and goes on in her second paragraph to comment:

I am glad that you are putting emphasis on the ‘Father’, it is about time someone brought him into the picture. Last year when I spoke at this conference (when the day nursery programme was being discussed) I said that I thought the Fathers of the children in the Day Nurseries might have views as to the upbringing of their children, to say nothing about the views they may hold about their wives working outside the home. I said they often took great pleasure in the practical upbringing of their children that I knew many fathers who did. I received many letters when I got back saying how pleased people were that the ‘Father’ had been mentioned ([AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48]).

Between 1945 and 1947 Mrs Helen Murtagh had lost her seat on the Council and been re-elected after the death of a councillor. On 23rd May 1947, Cardinal Griffin wrote to Mrs Murtagh, “I think that your experience must be very similar to mine. I always find that I get
mighty set-backs before light begins to shine on the horizon. But I try never to get depressed and I hope you will do likewise [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48]."

Finally, in this fascinating montage of social and political correspondence between Mrs Helen Murtagh and Cardinal Griffin which covers the above extracts and the Home Office funding of courses to train ‘Catholic’ House Mothers for Homes; Mrs Murtagh, in a letter to Cardinal Griffin, dated 9th October 1947, raises the following point:

At a meeting of the Union of C. Mothers His Grace said there ought to be many more women in political circles. I think the ‘stop’ is mostly lack of finance. It costs a terrible lot to stand an election. It was easy for me because Bernard considers paying for my election part of his contribution to a Catholic cause. But many women have not private means. The men also say they cannot spend money on election campaigning when wives and children have to be considered first. Labour people have no trouble[;] they are supported by the T.U.C. as you know. Some day it might be a good thing to have a Catholic fund to help suitable and able Catholics to fight elections. My Edgbaston seat cost us £127. It all depends on the numbers in the Electorate, cost of postages and election addresses. I think we shall have to copy Lord Woolton and get ‘a Catholic fighting fund’ started [AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48].

AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944
This portfolio begins with a letter from Pope Pius XII, on the Feast of the Assumption, 1944, to Archbishop Griffin. Three paragraphs are of interest. Paragraphs 2 and 7 are supportive of the new Archbishop and the principles that should guide re-building and re-organisation after the war. The fifth paragraph asks for a spirit of forgiveness; this sentiment was misreported by the Sunday Express and resulted in a tranche of hostile correspondence directed to Archbishop Griffin:

It has been a great joy for Us to receive for the first time since his appointment to the See of Westminster, and Our welcome to him will be more proof to you of the confidence and affection We feel for him, and the assurance We have that he will continue the noble traditions of the now lengthening line of the Archbishops of Westminster (§ 2).

…We exhort you to bear your trials with Christian resignation and fortitude, and also with Christian sentiments of forgiveness, charity and mercy, so that God may reward in you what the world will admire in you – an example of magnanimity inspired by the spirit of Christ’s Gospel, and thus the present severe trials will bring forth for you and your fellow-sufferers fruits of expiation and amendment, of spiritual elevation and of eternal life (§ 5).

…We exhort you to seek in humble prayer guidance from Christ for your rulers and for yourselves, so that the re-organ[i]sation, the re-building of the
entire public and social fabric after the war may be animated by the principles of the Gospel; and that the Holy Spirit may descend on this tortured world, bringing back once more brotherly love. For, as we are borne on the dread waters of the devastating flood of war, only with the return of love between men shall we deserve to see the Dove come back to us with outstretched wings, carrying a sign that the waters of death have receded and the haven of Peace is in sight (§ 7) (Letter from Pius XII to Archbishop Griffin, 15th August 1944, [AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII's message to 1944]).

In a letter of 31st August 1944 Archbishop Griffin, through his Private Secretary, asked whether the Press Association would forward to him a copy of its notes from the interview he had given to the Press the previous Saturday (notes dated 26th August 1944) on his return from Rome. These notes were furnished by the Press Association with a covering letter from H. Carr (Deputy Editor-in-Chief) dated 1st September 1944 in which he apologises “for sending copy from our machine, but these days we do not type our service.” What is of interest are the two references to the Education Bill made therein.

In PAC (sic)

3. Pope we find:

HE HAD TWO AUDIENCES WI T POPE. T FIRST WAS A FEW DAYS AFTER HIS ARRIVAL WHEN AT T POPE’S REQUEST HE OUTLINED T EDUCATION BILL TO HIM. HIS SECOND AUDIENCE WAS ON AUG 17 WHEN HE LEFT FOR MALTA.

WHILE IN ROME HE PREACHED AT ST PETER’S TO 2,000 ALLIED SOLDIERS AND AFTERWARDS SPOKE AND SHOOK HANDS WI EACH ONE OF THEM “IT TOOK ME SOME TIME” HE SD WI A LAUGH.

PA.

4. Pope

THE MEN’S GREATEST CONCERN, HE SAID, WAS TO RECEIVE MORE LETTERS FROM HOME. THE SECOND INTEREST WAS IN THE FLYING BOMBS, AND THIRDLY THEY WERE VERY KEEN TO KNOW ABOUT THE EDUCATION QUESTION.


“AS TO THE EDUCATION BILL I TOLD THEM THAT THE CATHOLICS HAD NOT HAD FULL JUSTICE BUT HAD NOT LOST THE BATTLE AND WERE GOING TO FIGHT AGAIN.”

PAC.

5. Pope

T POPE WAS MOST KIND AND HOPED TT T HAPPY RELATIONS BETWN T VATICAN AND GT BRITAIN WLD ALSO CONTINUE [AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944].

On 30th August 1944 Archbishop Griffin wrote to the editor of the Sunday Express:
Sir,

I was astonished to read what you printed in your last issue in reference to the letter from the Pope which I brought with me on my return from Rome. Your paragraph was a complete distortion of the contents of that letter and has misled your readers up and down the country.

I could not hope that you would print it “in extenso”, but the least I expect is that you would convey its sentiments accurately in the extracts you give.

As it was, you began with a misquotation and conveyed to your readers that, after I had given an account to the Pope of the suffering inflicted by the latest Nazi weapon, all His Holiness said was, “London should forgive.”

You said nothing of the anxiety on our behalf which the Pope expressed, or his prayers and sympathy, or of his words of encouragement, or of his exhortation to us to persevere in prayers for divine protection for this country and our Empire (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to the editor of the Sunday Express, 30th August 1944, [AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944]).

On 9th September 1944, Archbishop Griffin wrote to Lord Beaverbrook, proprietor of the Sunday Express:

I should welcome the opportunity of discussing one or two matters with you.

I shall be quite prepared to call on you or perhaps you may prefer to come here to Archbishop’s House to see me. Will you kindly ask your secretary to get in touch with mine (Victoria 4717) to arrange a time convenient to both of us? (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Lord Beaverbrook, 9th September 1944, [AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944]).

This meeting took place on 20th September 1944 at 4.30 pm at Gwyder House; there is no record in this portfolio of the outcome thereof. The invective, surrounding the correspondence within this portfolio and across the Sunday Express is evidence that hostility towards the Catholic Church was still operative within British society. Yet members of the Catholic community had fought with valour in the War, and the rights to a Catholic education could not easily be ignored, if community cohesion was to be restored in post-war Britain there would need to be compromise. One letter from a correspondent published in the Sunday Express on 10th September 1944, which was neither pro-Pope nor anti-Pope, recognises how destructive the sentiments expressed may be. A Ewart G. Ford of Hamilton House, Hamilton Avenue, Ilford Essex writes:
Better that you discontinue readers’ letters since you obviously have no idea of conducting such a feature ([AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944]).

AAW Gr 1/27c Twelve Catholics who won the Victoria Cross 1944

In a letter to Fr. Collingwood c/o Archbishop’s House dated 14th September 1944, the number of Catholic soldiers to be awarded the Victoria Cross is numbered at twelve. Maurice Quinlan, of The Universe, makes the following introductory qualifier:

Twelve Catholics have won the Victoria Cross in this war (so far as we have been able to find out; there may be other Catholics among the Dominion officers and men who have received it ([AAW Gr 1/27c Twelve Catholics who won the Victoria Cross 1944]).

There follows in this rather short portfolio a paper identifying the names of the twelve Catholic men who were awarded the Victoria and the reason for its award:

Lt. Colonel Ervine-Andrews: First Army officer to win it in this war. He was at Dunkirk.

Flying Officer Donald Garland: First R.A.F. officer to win it. Led air attack on vital bridge over Albert Canal when Germans invaded Belgium and France.

Flight Sergeant Arthur Aaron: Mortally wounded, he flew his bomber for many hours from Italy to North Africa; landed it safely and died an hour later.

Lieutenant Commander Esmonde: Led Swordfish air attack on German warships in the English Channel.

Capt. Fogarty Fegen: “Never was the Victoria Cross more deservedly bestowed than upon Capt. Fogarty Fegen”, said the Daily Telegraph in a leading article. He was in command of a converted liner protecting a convoy of 38 ships in the Atlantic. Outranged, crippled and in flames, his ship, the Jervis Bay, rounded on a powerful German warship, drew all its fire and saved 33 of the convoy.

Leading Seaman Jack Mantle: Won V.C. in middle of 1940. When his ship was attacked by German aircraft he was repeatedly wounded but went on firing his gun. The official citation said: “Between his bursts of fire he had time to reflect on the grievous injuries of which he was soon to die; but his great courage bore him up till the end of the fight, when he fell by the gun he had so valiantly served.”

Capt. James Joseph Jackman: Won V.C. near Tobruk. The official citation said that “he showed outstanding gallantry and a devotion to duty beyond all praise.”

Commander Anthony Miers: Awarded V.C. for submarine work only a week after receiving D.S.O. and bar from the King at Buckingham Palace.
Private Adam Wakenshaw: He was [a] Newcastle man who in the Desert fighting went on firing his gun though his left arm had been blown off. Wounded again, he crawled back to the gun, loaded it, was about to fire when a shell hit his ammunition and killed him.

Sergeant John Patrick Kenneally, Irish Guards: Was the Guardsman who scattered a large enemy concentration on his own and did it not only once but twice, on separate days. The official citation said this was an achievement that has seldom been equalled and never surpassed.

Private Richard Kelleher: Won the V.C. in the South East Asia fighting.

Major Paul Triquet: Canadian officer; won V.C. in Italy.

This entry goes on to record that “Catholics have won every possible decoration and award from the V.C. down to “mentions” and citations in Army Orders at home. More than one Catholic has won the George Cross, many the George Medal, both men and women.

The first war knighthood went to a Catholic, Sir Henry Harwood, who beat the Graf Spee in South American waters (AAW Gr 1/27c Twelve Catholics who won the Victoria Cross 1944).

AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)’

Within this portfolio, there is a fascinating insight into end-of-war and post-war ecclesial discernment on the ‘Freedom of Conscience’ and ‘Freedom to Worship’. These papers chart the Catholic response to how the Church could usefully enter into ecumenical dialogue with other denominations and then the State theologically as well as politically.

Drafting general principles of agreement concerning for ‘Freedom of Conscience’ and ‘Freedom to Worship’ for the Joint Standing Committee of Religion and Life and the Sword and the Spirit occupied Cardinal Griffin for the first eighteen months of his time at Westminster and must have informed negotiations with the Board of Education. At the end of paragraph 2 of the original notanda/statement we find: “Accordingly there is a natural and civic right of every citizen to act in accordance with his conscience (sic); and it is the duty of the State to safeguard this freedom for all its members [AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)].” The nature and scope of such rights and duties exercised Catholic theologians consulted by Cardinal Griffin. At Griffin’s behest each of the seminaries suggested amendments. The difficulty is best summarised by Cardinal Griffin in his letter to Mgr. Charles Corbishley, Saint Cuthbert’s College, Ushaw, Durham, dated 18th September 1944: “Some of the theologians I have consulted insist that whilst man has a duty (sic) to follow his conscience, he cannot claim that he has a right (sic) to do so if the conscience happens to be erroneous. But what we really want to stress is the doctrine of civil tolerance. If you, and those who examine it, could make verbal
alterations which could make the statement in accordance with Catholic doctrine, and would not upset the general format of the statement, I should be very grateful. You might also like to say whether you think it opportune or not for such a statement to be issued (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Mgr. Charles Corbishley dated 18th September 1944, [AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)]).

The sensitivity of this consultation is apparent in Corbishley’s handwritten reply dated 23rd September 1944. Having asked two of the professors to make detailed comment in his covering letter he opines “I am myself no expert in these matters, but after reading through the statement I feel that it needs a good deal of amputation and clarification. For instance it doesn’t seem to make quite clear that though the individual must follow his own conscience, that duty of his does not necessarily make a corresponding duty of the State to let him do so. The State also has a conscience which it must follow – as e.g. in its dealing with a dangerous maniac; especially if it's a Christian, still more a Catholic State (Letter from Mgr. Charles Corbishley to Archbishop Griffin 23rd September 1944, [AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)’]).” The responses from Wonersh and Upholland Colleges identify reservations over the second paragraph of the statement in former and flaws throughout the statement for latter:

**Wonersh**

I have pleasure in sending, besides my own, a report from Mgr. Hallett. Other persons have also been consulted before writing what follows.

It is a fundamental principle that “Error has no rights”. This would rule out the last sentence of paragraph 2. There seems no doubt that, although a man has a duty to follow his conscience, he has not the right to do so if it is erroneous. Thus the State is justified in prohibiting e.g., the practice of “Suttee” in India.

…The sentence might be amended and retained as follows: - “Accordingly there is a natural and a civic duty of every citizen to act in accordance with his conscience; and it is the function of the State to safeguard this freedom for all its members (Letter from Dr. Curtin to Archbishop Griffin, 27th September 1944, [AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)’]).

**Upholland**

I hope you will excuse my delay in replying to your letter of September 18th.

First, let me say, that I know unofficially that the Archbishop of Liverpool asked certain professors of Upholland to advise on the publication of a former document of the Sword of the Spirit, namely, “The statement adopted by Joint Meeting of Representatives on January 24th 1942.” The three professors advised against its publication. Therefore I would regard it as a favour, if Your
Grace would consider the following statement made on this new document ("Religion & Life") as private and unofficial.

The document was read by three additional professors Dr. Lennon (Moral Professor), Fr. Cummins (Ethics), Fr. Jones (Scripture) and the author [Rev. Dr. J. Campbell] (Philosophy). The above agreed on the following statement:

From one or two readings of the document in question (Religion & Life), it seemed impossible for us to make verbal alterations and so bring it in line with Catholic doctrine; for we read it in light of those principles that govern all the relations between the one, true Church and the Ideal (sic) State. But after consideration and discussion, and bearing in mind the existing (sic) relations between the Church and the Modern (sic) State, we decided that the document was capable of correction. Indeed, when we reflected on the increasing menace of state control over the life of the individual, we agreed that the document would, after certain modifications, be not only suitable for publication without detriment to the Catholic position, but would, if published, be even more opportune.

There follows two pages of proposed editorial amendments (Letter from Dr. J. Campbell to Archbishop Griffin dated 8th October 1944, [AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)].

A note to Cardinal Griffin, from Douglas Woodruff, Director of ‘The Tablet’ and member of the Joint Committee, dated 20th September 1944 records the work of the Committee thus:

The Committee decided to work with the brief original statement that was agreed to and issued about the rights “organised Christianity” must enjoy. I think we can leave that statement in circulation because the Cardinal had authorised it, although the phrase “organised Christianity” subsumes under one head the Church and various groups of heretics. The protagonists of natural right wanted to extend the claim to full freedom to all religions, but here we were helped by the Baptist, Dr. Dunning. He pointed out that there is a kind of Germanic blood and race Christianity which could be a cover for the Nazis, and might prove a great embarrassment if it claimed “freedom of worship of blood and soil.” That made them see almost anything may be called modern Christianity, but they did not draw the deduction that something is true and that what is not true cannot be put on an equal footing with what is. I think we are very much helped by its being obvious that very general statements if they are not so vague that everyone endorses them, would in fact get in the way of Allied Policy in Germany. We can make claims for organised Christianity and extend them to the Jews, but “the natural right to worship, educate and persuade” has to be denied to the Nazis, and therefore cannot be stated as a universal right.

The Joint Committee does not meet again for a month (Letter from Douglas Woodruff, Director of ‘The Tablet’, to Archbishop Griffin, 20th September 1944, [AAW Gr 1/29a Joint Statement ‘Sword of the Spirit (1943-47)]).

Archbishop Griffin charged Canon Smith with the task of drafting a Statement on Freedom of Conscience which could, in time, be shared with the Joint Committee. The statement
was dated 5th February 1945 and the ‘Compiler’s Foreword’ is most revealing. It identifies well the challenge entailed in completing such a commission for such a mixed audience. Below is a verbatim copy of both the ‘Compiler’s Foreword’ and text:

Compiler’s Foreword (sic)

The notes provided on the pages facing have been thought necessary in order to explain why, for Catholics, the advocacy of freedom of conscience – particularly so far as it relates to religion – must be hedged round with provisos (sic) and qualifications40. Leo XIII’s postulate is that the Catholic religion is the one true religion, which every State is bound itself to profess and to encourage and protect in its citizens. This is the reason why any Catholic statement of the rights (sic) of this matter presupposes a Catholic State and a Catholic community. Any other condition of affairs, whether that of a Catholic State with non-Catholic subjects or vice-versa, assumes for Catholics the character of a de facto (sic) situation and therefore, apart from some very general principles, can be treated by them only on a de facto (sic) basis.

At this level there is likely to be little or no difference of opinion between the members of the Joint Committee. At the same time, if the agreement expressed in this Statement is to be real and not only verbal it seems necessary to state therein that the said agreement is reached only on a de facto (sic) consideration of the question. An attempt is accordingly made, in paragraph 6, to give a clear and fair statement of the position.

The Compiler can well understand that some members of the Joint Committee may be reluctant to confine the discussion to the de facto (sic) level. But the doctrinal issue, which is beyond the Committee’s term of reference, seems to him to preclude any other common approach.

It will be observed that the first three paragraphs of the Statement relate to Freedom of Conscience in general. The Committee may think it preferable to restrict their Joint Statement to this subject; in which case it is hoped that these paragraphs may provide a basis of agreement.

Statement on FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE (sic)

1. We are agreed that the State has a God-given function, that of securing the temporal welfare of the community. In order to be able to fulfil this duty towards its members it has rights over them, its basic right being, within its own province, to give orders and to be obeyed. This right of the State, however, is not absolute but limited; it is limited by the divinely given nature of man as being endowed with reason, freewill and conscience. Superior to any law of the State is the law of God, which man in all circumstances is bound to obey. Therefore no law of the State has validity if it is contrary to the law of God, from which the State itself derives its function and authority, and no ordinance designed for the temporal benefit of its citizens can claim their obedience if it is detrimental to their everlasting welfare.

40 For this record, these notes have been translated into footnotes; the notes are aligned with the pertinent paragraphs.
2. This right of the individual to obey God’s law without hindrance from any human authority is what we understand by freedom of conscience. It is according to his observance of God’s law as he apprehends it by conscience that he will be judged, and therefore any coercion which forces a man to do what his conscience reprobates is an outrage upon his nature as a free and responsible person. No man can be compelled to do what he is sincerely convinced to be evil.

3. But we are also agreed that the freedom of the individual to act according to his conscience is subject to limitation on the part of the State. The human mind is liable to error, and a mistaken conviction, however conscientious, may lead to external actions which are patently contrary to public order and morality. In such cases the merely putative right of the erring citizen yields to the real right of the State to protect the Common Good, and the civil authority may and should restrain him. The extent to which this restraint is justly applied will depend upon the measure in which the State and the community rightly apprehend and scrupulously observe the principles of moral law, and also upon such wise policy of toleration as authority may legitimately maintain with a view to the avoidance of greater evils.\footnote{Right is a moral power – as We have already said and must repeat again and again – it is absurd to suppose that nature has accorded indiscriminately to both truth and error, virtue and vice (Leo XIII, Libertas: Acta Leonis XIII, III, p.110).

The Church (concedes) no right save to what is true and virtuous (Op. cit., ibid., p.115).

Since freedom is a virtue by which man is perfected its sphere should be the true and the good...It is therefore wrong that anything contrary to virtue and truth should be published and advertised; much worse that it should enjoy the favour and protection of the law...The State is consequently acting against the law of nature if it allows such licence of opinion and action as may with impunity lead minds astray from the truth and hearts from virtue (Immortale Dei, op. cit., II p.1).

It is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights (Libertas; op. cit., III, p.116).

On the other hand, (sic)

The Church, while not conceding any right save to what is true and virtuous, does not object to the public authority tolerating what is at variance with truth and virtue, for the sake of avoiding a great evil or securing or preserving a great good (Op. cit., III, p.115).”

\footnote{Leo XIII condemns the view: “that the State is not bound to make public profession of any religion” (Immortale Dei, op. cit., II p.157) and “that it is lawful for the State, any more than for the individual, to disregard all religious duties (ibid., p.161).” On the other hand, “The Church is most solicitous to ensure that no man shall be forced against his will to embrace the Catholic faith (ibid, p.162).”}

4. Foremost among man’s obligations in conscience is that of rendering due worship to God, and this binds the State as well as the individual. The State is therefore bound, not only to refrain from hindering its citizens in the performance of their religious duties, but also, so far as lies within its province, to facilitate and encourage the practice of religion in every way, in particular by respecting the natural rights of parents in religious education of their children. On the other hand, no human authority can or may apply force in this matter, for it is of the very essence of the act of worship that it should be freely performed.\footnote{“Right is a moral power – as We have already said and must repeat again and again – it is absurd to suppose that nature has accorded indiscriminately to both truth and error, virtue and vice (Leo XIII, Libertas: Acta Leonis XIII, III, p.110).

The Church (concedes) no right save to what is true and virtuous (Op. cit., ibid., p.115).

Since freedom is a virtue by which man is perfected its sphere should be the true and the good...It is therefore wrong that anything contrary to virtue and truth should be published and advertised; much worse that it should enjoy the favour and protection of the law...The State is consequently acting against the law of nature if it allows such licence of opinion and action as may with impunity lead minds astray from the truth and hearts from virtue (Immortale Dei, op. cit., II p.1).

It is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights (Libertas; op. cit., III, p.116).

On the other hand, (sic)

The Church, while not conceding any right save to what is true and virtuous, does not object to the public authority tolerating what is at variance with truth and virtue, for the sake of avoiding a great evil or securing or preserving a great good (Op. cit., III, p.115).”

“Leo XIII condemns the view: “that the State is not bound to make public profession of any religion” (Immortale Dei, op. cit., II p.157) and “that it is lawful for the State, any more than for the individual, to disregard all religious duties (ibid., p.161).” On the other hand, “The Church is most solicitous to ensure that no man shall be forced against his will to embrace the Catholic faith (ibid, p.162).”}
5. It is admitted, however, that religious freedom is subject to limitations analogous to those which restrict freedom of conscience in general, since in religious matters, too, men are liable to error. In some perverted forms religion may menace public order and morality, and here it is evident that the civil authority may and should intervene. Against the possible misuse of this limiting condition, and the danger that the argument of public order may be unjustly invoked to defend measures of discrimination and oppression, the remedy lies in the vigilance of public opinion.

6. We are moreover agreed in principle that, while the individual conscience has an inviolable right to be free from compulsion, the State is nevertheless bound in its legislation to favour the real rights of truth as against the putative rights of error. The detailed application of this principle, however, as well as the claim of any one religion to be exclusively true, would carry us into the doctrinal field, which it is not for this Joint Committee to enter. It is to be understood, therefore, that in what follows we abstract from the question of real and putative rights and limit our consideration to the policy which, as we are agreed, is called for in those countries where different religions are practised side by side.

7. Where such conditions prevail, we are agreed that public order and the common good which it is the duty of the State to promote are best served by a policy of toleration, which guarantees all religious bodies in their civic freedom. Such freedom would secure each body from any hindrance in what relates to its religious practice, subject always to the limiting condition laid down in paragraph 5, and without prejudice to the rightful claims of the truth. It would thus become the civic duty of the members of one religious body to respect the rights of other religious bodies to their proper freedom.

---

43 Leo XIII condemns the doctrine that the State is not bound...to enquire which of the many religions is the only true one; nor to prefer one religion to the others; nor to show special favour to any one religion; but that it is bound on the contrary to grant equal rights to all creeds, so long as public order suffers no detriment from them (Immortale Dei, op. cit., II p.157).

or that it is lawful for the State, any more than for the individual,....to hold in equal; favour different forms of religion (ibid, p. 161).

or that it is lawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion (ibid, p. 162).

or that no one form of worship is to be preferred by the State to another, but that all should stand on an equal footing, without any regard to the people, even if they profess the Catholic faith (Libertas; op. cit., III, p. 109).

He teaches that:

Justice and reason alike forbid the State...to treat various religions alike, and to grant them indiscriminately equal rights and privileges (ibid., p.109)....It is quite lawful to demand, defend, or grant indiscriminate freedom...of worship, as though (this) were a right given by nature to man. If nature had truly granted this right it would follow that God's commands could be rejected and that human freedom could not be restrained by any law (ibid, p.119).

44 "The Church...does not object to the public authority tolerating what is at variance with truth and virtue, for the sake of avoiding a great evil or securing or preserving a great good (Libertas; op. cit., III, p. 115)."
AAW Gr 1/29b Town & Country Planning Act, 1947-49

In this portfolio there is a copy of the Act and papers from the relevant HMG Department on the application of a proposed ‘development charge’ and the subsequent implications for charities. Also within this portfolio is a letter from Cardinal Griffin to all clergy dated 12th August 1948:

My dear Father,

So that steps may be taken to comply with the provisions of the Town & Country Planning Act 1947 we have to have an up-to-date and accurate return of all diocesan land in your parish.

Will you therefore please complete the attached form and return it to the Financial Secretary by September 15th 1948.

Praying God to bless you and your flock.

Your devoted servant in Christ,
Bernard Cardinal Griffin

[encl]

........................................Parish

1. Description of Property

2. The purpose for which the property was used on 1st July, 1948 (sic).

“The Church while she considers it lawful to place the various norms of religion on the same footing, yet does not condemn those rulers who, for the securing of some great good or the avoiding of some great evil, tolerate that each of the several forms of religion shall have some standing in the State (Immortale Dei, op. cit., II p.162).”

The same principles are recalled by Leo XIII in a letter to the Emperor of Brazil (19th July 1889), in which he deprecates legislation to establish religious freedom in that country, “which had hitherto preserved the previous heritage of the faith, and whose people are so faithful to the holy laws of their fathers (Op. cit., III, pp. 265-269).”

The Pope concludes:
“This universal freedom is not to be sought for its own sake, for it is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights (Libertas; op. cit. II 116).”
3. If the property was acquired for diocesan purposes e.g. new church, school etc. but was not used as such on 1st July 1948 please state purpose for which acquired.

4. If the property was let on 1st July 1948 state to whom and for what purpose. (Letter and enclosure from Cardinal Griffin to all diocesan clergy, 12th August 1948, [AAW Gr 1/29b Town & Country Planning Act 1947-49]).

In a letter from A. G. C. King of Stone, King & Wardle of Bath, dated 25th September 1948, in reference to the possibility of acquiring an exemption from the proposed ‘development charge’ for Church charities Mr King writes on page 3: “The success of negotiations undertaken by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster with the Minister of Health was so marked that it is suggested that the same course might now be adopted and that the following points be discussed with Mr. Silkin, namely:-... [AAW Gr 1/29b Town & Country Planning Act 1947-49].” By 1948, there is growing evidence that Cardinal Griffin had won the confidence of the Catholic community in his dealings with HMG.

AAW Gr 1/30a Annual Conference of Catholic Teachers’ Federation, Brighton 2nd January 1947

In this portfolio there is correspondence pertaining to the above conference and a copy of Cardinal Griffin’s address:

Talking of education, it seems strange that even in these days so many people fail to understand its true meaning. Education is only a means to an end. It is to bring out in the child all that is best; to help develop a child’s faculties. But it is useless to discuss the education of a child unless we understand what a child is, and what is the purpose of a child’s existence. A child is born to live not merely for peace and happiness in this world, but to prepare for peace and happiness in the next world; to know, love and serve God here in this world and to be happy with Him for ever in the next. Unless the purpose of a child’s existence is fully realised by our educators and
others, any educational system will be not only useless but disastrous. The Nazis held that the education of a girl was merely to fit her to have children for the State, and the purpose of a boy’s education was to fit him to be a soldier for Germany, and so to secure the dominance of that country over all nations throughout the world. Communists will tell you that education is to train a child to be an efficient member and contributor to the welfare of a materialistic State.

What does the Church tell us about the object of education? Pope Pius XI says that the proper and immediate end of Christian education is to cooperate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian. Education, he says, takes in the whole compass of human life, emotional and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social, not with a view of reducing it in any way, but in order to elevate, regulate and perfect it, in accordance with the example and teaching of Christ.

Hence the true Christian, the product of Christian education, is the supernatural man who thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished man of character.

We know that Christ’s coming created a revolution in the system of education. Before He came, education attempted to train the boy in the natural virtues, and for this world alone. Christ told us that man’s destiny was not merely happiness in this world, but a future life to which the present life was to lead. It is clear, therefore, that to divorce religion from education is unreal. Purely secular education leaves the child undeveloped. He will be only half a man, only half developed. It is for this reason that the Catholic Church insists that true education must concern itself with the whole man and must therefore be Christian.

Griffin goes on to discuss some of the operational challenges connected with implementation of the new Act stating “…we must see and insist that in the working of the present Act both the Ministry of Education and local education authorities give equal; treatment to county and voluntary schools (Address given by Cardinal Griffin, CTF Conference, January 1947, [Annual Conference of Catholic Teachers’ Federation, Brighton 2nd January 1947], pages 1 & 2).

Griffin goes on to comment that one of the most important clauses in the Act is no. 76:-

In the exercise and performance of all powers and duties conferred and imposed on them by this Act the Minister and local education authorities shall have regard to the general principle that, so far as is compatible with the provision of efficient instruction and training and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure, pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents.

Griffin continues “…[i]n the discussion of the Bill emphasis was placed on the provision of facilities enabling parents to send children to schools belonging to the denominations to
which they were attached (Address given by Cardinal Griffin, CTF Conference, January 1947, [Annual Conference of Catholic Teachers' Federation, Brighton 2nd January 1947], page 2)." This Griffin expected to be undertaken through a fair, and proportionately equitable, distribution of resources across the system. So he would assert: "We share equally with others the burdens of taxation and so we should enjoy with them equal benefits (Address given by Cardinal Griffin, CTF Conference, January 1947, page 2, [Annual Conference of Catholic Teachers' Federation, Brighton 2nd January 1947])."

AAW Gr 1/30 d Education Interchange Council 1947-48
This portfolio contains nothing of direct interest.

AAW Gr 1/30 e General Election – educational notes for Parliamentary Candidates 1945
In this portfolio is a collection of correspondence primarily between the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle and Archbishop Griffin. Cardinal Griffin’s capacity for simplicity, in matters educational, is infectious. In a handwritten covering note to Archbishop Griffin from the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, dated 29th April 1945, the latter writes: “…I have tried to use the simplest words so that they may effectively serve our purpose, - to assist ‘our priests’ (sic) in coaching the deputation to the parliamentary candidates (Letter from the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Archbishop Griffin, 29th April 1945, [AAW Gr 1/30 e General Election – educational notes for Parliamentary Candidates 1945], pages 1-2).” Hexham and Newcastle was undertaking this work with the Bishops of Nottingham and Leeds respectively. There are three successive copies of the draft enclosed in this portfolio; each draft is shorter and more succinct. At the heart of these draft is a belief that “Catholic parents pay twice over for Education. As tax-payers and rate-payers they meet their fair share of the total cost of education; as Catholic parents they are condemned to pay increasingly heavy sums because of their insistence on the principle already referred to… "[namely,] children should be educated in harmony with their parents' wishes. The "Education Question" is not (sic) settled. There is no equal opportunity for all citizens, - nor will [there] be until this unjust discrimination ceases and the penalty on “full freedom of conscience is removed (page 2, second draft).” In general terms the following was true:

In the case of any brand new school (whether Primary of Secondary) which is not in some way a replacement of the whole or part of an existing maintained Catholic school, Catholic Parents must provide the whole capital cost of both the site and the buildings.

In the case of alteration, extension or replacement of existing maintained or grant-earning Catholic Schools, Catholic Parents must pay at least a quarter,
and in some cases at least half the capital cost of both site and buildings, and in other cases at least half the capital cost of the building alone.

Always in addition, Catholic Parents must pay annually at least half the cost of the external repairs to the school buildings (page 2, third draft).

AAW Gr 1/30 f Centenary of Arrival of De La Salle Brothers, 1955
While details of correspondence between the Order (sic) and Archbishop’s House over this celebration are not of direct interest, what is fascinating is a flyer that charts the growth of the order in education in Great Britain (five of the De La Salle schools were ‘Home Office Schools’ in Scotland) over the hundred years:

- Four De La Salle Brothers came to England in 1855 and opened St. Joseph’s College at Clapham, starting with four boys;
- To-day there are 250 De La Salle Brothers in Great Britain teaching some 7,000 boys. Numerically this is the greatest single contribution in the country to the Catholic education of boys;
- St. Joseph’s College that started in 1855 at Clapham moved in 1888 to Tooting and in 1904 to Beulah Hill where it is now;
- In 1860, in Kennington, the Brothers opened St. Joseph’s Academy, which has been at Blackheath since 1919;
- Old boys of the Brothers in England today include the Right Rev. Bishop W. Siedle, W.F., 385 priests (Diocesan and Religious) and 145 Seminarists (The De La Salle Brothers, One Hundred Years in Great Britain: 1855-1955, [AAW Gr 1/30 f Centenary of Arrival of De La Salle Brothers, 1955], page 2).

AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47
In this portfolio there is a memorandum undated (although the following written annotation appears aside the title: “[the] figures refer to 1941”). It is entitled: “Grievances and Disabilities of Catholics in The Six Counties of Northern Ireland” with no indication of authorship. The memorandum offers an interesting historical vignette sketching ecclesial difficulties apparent in the running of the four individual dioceses that straddled both sides of the border and how the State in Northern Ireland operating with devolved powers perceived itself religiously:

…the diocese of Clogher has its Diocesan College and the Bishop’s Seat in County Monaghan in National Ireland. More than half of the area, however, lies in Tyrone and Fermanagh which is in Northern Ireland. The Catholic youths of those counties, when winning county scholarships, cannot avail of them at the Diocesan College in the normal way. Thus the normal and happy development of diocesan life cannot flourish and ecclesiastical units which have existed for 1500 years are torn asunder (page 2).

Rather discontentedly the author on page 3 opines: “The regime in Northern Ireland is that of a political party. The Orange Unionist Party commands the State: The state is its
instrument. It has been in control of the State since England established it. (Grievances and Disabilities of Catholics in The Six Counties of Northern Ireland, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47], page 3).” What is interesting is that this settlement was tolerated by Westminster who a decade later would pass legislation for England and Wales that would lead to the establishment and expansion of schools with a religious character, in the maintained sector, beyond the Protestant community. Within the social history of England, Catholics were no longer “tolerated outlaws” (Grievances and Disabilities of Catholics in The Six Counties of Northern Ireland, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47], page 3) but citizens with rights who became more politically adroit in declaring the rights of parents and the cause(s) of inequality between different sets within the public space as well as in parish churches.

Below are two quotations from Northern Ireland; that give a sense of the vitriol present in Northern Irish politics in the 1930s:

...Here are some of Lord Craigavon’s anti-Catholic utterances: “Ours is a Protestant Government and I am an Orangeman. (12th July 1932) (page 3)

...The Prime Minister speaking in Parliament on 24th April 1934, declared himself in agreement with the speech of Sir Basil Brooke at Derry on 19th March 1934 which recommended people not to employ Catholics. In the same debate he said: “All I boast of is that we are a Protestant Parliament and a Protestant State”...He had often said that he was an Orangeman first and a mem[b]er of that Parliament afterwards. (Grievances and Disabilities of Catholics in The Six Counties of Northern Ireland, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47], page 3).45

---

45 Later in this portfolio, there is a thirty-two page report entitled: The Position of Catholics in the Six Counties with special reference to Derry, March 1943, as with other papers in this portfolio; its authorship is unaccredited. Appendix E offers a more detailed summary of the contemporaneous demographic situation.

Appendix E: Education

a) Numbers and Catholic percentage at Primary Schools.
b) Government Grants.
c) Derry Municipal School.

a) The figures given here are taken from the official Summary issued annually by the Ministry of Education since 1924. The last Summary was issued in 1938, and since that year we have no authentic data unless occasionally details may be given under a particular head[ing] in answer to a question in Parliament. It is reasonable, however, to argue that the Catholic percentage is continuing to increase.

Religion of Pupils at Primary Schools in Northern Ireland on December 31st of each year.
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catholics on Rolls</th>
<th>Total on Rolls</th>
<th>Catholic Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>69,166</td>
<td>198,593</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>72,143</td>
<td>199,560</td>
<td>36.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>72,872</td>
<td>201,683</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>75,150</td>
<td>206,834</td>
<td>36.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>72,964</td>
<td>197,353</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>71,789</td>
<td>191,862</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Grants paid from Public Funds in respect of:

1. Schools vested in the Local Education Authority.
2. Voluntary Schools
3. Schools vested in a “Four and Two” Committee.

**Under 1. (sic)** Grants made for building, enlarging, and repair of schools under the control of the Education Authority from the time of the establishment of the Government of Northern Ireland until 31st December, 1938 - **£1,815,273**.

**Under 2. (sic)** Grants to Voluntary Schools up to 31st Dec. 1939 (sic) - **£162,488**.

**Under 3. (sic)** Grants to Schools vested in a “Four & Two” Committee up to 31st December 1939 (sic) - **£12,821**.

Note. There are no Catholic Schools under No.1. Not all schools under Nos 2 and 3 are under Catholic Management.

The Position of Catholics as compared with Protestants in the matter of grants for the building and upkeep of Schools.

Although Catholics contribute their due proportion of the tax levied for educational purposes, the Managers of the Voluntary Schools – and all Catholic Schools come under this head[ing] must find from parochial funds sufficient money to meet the following:-

HALF THE COST (sic) of building, equipment, alterations, heating and cleaning.

THE ENTIRE COST (sic) upkeep, repairs, improvements, rent.

The Government contributes merely half the cost of building and equipment, alterations, heating and cleaning.

In the case of schools vested in the Education Authority public funds contribute

THE ENTIRE COST (sic) of:

- building and equipment
- alterations
- heating and cleaning
- upkeep, repairs
- improvements and rent.

Yet in three of the Six Counties which make up Northern Ireland, and in one County Borough, the number of Catholic children, attending Primary Schools is over 50% of the total attendance; while in the Six Counties taken as a unit Catholics contribute nearly 40% of the total attendance.
Into this setting was proposed the establishment of the first “secularised” school system in the United Kingdom:

…In the last century there was developed in Ireland a Managerial System by which the priests in their capacity as School Managers had control of the Schools. Shortly after the present Government came into power in Northern Ireland the Education Act of 1923 was adopted by which it was proposed to secularise the elementary school system. It was enacted that no State contribution should be made for the building, renovation or upkeep of school premises unless the authority previously exercised by the Catholic Clerical Managers was transferred to a School Committee.

The only provision for religious education in the schools transferred was a thing called “simple Bible teaching”. It was sufficient to satisfy the Protestant conscience." Even though, the author continues “There are a greater number of Catholic children than any other single denomination (Protestants several denominations: Church of Ireland, Presbyterians, Methodist, etc.) Yet the Catholic conscience, which of course could not accept “simple Bible teaching” as a sufficient religious education for catholic children, was ignored.ii

Persistent agitation by the Catholic Bishops resulted, after seven years, in the system being modified by the Amending Education Act of 1930. It was enacted that Catholics should pay half the cost of building, equipment, upkeep, alteration, heating and cleaning, and the entire cost of rent upkeep and improvements.

This success, while partial, would provide a prototype for the Catholic community whereby by it was able to define itself within public debate as a social entity as well as an ecclesial reality. This growing self-confidence would find acknowledgement in subsequent Education Acts in England and Wales and in Scotland in 1936, and England and Wales in 1944. Each time the settlement would become more generous for Catholic tax payers. What is fascinating is that the first “secularised school system” would be established and founder within Northern Ireland.

c) Derry Municipal Technical School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that the proportion of Catholics increases as the status (and salary) of the position falls. It should be noted also that the Derry Technical School is financed completely from public funds (The Position of Catholics in the Six Counties with special reference to Derry, March 1943, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47], pages 27-28).

46 A newspaper article found in the portfolio, attached to a letter addressed to Archbishop Griffin, 16th October 1944, from "a 60 year old resident of N. Ireland" does comment that the arrangements for education in Northern Ireland are equally applied and that Archbishop Griffin should "shed a tear over Protestant ["clerically-controlled"] Church Schools which are in precisely the same position [as Catholic schools]. The Northern Government is, according to the unnamed newspaper, impartial in its persecutions."
The secularised, transferred schools, which the Protestant conscience permits them to accept are built, equipped, repaired, enlarged, altered, heated and cleaned entirely out of public money to which Catholics contribute their just share. Catholics pay out of their own pockets something more than half the cost of their own schools and then are obliged to contribute as payers of rates and taxes for the provision and upkeep of non-Catholic schools which their Catholic conscience does not permit them to use (Grievances and Disabilities of Catholics in The Six Counties of Northern Ireland, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47], pages 5&6).

The persecution in Northern Ireland was referred to by Archbishop Griffin when speaking on “Freedom from Fear” at a meeting of the ‘Council of Christians and Jews’ on 7th November 1944. In the speech Griffin observes “I speak with feeling because both Jews and Christians have suffered persecution. Prior to the War we have records of the persecution of the Church in Mexico, Russia and Spain, and to-day Roman Catholics are being persecuted in Germany and Poland – and I need hardly mention the persecution that is going on even at the present day in Northern Ireland ([AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47]).” This generated several letters of protest to which Griffin’s Private Secretary replied: “I am desirous by His Grace to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th [November]. Yours faithfully, Private Secretary [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47].” Although there is no evidence of a writing campaign, the majority of the individual letters were dated on this day.

Archbishop Griffin in a letter dated 21st November 1944 to Alex E. Donnelly noted “I do not wish to cause dissension but to try to remove anything that exists in the way of religious intolerance, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter and the principles for which we are fighting. (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Alex E. Donnelly, 21st November 1944, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47]).”

It is apparent from correspondence in this portfolio, whether personal testimonies describing examples of intolerance or conversations once removed from the streets, that Archbishop Griffin was prepared to stand up for the marginalised even if it weakened the newly attained political status quo. On 20th November 1944 Mr A.C.F. Beales, Honorary Secretary of the Sword of the Spirit, writes to the Archbishop:

Your Grace,

I have been categorically challenged today, by a high official colleague in the B.B.C. to substantiate Your Grace’s words on the persecution of Catholics in
Northern Ireland. In reply I stated roundly that the charge can be documented up to the hilt, & that I would get evidence; I added that perhaps the English Protestants could induce the Belfast papers to call off their present tirade, lest we be forced to publish (sic) the evidence & risk a really tense situation

Will Your Grace very kindly tell me where I can get the documentation that will do this? (Letter from Mr A.C.F. Beales, Honorary Secretary of the Sword of the Spirit, to Archbishop Griffin, 20th November 1944, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47]).

Archbishop Griffin’s response is clear but understated:

Dear Mr Beales,

…I think I have all the evidence here to prove the truth of my statement, and if you can manage to call around I will give it to you.

I consider that the persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland is a blot on the British Government, and from the letters of protest I have received it is quite clear who are the perpetrators as they have been so anxious to try to clear themselves. I do not want to cause dissension but, at the same time, I want to try and removed what is a disgrace to this country, and what is so much against the principles for which we are fighting…

My main source of evidence, when I made the statement, was from people who have been to see me here, and also from a booklet entitled “Orange Terror”, but it seems to me that the matter is too clear to need proof (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Mr A.C.F. Beales, Honorary Secretary of the Sword of the Spirit, 21st November 1944 [Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47]).

As is the way with such public policy discourse, a handwritten note from a serviceman, who does not disclose his name or denomination, is moving beyond its ascription. More because it reveals how war forged new relations:

I feel that as an Ulster-man I must thank you for condemning the bigotry which exists at the present time in Ulster…This is all I have to say, Sir, and permit me to thank you once again, for your magnificent words, and in years to come people of Ulster, will remember you as a friend, who tried to make his voice heard above the storm of hatred, bigotry and religious strife. Service man [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47].

Within this portfolio is a copy of a report commissioned by the National Council of YMCA’s Irish Union on A Month Of Camps For Unemployed Boys - Ballymoyer, June-July, 1940. The authors of the reports were: J.D. McCaughey, John M. Malone and Thomas Kay. The report begins with a series of biographies of boys who had attended the camp. The commentary contained within the report is fascinating, lamenting the attitude of some of the boys and some of the leaders in equal measure:
One further point must be made about the boys. We firmly believe that one of the reasons for difficulty of contact between leaders who wish to obtain some reliable response from the boys and the boys themselves was the enormous growth of seculism (sic). There just were no, or at best very few, ideals or principles held in common by the Camp as a community, to which one could appeal. This is at root a religious phenomenon. In spite of Church-going, and attendance at Mass, religious consciousness was as little in evidence as moral conscience (sic). One leader expressed the opinion that there was less of the former but more of the latter among Catholic boys; among Protestant boys, both in Camp and Club experience, he thought that the situation was reversed. Certainly the phenomenon is common on both sides. In the case of some Catholic boys, the vacuum caused by the absence of specifically religious conviction was being filled by a Utopian Irish Nationalist cult Catholicism (sic): and it is not difficult to discover a corresponding Orange cult Protestantism amongst groups of Protestant boys. When the dispelling of present bitterness against boys of other creeds has been accomplished (and we believe that is no mean achievement on the part of these Camps to have done that for many) we are still left with the problem of rehabilitating the boy’s religious conceptions, and of restoring religion to its true position as the source of all life and morality for a boy, rather than as a particular aspect of a cult. Along with this will go the rehabilitating of his political conceptions, by which we do not mean the conversion of bigoted Unionists and Nationalists into good kind Liberals. But rather, they must be enabled to become aware of political, economic and social realities in such a way that they will not so easily become the dupes of unscrupulous exploiters of a boy’s natural Utopian idealism (sic) (page 4).

Later in the report, the authors reveal their operative anthropology when reflecting on how the training of leaders may be amended in light of experience:

i) We do not ask anyone to feel religious but to be religious in their attitude to life. This means an awareness of the world of the New Testament and its conception of man as a creature of importance, not because he is a British man or a Catholic Irishman but because he is a sinful man called to be obedient to God as King, and to live in a relationship of a certain kind with his fellows because God is Father; but, N.B., that is what he is called to do, that is not what he naturally does, whether he is an unemployed boy or a leader in Camp. If we see something of what is involved in that (for instance, of the inevitability of the failure of the Cross), then we shall not despair however discouraging the results of our social service turn out to be (page 5).

The authors move from the specific to the general in their considerations. This paragraph is of interest since it is marked by a single line in the left-hand margin:

POLITICAL ACTIVITY (sic)

We cannot refrain from expressing our concern at the similarity between the spiritual, moral, intellectual and physical state of the unemployed youth of this province to that which obtained in Germany at the rise of the National
Socialistic Party. In short, we are on the brink of a revolutionary situation (sic); for we would point out that a revolutionary situation is not only created by mass defiance (sic), but it is also aided and abetted by mass submission (sic). How do we know that we would be worse off under Hitler. (sic) "We could not be worse off than we are." "There is work for everyone in Germany, anyway." "We'll do away with all that (i.e. police unemployment, poverty) in a free Ireland." "There is a good nation rising up now." These were all commonplace sentiments amongst the boys; and not only among the Catholic boys. The smaller numbers of Protestant boys whom we had were mostly the submissive ones. In one or two cases where leadership and personality were not altogether absent we have discovered that the boy is a problem at home – no respect for authority, defiance, "agin (sic) the government". We point all this out in order to suggest that the situation is far more urgent than government action in relation to it would lead us to believe our leaders realise (page 6).

...i) b) To prevent [an] increase in juvenile crime, which is only a specific aspect of [the] total problem, it is essential that boys should not be thrown into the spasmodic uncertain labour market at 14 years of age. We could produce a large number of case-sheets of boys who only got into trouble after they had lost their jobs. Blind-ally employment has a big haul of crime to its discredit here. We would hasten to add that many boys known to us who have police-court records are not bad boys; in some cases they are boys with personality and initiative above the average – but how else are these qualities to express themselves (page 6).

...iii) With the instruments of propaganda now in the hands of the government it is of urgent importance that the refusal by many to employ Catholic boys should be discouraged. It may be that the form in which it is often stated, the cry of "discrimination against Catholics" is ill founded; but it is a powerful fact that the vast majority of boys attending the Juvenile Instruction Centre are Catholics. The evidence of quite good boys who have been constantly looking for jobs and who have failed to get them in works where at least the majority of workers are Protestant, and where Protestant boys are constantly taken on, is – to say the least of it – suggestive (sic). We continue to neglect this problem at our peril. One wonders if it is not already too late (J.D. McCaughey, John M. Malone and Thomas Kay, National Council of YMCA’s Irish Union Report on A Month Of Camps For Unemployed Boys - Ballymoyer, June-July, 1940, [AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47], page 7).47

AAW Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48
This portfolio, records the work undertaken mainly under the auspices of ‘The American Catholic Welfare Committee’ and ‘The American Committee for Catholic British Relief’. Such welfare committees became the primary vehicle through which catechetical materials were distributed to Catholic German Prisoners of War within England. In the correspondence, one sees a shift between Hinsley’s desire to enunciate a Catholic

47 In a letter dated 21st December 1944 from Archbishop Griffin to Mgr. Coghlan C.1 Chaplains (R.C) War Office he thanks Mgr Coghlan for sending him a copy of this report and promises to return it to him once it is copy-typed.
spirituality for a ‘Just War’ to Griffin’s aspiration to provide Catholic catechetics for a ‘Just Peace’. Both were concerned for the pastoral care for all Catholics whatever their nationality.

Lady Holberton, Chairman of the London Committee of ‘The American Committee for Catholic British Relief’ to Cardinal Griffin, 22\textsuperscript{nd} July 1946, writes:

\begin{quote}
After Pearl Harbour, the [National Catholic Welfare Conference] N.C.W.C. wired the late Cardinal Hinsley, asking him to set up a Committee to administer any funds that they might send over to this country, and that is how The American Catholic Welfare Committee was formed. We began by administering funds sent over for the benefit of American Chaplains; then there was £3,000 left by Cardinal (then Archbishop) Spellman for the exclusive welfare of British troops, and finally between £60/70,000 which has gone in Catholic War Relief ([\textit{AAW Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48}], page 2).
\end{quote}

Fr Derek Worlock, recently appointed Assistant Private Secretary, to Lady Holberton, 6\textsuperscript{th} August 1946, writes:

\begin{quote}
I just want to thank you for your letter of 5\textsuperscript{th} August, addressed to His Eminence the Cardinal. I know that the Cardinal will be simply delighted at the good news that Father Swanstrom and Father Wycislo are to arrange a day of prayer for Poland on September 8\textsuperscript{th}. I shall be writing to the Cardinal tonight and will forward your good news to him ([\textit{AAW Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48}]).
\end{quote}

Griffin, in a covering letter to Prisoner of War camps, February 1947, (sent before the dispatch of German New Testaments and prayer books entitled, “Gott mit uns”), writes:

\begin{quote}
Sir,

I am venturing to send you, under separate cover, a quantity of German New Testaments and prayer books destined for the use of Catholic prisoners of war.

I should be grateful if these books could be consigned to the Catholic chaplains for distribution among Catholic prisoners. If there is no Catholic chaplain[,] on the strength of the camp[,] perhaps you would be good enough to give the books to the senior Catholic prisoner for distribution.

May I thank you in anticipation for your kind co-operation.

Yours very truly,

+Bernard Cardinal Griffin
\end{quote}
The responses received from Camp Commanders is revealing, such as, Lt. Col. M. G. Beckett of 73 P. W. Camp, Storwood Camp, Melbourne, Yorkshire, 28th March 1947:

My Lord Archbishop

I wish on behalf of the German Prisoners of War in this Camp, to thank you very much indeed for the gift of German New Testaments and prayer books you recently sent to us.

It is a gift that is very much appreciated by the Roman Catholic prisoners and one which should help the men realise that the Christian way of life transcends all other ideologies ([AAW Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48]).

It is clear that there are competing pastoral priorities, as apparent in Cardinal Griffin’s letter to Lady Holberton, dated 18th April 1947. Frustratingly, Lady Holberton’s original letter is not in the Archive, only Griffin’s reply:

Dear Lady Holberton

…The difficulty about the further extension of work at St. Charles’s Square is that we shall require the building for our own school purposes. The Poles have already been notified of this and I am afraid that as it is impossible for us to find school accommodation elsewhere we may eventually have to ask the Poles to leave ([Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48]).

AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1944-50

This portfolio deals primarily with the mundane and routine; but gives an insight into life in post-war Britain and the shortages endured after the war from bed linen to wine. The latter of which can be seen from the letter below from J. Chandler & Co, Wine Merchants:

Dear Rev. Private Secretary,

…In view of this reduction [and the need to export more Whisky to the dollar countries, and reduce our sales at home]. We therefore have to advise you that during the year 1947, we hope to be able to send you, at the regular quota intervals, the following:-

12 bts[.] of spirits ([AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1944-50]).
Although pecuniary interest may be manifest in the correspondence in this portfolio, it is apparent the genuine affection and esteem Cardinal Hinsley was held in. In a letter to Archbishop Griffin from Messrs Alex Macdonald & Co., 20th December 1944, we find:

Your Grace

Under separate cover we have today sent you per Passenger Train the customary case for the use of your goodself (sic) and your house, which we trust will arrive safely and help to brighten this wartime Christmas.

Our partners extend their very best wishes and our Mr. P.J. Herraghty trusts that you will long be spared to carry on the fine work done by your predecessor with whom he was a firm friend.

We take this opportunity of enclosing a Mass Intention Book which we hope you will find useful, and with very best Christmas wishes...([AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop's House 1944-50]).

It is also apparent that the keeping of a wine cellar after the war, or sufficient wine to celebrate Mass, was operationally challenging. There is exchange of correspondence during 1944 and 1945 with Mr. Gilbey and Mr Wetz:

Dear Mr. Wetz,

Could you be so good as to send us a dozen bottles of your sweet Credo altar wine. If I remember rightly, you have two sweet wines; His Grace prefers the sweeter. Also, if I remember rightly, you once made the kind suggestion that perhaps the occasion might arise when you could help His Grace in another way. If that was so, may I be emboldened to let you know that the archiepiscopal cellar is almost empty and that if there is anything you can do to replenish the stock, the kindness would be very well received. In particular we are low in wines; also we could do with some whiskey...([Letter from the Private Secretary to Albert H. Wetz of Altar “Credo” Wines, 1st July 1945, [AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1944-50]).

Herewith the reply:

Your Grace,

I thank you for the kind references to myself in your letter of the 7th instant, and hasten to assure Your Grace that I am more than repaid by the generous terms in which you are pleased to signify acceptance of this small allocation of Wine fortunately preserved from Air-raid damage ([Letter from Albert H. Wetz of Altar “Credo” Wines to Archbishop Griffin, 9th July 1945, [AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1944-50]).
Amidst paperwork concerning renovation of the roof in Archbishop’s House and extension of gas and electricity supply to the Chauffeur’s Cottage, there is a copy of a paper entitled Central Advisory Council for Education (England): Memorandum submitted by the Young Christian Workers, 16th May 1947. Membership of the Y.C.W. in England was 15,700 and “is open to all young workers, but the main membership and inspiration is Catholic”; below is Y.C.W.’s analysis of contemporary “mass” education:

§4. The Y.C.W. considers “education” to be a training for (sic) life, in (sic) and through (sic) life. It considers education to be the awakening in the minds of the masses of the people, to a consciousness of their responsibility to their families, their work, their civic duties, the organisations to which they belong and to the whole of civilisation.

The problem of mass education cannot be solved by extending the opportunities for “university education” any more than the social problem can be solved by the possibility for all workers who are able, to achieve high economic or political posts, or wealth. The Y.C.W. attempts to solve the problem of mass-education by regular discussions, study weekends, campaigns, meetings and publications. These are designed to bring home to the workers their own situation with regard to work and preparation for work, conditions of work, savings, health, recreation, morality, marriage - to make them SEE (sic) for themselves what sort of lives they lead. They are led to JUDGE (sic) these facts in the light of their own dignity as human beings, with immortal souls. This examination of facts and comparison with an ideal leads them to demand concrete and progressive action to achieve the solution to their problems. The “Inquiries” bring out the greatness and responsibility of their position as workers, make them realise their own capabilities, show them the great natural tendencies for good that are extant in the workers, e.g. the solidarity that joins them all together.

The Y.C.W. has been able, by its educational activities and especially by the “Inquiry Method” of SEE – JUDGE – ACT, to develop enormously the character and worth to the community of great numbers of its members (Central Advisory Council for Education (England): Memorandum submitted by the Young Christian Workers, 16th May 1947, [AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1944-50], pages 1-2).

…3e. Our education system should be judged by the success it achieves in turning out good and useful citizens and not by the amount of theoretical knowledge it succeeds in imparting to each scholar. The present education system does not adequately form the character of young people to whom it is given. The system of scholarship awards and examination tends to cause the teachers to turn from character training to mere cramming and in this sense may be said to aim too high, that is, it demands too much in the way of factual knowledge and not enough in the way of formation (Central Advisory Council for Education (England): Memorandum submitted by the Young Christian Workers, 16th May 1947, [AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1944-50], page 3).
The paperwork within this portfolio involves aspects of boiler repairs, maintenance of lifts, wine orders, personnel documents and other assorted housekeeping matters. What is apparent in the correspondence is that goods and supplies are more freely available. However, in a handwritten note on a letter received from Westminster Cathedral, 25th May 1948, to Fr. Worlock, he writes the following:

It was agreed between H.E. Cardinal & Rev. Collingwood (now Cathedral Administrator) that in future Cathedral will pay Archbishop’s share of heating and cost of boiler. DW ([AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1948-52]).

One senses that Fr. Worlock was rather fastidious in his expectations and attended to detail in all his dealings.

**AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop’s House 1955-56**

Nothing of interest beyond correspondence concerning maintenance of recently installed “armourplate[d]” entrance doors to the Library in Archbishop’s House (Correspondence between Tonks (Birmingham) Ltd and Archbishop’s House, May 1956, [AAW Gr 2/5 Archbishop's House 1955-56]).

**AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944**

The Education Bill: Statement of the Catholic Hierarchy:

While we welcome the general provisions of the Bill for the reconstruction of the national system of education we wish to make clear that we have never accepted, do not accept, and never shall accept the Bill as it now stands. We hope that modifications may still be made to meet our objections, among which we would particularly stress the following:-

1. The absence of explicit recognition of the rights of parents concerning the establishment and continuance of schools.
2. The excessive influence of State officials in the determination of the type of school to which a child must be sent.
3. The intolerable injustice of the proposed financial conditions, which would make it impossible for the Catholic body to meet their obligations under the Bill.

It is our sincere conviction that it would be for the lasting good of the nation if the sovereignty and freedom of conscience were given practical and official recognition in Mr. Butler’s Bill.

We stand by that conviction and we would welcome the co-operation of all who agree with us. But we must face the realities of the situation, unpleasant as they may be. The Bill has passed its First Reading. The Anglican and Free Church leaders have publicly agreed to accept it. They have not expressed
any conscientious objection to the Agreed Syllabus. We have consistently
done so. Not by choice, but perforce, at this critical moment we stand alone
as a religious minority. As such we ask for minority treatment in accordance
with English practice and tradition. On many occasions, as for example in the
Peace Treaties of 1919, England has shown herself to be a powerful and
prominent protector of religious minorities in other countries, especially in
the matter of education. All we ask is that an English Catholic minority may, under
the same protection, be enabled with freedom of conscience to enjoy, as the
equals of their fellow-countrymen, the full measure of educational reform.

Finally, whatever the issue, we shall do our best to keep pace with any
national advance in the educational system, but we shall never surrender our
schools.

The statement is signed by The Archbishops of Westminster, Liverpool,
Birmingham and Cardiff; the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark; the Bishops of
Brentwood, Middlesbrough, Plymouth, Clifton, Shrewsbury, Leeds, Hexham
and Newcastle, Lancaster, Salford, Northampton, Menevia and Portsmouth;
The Vicar Capitular of Nottingham (Letter from Hierarchy of England & Wales
following its meeting at Archbishop’s House, Westminster, 5th January 1944,
[AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

There follows a fascinating article entitled How the Schools Injustice began Cowper-
Temple-ism, undated but reprinted from the Catholic Times by Nuneaton Newspapers Ltd.:

In any county school (i.e., a school built and maintained by the education
rates and taxes paid by everybody)...the collective worship...shall not be
distinctive of any particular religious denomination and the religious
instruction...shall not include any catechism or formulary which is distinctive
of any particular denomination... So reads Section 26 of the 1944 Act, the
relic of Cowper-Temple-ism to-day.

The number of Catholics since the Reformation had fallen significantly by
1770 it was reduced to approximately 60,000. The author believes that this
year is significant since it marks the year that the persecution of Catholics lost
its intensity. He posits that Catholic education in this country was revived by
the effort of Bishop Challoner who opened a school at Sedgley Park in 1762.

But the real revival at least as to volume was occasioned by the revolution in
France which drove back to their native country the English “Catholic
Colleges beyond the seas.” At the same time (because the British
Government wished to recruit Irish troops for their war against America),
some of the bitterest penal laws had been repealed by the First Relief Act.

Consequently there was, in a relatively short period, a reasonable number of
Catholic secondary schools (page 1).

The same could not be said for primary provision in fact the general condition of primary
schools at the end of the eighteenth century was dire.
...[T]he chief agencies for the building and maintaining of schools for the poor in the nineteenth-century were two voluntary societies – one Anglican (The National Society) and the other Dissenting (The British and Foreign Schools' Society).

To these two societies was made the first Government grant to help primary education – the sum of £20,000 in 1833. Note that the money was given to these two societies and to them alone (sic) (page 1). Not to the Catholic Schools Committee [which] was founded in 1847. Thereafter the Government continued its interest in primary education; the grant became an annual one; “it was increased from time to time; but the same spending agents were used (sic).” This arrangement was extended to the establishment of teachers training colleges in 1839. In 1851, a small element of the grant came to the Catholic community. It is estimated that the Catholic community had “10 primary schools in 1800, about 65 in 1829; but there were 311 in 1851 and 383 [accommodating 113,490 pupils] in 1870 (page 2)."

Unfortunately, the author does not reference his source for these statistics. However, he does comment:

The national system of education in England and Wales prior to, and up to, 1870 was completely denominational and the Government acknowledged it as such (sic) (page 2).

This assertion is important since it makes little sense for Dissenters, from the Free Churches, to claim that the origin of their schools was either non-denominational or non-sectarian.

In 1870, there were many elementary schools in the country but they did not exist everywhere and Mr Gladstone, the Liberal Prime Minister, wished to remedy this inequity. The schools already in existence, “all of which were voluntary and denominational, were to remain (page 2)” in places where no schools existed they were to be built under the Bill. The Bill proposed to divide the country into districts, every one of which would have a “School Board”.

Initially, it was proposed that schools built by the aforementioned School Boards might be “Catholic, Dissenting or Anglican” and funded out of public money namely local rate assisted by grants from central Government; it laid down that all new schools in an area should be “assisted on an equal basis or else (sic) no assistance whatsoever shall be given to any school (page 2).” Once made public the Dissenters objected vehemently, and there came to pass a compromise suggested by Mr. W. F. Cowper-Temple. Between 17th June 1870 and 24th June 1870 this proposal was amended again under pressure from a newly formed group of M.P.s. The amendment went through three phases:
First, all existing (sic) schools (all of which were denominational) were to be subsidised out of the education rates and taxes paid by everybody in the same way as new (sic) schools, which, too, were to be denominational according to the denomination prevailing and predominant in the area in which they would be built. Next all existing (sic) schools were to be subsidised in the same way as new (sic) schools, but the new (sic) schools, to be built by the School Boards, should not be allowed to teach denominational religion. Finally, no school at all new (sic), existing or future, should be subsidised if it taught denominational religion (page 3).

No wonder the author concludes: “Thus did the Dissenters, NOT (sic) Cowper Temple, that small but vociferous group, politically achieve the imposition of their sectarian notion of schools on the whole country (page 3).”

“Cowper-Temple-ism” became Section 14 of the 1870 Act. But its career has not been unchecked. It was modified by the 1902 Act to allow denominational schools to be partially subsidised from public monies to the extent of part running costs, not to building. That modification passed into Section 28 of the 1921 Act.

It prohibited denominational religious instruction in provided primary schools but allowed it (Section 72) in all provided secondary schools! (sic). The 1936 Act restricted Cowper-Temple-ism still further by allowing a subsidy for building certain (special agreement) denominational schools (page 3).

The author winds up with the following rhetorical conclusion:

Is it too much to hope that saner counsels will prevail in political circles so as to expunge from the law of this land the last remnants of Cowper-Temple-ism? Will the country never realise that Cowper-Temple-ism is in reality Nonconformity? In 1870 it was sensational. It is now stale because it is familiar (Catholic Times, How the Schools Injustice began Cowper-Temple-ism, undated but reprinted, Nuneaton Newspapers Ltd, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944], pages 1 to 3).

One of the most intriguing letters in this portfolio is from Commander George Atwood, The Royal Navy Base, Holyhead, dated 15th January 1944. The narrative of equality, and standing against injustice, finds expression not only amongst clerics but the laity:

Your Grace,

As a humble and insignificant Catholic I should like to express to you and the Hierarchy my gratitude for the firm attitude you are taking towards this disgraceful Education Bill. I know this gratitude is felt in a very widespread sense and every Catholic whom I meet feels most bitterly [against] Mr. Butler[*]’s total disregard of our just claims.
Democracy pronounces itself the Champion of Minorities, but what travesty of the Truth this trumpeting is.

If Catholics were to read Lord Warell’s new book “Allenby in Egypt” they would realise the depths to which a Cabinet Minster will sink to save face. The dishonesty and subterfuge Lord Allenby experienced at the hands of Lord Curzon makes one realise a little your position in having to deal with Mr. Butler Thank you and Bless you for your work for us…([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

On 19\textsuperscript{th} February Archbishop Griffin wrote to the Hierarchy individually seeking their views on a suggestion over whether there should be a “monster” public meeting at the Albert Hall. While some, mostly Northern bishops, such as the Archbishop of Liverpool, were in favour. Archbishop Griffin was swayed more by the reflections of the Archbishop of Birmingham, dated 25\textsuperscript{th} January 1944: “I am against a monster Catholic meeting at the Albert Hall on the Education Bill. I think it would do us no good…” This is reinforced in his postscript in which the Archbishop of Birmingham writes: “p.s. I don’t believe in holding such a meeting it may easily do more harm than good ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).” He was also influenced by the Archbishop of Cardiff who was equally ambivalent in his response dated 19\textsuperscript{th} January 1944: “In the circumstances it may prove beneficial to have such a meeting: though I much doubt if the Government will be influenced in the slightest in their dealings with us. The keen Catholics generally know our position and are in a great many cases more favourable than on past occasions ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]). The proposed meeting was not held.

In the portfolio there appears an untitled record of a meeting held on the morning after the Second Reading of the Bill between Mr. Rab Butler (President of the Board of Education) accompanied by Mr. Chuter Ede and Sir Maurice with Archbishop Griffin and the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle. This has been separated from a handwritten covering letter sent by the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Archbishop Griffin, 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 1944. In it he writes:

I drafted this report on the train and my secretary has duplicated it for me. I have tried to make it objective and an impartial version. If you think it is accurate you have it in a convenient form for posting. If you think it should be changed or modified it is just as easy to put 18 copies in a wastepaper basket as one. I think it was quite fair of Butler to say he (sic) would not commit himself to anything definite – after all we (sic) had made up our minds not to commit ourselves to anything definite!
It would be nice if you were to send a brief covering letter, with the Report, to the Bishops and, if you desired, you could then leave the reports unsigned.

Finally what about letting Butler have a copy? If you do I would suggest that it be typed and that the first paragraph and the last (i.e. 1 and 10) be omitted. It would be the straight thing to let him see our report and it would give him the opportunity – to disclaim anything with which he did not agree.

I am most grateful to Your Grace for the great kindness you showed me during a very happy week…

+ Joseph, Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle

I think the observations of the Catholic Education Council would be worth having; but they should be bound to secrecy ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

The suggested _modus operandi_ over how the Hierarchy should relate to a Minister of the Crown and communication with interested professionals within the Catholic community makes this brief missive significant. It marks a proto-experience of ecclesial subsidiarity in action. The drafting of point 10 below would suggest that this report was indeed typed up for circulation among members of the Hierarchy. It is difficult, with certainty, to establish the authorship of the Report beyond Catholic, and possibly the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, however there is strong circumstantial evidence that these are the latter’s notes:

1. The Catholic Members deserve well of the Catholic body for their presentation of the Catholic case. Great help was given by many non-Catholics. It would be a mistake to conclude that Parliament has been converted. Real indication of the numerical strength of our supporters will only emerge at the Committee stage which probably begins in about three weeks...

5. In the opinion of the President the best way to open a door to further financial concessions lay in an authoritative and clear expression by the Hierarchy that an increased measure of public control could be accepted by the Catholic body. He thought we would be wiser to retain our full independence and pay the price. But it was for us to decide, and for us to say what amount of independence we could forego.

6. Mr. Chuter Ede suggested that we might agree that we do not require all the teachers in our schools to be Catholics, and in particular that we would not insist that teachers of “special subjects” (e.g. domestic science and woodwork) must be Catholics. He also suggested that we might agree that all appointments of our Catholic teachers be made by the Local Education Authority without the obligation of obtaining the consent of the Managers; the appointments to be made from the Bishops’ list of approved Catholic teachers; the Bishops would, so to speak, issue a “certificate” to an approved Catholic teacher and this would entitle the teacher to a place on the list. A
teacher’s name could be removed from the list by the Bishops for adequate reasons.

7. The President asked us not to press him to commit himself to any definite financial concessions there and then. With this proviso he would say that an exchequer concession up to 100% for the 289 revived 1936 Act schools was not ruled out; nor was a privileged loan, though this might present greater difficulties; any attempt to increase the 50% offered in clause 95 might be attended by danger; the ceiling solution might be pilloried in certain quarters as an attempt to increase the 50% grant without Parliament understanding what was in effect being done.

8. We stressed the value of the work being done in the Schools by nuns and religious. The Catholic body was not prepared to accept any arrangement that would disturb this.

Mr Chuter Ede suggested that from that point of view we could get useful and encouraging guidance from an examination of the Instruments of Government for the Wimbledon Ursuline Convent and the Wimbledon Jesuit College.

9. In saying that we would inform the Hierarchy of the trend of this conversation we impressed on the President of the Board of Education, beyond the possibility of misunderstanding, that there was no question of our withdrawing in the very least degree from the principles stated by the Catholic Hierarchy. While financial concessions might lead us to tolerate less than financial justice we would never accept them as a settlement.

10. Will Your Lordship be so good as to indicate immediately,-

   a). Whether you are of the opinion that further negotiations should be attempted on the lines of paragraphs 5, 6 & 7?

   b). Whether you agree with us that this report be handed to the Catholic Education Council (who meet in London on Thursday) with a request for their observations ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

Often it is the asides in letters between bishops which are more interesting. For example, in a letter from the Bishop of Shrewsbury to Archbishop Griffin, 25th January 1944, he ascribes that he considers Mr. Jack Donovan “an excellent Catholic”. He writes further of him:

I hear that he is first a Catholic then a T.U.C. leader. He is the leader of the Dockers’ Union and spending his time in going round this country and N. Ireland settling the local disputes. He is intimate with Bevin who was his predecessor at Transport House. It was from him that I learned that Butler had been giving a wrong version of our attitude to the Cabinet. This was afterwards confirmed by Commander Bowers M.P. ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).
The remainder of this portfolio comprises correspondence and papers circulated within the Hierarchy, between Archbishop Griffin (and other bishops) and members of the laity and between the Church and State at different ecclesial levels. It is evident that the education debate exercised clerics, parents, officials and Ministers of the Crown. Although there was often disagreement between the Catholic Community and the political establishment, the aspirations of both were shaped by a similar default position which is best summed up as ‘revisionist’. The Catholics wrote and spoke of protecting the rights of a minority and the State of establishing an education system protecting all young people from indoctrination and preparing them for an increasingly techno-industrialised world. Both looked across the channel at a generation of ‘Nazi’ youth who had become dehumanised and morally illiterate. However, often the pieces of correspondence were not of high principle but focused on the art of the possible in their scope and substance. So, the Duke of Norfolk wrote to Churchill on 2nd February 1944 (a copy of which is in the Archive and a letter to Archbishop Griffin on 17th February 1944).

Below is a copy of the whole of Norfolk’s letter to Churchill:

My dear Prime Minster,

I am greatly concerned at the position of the Catholic Schools under the Education Bill, and, while fully realising the serious inconvenience of intruding on your time, I feel none the less bound to approach you.

The anxiety which certain proposals are causing co-religionists, unless remedied, cannot but arouse such a feeling of bitter resentment as to disturb that sense of national unity which all of us are so anxious should be maintained.

I will not dwell on the question of giving parents a greater voice in the education of their children, since this concerns all parents and not Catholics alone and will no doubt be brought out in the Committee stage. The position of our Catholic Schools is, however, on a different footing and is of peculiar concern to us, and it is on this subject I feel bound to approach you.

Our hope was that the Bill would be an agreed one and that we should be able to join whole-heartedly in its support; but these hopes have vanished and though there is much that is excellent in the new proposals, we cannot but oppose some of them on the grounds of conscience. When Butler found he could not get full agreement on certain points, he naturally got as much support as was possible for his proposals. No one could, or would, blame him for this and he has obtained such support through the general approval of the Church of England and the Non-Conformists. Unhappily, the compromise thus reached affects us greatly and is one we cannot accept. I am myself satisfied that Butler would do anything in his power to help us, but it would seem he cannot do so unless you can see your way to help him and us. We had hoped that as we pay rates and taxes like all other citizens, the Government would have been prepared to give equal treatment to Catholic
Schools, at any rate in the towns. In the country districts we recognise the Non-Conformists have a grievance in respect of single-school areas, and we are prepared to meet it. We are, however, told such equal treatment cannot be given to us as it would be contrary to tradition and offend a large section of public opinion. No one has dared to say that it would not be just or fair that we should have it.

If the Government feels that it is impossible to grant us equal treatment, then surely it ought to mitigate as far as possible the resulting injustice. Butler declares that he does not wish to injure our schools and he desires that they should continue. We are told that the present offer is more generous than any made up to now. In a sense this is true, inasmuch as the State will bear a greater proportion of the expenses, but these expenses are certain to be so much greater that in spite of the higher Government contribution we shall have to find a larger sum than before. During the last twenty-five years, we have spent nearly three and a half millions on our Schools. This meant scraping and saving since we are a poor community, and, alas! (sic) the debts and mortgages are by no means extinguished. Under the Bill we are asked to undertake liabilities of an unknown amount. The best calculations show that the minimum cost of the next twenty-five years will be ten millions, and it may reach a figure of fifteen millions in view of post-war building costs, etc. That is a burden which frankly we cannot shoulder and we shall therefore be faced with the loss under financial pressure of some of our schools.

I should hope that a generous view would be taken so that our people might not be unduly penalised if penalised they must be. If we could get 100% for the 1936 schools and in addition a loan free of interest for the aided schools where 50% is our liability, our prospects would be happier, and I am not without hope that Butler may be prepared to recommend this for your favourable consideration. If this were effected, while we would still feel we were not receiving full justice, we would do our best to cooperate in the working of the Bill when it became law and the sense of acute grievance would be removed.

I am satisfied that in making this suggestion I am acting in accordance with what would have been the wishes of our late revered Cardinal Hinsley, whose mind was absorbed in the welfare of our Catholic Schools.

Yours sincerely,
Signed FITZALAN ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

To Archbishop Griffin, in his letter of 17th February 1944, Norfolk suggested the following financial changes to the Education Bill:

For the 1936 schools: The L.E.A. to contribute 75% for these schools and the Government to find the other 25%. We have proposals for 289 of these schools and the Church of England for 37 only. It would mean an extra 25% from the Government and would not occur again. See third schedule par. 5.

For the aided schools (Primary and Secondary) under clause 95 it is proposed that we receive 50% and therefore the Managers have to find 50%
of the cost. We suggest that the figure to be paid by the government should be 75% and that managers have therefore to find 25%. We should like this to apply to BRAND NEW SCHOOLS (sic).

If Mr Butler wishes to preserve the figure of 50% in clause 95, then we ought to have a loan free of interest or a cheap loan to include interest and sinking fund at say 3% This also to apply to BRAND NEW SCHOOLS (sic) (Letter from the Duke of Norfolk to Archbishop Griffin, 17th February 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

In correspondence between Archbishop Griffin and the Archbishop of Cardiff, Griffin’s reply dated the same day we find the following advice:

...In the meantime I think you would be well advised to have proposals ready regarding the reorganisation of all your schools outside the Cardiff area, so that you will be in a position to know exactly what senior (secondary – this is the new term) schools you will require. If you cannot get the 1936 Act applied to Aberavon, Swansea, Merthyr Tydfil-Dowlais and other areas, you may still apply under the new Bill, when you will receive the 50% under clause 95, and we hope [to] be able to secure a cheap loan for the 50% the Managers will have to find. It has just been accepted that the wishes of the parents must be taken into account when the L.E.A. make proposals and we have just put to amendments as follows:

100% for the 1936 Act revived schools.
75% instead of 50% for the aided schools under clause 95. We are adding to that an amendment that this will include brand new schools and that we shall have a loan free of interest [or] at a cheap rate if the 50% is to stand.

The C of E are now after the cheap loan and the Church Assembly have just submitted proposals to Butler. I am trying to get hold of a copy of these.

In the meantime I am urging my people to storm heaven with prayers. Butler cannot stand up against these! (sic) (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to the Archbishop of Cardiff, 17th February 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

There appears a four-page handwritten paper, in uppercase, whose authorship and date is unknown; these notes rehearse the perceived danger to Catholic schools from the 1944 Bill and identify "THE HUMBLE PENNY [AS] OUR UNCONQUERABLE WEAPON (sic)".

The paper proposes the establishment of ‘The Catholic Schools Penny-A-Week’ fund to help meet the new expense on the horizon. It was envisaged that this would help raise a million pounds per annum. Below is the thesis:

Just consider there are some four millions of Catholics in Great Britain, or perhaps slightly more. If each gives only a penny a week, it will bring to The Catholic Schools Penny-A-Week Fund, nearly a million pounds a year. What
a marvellous help that would be ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944], page 2).

On 8th February 1944 Mgr John Vance writes to Archbishop Griffin on the topic of “Secondary Schools: Amendments to The Bill” as Chairman of the Association of Catholic Schools and Colleges. Members of the Association, and more particularly the ten-strong Liaison Committee thereof, were becoming more confident that the amendments and concessions made by the Government to the 1944 Bill would preserve existing Catholic secondary schools. However, they felt strongly that the Bill did not address sufficiently the need for new Catholic secondary schools. Mgr. Vance wrote thus:

Many entirely new secondary schools will be required. In the past [Catholic] schools have been opened and financed, in the main and on the whole, by the communities of Religious men and women. In future they will not be able to provide the schools, partly by reason of the number, partly by reason of their kind (Technical), and largely owing to the fact that all their resources will be required to provide (a) for their debt services and (b) for their percentage of the required alterations and improvements. Where, then, is the money to be found? The parishes surely will not be able to bear any additional burdens of debt, and the central funds in most cases are either meagre or non-existent. In Your Grace’s Diocese, for instance, in the whole County of Hertfordshire there is no Catholic secondary school for boys; in the County of London north of the Thames there is only one Grammar school for boys, the Vaughan, which lies at the extreme western boundary. There is not one Catholic Technical school in the whole of the Diocese of Westminster. Other Dioceses must surely be in a similar or worse plight. If large numbers of our children should be forced at the age of eleven to go to non-Catholic secondary schools, we fear that the leakage may be terrific. This question is our gravest pre-occupation for the future of the Church in England and for the lives and souls of our children ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944], pages 1-2).

On 8th February 1944, Archbishop Griffin also received a letter from John Boland, as the “surviving official of the old Irish Party which was so prominent and successful in the fight against the Birrell Education Bill of 1906. Leaders, Secretaries and three of the Whips have passed away, leaving me the only Whip left ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944])." The correspondent goes on to write:

It occurred to me that if the Government does not meet the Catholic Case and if subsequently (after the Bill has become an Act) the Hierarchy issue a statement calling for the continuation of the struggle, an appeal from me to the Irish Catholics in this country who voted against the 1906 Bill and to their sons and daughters, might have a useful effect after (sic) the Hierarchy has spoken. I would aim at strengthening the C.P.A., not in any way advocating separate action by Irish Catholics ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).
John Boland goes on to reassure Archbishop Griffin; “I should not dream of doing anything which could in any way hamper joint Catholic activity. My only desire is to bring in those who have been holding back ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).”

On 12th February 1944, Archbishop Griffin, writes to an unidentified bishop of Mr. Butler: “[Butler] seems to be continually shifting his position and that just leaves us guessing (Letter from Archbishop Griffin to unnamed bishop, 12th February 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).”

On 16th February 1944 Archbishop Griffin, in a letter to another unnamed bishop, writes about the current state of play in negotiations between the Church and the Board of Education. In the penultimate paragraph the following appears:

The best bit of news is that the P.M. has promised to talk to Butler about the Bill, and is to see the Duke of Norfolk next week. I am sending the Duke our suggestions as he had intimated to the P.M. that he will resign from the Government if we do not get satisfactory terms. This is all strictly confidential. I am not meeting the members at the House again for some time, but am continuing with our small select committee and we are much happier and can get down to brass tacks…(Letter from Archbishop Griffin to unnamed bishop, 16th February 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944]).

AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944

A change occurs in the Archive over how the papers are catalogued with the ‘oldest’ page appearing at the back of individual portfolios. This is significant, since it suggests that either contemporaneously or retrospectively the papers are being handled by another person. Who this person is and when these administrative decisions are being made remains unclear.

In a letter from the Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle to Archbishop Griffin, 19th February 1944, he writes:

I like your Pastoral. It is simple, direct, and full of sound doctrine well applied to today. It will do good ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

On the same day, 19th February 1944, an aide mémoire was drafted. While it is unclear whether this note was for or from the Duke of Norfolk, what is clear is that the resentment
of the Catholic community against the perceived injustice of the Education Bill is no longer veiled:

When you see the P.M. would you stress the fact of the unrest which exists among our Catholic service men about this Education Bill. We are receiving letters from them from all parts. They cannot vote, neither can they present a petition, but they are gravely concerned as to what will happen to our Catholic schools if the Bill goes through in its present form. They fear we shall be starved out and they are afraid that when they return after the war, they will find that they will be forced to send their children to non-Catholic schools or have to pay the penalty of impossible financial burdens ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

The bishops commissioned a memorandum entitled The Education Bill, 1944: Financial Aspects for Consideration by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, written by Arthur Collins, 17th February 1944. This detailed memorandum aimed to estimate future post-war building costs; the author reminds the reader in paragraph 15 that: “it is important to remember that over 80% of the expenditure on a building is paid, directly or indirectly, for labour; and so it is on labour-rates that post-war building costs will be mainly dependent ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).” In paragraph 19, Collins concludes: “Taking all relevant factors into account, including practical experience after the last war, it is my opinion that [a] 35% [increase in 1939 building prices] is understated and 100% is over-stated as the post-war building-price level. By the time the third year arrives after warfare ends, it is in my judgement reasonable to postulate that the building price level of schools of to-day’s standard will have risen by about 50% over the 1939 cost.” Collins goes on in paragraph 20 to comment:

It will be observed that this opinion links the price-level with a date. This date is not and cannot be, say, 1948, or 1949, or any other numeral. It allows for an unsettled period of demobilisation and business re-organisation, of an earlier start on (i) house-building than on (ii) school-construction; of a gradual establishment of the requisite proportions of (i) to (ii); of the establishment of fairly steady material prices, whether controlled or uncontrolled; of the settlement of land-prices under the Uthwatt (or some substituted) regulations and other considerations...

Consequently, in paragraph 21 Collins calculates that:

by preferring a basis of 50% plus on 1939 building costs to the 35% adopted in the Board of Education memorandum, one-ninth has to be added to all figures embodied in the Estimate of Expenditure on building as set out in that memorandum, both as to capital provision and annual charges on capital. (Thus £100 pre-war + £35% (sic) = £135, + 1/9th (15) = £150 post war cost adopted) ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).
This portfolio contains a twenty-page Pastoral Letter for Lent, 1944 entitled *A Lenten Pastoral Letter on The Present Education Bill and Our Catholic Schools* by the Bishop of Salford.

A note from R. R. Stokes dated 25\(^{th}\) February 1944 over the Committee discussion surrounding Education Bill:

Your Grace,

I am afraid Hansard has reported me badly in yesterday's Committee discussion. What I emphasised was that whilst we would concede the Single Schools it could only be part of general settlement and on the understanding that proper provision was made for religious instruction of the children. I am afraid I did omit to mention the rights of parents and that is the point of the whole discussion, and I don't think that will be taken amiss. In any event the Government won't accept the proposal so no harm will be done. I thought I would just write you this note in case you were in doubt about what I said. I am having the bound copy of the report altered to include the words "as part of a general settlement."

Yours sincerely,

R. R. Stokes (Note sent from R. R. Stokes to Archbishop Griffin, 25\(^{th}\) February 1944, over the Committee discussion surrounding Education Bill [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

In the general correspondence within this portfolio there is a growing awareness of the impact and cost of transport especially in either more-rural dioceses or dioceses that comprise both industrial cities and county areas. On 26\(^{th}\) February 1944, E. Mahoney (Sec. Sch. Comm., Diocese of Southwark), writes of a meeting of the Southwark Diocesan Schools' Commission that members present recommended that the offer of 75% would only be acceptable on the following conditions:

1. reasonable transport facilities must (*sic*) be provided to the nearest Catholic school. (The wording at present is merely permissive) (*sic*);
2. [t]he Bill should also make provision for entirely new Catholic schools.

In exchange for the above, the Commission recommends and would welcome that the appointment of the teachers be made by the L.E.A. from an approved panel ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

Also on 26\(^{th}\) February 1944 Lord Rankeillour writes the following handwritten note to Archbishop Griffin:
As I have not yet seen the Official Report of the debate on Friday I do not like to make any comment; but as I cannot be at the meeting on Tuesday I do wish to say that I trust that the idea of a payment per caput of school places will be further considered. It will give us a real ‘ceiling’ and I hope we might arrive at a figure not too impossible. I hate the notion of a percentage of a sum which no one can now assess ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

Mgr. Quigley, of St Helen’s, Wyndham Street, Barry, Glam, in a letter to Archbishop Griffin, dated 28th February 1944 reinforces the earlier concern over transport:

… With regard to Transport of children (sic) – the new Bill says (sect. 53) ‘A local Education authority MAY (sic) make such arrangements for the provision of transport and otherwise as they consider necessary (sic), or as the Minister may direct for the purpose of facilitating the attendance of pupils at schools, or young people’s colleges or at any course or class provided in pursuance of a scheme of further education in force in their area.’…([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

He goes on “but this will all depend upon the necessity of such. They will not now bring the children from our farthest point to this school; of course they can plead shortage of transport; but I cannot see our Welsh authorities helping much in this way…([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).” Quigley goes on to comment that in rural areas the density of the Catholic population may militate against the establishment of a Catholic secondary school without a set subsidy towards transport costs. “I think you will find that the offer of transport is to enable children to get to school who would otherwise not reasonably be able to do so; it is not by any means to enable anybody to have children brought to the school they may wish…([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).”

In a letter of 29th February 1944 from Archbishop Downing to Archbishop Griffin he comments “…Your Grace will recall that at the meeting of the Hierarchy on January 4th I tendered my resignation of the chairmanship of this “large” – or, as it became known-Liaison Committee, and suggested that Your Grace might take over the chairmanship in my place, to which you and the bishops agreed (cf. Acta no.8) ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).” This change ensured that the conduit for negotiations between Church and State became Westminster-centric once more. Interim arrangements for monitoring the Education Bill, established during the last months of Hinsley’s tenure and the subsequent interregnum, had not served the Church well.
There exists a handwritten note from Richard Stokes, 2nd March 1944, covering a typed record of a meeting held on Wednesday 1st March 1944 between The President [of the Board of Education – Mr. Butler] and Catholic Parliamentarians48 at the House of Commons. The summary of this meeting gives an insight to the remaining matters of disputation:

Summary (sic) – The President will consider any proposal we put forward in order to ensure the rights of parents, prevention of arbitrary closing by a Local Education Authority, the provision of land for brand new schools, and he is going to meet us further for a talk about the financial burden and how to overcome our difficulty. It is now for the Drafting Committee to suggest where we should urge the President to include further safeguards, and it is important that the proposals of the Drafting Committee should be available as early as possible.

Incidentally in the course of the President’s remarks he claimed that the Jewish arrangement with the L.C.C. schools is not what it appears to be, namely a complete Jewish syllabus, - it is only an agreed syllabus. This sounds contradictory to me, but as the President was not there to argue the point at the end of the meeting, it seemed better to leave the matter alone and get further facts from Bishop Brown. (Record of Meeting held on Wednesday 1st March 1944 between The President [of the Board of Education – Mr. Butler] and Catholic M.P.s at the House of Commons, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], page 3).

This last paragraph is almost an addendum to the note, yet it reinforces the point, that in the mind of Catholic Parliamentarians, the need to secure the nature of denominational religious instruction was equivalent to a just settlement over the reorganisation of schools. There was an innate unwillingness on their part to see these two issues atomised.

On the margins of the debate there were still those who were hostile towards the intentions of the Catholic Church. In this portfolio is a copy of Papist are Traitors by C.R. Boyd Freeman, undated. The first paragraph suffices to give a feel for the booklet:

For ten years I have been urging drastic measures against the political conspiracy run under the guise of religion by the Vatican gang, in collaboration with the Irish and the French Canadians, against the British Empire. In my books “Priestcraft”, “Towards the Answer”, “The Uncivilised Irish”, “By Thor No!”, “Frank Words to the Free Churches”, etc., I have fully shown up the R.C. “religion” as a mere pagan superstition with a tendency to degeneration of intellect and morals. For these reasons alone it ought not be

allowed to poison people’s minds, and its own doctrines of intolerance and persecution (carried out in practice whenever it has a chance) give other people the right and duty to treat it with drastic severity ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

This was sent to Archbishop House by Alfred Denville on 2nd March 1944 with a note: “Your Grace, I enclose a pamphlet, a copy of which, I understand all Members have received ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).” The maxim “better know your enemies” comes to mind, or as Alfred Denville commented, in a note, 12th May 1944, to Archbishop Griffin “Just as well to know our “friends” isn’t it?” He enclosed this note with another paper that was circulated to Parliamentarians by the Gospel Standard Strict and Particular Baptists. The latter “Memorandum” protested “against the religious provisions of the Education Bill.” There is no evidence, in the Archive, that Griffin responded to either publication.

In a handwritten letter from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, 55, Whitehall, SW.1, dated 14th March 1944, the Duke of Norfolk writes:

Your Grace,

This is just a line to explain why I shall not be at your meeting in Brighton next Sunday. You know the present position between yourself and Butler. I do not know where the negotiations stand but I do not wish to take any action which at this moment might adversely effect the situation. You know where I stand and hope you will agree that I had better not move.

I have not yet been to the P.M. It did not appear that I could do so as long as the discussions were going on.

If the matter is settled except for possible changes by pressure of Parliament then that will alter the position. I assume the question must the decided in the next two weeks.

Yours sincerely,

Norfolk (Letter from the Duke of Norfolk dated to Archbishop Griffin, 14th March 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

The following day there was held a special meeting of ‘The Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales’ at Archbishop’s House, Westminster. Archbishop Griffin shared with the gathered bishops a letter he had received from Mr Butler (undated) in which Mr Butler stated:
(i) That the smallest desirable unit for Secondary Schools would be from 100 to 120 children.

(ii) That where the development plan provides for a denominational Secondary School there would be no question of transferring the older children from the existing all-age school until the new Secondary School was ready, but Managers would be expected to adhere to the time-table in the development plan.

(iii) That Technical Schools within the meaning of the Bill are expressly confined to persons over compulsory school age; but in Secondary Schools, provided that the curriculum is so framed as to give a suitable full-time education, it will be permissible in such schools to have a technical bias, i.e. it would be possible to have a Secondary School with a technical wing.

(iv) That no direct grant was provided for Brand New Schools in the Bill, but that the majority of such schools will be covered by Clause 15 or by the proposed amendment to Clause 96.

(v) That the President thought that the Governors of Secondary Schools would wish to opt for aided school status (Acta, Special Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, Wednesday, March 15th 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], § 1).

This letter seems to be in addition to a Memorandum issued by Mr. Butler, 8th March 1944. Archbishop Griffin was asked to raise the following points with Butler over the Memorandum:

(i) The Bishops ask for a written guarantee by the Board of Education that they will force the Local Education Authority to give the 75% for the construction and sites of Special Agreement Schools, or failing such compulsion, that the Board will use its powers, granted under Clause 96 of the Bill, to supplement up to 75% in those cases where the Local Education Authority has refused some or all of the grant.

(ii) The Bishops are concerned that the power of making loans should be entirely at the discretion of the President in view of the frequent changes which may occur at the Board of Education.

(iii) The Bishops consider that the inclusive figure of 4.5% interest on loans is too high to give necessary assistance; they suggest a figure more like 3.5% to 4%, and the period to be not more than 35 years (Acta, Special Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, Wednesday, March 15th 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], § 1).

In conclusion of the discussion at the Meeting the following resolution was proposed and adopted unanimously:

While we continue to maintain our frequently expressed claim for simple justice, we recognise that the Government has gone a considerable way to meet many of our representations and we are of [the] opinion that on the lines
of the Memorandum of 8th March 1944, a settlement could be arrived at such as would be acceptable for the time being.

We propose adjustments (given on the accompanying sheet [– frustratingly, this is not in the Archive]) for the consideration of the President. On arriving at such a settlement we shall do our best to co-operate in working the Bill (Acta, Special Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, Wednesday, March 15th 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], § 1).

Interestingly, the next resolution reflects the amount of time bishops, both individually and collectively, spent reflecting on the education legislation:

2. It was decided that in view of the frequent meetings of the Hierarchy which had been held recently, and the Government’s wish to restrict travelling, there should be no meeting in Low Week this year (Acta, Special Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, Wednesday, March 15th 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], § 2).

This commitment did not signal an end to exchanges between the bishops, their officials and with Ministers. There are several complete and partial pieces of correspondence. On March 24th 1944 Lord Rankeillour wrote to Archbishop Griffin:

Yesterday I sent Lord Grey a message…

Dear Lord Grey

I saw the Archbishop of Westminster yesterday and am able to say that we are entirely disinterested in the proposed ‘option’ as to security for the loan, so long as it is an option and not a condition of the advance. We should never contemplate any agreement whereby our schools might become ‘controlled’; but it must be a matter for the managers of other schools to make such arrangements as suit them best… (Letter from Lord Rankeillour to Archbishop Griffin, March 24th 1944, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

In a letter from the Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle on 1st May 1944 to Archbishop Griffin we read in the second paragraph:

I am glad you have prevailed on Butler to do something more for parents. And if you can get a low ceiling and some concession for New (sic) schools it will be just splendid. I think Butler is particularly well disposed towards […indecipherable] and I hope he will take the opportunity to show it in a practical way. I fancy that Salford’s grumbling may well prove helpful: and it is well that there should be somebody to strike the note that he is striking (Letter from the Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle to Archbishop Griffin, 1st May 1944,
There is a copy of an exchange of correspondence between bishops. Bishop Pella in writing to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle on 10th May 1944 seems more than a little discouraged with the state of play:

There is discontent up and down the Country over the failure to improve the Bill. I never thought we could get it done, but many thought I was mistaken. But once a Coalition Govt had agreed on its main lines and had arranged with all except Catholics I never expected to get better terms …

The Hierarchy will be blamed, someone always is for failure, and I think it would have been wise to get the opinion of the CEC & parents more than was done. Card De Lai insisted on the Scottish CEC and parishioners being fully consulted besides the Bishops. I had to tell him the result before the Consistorial assented to the Hierarchy accepting the 1918 Bill!

I hear at least one Bishop was very peremptory when told by a person of position, that he had been approached by an influential non-Catholic who thought he might be able to help in certain important quarters “It is entirely a matter for the Bishops.”

The co-relation of sole responsibility is sole blame if things go badly. And so it will be in me. Experience tells me Bishops seldom shoulder responsibility when blame comes. Do not think I suggest it could have been different in [the] present legislation. The time for other action was long ago. But we may be in for a nasty conflict between North & South which must be deplored. I hope you are quite well. I am sorry to hear +Northampton is still unwell.

Always in Domino

William Brown
Bishop of Pella ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

The Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle replies on 12th May 1944 and copies his reply to Archbishop Griffin; clearly, he does so with filial concern for a fellow bishop and perhaps, a greater feel for the art of the possible and the game afoot. In private, there is clearly ambivalence towards the Bill among certain members of the Catholic Hierarchy, annoyance with the perceived duplicity of the Anglican Hierarchy, and a growing acknowledgement of the role of the Catholic laity in negotiations. The hope of Hinsley’s ‘Sword of the Spirit’ is long gone. This ambivalence has found expression in subsequent negotiations. Was Canterbury facing towards the Free Churches or towards Rome?

My Dear Lord,
Thank you for your letter. I agree that there is dissatisfaction with the Bill. But instead of saying it is “up and down the country” I would say it is universal and united in the whole Catholic body, - bishops, priest and laity. The Bill cannot be a permanent national solution; and we have not been given a square deal.

But the Bill may pave the way for a final solution. Am I wrong in thinking that Your Lordship’s own consistent opinion has been that subject to any adjustments we could secure the present Bill was inevitable as half-way house to what we want? Did anybody having knowledge of educational politics and administration really hope for more than adjustments at the present time? Anyway, a half-way house is what we must seek to make of it? We shall have to dig our heels in and keep up our courage.

As you rightly say the Vote of Censure interpretation spiked our guns finally and completely. Mrs C.K.’s little equal pay victory had the unforeseen effect of leaving us alone and powerless to make any effective protest against the Bill. We were isolated at once. But the basic obstacle to a really fundamental settlement (and politically the decisive obstacle) has been the C of E’s avoidance of a conclusive bargain for themselves. They did indeed make a bargain for themselves as between the Government and the Free Churches; and the Archtemple (sic) called it “a glorious opportunity”. But though they were thereby satisfied in conscience and pocket beyond their own hopes they persisted in demanding a share in any concessions made to meet the Catholic conscience. This had the effect of creating opposition to Catholic claims which would otherwise have been met. The C of E ought to have had the honour, honesty, and sense to make their bargain and retire from the fray. However under the administration of the Bill the C of E will largely have their problems settled for them (sic). Once that is done (3yrs, 5yrs, 7yrs?) and before we get into financial difficulties we must seek a negotiated settlement for Catholic schools. If the present temper of the country can be maintained we ought to be able to make a move in this direction before long.

I can see no sign of cleavage between North and South. I don’t believe there is or will be any. Why should there be? The Catholic Herald is regularly mischievous. Its suggestion of cleavage, in last week’s issue, was typical and contemptible Herald journalesse, - and completely misrepresented the quoted text of the Leeds C.P.A. statement. I know Your Lordship has had an anxious and trying time, and I always wonder how you stand the strain of all the work you do. But I hope you won’t be swayed by the pessimistic sensationalism of the Herald; nor let it dishearten you. You have a lot to do for the Church of God yet. And there will be no cleavage.

Our little handful of Catholic M.P.s, excellently coached by Your Lordship in educational matters, have in fact secured many and valuable concessions. They have kept their heads and their tempers. They have aroused no bitterness. They have exceeded beyond expectations in presenting the Catholic case. Butler stated specifically in the House that Catholics do not accept the Bill as a just measure. And I see that Sir John Shute has finally re-asserted this in the 3rd reading. All this will help us I am sure in our next advance beyond the mid-way house.

Your Lordship is an old hand and I feel like a child in knowledge and experience beside you. But I hope you won’t mind my setting down these
points as a disjointed and incomplete outline of the present position as it appears to me.

Yours devotedly and fraternally
+ Joseph, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

Somewhat prior to the above correspondence, in a letter dated 22\textsuperscript{nd} May 1943, from the Reverend V. P. Nevill to the Archbishop of Liverpool on behalf of the Conference of Catholic Colleges, Catholic educationalists were exercised by the organisational ramifications of the proposed Bill, especially, “the proposed new ‘lay out’ of schools whereby Senior Schools will come under the Secondary code (Letter from the Reverend V. P. Nevill to the Archbishop of Liverpool, 22\textsuperscript{nd} May 1943, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], page 1).”

Nevill goes on to make seven substantive points concerning organisation, training and funding. While the content of this letter is guided by a common sense approach to the operational challenges facing the Church, the proposed solution takes insufficient cognisance of the canonical rights and responsibilities of individual bishops. The loci of policy making for State and Church are diametrically opposed. Within England and Wales, even with devolution, education policy is set nationally by the respective Secretaries of State; whereas ecclesiologically, education policy is set locally by the diocesan bishop. Even with amendments to 1983 edition of the Code of Canon Law within a Conference of Bishops the subsidiarity envisaged by the Second Vatican Council can remain “virtual” with individual Ordinaries following separate policy schemas in response to concerns over ‘authority’ and ‘capital’. The multi-layered natures of the four voices, namely ‘normative’, ‘formal’, ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’, help interpret this complex field of inquiry. Paradoxically, the strands of the current debate over Academies lie dormant in the compromises made implicitly and explicitly during the passage of the 1944 Education Bill.

The above anomaly is most evident in Nevill’s first point:

1. Strong and immediate measures by the Church in this country are called for to anticipate and prepare for the crisis in Secondary education which will certainly arise at the end of the war or possibly even sooner (Letter from the Reverend V. P. Nevill to the Archbishop of Liverpool, 22\textsuperscript{nd} May 1943, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944], page 1).
How it was resolved is expressed most clearly in an Ad Clerum from the Leeds Diocese entitled *The New Education Act*, 22nd June 1944. Subsidiarity would take place locally also within dioceses:

…Since, We, as Bishop are responsible for all the children of the diocese and for the organisation of all work for the salvation of souls, We have appointed a

**Leeds Diocesan Schools Commission (sic)**

Vice-Chairman: The Very Rev. Mgr. C. Tindall.  
Secretary: The Very Rev. Mgr. J. Dinn.  
   The Very Rev. Canon W. Hudson.  
   The Very Rev. Canon J. Grogan.  
   The Very Rev. Canon J. Bradley.

The Commission will be responsible for carrying out in the diocese the plans for the reconstruction of schools and the provision of new schools according to the needs created by the requirements of the new Education Bill. This applies to all (sic) schools and to all (sic) districts whether under the acre of seculars or regulars.

The local clergy will give all help possible to the Commission by contacting their L.E.A and finding out their requirements. But it is for the Commission to negotiate with the L.E.A.

…Whether the present Bill will ever come into practical effect is a question of doubt. But in any case we must be prepared, for otherwise our schools will be left behind and lost.

+Henry John  
Bishop of Leeds ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

Within this portfolio there is a ‘Marshalled List of Amendments’ for the report stage of the Bill in the House of Lords, 11th July 1944. Lord Rankeillour seems to have been very vocal in the later stages of the passage of the Bill. Although in a handwritten note to Archbishop Griffin, 15th July 1944, he writes somewhat diffidently:

My dear Lord

I am very grateful for Your Grace’s kind letter. Perth & I did what we could but it was very late in the day.

Believe me

Ever sincerely yours
Rab Butler clearly wanted to assure Archbishop Griffin of the Government's good intentions, even after the Report Stage of the Bill had been completed. In the correspondence between them, Archbishop Griffin realised the importance of making explicit that which was still implicit in the amendments of the Bill; so that any new Minister or new administration after the War would appreciate the spirit of the Bill, its mechanisms and responsibilities to the Catholic community. Justice in this matter was not to be aspirational but corporeal. Butler also recognised that Griffin was attempting to assuage concerns both within the Hierarchy and wider Catholic community. In a letter, dated 25th July 1944, he writes to Archbishop Griffin about the administration for the loans that would be made available to the Church:

…I can assure you that the Government are in sympathy with the general sense of the amendment which Lord Rankeillour moved at the Report stage of the Bill; indeed, that is clear from statements which I myself made on this subject during the Committee stage in the House of Commons.

There is no hidden significance in the use of the phrase "on the same sort of basis as the local authorities". I would point out that it would have very considerably lessened the usefulness of the facilities offered to managers and governors in the Loans Clause if the Bill had provided that loans were to be made on the same conditions as loans are made to local authorities, for such a provision would have implied that the managers and governors would be required to offer security equivalent to that required of local authorities through the rates. The Government realised that this would not normally be possible for managers and governors to comply with such a requirement and that in consequence the extent to which managers and governors would be able to take advantage of the loan facilities would be very much restricted. They accordingly adopted a different arrangement and, by making the loans available under provisions which do not imply this requirement, they have, as you will appreciate, placed managers and governors at an actual advantage in this respect as compared with local authorities in the matter of raising loans from public funds.

I will consider whether it would be practicable to make any general statement about the administration of loan facilities under the Bill. Meantime I can give you an immediate assurance that the inability of managers or governors to offer security equivalent to that which local authorities are required to offer will not stand in the way of their borrowing money at favourable rates of interest: and further, that in the terms for loans for work of a similar character there will be no differentiation against the managers of a small primary school as compared to managers of a large secondary school. I cannot attempt to anticipate what will be the actual rates of interest chargeable in the post-war years on these loans any more than I can anticipate what will be the rates of interest on loans to local authorities. I can, however, say quite definitely that it is intended that in cases where a loan is granted to managers or governors the rate of interest will be more favourable than the managers or governors could
obtain from banks, insurance companies and other similar sources, and that it will be akin to that applicable to loans to local authorities.

The Loans Clause is an entirely novel provision and we have no experience to guide us as to its administration. You can, however, be sure that, consistently with the Minister’s due responsibility to Parliament in the administration of public money, the Government intend to operate it so that it will be of real practical benefit to those whom it was expressly designed to help, and I feel confident that the sceptical attitude which I am sorry to see from your letter that some of your people are adopting will not be justified by experience.

Yours sincerely,

R. A. Butler ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

There is an interesting note from Lord Rankeillour that would suggest that Cardinal Griffin has been successful in his endeavour of eliciting from Butler reassurances. Since Butler, either knowingly or unknowingly, disregarded parliamentary convention:

27th July 2012
My dear Lord,

Thank you for sending me Butler’s letter. I am sure he is quite bona fide; but he should not have said “the same” in his second speech unless he was prepared to bind his successors by words in the Act.

Ever sincerely,

Rankeillour ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).

In a one-line note from Dyson Bell & Co., dated 3rd August 1944, Archbishop Griffin is informed that the Education Bill “to-day received the Royal Assent ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944]).”

AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File E: all no date (n.d.)
In this portfolio there is a miscellaneous group of papers; most of the papers have no date and authorship. The audience to whom these papers are addressed is also unclear. In one paper entitled Main Details of Case for Catholic Parents and Electors in Regard to the New Education Act, there are ten points made. Evidently, there was still suspicion over the provisions of the new Act. The last three points are particularly germane and although the provenance is unclear it is attached to another paper entitled Statement of Catholics Parents and Electors re New Education Bill. The type and tenor of both papers is similar:
8. We affirm our full agreement with the pronouncement of the Prime Minister in his broadcast of Sunday, 21st March 1943 – who said:

There is another element which should be banished from our system of education. Here we have freedom of thought as well as freedom of conscience. Here we have been the pioneers of religious toleration. But side by side with all this has been the fact that religion has been the rock upon which they have built their hope and cast their cares. This fundamental element must never be taken from our schools (sic).

9. The time has arrived for the removal of the fundamental injustice against Catholics in the 1870 Act and the elimination of the Cowper Temple Clause. Provision is made in the Forces (i.e. the appointment of Chaplains) to meet the requirements of various denominations, why not so in Education?

10. Catholic Education is not inimical to the State and instills submission to lawful authority. Catholics accept equality of sacrifice and service in War and they expect equality of treatment in the matter of Religion and Educational facilities for their children ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File E: all no date (n.d.)]).

AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45

In a report for the ‘Conference of Catholic Colleges’ found in this portfolio entitled The Fleming Report and Direct Grant Schools [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45] reference is made on page 1 to a report published by the Fleming Committee in July 1944. The commissioning of the Fleming Report seems to take cognisance, at some level, of the existent diversity within the education system and the amalgam of Trusts and practices operative within the Catholic Church. There is concern for the provisional nature of the Government’s deliberations in response to Fleming and the fair distribution of ‘Associated Schools’. The most interesting comment made in The Fleming Report and Direct Grant Schools concerns salaries:

9. The estimate of annual costs will allow for the payment of all salaries at least on Burnham Scale; an important point for schools now conducted by Religious, where there own subjects, if not their secular teachers, have been often paid extremely low salaries. For other items of expenditure, the ordinary accounts we have had to supply to the Board as a condition of receiving

49 The Public Schools and the General Education System.
50 Archbishop Griffin, in a letter to the Bishop of Shrewsbury, 4th December 1944, writes:

...I will ask Mr. Butler when the Ministry are going to publish the instrument of management and government. From inside information I do not think the Ministry of Education itself has clearly made up its mind as to the best method of dealing with secondary grammar schools throughout the country. I was on the point of submitting to the Bishops points which could be sent round to our convent schools and teaching brothers, but just at the moment it is not possible to give them a clear lead ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).
direct grant are a sufficient guide. We are also used to the requirement that one-third of our Governing body should be composed of nominees of Local Authorities; that requirement will still hold (The Fleming Report and Direct Grant Schools, [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45], page 2).

Butler is clearly concerned not to disrupt relationships with the Hierarchy as is seen in a letter written by him to Archbishop Griffin, 17th October 1944. This note, written by the Secretary of State, not officials in his Private Office, reassures Archbishop Griffin personally that no slight is intended by the non-attendance of Sir Maurice Holmes at a meeting on the next day with the bishops. In the febrile atmosphere of the Bill’s recent passage through Parliament, where the inconsequential took on added significance, Butler leaves nothing to chance:

My dear Archbishop,

I am very sorry to say that Sir Maurice Holmes has influenza and will not be able to come to Your Grace’s meeting to-morrow morning. He was intending to bring with him Mr. W.C. Cleary, who has given us invaluable assistance throughout the preparations for the Education Act and is fully conversant with the problems of the Denominational schools. In the circumstances I am asking Mr. Cleary to deputise for Sir Maurice Holmes and he will be ready to come to Archbishop’s House, Westminster at 11 a.m. or at such later time that you name. Perhaps your Secretary would like to telephone Mr. Cleary direct, Sloane 4522, extension 180 (sic), to tell him the time when his attendance is desired.

Yours sincerely
R.A. Butler ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).

Within the portfolio, there is a list of detailed questions by dioceses, and detailed preliminary observations, with the proviso that these answers, in type by Mr Cleary, should not be used in negotiations between individual dioceses and particular local education authorities. The Ministry was clearly sensitive not to infringe on the latter’s newly delegated authority:

GENERAL

…many of the questions do not admit of a categorical or unqualified reply if only because in addition to the managers and governors and the Ministry there is a third party whose views in each particular case will have to be considered, namely the local education authority. In so far as the questions relate to primary and secondary schools, the fact must not be overlooked that it will be the duty of the local education authority to prepare the development plan (Section 11 of the Act) which will embrace primary and secondary schools and will cover many of the matters which it is clear are exercising the minds of those who have asked the questions.
…While therefore the answers aim at giving all the help possible, any statements made or views expressed cannot in any way prejudice the position of the local education authorities. Nor should the replies be used by managers in their negotiations with local education authorities. It would be agreed that the Minister would be placed in an intolerable position if, for example, a body of managers when discussing transport arrangements with a local education authority were to be in a position to say “But the Ministry’s representative assured the Hierarchy that the Ministry regarded it as quite reasonable that the local education authority should convey Roman Catholic children 10 miles, or whatever the distance might be” (Answers given by an Officer of the Ministry of Education to Questions on the 1944 Education Act put by Members of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy: [18th October 1944]. [AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).

A letter to all Bishops from Archbishop Griffin over the first amending Bill dated 19th December 1945, concludes “…the Ministry is pressing for an immediate reply before publishing the Bill, I am in touch with the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle and the Catholic Education Council. May I presume that you will allow us to act on your behalf ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).” Attached to this letter is an agreed note of meeting between Archbishop Griffin and the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle with the Ministry of Education, held on 13th November 1945. Three areas were covered in the meeting:

- one, the proposed increase of the school leaving age to 15 in 1947 and the required additional temporary building stock;
- two, the proposed temporary use of existing voluntary school buildings as Aided Grammar Schools;
- three, the establishment of an additional New Catholic Training College for Men Teachers51 ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).

51 Concern over numbers of teachers generally was rehearsed in an article in The Times, 28th March 1945, entitled ‘D Day in the Schools’:

…Those responsible for public education are attempting to prop up with one hand the crumbling wall of “what is” while they manfully wield the trowel of “what might be” with the other. The most acute educational problems of the next 12 months, from the administrative point of view, will revolve around, not the idiosyncrasies of divisional executives or diocesan education committees, nor the interminable controversy of the “multi-” versus the “uni-lateral” secondary school, but around the plain, ugly fact that many thousands of married woman teachers will be returning to the business of home-making as a full-time job, and many veterans fading away to a postponed or interrupted retirement, long before newly qualified teachers are emerging in adequate numbers from the training colleges. It will not be a question of reducing classes from 50 to 40 but preventing them rising to 60; not so much a matter of raising the school-leaving age to 15 as of ensuring those under 14 get full-time schooling ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).
Although particular issues these three areas reflect generic concerns recorded in the Archive over the bedding in of the new Act and a deep and growing suspicion, on the part of the Church, of local education authorities. 'Institutional' inequity was being experienced locally. The following commentary appears in this note:

There is no evidence available to us that Local Education Authorities are consulting the voluntary bodies or taking account of the needs of voluntary schools in this matter of temporary accommodation. On the contrary the declared attitude of certain authorities on the permanent accommodation which will be required for voluntary schools so completely ignores the wishes of parents (e.g. in the provision of transport, provision of boarding accommodation, co-operation between neighbouring local authorities etc.) that we are compelled to assume that the same attitude exists regarding this more immediate question of the provision of temporary accommodation ([AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File F: 1944-45]).

**AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46**
The letter of A. C. Dawes to Archbishop Griffin, 23rd January 1945, is one of a series of letters, some of which are in the Archive and some of which have perished. However, the operational detail of this letter over the advantages of various types of provision i.e. 'Direct Grant' and 'Aided' reveals the cost of greater subvention. Money and governance are linked on a sliding scale of uniformity and freedom. Reconciling these two opposing principles has been at the heart of educational debate in and since 1944. This is perhaps summarised best in an undated aide-mémoire, the authorship of this note is unknown. However, it is sceptical in the idealised nature of the 1944 Act believing that many of its aims are unfeasible due to a paucity of qualified teachers, lack of buildings and potential costs. The fifth, sixth and concluding points are revealing:

5) Nothing at all has been definitely stated about the content of future education, because nobody knows what this content is going to be – neither the Ministers nor the teachers.

   First of all, what is going to be the object of this education? We ought to have this clearly defined.

6) We don’t want a standard, uniform education throughout the country. We are tired of listening to statements that the object of the new education is to level down everybody. We want freedom and variety within the scheme.

   Let us sit down calmly and think things out carefully, and not rush at some unknown thing which might do more harm than good (one-page note with no authorship and undated, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).
In the portfolio, there is a confidential four-page briefing paper on the proposed amending of the 1944 Act. It begins, in the introduction, with an acknowledgement that “it is only to be expected that a measure of the size and complexity of the Education Act, 1944, would be found to need amendment and clarification in certain respects and already experience has shown this to be the case (no author, no date, Confidential Note on Proposed Clarifications and Amendments of the Education Act, 1944, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46], page 1).”

2(ii) reads:

2 (ii) The duty should be placed on the Local Education Authorities where they extend the site of an existing voluntary school or provide a new site for a transferred voluntary school under Section 16 to convey the land to the Trustees of the school. In many cases the school Managers and Governors will have to erect buildings on this site, often out of charitable funds and it would be quite inconsistent with the Charitable Trusts Acts to allow Managers or Governors to expend their charitable money in erecting buildings on somebody else’s land with no security of tenure whatsoever. The proviso to Section 14 (1) of the principal Act provides Local Education Authorities with ample financial safeguards (no author, no date, Confidential Note on Proposed Clarifications and Amendments of the Education Act, 1944, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46], page 1).

In the following paragraph the author acknowledges that “the Trustees may, however, be able to sell the old premises for a considerable sum of money. In such cases it is considered that the Trustees should pay, out of the proceeds of the sale of the old premises such sum as the Minister may consider just to the Local Education Authority as a contribution towards the cost of new buildings. It is proposed to place a duty upon the Trustees accordingly (no author, no date, Confidential Note on Proposed Clarifications and Amendments of the Education Act, 1944, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46], page 1).”

The Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle urges caution over responding to any proposals “You might just acknowledge it [to the Ministry] and say there are not likely to be any big difficulties raised by the Catholic Hierarchy, but there might be some small amendments at a later date after there has been time to consider it fully – in other words play for time. His Lordship will write fully when he has thought about it (ascribed in pencil, 19th December 1945, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).”

To this end, there follows a two-page handwritten letter and a typed one-page addendum, dated 19th December 1945. Separate from this in the Archive are two-sides of detailed
notes drafted by Fr. John Milroy who advised the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle in his correspondence with Archbishop Griffin. What follows is in the Addendum, part of Milroy’s notes is in my footnote related to Robert Mathew’s letter to Archbishop Griffin, 29th December 1945:

…duty of the Authority to convey…to such persons as the Minister may direct to be held on trust for the purposes of the school.

As Your Grace suggests it would be well if there were an obligation on the Minister to direct that the property should be held in trust by those appointed by the competent religious body.

I think it is even more important that the trust itself should be defined. The importance of such a declaration of trust is seen from Section 67 n 3, - a case in which it is the declaration of Trust which empowers the Bishop to make a decision about the adequate giving of religious instruction. This is an example of the importance of the terms of the Trust (Addendum, Letter from the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, 19th December 1945, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46], page 2, section 2).

Robert Mathew, of the Catholic Education Council, in a letter, 29th December 1945, writes to Archbishop Griffin cautioning against two clauses:

Then first is the proposal that in the event of one of our schools being discontinued under the second paragraph of Section 2 (XI) the school may be transferred to the Local Authority, and no suggestion is made that the Authority would be bound to use it for educational purposes. As the only circumstances in which we would discontinue a school would presumably be where we were unable to carry it on owing to the number of children being insufficient, the Local Education Authority would equally be able to carry it on as a School. Under the provisions of the 1936 Act the School site would[,] in these circumstances[,] have remained our property (sic). I think it is important therefore that we should see that similar provisions are inserted in the Bill.

The second point which I do not like is under Paragraph 2 (ii) which provides for our schools to be vested in the Managers as Trustees. Although this only refers to schools or extensions of existing Schools where the Authority has compulsorily purchased the land if the principle is allowed in this case, I feel the Ministry may wish in the near future to extend them to all our schools. I know that the Ministry views with increasing disfavour, the expenditure of public monies upon Schools over which the Managers have no effective control i.e. that the school could in practice be discontinued without the Managers being able to prevent it52 (Letter from Robert Mathew to Archbishop Griffin, 29th December 1945, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

52 In undated notes, Fr. John Milroy, raises concerns over 1st Schedule n.6. These notes were included by the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle in a letter to Archbishop Griffin, dated 20th January 1946 with permission to share them with Mr Mathew. Due to the order of the Archive it is difficult, with certainty, always to know what draft individual correspondents are referring to, however, what this aide-mémoire reveals clearly are budding tensions between ‘national representatives’ and ‘diocesan representatives’ within the Church:
William Castle Cleary (Deputy Secretary at the Ministry of Education), writes a confidential letter to Archbishop, now Cardinal, Griffin congratulating him on his elevation Cardinal and enclosing (unattached in the Archives) a latest copy of the Amending Bill. In Cleary’s commentary, he notes that the order of the clauses has been amended, for technical reasons. However, he concedes that the more substantive change has been to clause 5:

We were only allowed to proceed with the Bill at all on the definite understanding that it would not occasion controversy. We found when we came to consult the various interests concerned that the proposals in the original clause 5 (first, to allow pupils excused from attendance at religious worship or instruction at school to attend denominational worship at church and, secondly, to allow the denominational instruction at controlled schools to be given off the school premises) met with considerable opposition.

It was quite evident that this opposition was likely to be carried on to the floor of the House and we had, therefore, to decide whether to drop these

1st Schedule. n.6. re Conveyance of site provided by L.E.A. “TO SUCH PERSONS AS THE MINISTER MAY DIRECT.” Mr Mathew suggests “Managers”. His reason hardly holds for Catholic schools. The Minister may ask for laymen. Could she guarantee, in case of Catholic schools, to follow existing procedure and direct conveyance to Diocesan Trustees.

“TO BE HELD ON TRUST FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE (sic) SCHOOL”. This means that trustees hold sites and buildings on a special educational trust and not on the general trust as previously. Mr Mathew says that the present freedom of the Trustees (they continue to hold on the general trusts when the special educational trust ceases) will be altered. But the circumstances are altered. Previously the site was conveyed on general and (sic) special trust because we paid for the site. The 1936 Act was only a temporary expedient. The 1946 Act legalises a permanent procedure, and in this case the L.E.A. pay for the site, convey it to Trustees for the special purpose, and when that special purpose ceases it will revert to the L.E.A. The buildings on such a site (for which we pay 50%) may be legally lost to us.

The safeguard would be a provision allowing us to recover of the value we have paid just as the Act allows recovery of the value paid from public funds in case of the discontinuance of a school (Notes ascribed to Fr. John Milroy, undated, The 1946 Bill, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

In the fourth paragraph of the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle’s covering letter to Archbishop Griffin, he writes:

It has occurred to me since typing the above that the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary always insisted in their interviews with us that any loans granted by the Minister would have to have for each diocese the pledge of repayment by the Bishop (sic) of the diocese. I fancy this also applied to grants made by the Minister dependent on his being satisfied that we could meet our obligations. Anyhow if the Ministry looks to the Bishop for security in parting with or in lending public money for Catholic schools it seems to me that we would have a strong case in favour of the appointment of Diocesan Trustees (sic) by the Minister as the right persons to whom sites should be conveyed by the L.E.A. I think this might be put to Mr. Mathew (Letter from Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Archbishop Griffin, 20th January 1946 [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).
particular proposals or to have a fight in the House and run the risk of losing the Bill altogether and with it that part of clause 5, still in the Bill, which enables the collective act of worship in aided and special agreement schools to take place, on special occasions, in church. We came to the conclusion that the balance of advantage lay in adopting the former alternative.

I am afraid this decision may be disappointing to you, but I hope you will agree with me that there are several things in the Bill which are of real advantage to the Church (especially clause 3 with the First Schedule which, incidentally, came as rather a shock to the Nonconformists, at all events when they first saw it), and it would be a great pity to risk a serious “religious” row in the House at this stage on something of not really first-rate importance (Letter from W.C. Cleary to Archbishop Griffin, 10th January 1946, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

In a letter from Archbishop Griffin to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, it is apparent that the former is less confident of the delegated authority given to him by the other bishops in dealing with the Bill (1946) due to his forthcoming visit to Rome. Given that the whole matter may flare up whilst he was in Rome, echoing what happened in the negotiations around the 1870 Act, he suggests:

Would you like to suggest some other bishop, i.e. Clifton, to help you in dealing with the problem? I don’t want to shirk but somebody must act in case of urgency...(Letter from Archbishop Griffin to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, 23rd January 1946, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

What is noteworthy in this suggestion is that he does not propose the Archbishop of Liverpool. In responding the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle also concurs that he would not wish to be thus exposed.

In correspondence between Robert Mathew and Archbishop Griffin dated 24th January 1946; it is apparent that the former concurs with the reservations of Fr. John Milroy on the revised text of the Bill and had already changed instructions to Mr Hope, the Council’s barrister. In the third paragraph, recognising the diocesan bishops were underwriting the education project, he writes:

The point made by Your Grace to secure the transfer of sites purchased by Local Education Authorities to the Diocesan Trustees is an excellent one. I must confess that I could think of no argument to resist an order from the Minister directing the schools to be transferred to Managers (Letter from Robert Mathew to Archbishop Griffin, 24th January 1946, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

53 The social context after the war that brought about a new Government is one of change and is summed up well in the musical Malcolm Stent, Go & Play Up Your Own End. Families are being re-constituted and soldiers had come back from the trenches but what had changed.
Mr Mathew and the Archbishop seem to be working at cross purposes at the end of January with an exchange of rather testy and formal letters. However, what this reveals is the growing need for specialised, technical advice in the realm of education legislation. Archbishop Griffin proposed a meeting of “our former Amendments Committee to approve of amendments drawn up for the committee stage of the [Education] Bill…” on Wednesday 6th February 1946 at 4 pm. This letter, located in [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46], was sent on 1st February 1946 to: Sir Patrick, Mr. Quirk, Mr. Hope, Mr. Mathew, The Bishop of Pella, Lord Rankeillour, Mr. Stokes, Fr. John Milroy and the Earl of Perth. Their proposed amendments were forwarded by Archbishop Griffin to Ellen Wilkinson, the relevant Minister before his departure to Rome. At the heart of the proposed amendments was a desire to secure mainly the rights of ‘Diocesan Trustees’ in any decision by the Minister to either close an aided school or the change the status of an aided school into a controlled school. The latter was unacceptable to the Catholic community, on a matter of conscience well rehearsed during the passage of the 1944 Bill; the three scenarios were drawn as follows:

- if the local education authority wish to acquire the premises to establish a 'controlled' school: The Minister shall make an order under which the trustees of the school shall convey the premises to the local education authority who shall pay the trustees such sum as represents the expenditure incurred by the trustees in the establishment or alteration of the school less an amount to be fixed by the Minister in respect of the deterioration of the buildings (Education Bill: Draft Amendments, undated, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]);
- “if the local education authority do not wish to acquire the premises for the purposes of a school and the value of the premises exceeds the total expenditure incurred on the establishment or alteration of the school the Minister will make an order under which the trustees shall pay to the local education authority such sum as represents the expenditure incurred by the Minister, any local education authority or former authority on the establishment or alteration of the school (Education Bill: Draft Amendments, undated, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46])” less the normal proviso on deterioration;
- in the case where the local education authority do not wish the premises and sale of the aforementioned is below the costs incurred by all parties then the settlement made to the local education authority by the trustees will be proportionate less the normal proviso on deterioration.

Miss Wilkinson in turn replied to Bishop Joseph McCormack, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, in a letter dated 14th February 1946 to which he replied on 20th February 1946 “acknowledging the “large measure of agreement between us on the objects which we have in mind.”
In a quirk of history since no Catholic M.P. was co-opted onto the standing committee, the ‘Catholic’ amendments to the Bill were moved by R. A. Butler. While some of these amendments were withdrawn others were disputed with HMG, Bishop Joseph McCormack wanted a clear assurance that if a school closed, because of conscience, no benefit would be lost (Letter from Bishop Joseph McCormack, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, to Miss Wilkinson, 20th February 1946, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]). This is most clearly rehearsed in his subsequent letter to Miss Wilkinson, dated 9th March 1946:

I am still, however, concerned about section 2 (c) of the First Schedule as I am advised that there is considerable doubt as to whether this sub-section could not have the effect of converting a voluntary aided or special agreement school into a controlled school against the wishes of the original managers and trustees. Our position is that if we are unable or unwilling to carry on an aided or special agreement school we should be assured that we can employ the procedure laid down in Section 14(1) of the Principal Act and the Second Schedule of that Act (Letter from Bishop Joseph McCormack, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, to Miss Wilkinson, 9th March 1946, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

One of the responses to increasing bureaucratisation of the education system is a move from theological reflection on the ends of education to protecting the Church’s assets. Inadvertently this made the Church ‘inert’.

In a letter dated 21st March 1946 from Robert Mathew to Cardinal Griffin he comments on the enclosed copy of Hansard (no longer in the Archive) concerning the debate on the third reading:

Your Eminence will see that the Parliamentary Secretary gave a categorical assurance that our amendment was unnecessary as paragraph 2 (c) of the First Schedule in no way affected our rights under Sections 14 and 15 and the Second Schedule of the Principal Act. This assurance was a repetition of the one which I obtained from the Parliamentary Secretary and Mr. Dawes, the Chief Legal Adviser, when I saw them with Mr. Cleary on Tuesday 19th March.

Although the assurance which has been given on the floor of the House is of some benefit and protection to us while the present Government is in office, I am afraid that it would be quite useless if another Government were to place a different interpretation upon the construction of paragraph 2 (c).

I am sorry to say that I am not in agreement with the interpretation placed upon the effect of this paragraph by the Ministry and it seems to me to be clear that this paragraph places an unqualified duty upon the Managers of an Aided or Special Agreement School where they are unable to carry out their financial liabilities. Colonel Hope, as Your Eminence is aware, held the same
view (Letter from Robert Mathew to Cardinal Griffin, 21st March 1946, [AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46]).

AAW Gr 2/21A 1946-47

In this portfolio there is correspondence on a draft memorandum from Mr Todhunter on the financial side of the Education Act. The frustrating aspect is only extracts of the memorandum survive in this portfolio since Cardinal Griffin enclosed the remainder in his reply to Canon Wood dated 6th January 1947. Canon Wood's main concern is rehearsed in his letter to Cardinal Griffin, 3rd January 1947, in which he writes:

In drawing up this memorandum the C. of E. had to be kept in mind but their financial arrangements are not the same as ours, for their schools are owned locally and are the property of the parish, not the diocesan trustees as are our schools, and it is our diocesan trustees who should make the arrangement with the Minister. I take it that the Bishop as chief trustee will decide what schools he wishes to be aided schools and then that he will enter into an arrangement with the Ministry. If that is so then these suggestions of Todhunter will not meet our case (Letter from Canon Wood, Westminster Diocesan Schools’ Association, to Cardinal Griffin, 3rd January 1947, [AAW Gr 2/21A 1946-47]).

There is some disquiet elsewhere in this letter that the Catholic Education Council should attend to this consultation without direct reference to the Hierarchy. Cardinal Griffin in his reply to Canon Wood begins “Todhunter, I think, is trying to reconcile the method employed in the Church of England with that which we employ in the Catholic Church ([AAW Gr 2/21A 1946-47]).” He encourages Canon Wood to meet with Robert Mathew, one or two his colleagues plus Mr Todhunter and see how the memorandum might be amended to best meet “the present conditions of the Catholic Church in this country ([AAW Gr 2/21A 1946-47]).”

AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47

This portfolio provides a fascinating depiction in the exercise of authority within the Church, the beginning of ‘operant’ subsidiarity and how it affects the nature of relationships between educational officials working for the Church locally and centrally, along with a narrative of receding ‘clerical’ rights.

The firestorm began with a letter from Canon Wood to Cardinal Griffin, dated 7th December 1946:
...Canon Browne and I were asked to go to County Hall last Wednesday to hear the views and suggestions of the education officers on the method of choosing the teachers. The accompanying letter from the L.C.C speaks for itself. The point is that in the Articles of Government of aided voluntary schools they hope the officers of the L.E.A. shall be presented in an advisory capacity at meetings of governors where appointments of headteachers are under consideration. The appointment will be made by the governors or managers after they have heard what the officers may have to say about the needs of the school and the qualifications of the candidates. In special agreement schools the L.E.A. appoint…([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).

There follows a candid admission, on behalf of Canon Wood: “I am quite sure that we have never had the best teachers appointed to our headships, for our managers usually appoint on other than educational grounds ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).”

Griffin consulted with the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle and Mr Mathew; but was sceptical over ceding any more influence to the local education authority. In a letter to Canon Wood, dated 9th December 1946, he argues that the local education authority already has nominees on management committees and does not feel that the education officer should be present, in an advisory capacity, at interviews of headteachers by right:

as far as I can see the only bargaining power we have with the Government for further concessions for our voluntary schools is the appointment of teachers, and although the education officer or his representative will not have a vote, he will certainly have a good deal to say in the future appointment of our teachers ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).

The Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle is more forthright in his reply to Cardinal Griffin, dated 10th December 1946:

...I am in full agreement with Your Eminence that such an arrangement, giving a right (sic) to the Education Officer to attend would be undesirable. It would be a surrender of a principle of liberty and it would have practical dangers. It would be quite in order to insert a reminder to Managers that they may invite (sic) the Education Officer to be present if they wish to do so (sic), - but not that they must (sic). I am enclosing a copy of the Catholic Education Council’s Rights and Duties of managers, and this very point is dealt with on

54 The L.C.C. was hoping that the following lines would be approved by the Ministry for insertion in the Articles of Government of aided voluntary schools: The Education Officer or his representative shall attend any meeting of the governing body at which the appointment of a head teachers is under consideration. He shall have the right to speak but not to vote ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).
Robert Mathew was consulted on this matter by both Cardinal Griffin and the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle. He did not believe that this proposal constituted an important question of principle. He conceded that “the suggestion made by Bishop McCormack that a Diocesan representative should also be present at these meetings, provides the necessary safeguard, in my opinion, to see that no undue influence is exercised by the Education Officer or his representative upon the Managers or Governors ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).” Mathew went on to remind the bishops that Section 24 of the Education Act 1944 states that in the Articles of Government or the Rules of Management for an Aided School, provision may be made for enabling the Authority to prohibit the appointment without their consent of teachers to be employed for giving secular instruction, and also for enabling the Authority to give directions as to the educational qualifications of the teachers to be so employed.

In Mathew’s concluding a paragraph he informed Cardinal Griffin that the Catholic Education Council was preparing Draft Model Articles to the effect that:

the Authority shall be entitled to appoint a representative to attend any meeting of the Governors at which the appointment of a Headmaster (Mistress) is under consideration. Such a representative shall have the right to speak but not to vote ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).

In a brief note to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle on 3rd January 1947 Cardinal Griffin wrote ‘Quid tibi videtur?’ The above revelation by Mathew raises serious concerns in the mind of the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle over the constitution of the Catholic Educational Council and the ‘executive’ authority of its officeholders to represent individual, self-governing dioceses in ‘collective’ national negotiations.

In a letter by the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Cardinal Griffin, dated 9th January 1947, he writes:

55 Catholic Education Council, Rights and Duties of School Managers in Catholic Non-Provided Schools, 1939, marked paragraph on page 4: “Nobody except a manager has the right to attend a managers’ meeting. A director of education, an inspector or other official of a local authority can only attend a managers’ meeting by invitation of a majority of the managers present at the meeting ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).”

56 A literal translation of this maxim from Matthew 17 might read “What might be seen to you?” Looking at the biblical context, the original was probably spoken in colloquial Aramaic. Therefore a colloquial reply would be expected, rather than a literal and legally correct reply...perhaps something like “What do you think?”; “What does it seem like to you?”; “What is your opinion?” or “How do you see it...understand it?”
My own feeling is that it would be a major mistake to accept the proposed legal obligation. It may be all very well in theory, but in actual life it would be disastrous. And in general I do hope the Catholic Education Council will resume its duty of calling the Executive together to go into the whole of this question carefully and without delay. During the war the calling of the Executive of necessity fell out a bit. But there seems no reason now why this constitutional requirement should not be resumed.

The Draft Articles went around in August last, - I know this as Fr. Milroy got a copy and sent up his observations. He is very alarmed about some of the suggestions in the Draft. Anyhow nothing in the way of consultation appears to have taken place since then.

Personally I would like (when the proposed Articles come before the Bishops for acceptance) to feel that the Catholic Education Council can guarantee to us that the question has been carefully examined by the Council which accepts full responsibility for it.

We must, as I see it, retain in full our right to appoint the teachers, and that means freedom. Otherwise when the time comes for a permanent and just settlement of the Education question we shall have already been disarmed. Butler always told us that the 1944 Act was only an instalment of justice, and he always advised us not to surrender the appointment of teachers (Letter by the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Cardinal Griffin, 9th January 1947, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).

Fr. Milroy's notes are attached to this letter. In a letter, dated 7th March 1947, Cardinal Griffin writes to Canon Wood:

We strongly object to the proposal to have inserted in the Articles of Government: "The Education Officer or his representative shall attend any meeting of the governing body at which the appointment of a headteacher is under consideration. He shall have the right to speak out but not to vote (Letter from Cardinal Griffin to Canon Wood, 7th March 1947, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).

AAW Gr 2/21A 1947

In this portfolio there are detailed papers on:

• the need of transport so that the imperative of free education does not become aspirational for parents who choose to send their children to aided schools - "The secretary, Gloucester County Education Committee writes to parents: "in view of the heavy burden which will be placed upon the Authority in respect of the payment of extra-district fees to Gloucester and Bristol for Roman Catholic children attending schools in the areas of these Authorities, they could not in addition undertake to bear the cost of transport...They

57 After each bullet point I have included one case study; the criterion of choice is due to either an annotation or line in the margin.
consider that the parents of children on the immediate fringe of Gloucester and Bristol would, in the circumstances, be prepared to meet travelling costs if any (Paper submitted by the Bishop of Clifton, 6th May 1947, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]);

- the size of schools – “We find Authorities averse to anything but whole form entries. For example, in a town area, in re-organising existing schools, the Catholic child population requires for accommodation and convenience, schools of 1.5 form entry (420 infants and Juniors). The Authority does not look on the proposal with favour (Paper submitted by the Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle, undated, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47])”;

- Schools Development Plans/Interim arrangements – D.C.S. foresees considerable difficulty in the interval before the Catholic part of the L.E.A. Development Plans can be put into practice. Where the L.E.A.s have reclassified their schools there will be a temptation for Catholic parents to send older children to the new County Secondary schools. If possible the Catholic Authorities should obtain from the Ministry a promise of equal priority with Local Education Authorities for all building and reorganisation schemes. As a rule Local Authorities have not paid any attention to this matter but the Director of Education for Leicester at a meeting with D.C.S. [5th February 1947] agreed to give top priority to the provision of a 4-stream Catholic Modern school...He thought that it would be possible to complete such a scheme in three years (Paper submitted by the Bishop of Nottingham, undated, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]);

- the provision of playing fields.

It is often difficult to identify the provenance of individual case studies and papers located herewith but they have been gathered together under a general subtitle of: Deputation To Meet The Minister of Education: Wednesday, 21st May 1947 and someone thought they were worth keeping.

Interestingly within this portfolio Cardinal Griffin is relying more and more on the counsel of the Archbishop of Birmingham along with the Bishops of Hexham and Newcastle and Clifton whom he invites to supper the night before the meeting at the Ministry on 21st May 1947 ([AAW Gr 2/21A 1947]). In the Archive there is a letter from Cardinal Griffin’s Private Secretary to the Private Secretary to the Minster Of Education. On the Catholic side, the aforementioned bishops attended with no record of officials from the Catholic Education Council. The following agenda drawn up by Cardinal Griffin’s Private Secretary was thus proposed:

---

58 In a note written to Cardinal Griffin’s Private Secretary, by Canon Manion, of Birmingham, 12th May 1947, he rehearses the record of an answer given to questions submitted to Sir Maurice Holmes at the Bishops’ Meeting with the Ministry on 18th October 1944. A question of the size of schools came from the Bishop of Menevia. Holmes’ responds “…in considering whether he could approve a proposed new school the Minister would aim at securing a secondary school with a minimum of one-form entry, i.e. about 120 pupils (when the leaving age is 15 and classes are limited to 30) and a primary school with a minimum of a half-form entry, i.e. about 120 pupils ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1946-47]).”
1. Transport and payment of travelling expenses.
2. Bilateral schools.
3. Scholarship.
4. Schools Certificate classes in secondary schools.
5. Interim arrangements and priorities
6. Representation on Education Committees (\textbf{[AAW Gr 2/21A 1947]}).

The Minister, and Ministry officials, would be left in no doubt as to diversity experienced in the implementation of the 1944 Act by dioceses across England & Wales. Infuriatingly, there is no copy of Minutes from this meeting in the Archive.

\textbf{AAW Gr 2/21B 1947}

This extract from \textbf{AAW Gr2/21A & B} offers a fascinating insight to how the Church coped with the increased bureaucratisation of Government and its response thereto; many of the theological and operational challenges are expressed in current intra and extra ecclesial dialogue. Competing narratives of ‘control’ and ‘freedom’ provide the backdrop for this legislation specifically and Church-State relations generally.

The outcome of the above conversations and negotiations can be seen below: \textbf{1947 Education Acts 1944 and 1946: Articles of Government for Catholic Voluntary Aided or Special Agreement Schools}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(5)] (i) the appointment of the Headmaster (Mistress) shall be in accordance with the following procedure:-

  \begin{itemize}
    \item[(a)] the vacant post shall be advertised by the Governors and a short list of not less than 3 (if there are so many) shall be drawn up from such of the applicants as appears to the Governors to be likely to be qualified and suitable for the post.
    \item[(b)] The Governors shall meet to interview the applicant on the short list and shall appoint one of such applicants to the post of Head Master (Mistress) [subject to the approval of the successful applicant’s educational qualifications by the Authority.] (sic)
  \end{itemize}

  (ii) The Headmaster (Mistress) shall be employed under a written contract of service with the Governors which contract shall be in conformity with the provisions of the following Article relating to dismissal and suspension, but otherwise shall be determinable by either party thereto giving to the other [six] months’ notice in writing to take effect at the end of any school term.

  \item[(7)] (i) The Authority shall have the power to determine the number of teachers to be employed in the school and may give directions as to the educational qualifications of the teachers to be so employed for the giving of secular subjects
\end{itemize}
(ii) Subject to any determination and directions the appointment of assistant Masters and Mistresses shall be made by the Governors after consultation with the Headmaster (Mistress)
(iii) All such appointments shall be made in the first instance on probation for a period of one year and shall not (sic) be confirmed until the consent of the Authority has been obtained.

(10A) The persons engaged for the purposes of the care and maintenance of the school shall be appointed and dismissed by the Authority [Other non-teaching staff shall be appointed and dismissed by the Governors] (Arnold Fooks, Chadwick & Co., 15, Bolton Street, Piccadilly, London W1, 1947 Education Acts 1944 and 1946, Model Form of ARTICLES OF GOVERNMENT for CATHOLIC AIDED or SPECIAL AGREEMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).

Within this portfolio there is reference in correspondence to a meeting between members of the Hierarchy and Ministers at the Department on 21st May 1947 over three issues, namely, (a) Transport for Pupils to and From School (b) Payment of Boarding Fees and (c) Extra District Children. In a letter, 10th June 1947, to the Catholic Education Council from M. Howlett (Department) addresses all three areas. Of particular interest is the response to Transport:

As your Council are aware (sic), the Minister has in Administrative Memorandum 63 and Circular 83 already advised authorities that their transport arrangements should be such as to enable pupils to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents so far as is compatible with the provision of efficient instruction and training and the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure; and where parents have expressed a desire for their children to attend a particular school on denominational or other reasonable grounds, transport should be arranged provided that certain conditions are satisfied.

Under Section 11 (2)(g) of the Act, authorities are under an obligation to include in their development plans information as to their general arrangements for the transport of pupils to and from school, and in considering these Plans the Minister has regard among other things to the obligations to which their attention has been drawn in the Administrative Memorandum and Circular already referred to (Letter to Catholic Education Council from M. Howlett, 10th June 1947, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).

What is apparent is that the right to transport is presumed and not enshrined in legislation. The official goes on to qualify his reply “the Minister is not...able to accept the suggestion which seems implicit in the fourth paragraph of your letter that an authority’s arrangements under Section 55(1) of the Act should be made without regard to the definition of walking distance in section 39 (5) of the Act (Letter to Catholic Education Council from M. Howlett, 10th June 1947, [in AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).” Transport was never more than a
premise; something Griffin was acutely aware of. This premise is reinforced in the official’s response to the payment of Boarding Fees: “The Minister would not, as a general principle, be disposed to consider that the lack of a school of a particular denomination within daily travelling distance of a child’s home was of itself sufficient ground for considering that the provision of boarding education was expedient in any individual case (Letter to Catholic Education Council from M. Howlett, 10th June 1947, [AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).”

Canon Wood represented Cardinal Griffin at an interview with Sir William Cleary, Ministry of Education. Canon Wood’s record of the meeting sent to Cardinal Griffin, dated 22nd October 1947, makes fascinating reading as much for today as then. The focus of the meeting was the ability of “business managers satisfying the Minister under Section 15 (2) of the Act that they are able and willing to meet the obligations which would repose of them under Section 15(3)(a):

(1) Sir William Cleary said that the Minister must be satisfied, before granting aided status, that the Managers are able and willing to meet their financial obligations that will fall on them in reconstructing their schools and to provide their share of the money in the case of special agreement schools and to meet the maintenance charges which will fall on them in due course…
(3) It is accepted in the Ministry that the Treasury will probably be asked to lend the full amount we require in most cases.
(4) It is known that our schools are not in educational trusts but are the property of the diocesan trustees who lease the school property to the Managers, the Bishop being the chief trustee. The Ministry wish it were not so but that there were educational trusts. But surely this would not be to our advantage.
(5) The Education Act provides that the Managers (sic) must show that they are able and willing to meet the costs. The Ministry suggest however that the application form for aided status, which has to be sent to them through the L.E.A. should in each case be first dealt with by the Diocesan Schools Association and approved by the Bishop ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).

The letter goes on to discuss “suggested costs which seem to us fantastic”. In the eighth point we read:

59 What is remarkable is the role of the State’s institutional memory. From after the Second World War, in various guises, the State has sought to establish separate educational trusts. This aspiration is rooted in a civic desire for ‘control’ and ‘accountability’. The present-day model of ‘Academies’ far from being innovative is atavistic. Care should be taken in what is being acquiesced in response to pragmatic resolution. In the Acta of the Bishops’ Meeting October 1948, under ‘25. Education d), we find “The question of school trust was referred for future discussion ([AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).”
If Managers were granted Treasury loans and then defaulted it would not be the case of taking proceedings against them; but it would seem that the schools would become controlled schools ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).

There follows in the portfolio a letter from the Ministry, 24th November 1947, Sir William Cleary writes to Cardinal Griffin. The key paragraph is:

Accordingly, the Minister would be prepared to accept evidence by the Managers or Governors showing either (a) that they had already raised or secured definite promises of a substantial capital sum sufficient to indicate that they would have a reasonable prospect of getting adequate funds by the time the building work would be due to be carried out under the Development Plan; or (b) that they are able, as shown by past experience, to raise a steady sum annually substantially greater than that necessary to meet merely the estimated annual cost of external repairs. In either case the Minister would also wish to know that the Bishop supported the particular school concerned and undertook to give financial assistance, if necessary, to its Managers and Governors (Letter from Sir William Cleary to Cardinal Griffin, 24th November 1947, ([AAW Gr 2/21B 1947]).

AAW Gr 2/21 1948

Canon Wood in further correspondence with Cardinal Griffin, 9th January 1948, over the countersigning of applications for new Voluntary Schools by the local Ordinary concludes:

“I take it that what Your Eminence decides will be acceptable to the other Bishops, for there surely ought to be a general practice for all the Catholic schools in the country (Letter from Canon Wood to Cardinal Griffin, 9th January 1948, [AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).”

Within this portfolio there is correspondence between Cardinal Griffin, the Religious Orders and Mr J.L.B.Todhunter of the Ministry over the desire of the Ministry to involve the Director of Education in the appointment of individual head teachers particularly of Convent Schools. The Ministry perceive the pecuniary interest of the Religious Order is sometimes undermining the appointment of the best candidate. While the State perceives this as an issue of accountability and justice, the Church interprets this as a matter of right and authority. In a letter to Cardinal Griffin dated 21st January 1948 Mother Mary Pauling, The Chairwoman of the Association of Convent Schools, concurs with the judgement of the Hierarchy that: “it would be most inadvisable to admit the Director of Education to the meeting of the Governors which appoints the head Mistress. One member considers that in their particular case no harm would be done but nevertheless supports the general principle ([AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).”

In a letter from Canon Wood to Cardinal Griffin over a proposed meeting at Archbishop’s House over the funding and establishment of Form I8 Schools (i.e. Aided Schools); a
sentence belies the wrangling taking place within the Archdiocese between educational officers and the diocesan treasurer. Loans would be awarded for individual schools against the assets of the Diocese. The Cardinal suggested that Father Rivers the new diocesan treasurer, and Canon Cahill (Diocesan Treasurer) from Southwark, be invited to a meeting with Mr Todhunter on 17th February 1948. Wood’s reply is quite peremptory arguing that there is no need for either Rivers or Cahill to attend since “the conference will be dealing with more important matters than the book-keeping with which those two are concerned ([AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).” In each generation there are initiators and those who are charged with finding the wherewithal to undertake what is proposed. On 27th February 1948 Sir William Cleary, of the Ministry, in a letter to Cardinal Griffin suggests the following wording over individual schools seeking the support of the Local Ordinary before a proposal is submitted to the LEA and Ministry. Cleary who had been involved in earlier negotiations was aware that Catholic schools had been built “on the pennies of the poor” and was mindful that individual bishops were chary at accepting inestimable financial liability. He proposed the following wording which met the proper discharge of the Minister’s statutory obligation and found favour with Cardinal Griffin:

This application has the support of the Bishop of the diocese, who undertakes, so far as necessary and to the best of his ability, to assist the Managers or Governors in carrying out their obligations under section 15(3)(a) of the Education Act, 1944 (Letter from Sir William Cleary, of the Ministry, to Cardinal Griffin, 27th February 1948, [AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).

Although there was agreement in principle of this proposal the details of a necessary deposit of 25% or more led to an exchange of letters which remain unresolved by the end of this Portfolio. A letter from H.E. Weston, Welsh Department, Ministry of Education, Curzon Street, to the Bishop of Menevia, Bishops’ House, Wrexham, raises how limited resources would be used in the field leading to the following assertion:

Urgent demands on the Ministry of Education for [the] raising of the school leaving age, movements of population, including new housing, the increased birth rate, overcrowding and insanitary conditions at existing schools, and the need for training [for industry] are at present so heavy that it is impracticable to give any facilities for the erection of new Primary and Secondary schools required on denominational grounds, except where additional Primary and Secondary schools are required in a particular district irrespective of denominational considerations. It is accordingly clear that no question of erecting the proposed R.C. Schools in Llandudno could in any case arise for some time to come…([AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).
Before replying the local Bishop deferred this to Cardinal Griffin and felt the letter should be put before the whole Hierarchy in the fear that “if it is passed over in silence, grave misunderstanding may arise at some future date (Letter from the Bishop of Menevia to Cardinal Griffin, 30th December 1948, [AAW Gr 2/21 1948]).”

AAW Gr 2/38 Apostolic Delegate 1944-63
1944, 1945 & 1946
The first part of this portfolio comprises arrangements for the consecration of the Bishop of Nottingham and the remainder deals with the pastoral care of Catholic soldiers with the British military and Catholic prisoners of war. Nowhere, apart from a paper concerning the establishment of an Institute of Education founded in Durham for the training of teachers and the likely impact on neighbouring Catholic Teacher Training Colleges is ‘education’ mentioned. The paper whose provenance is the University of Durham is dated 25th November 1946 and the initial response from Cardinal Griffin concerns precedence and Catholic Governance.

AAW Gr 2/38 Apostolic Delegate 1947 & 1948
Cardinal Griffin wrote to Archbishop Godfrey, Apostolic Delegate, 8th January 1947, acknowledging his prior letter on ‘Secours Catholique’ as well as the letter he had also received from Cardinal Suhard on the same subject:

You will be glad to know that we are already represented on the committee and, in addition, I propose sending a representative of the C.C.R.A. to a meeting to be held within the next month or so in Paris. From the letters you sent to me, I gather that both the Swiss ecclesiastical authorities and the French ecclesiastical authorities are trying to make their centres international. Mgr. Montini is very reserved in his letters to them and, in fact, has refused to send a representative from the Holy See to the meeting which is being held in Switzerland. I gather that the Holy See has no objection whatever to national organisations co-operating, but at the same time it does not feel that the time is ripe for the setting up of an international organisation. However, if such an international organisation was set up, the headquarters would probably be in Rome ([AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).

Archbishop Godfrey, Apostolic Delegate, wrote to Cardinal Griffin on 28th February 1947 asking for information on those dioceses who had registered as Corporations under the Companies Act, 1929. Cardinal Griffin replied on 4th March 1947. This exchange of letters was initiated by a concern registered with the Holy See (Exchange of Letters between Archbishop Godfrey and Cardinal Griffin dated 28th February 1947 and 4th March 1947 respectively, [AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]). Cardinal Griffin replies, drawing on his experience in Birmingham and Westminster, 4th March 1947:
The objection to the corporation I think might be that if parish properties are incorporated into a trust, the parish priest loses the right to administer the parish property. I did not think this is an insuperable difficulty because no parish priest was compelled (sic) to have the parish property invested in the diocesan corporation. It has always been left to each parish priest to have the transfer made voluntarily (sic).

This has been observed also in the Westminster diocese. In fact, parish priests have welcomed the arrangement. It avoids, [as Cardinal Griffin’s letter to the clergy states], the problem of the all too frequent appointment of new trustees. Secondly, it also avoids the difficulty with which we have been faced in the past of finding parish property without any trustees at all – since previous trustees have all died. In some cases the property has been claimed by the relatives. I knew of one case in Birmingham, prior to the existence of the corporation where the diocese (sic) had to buy back the presbytery from the relatives. Thirdly, though this was not mentioned in the notice, by declaring ourselves a charitable trust and corporation, we can claim rebates of income tax and each parish in the corporation benefits. Thousands of pounds were recovered in Birmingham after the corporation was set up and the same has been done here in Westminster (Letter from Cardinal Griffin to the Apostolic Delegate, 4th March 1947, [AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).

Both ad extra conversations between State and Church are founded on authority and governance as well as ad intra conversations between parish priests and their respective bishops.

The postscript of a letter from the Apostolic Delegate to Cardinal Griffin dated 13th March 1947 offers an interesting insight into post-war society:

After our conversation concerning conscription, and the possibility of our Church students being called up, I have been wondering whether some system by which the students were bound to attend, during the vacation time, for two years, lectures on chaplaincy work and the [Royal Army Medical Corp] R.A.M.C., might be proposed and found satisfactory by the Government…

…The R.A.M.C. proposal has the advantage of giving point to the undesirability of the students being trained for fighting. In Catholic countries on the Continent I think Church students are enlisted in what was called the “Sanitaire”. I often heard whilst in Rome, of Church students from Belgium and elsewhere speaking of having their military service in this way.

…If every student who was liable to be called up, had perforce to undergo this training, the Government would not be embarrassed by having to admit that the exemption from military service had been made in our favour (Letter from the Apostolic Delegate to Cardinal Griffin, 13th March 1947, [AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).
In the middle of the portfolio there appears ‘triangulated’ correspondence between Cardinal Griffin, Archbishop Godfrey (Apostolic Delegate) and Joseph Scott (a prominent Republican from the West Coast of America). Scott a confrère of Hoover, in his letter of 11th March 1947 to Archbishop Godfrey, identifies two matters of concern uniting the Church on both sides of the Atlantic. Namely, one the unresolved Irish question, and the need for “an honest plebiscite” that would determine the question of partition believing that if such a vote was against partition, then there could be no further complaints. Scott believed that Lincoln’s phraseology at Gettysburg “Government of the people, by the people and for the people” held true for Ireland ([AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48])." Two, the threat posed by Communism, Scott opines “there is no question that the leadership of His Holiness is being intensified daily among non-Catholic Americans who maintain that the Catholic Church is the only organisation that can cope with this atheistic Communism (page 2).” Cardinal Griffin, in a letter to the Apostolic Delegate 25th March 1947 concludes “I do feel, however, that the Labour Government would be in a better position than any other to settle the Irish question and I shall be glad if you would let your friend, Joseph Scott, know that I will do everything possible to help. I feel that anyone who knows Ireland realises that the partition of the country is a grave injustice and is economically unsound ([AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).”

In a letter dated 22nd May 1947 Cardinal Griffin acknowledges receipt from Archbishop Godfrey of a book entitled The Netherlands Solution of the Education Question on which he reflects “I have only had time to glance through it but I am convinced it is going to be not only interesting but extremely useful ([AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).”

Another indication of post-war life is a letter dated 28th October 1947 sent to either Archbishop Godfrey or to Cardinal Griffin over a missing lady, Mde Sozanska Wojnowska, whom the British Red Cross and the British Consul in Italy had failed to trace after the war; with a request “I wonder if it would be possible for the Vicar Apostolic to trace her. I should be very grateful if you could help in this matter. Every other source has been tried, including the Polish Embassy ([AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).” Amidst the renewal of the education system, so the lives of individuals and families were also being re-constructed.

There is a sense by 1948, of the reinstitution of some semblance of normality in relations between Rome and individual dioceses. In a letter from the Apostolic Delegate to Cardinal Griffin, 2nd March 1948, three issues are raised: ‘Peter's Pence’; a reminder that individual ‘Pastoral Letters and diocesan communication to the clergy’ should be sent to the Delegation; and the submission of ‘Catechetical Reports': “I have received a
communication from the Sacred Congregation of the Council in which I am informed that the Catechetical Reports to be presented by the Bishops according to Pope Pius XI's decree Provo Sane Consilio (12 Jan. 1935: AAS 27-145) have been due since the end of 1946 which concluded the five year period. It is mentioned that only one report has been received. Accordingly, I have replied that I am communicating with the Bishops about this matter. These reports may be sent either directly to the Congregation of the Council, or, if preferred, through this Delegation ([AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48]).

**Gr 2/38 Apostolic Delegate 1949-1951**

The portfolio begins with a letter from Archbishop Godfrey, Apostolic Delegate to Cardinal Griffin, dated 1st January 1949, reporting the arrest of the Cardinal Primate of Hungary and a request that the Cardinal, members of the Hierarchy and members of Catholic "societies and organisations" lodge messages of support “deploring the grave injustice committed by the Communist Government ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951])."

In a letter from the Apostolic Delegate to Cardinal Griffin, dated 28th April 1949, marked ‘Personal’ we get the first indication that the latter’s health is failing significantly:

**Personal**

My dear Lord Cardinal,

I have received your letter of the 28th April, and am glad to know of the application you have made to Rome.

It is good to think that you are in a place where you have peace and quiet, and are being well cared for. I am sure the good Sisters of the Holy Child will be most devoted and helpful in every way. If the period of convalescence takes some time, I am sure you will not be too anxious, because you must, with God’s help, get thoroughly well again and recover your full strength ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

On 28th June 1949, in a handwritten note from Archbishop Godfrey, he welcomes Cardinal Griffin back to his Cathedral. Business returns to normal with a letter from Cardinal Griffin to Archbishop Godfrey on 4th July 1949 over liturgy and on 5th August 1949 over Canon Wood:

...You will see from the decision of the bishops at the Low Week Meeting, 1948, under no. 19 that Oscott were asked to revise the ORDO ADMINISTRANDI SACRAMENTA (sic) and it was suggested that whilst the revision was taking place certain ceremonies might be placed in English with

---

60 Seemingly, not in the Archive.
the Latin on one side of the page and the English on the other, and that after
the bishops had seen the revision, application should be made to Rome for
the use of the vernacular for the administration of Baptism, Extreme Unction,
funerals and churchings, especially since the French Hierarchy had received
similar permission. We were then thinking of having the Ordo Administrandi
bound up as a supplement to the Rituali Romanum.

I do not know who wrote the article but I have only just seen it because it
must have arrived whilst I was ill. But there is no question of any translation of
the Roman Ritual into English; it was a question of a revision of the Ordo
Administrandi Sacramenta.

The English Liturgy Society has no authority to exist. Most of the people are
cranks…([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

Griffin continues:

I am sending you a copy of an application I have sent to Rome for Canon
Wood to be made a Domestic Prelate. I am sure you know all about him. He
has been a tremendous help to me in reorganising the schools of the diocese
and such a distinction would be welcomed, I know, by all the clergy with
whom he has had to deal …([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

However, a letter from Archbishop Godfrey to Cardinal Griffin, dated 22nd September 1949,
acknowledges a setback in the Cardinal's health:

I sympathise with you in your setback which I trust may prove to be merely
temporary. We must all pray very earnestly for your complete restoration to
health and strength. You know that you are in all my Masses and prayers…
([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

What is apparent in this portfolio is the way in which Cardinal Griffin is becoming more
reliant on Father Worlock for the ordered running of his office. On 24th October 1949 Fr.
David Cashman (Secretary to Archbishop Godfrey) writes to Fr. Derek Worlock:

My dear Derek,

His Grace is grateful for the papers recently received concerning education,
and he would be glad to have another copy of:-

a) The letter to Mr. Tomlinson.
b) The letter to the Clergy.
c) Catholic Voluntary Schools - possible solution.

He would also be very grateful if he could have a second copy of any other
circular sent around on this subject as the Holy See is very concerned and
His Grace keeps them informed of all developments.
With every kind wish ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

Through Fr Worlock the Holy See was kept apprised of developments. There is no evidence, for or against, over whether Cardinal Griffin was aware of this agreement. However, what is intriguing is that this letter is not copied into the Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle who had been assisting Cardinal Griffin in such matters, nor mentioned either to him or by him in subsequent correspondence with/by Cardinal Griffin.

3rd November 1949

Dear David,

In accordance with your letter of 24th October I am sending you two copies of the letter which his Eminence is today sending to catholic peers and M.P.‘s.

In itself it is self-explanatory but perhaps I should let you know that the Bishops’ Standing Committee for education has set up an Action Committee, the members of which are: - the Bishop of Hexham & Newcastle; Bishop Beck; Mr R.A.G. O’Brien and the Rev. G. Winham (Catholic Education Council); Councillor M. Burns (Westminster); A.C.F. Beales (Southwark); Mr Gabriel Wall (Salford).

This Committee met last Sunday and elected Bishop Beck as chairman and Mr R.A.G. O’Brien as secretary.

Its purpose will be to co-ordinate activities in connection with the education campaign and to arrange propaganda, etc. Bishop Beck and other members of this Action Committee will hold a press conference at Archbishop’s House tomorrow to elaborate and answer questions about the leaflet on Catholic voluntary schools. National, provisional and religious newspapers have been invited to this conference

I think this brings the matter up to date but if there is any further information you want please let me know. I will, of course, keep you informed of all developments.

With good wishes,

Yours very sincerely,

Private Secretary ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

On 8th November 1949, Fr Worlock wrote:

Dear David,

I enclose two copies of the letter recently circulated by Bishop Beck as Chairman of the Coordinating Action Committee for Education to the various Catholic societies.
Please do not bother to acknowledge all these things unless some point requires clarification.

Yours sincerely,

Private Secretary ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

Cardinal Griffin wrote to Archbishop Godfrey on 7th December 1949:

Your Grace,

Thank you so much for your letter.

May I say how delighted I am at the appointment to Southwark. I think we can hope for happier relations between Southwark and the rest of the Hierarchy and I was very glad when he came to ask me whether I would be able to consecrate him. My medical advisers had a consultation as to whether I could do this ceremony and they have given me full permission. In fact, they do not think that the ceremonies affect me very much. The real problem is the big speeches and the frequent audiences I am supposed to give to all and sundry.

In case you may be alarmed at the attitude taken by the two main Parties with regard to our Memorandum on the education question I want to assure you that we are going ahead to interview all candidates and I have written a pretty strong note to the editor of the Catholic Herald especially regarding the so-called “representative Catholics”. I have also told the Catholic M.P.s. that I want this matter settled on a non-Party basis, that I want some help from them and that I don’t want Catholic M.P.s merely to follow the Party Whip. I think it is a good sign that we have met with some opposition because this has happened so often in our problems and in the difficulties I have had in dealing with the Government but eventually, with God’s help, we get our way.

With kindest wishes,

Your devoted and affectionate brother in Christ

Archbishop of Westminster ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

In a handwritten reply to Cardinal Griffin, dated 13th December 1949, Archbishop Godfrey writes:

...I have news now that
Canon Wood is made Domestic Prelate
&
Father Worlock, Privy Chamberlain...([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

And Cardinal Griffin replies on 14th December 1949, apologising for his use of the typewriter:
...I am most grateful to you for giving me the news that Canon Wood is made a Domestic Prelate and Father Worlock a Privy Chamberlain. Both are, as you can imagine, very delighted indeed. May I thank you for what you have done to support my application. Canon Wood has well deserved the recognition for all he has done in the reorganisation of the schools and Father Worlock is to me what David is to you.

Please give David my kindest regards. I send you every best wish and please accept my deepest thanks and affectionate regards…([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

On 31\textsuperscript{st} January 1950 Fr Worlock writes to Mgr Cashman:

Dear David,

His Eminence the Cardinal has asked me to let you have two copies each of the speeches made by Bishop Beck and himself at the Catholic Schools Rally at the Albert Hall last night.

These really cover most of what was said at this great meeting but if you so wish I will try to secure from Mr. O'Brien copies of the other speeches. Just let me know.

With good wishes,

Yours very sincerely,

Private Secretary ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

Around 27\textsuperscript{th} August 1950, there is an exchange of correspondence between Cardinal Griffin and Archbishop Godfrey concerning the one hundredth anniversary of the re-establishment of the Hierarchy in England and Wales in 1850. The Cardinal in his letter to Archbishop Godfrey on that date observes:

...I have been thinking over the question of His Holiness's broadcast message and it it is my considered opinion that not merely would such a message be deeply appreciated by the Catholics of England and Wales but the danger of any controversy arising similar to that of 100 years ago, is negligible. The Congress has already achieved considerable publicity in the Press and there has been no sign of hostility even where journalists have referred to the events of 1850. Indeed such organisations as the B.B.C. have expressed the hope that in their programmes covering the Congress they will be able to include some message from His Holiness. A premature Reuters report from Vatican City last Tuesday to the effect that His Holiness might send such a message was favourably received. So many Englishmen especially ex-Servicemen, treasure memories of having seen and heard the Holy Father in Rome in recent years that I am confident that such a broadcast
message, especially if spoken in English, could only do untold good to the Church in this country…([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

On 18<sup>th</sup> February 1951 Cardinal Griffin writes to Archbishop Godfrey:

Your Grace:

I want to thank you most sincerely for coming to see me on Friday and for giving me the good news from the Holy See. I also want to thank you for all you have done to help bring about this very happy solution.

I have already seen Archbishop Myers and have asked him to look after everything. I now feel very happy and contented with this arrangement and with the help of all the prayers which are being said for me I hope to get better and even to make a full recovery.

With renewed thanks and all kind wishes,

Your devoted and affectionate brother in Christ,

Archbishop of Westminster ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

Archbishop Godfrey writes to Mgr Derek Worlock on 25<sup>th</sup> April 1951:

My dear Monsignore,

I have to thank you for your letter of 24<sup>th</sup> April [1951] in which you kindly enclosed copies of the correspondence between the Bishop of Brentwood and Mr Chuter Ede. I am please to have this information which will be of much interest to the Holy See.

With all kind wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Apostolic Delegate ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

A note dated, 8<sup>th</sup> October 1951, is found in the portfolio:

The Apostolic Delegate thanks His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster for his kindness is sending the circular dealing with the Catholic Schools' problem ([AAW Gr 2/38 1949-1951]).

AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors' Association 1943-45

From the constitution in its various drafts present in the above portfolio; the following introduction was agreed after consultation among interested groups during 1943-45:
The organisation shall be called the Catholic Parents’ and Electors’ Association.

**Definition** It is a lay organisation, free from political affiliation, functioning with Ecclesiastical approval.

**Aims and Objects**

(a) To study and defend the rights, duties and powers of parents, especially in regard to education, and to further the application of Christian principles to social questions as they affect the family.

(b) To give attention to the welfare of Catholic Youth.

(c) To encourage Catholics to play their part in civic life and to make their full contribution to the common welfare.

(d) To deepen the spiritual life of its members through the practice of family prayer and other methods.

**Membership**

Membership shall be open to all Adult Catholics, and to non-Catholic parents or guardians of Catholic children ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1943-45]).

The correspondence between bishops on this question refers to the nature, membership and sway of such lay associations, the role and authority of ecclesiastical representatives and, as always, the ever-present collateral danger of war. So, the Bishop of Nottingham would sign off his letter to Archbishop Griffin, dated 13th October 1944: “I hope that despite the “doodle-bugs” you are in good health [AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1943-45].” In a letter from Archbishop Griffin to Canon Wood, dated 11th October 1944, he intimates his intention to appoint Bishop David Mathew to be the ecclesiastical adviser for Westminster.

What is apparent on individual slips of paper is that the Catholic laity is becoming aware of its political identity and influence. At a meeting of the Isle of Thanet Catholic Parents’ and Electors’ Association on 10th September 1944 two motions were passed. The first reads:

(1) That the Catholic laity be encouraged to organise a network of parents’ Associations covering the whole of England and Wales, and that these Associations be federated nationally with the approval of the Bishops, thus bringing home to the Government, in any future negotiations with the Catholic hierarchy, that the hierarchy have a backing of voters potentially stronger than our opponents in the educational field. We feel that if this step is not taken, the Catholic body will lose the second round in the educational struggle, as they have already lost the first ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).

The second motion addressed the need to establish a Central Committee of educational experts, representing the whole of the Catholic Church of England and Wales under the

---

61 The inclusion of the qualifier ‘and Electors’ was a matter of dispute. The phrase was deleted, at Griffin’s behest, in the final set of Diocesan Constitutions dated 21st February 1945.
authority of the Bishops with the purpose of “giving authoritative advice and direction to
local Catholic educationalists, especially in the matter of interpreting and implementing the
Education Act, [1944] ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents & Electors Association 1946-
48]).”

On 16th June 1945, Archbishop Griffin gave an address to Westminster Catholic Parents’
Association at Westminster Central Hall:

…Family Life must be strengthened in this country and the parents will mainly
have to undertake this work…St. Thomas teaches that the child is naturally
something of the father and so, by natural right, the child, before reaching the
use of reason is under the father’s care. Hence, he says that it would be
contrary to natural justice if the child, before the use of reason, were removed
from the care of parents, or if any disposition were made concerning him
against the will of the parents.

Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical Letter on Education, says that this right
endures until the child is in a position to provide for itself.

For, as St. Thomas says, nature intends not merely the birth of the child, but
also its development and advance to the perfection of man considered as
man, that is to the state of virtue.

…Education is one of the important matters that affect the rights and duties of
parents. Pope Pius XI explains that education belongs to the family, to the
Church and to the State. These three are partners in education…Education
must pay attention to the whole man and to the purpose for which he has
been created. He is destined to enjoy God for all eternity. Hence true
education must train a child for this purpose and the Church has, therefore,
an independent right to train citizens for God’s kingdom…The State exists to
protect and further the rights of the family and to promote the well-being of the
community. It’s function in education is therefore to encourage and assist and
supplement the work of the Church and the family…For it is the duty of the
State in furthering public and private education, not only to respect the
inherent rights of Church and family in regard to Christian education, but also
to observe distributive justice. It is therefore unlawful for the State to claim
such a monopoly in education and instruction that families are physically or
morally constrained to send their children to State schools against the
dictates of a Christian conscience, or against their legitimate preferences.
These are the words of Pope Pius XI, who goes on to say: “The money which
has been placed at the disposal of the State for the common needs of all,
should be spent for the benefit of those who have contributed to it ([AAW Gr
2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1943-45]).

Griffin goes on to conclude this address with the following comment: “I do not want the
Catholic Parents’ Association to confine all their activities or discussions to the Education
question. There are even more important problems that affect the welfare of your family
and consequently the welfare of the nation ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’
Association 1943-63)." Griffin then goes on to list twelve points that the Westminster Catholic Parents’ Association might usefully attend to. It is apparent that Cardinal Griffin expresses ambivalence towards the Association in correspondence with his closest advisers, worried by a perceived nascent anti-clericalism and an initiative outside his experience. Are these the delivery pains of the birth of a twentieth century Conciliar Church?

AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48

Even so, it was to members of the Westminster Catholic Parents’ Association that Archbishop Griffin turned when the Ministry of Education published Circular 83 entitled Choice of Schools. One quotation gave cause for concern with the belief that “lip-service” was being paid to right of a parent to have their child “educated in accordance with his wishes” as outlined in Section 76 of the Education Act, 1944. This right the Circular comments in paragraph 3: “…is a matter on which the wishes of the parent will need to be considered, but the decision, pending as it normally does upon the ability and aptitudes of the child as revealed by his performance in the primary school, must necessarily rest primarily with the local education authority (sic) ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).” This judgement seems to be emphasised later in the Circular when it deals with “arrangements for transport” in paragraph 7 (b) (iv) “The distance is reasonable having regard particularly to the terms of Section 76 as to the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure. In estimating what can be regarded as a reasonable distance, regard might be had to the normal catchment radius for a school of this type in the area, and a distinction might appropriately be drawn between junior and senior children on grounds of age, and between modern and other types of secondary schools on the ground of the large provision of modern schools ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).”

And boarding arrangements in paragraph 8: “…in dealing with such applications the authority will bear in mind that, in accordance with Section 8/2) (d) of the Act, the parents’ opinion needs to be reinforced by the opinion of the authority that this form of education is desirable for the particular child in question [AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48].” This interpretation of the wording of paragraph 76 of the Act is weighted to the Authority:

76. In the exercise and performance of all powers and duties conferred on them by this Act, the Minister and Local Education Authorities shall have regard to the general principle that, so far as is compatible with the provision of efficient instruction and training and the avoidance of unreasonable public
expenditure, pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents.\textsuperscript{62} ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents' & Electors' Association 1946-48]).

In the Place of Religion in Education, published in CPEA Bulletin, Vol. 2 No.1, Spring Term, 1948. Mgr Tindall rehearses once more the Catholic position concerning the place of religion in the school curriculum:

To assess the position of religion in a school we must define what is the purpose, the final end of education under which all subsidiary ends must fall.

We are all agreed, I presume, that the school must train children to enable them to earn their living, to be useful members of the community, to lead good moral lives. But are these the final ends?

The final end of our education will be determined by our philosophy of life. Why are we here? Where have we come from? Where are we going?...If we come into existence by chance and go into nothingness, obviously the purpose of education is to get out of life what we can, and the obvious result is self-seeking and ruthlessness in the attainment of our end. Morality is reduced to vague sentimentalism that will wither at the first blast.

To Catholics, the answers to these questions are clear and determine their attitude to life in general, and also to education which is a preparation for life [and life-eternal]...([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48], page 14).

After underlining the centrality of religion to the curriculum; Tindall goes on to critique the quality of teacher-training in Religious Instruction for teachers preparing to teach in State schools. The training is gravely flawed since Tindall argues: “The final purpose of education must permeate the whole of the training as it must permeate the whole of life (page 15).” Consequently, “teachers themselves must believe what they teach and practise what they believe (page 15).” Tindall asserts:

\textsuperscript{62} In a speech on 11\textsuperscript{th} January 1948, Cardinal Griffin gives an interesting commentary on this Clause:

This section was inserted by the House of Lords in substitution for a provision as to the interests of parents which originally appeared in Section 8 but which was not thought to be sufficiently comprehensive. We worked very hard to get this clause inserted. By it your rights as parents received legal recognition and you hold these powers and rights under the Act. But rights mean corresponding duties. If, in a given case, you feel that your interests are not safeguarded, it is your duty to make representation first to the local authority and then to the Minister. You take action as parents, and I know that your appeal will be treated with sympathy and understanding (Extract from Address Given By His Eminence Cardinal Griffin at a Rally of Westminster Catholic Parents’ Association Cathedral Hall, Sunday, 11\textsuperscript{th} January 1948, [AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).
A system which takes no account of the reason of man’s existence, that we are here to know, love and serve God, is valueless in the eyes of God, and a system that does not keep constantly before the eyes of its children man’s final and eternal happiness with God, is disastrous…

...We believe that children are entrusted by God to their parents...and parents cannot refuse this responsibility nor can any man-made power or [any] man-made state remove this responsibility from them ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents' & Electors' Association 1946-48], page 17).

The manner in which the Education Act, 1944 was being implemented was still giving cause for concern, as can been seen in correspondence, 28th December 1948, between Mr. T. D. Leech, Chairman, Catholic Parents’ Association, Westminster Diocesan Council and Cardinal Griffin. In this letter the former proposes:

...If Your Eminence would permit and it was considered to be desirable, the Diocesan Council would like to approach [candidates] for the forthcoming Parliamentary elections with a request63 to support an Amending Bill as suggested by Stratford.

There is some doubt, however, as to whether mere amendments would give us sufficient relief or whether repeal in favour of something like the “Scottish System” should be pressed…([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).

Inserted in this portfolio is a leaflet entitled Catholic Schools That Serve This Parish. In the preface is an extract from Pope Leo XIII:

IT IS NECESSARY NOT ONLY THAT RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION BE GIVEN (sic) to the young at certain fixed times, but also that every subject taught be permeated with Christian piety. If this is wanting, if this sacred atmosphere does not pervade and warm the hearts of teachers and scholars alike, little good can be expected from any kind of learning and considerable harm will often be the consequence ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).

Another individual piece of paper that appears in this portfolio opens the vista of a concurrent debate taking place with HMG, and within the Catholic community, of the

---

63 This request was worded so:
That this Conference of delegates of the Catholics of the Stratford Parliamentary Division believes that it is necessary in the next Parliament (1950) to amend the Education Act to ensure: (a) clearer recognition of the rights of parents; (b) fairer treatment of new and existing denominational schools, and (c) clearer determination of the duties of Local Education Authorities in respect of certain sections of the Act which at present leave such Authorities the liberty of withholding the benefits of the Act from denominational schools ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).
establishment of a National Health Service and the place of denominational hospitals therein:

Dear Mr. Howard,

...It is still felt that representations to your Member of Parliament in regard to Catholic hospitals would do no harm as it would help the member to understand the position in which our hospitals are, vis-à-vis, the National Health Service Act.

The present assurances from the Ministry of Health are not adequate yet, and it would be a good thing if the matter were taken up throughout the country as indicated in the Catholic Press recently...(Letter from Private Secretary to Mr. N. P. Howard, 1st December 1947, [AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1946-48]).

AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52
The first document in this portfolio is a report on Good Housing: the XXth Century Crusade written by the Housing Committee of the Westminster Diocesan Council of the Catholic Parents’ Association dated 7th May 1951. On the inside cover is the maxim of Pope Pius XII: “What the family is: that is the nation.” The authors on page 9 of the report comment:

Our sole concern is the welfare of the family “The natural and fundamental group unit of society – entitled to protection by society and State” (vide The Declaration of Human Rights), that the homeless and inadequately housed family is accorded the greatest possible measure of assistance in what has been described as “the gravest social tragedy of our time...” which as Christian people we should arrest by attending without delay to the appalling plight of those who suffer from the lack of homes ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52]).

In a letter from Cardinal Griffin to Alderman M. W. Burns, 15th July 1949, the Cardinal averred that:

I am strongly of the opinion that no real advance will be made until the body of Catholic Parents are organised throughout every diocese and are working on the lines suggested by His Late Holiness, Pius XI in His Encyclical on “The Christian Education of Youth” ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52], page 1).

In this portfolio the competing needs of housing and healthcare emerge, however, concerns over education still troubled the Westminster Diocesan Council for CPAs under the chairmanship of Alderman M. W. Burns. He moved the following motion at the Co-
ordinating Council of the CPA and CPEA Associations Meeting, Rhyl, 15th-16th October 1949:

THAT ALL DIOCESAN COUNCILS:
i) PREPARE AN IMMEDIATE AND INTENSIVE CAMPAIGN TO COMBAT THE APATHY OF THE LAITY
ii) PLACE URGENTLY BEFORE ALL PARISH PRIESTS AND BEFORE THE LAITY THE URGENT NECESSITY OF PREPARING PLANS OF ACTION FOR STRONG, VIRILE BRANCHES OF CPEA, PARTICULARLY WHERE NONE EXISTS AT PRESENT
iii) USE EVERY ENDEAVOUR FROM NOW UNTIL THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BRING BEFORE THE CATHOLIC LAITY THE DANGER WE ARE FACING IN RESPECT TO THE FUTURE OF OUR SCHOOLS, AND OUR CHILDREN’S EDUCATION, AND THAT MORE ENERGY MUST BE DISPLAYED NOW THAN WE PUT FORWARD FOR THE 1944 EDUCATION BILL ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52], page 7).

In the following minutes of the Co-ordinating Council of the CPA and CPEA Associations Meeting, London, 7th-8th January 1950, the minutes record under point 9 vi):

That all or some of the following questions be put at the conclusions of interviews [with Parliamentary candidates], if considered desirable and prudent:

a) (As in the Hierarchy’s manifesto) Do you agree that Catholics are justified in asking for a revision of the 1944 Education Act in view of the unforeseen burden which it imposes on them?
b) Do you think that a very (instead of “the most”, as in October statement) satisfactory solution to the problem would be to adopt the proposal outlined above (alteration approved by Bishop Beck)
c) Would you be prepared to press for and support legislation in Parliament along the lines of this proposal or other solution acceptable to the Catholic body?...([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52], page 5).

In a letter to Alderman M. W. Burns, dated 4th May 1951, Mgr Worlock refers to Archbishop Myers in the following way:

…In any case in the Cardinal’s absence your best approach is to his Coadjutor, Archbishop Myers. He will be the right man for you to approach with regard to the appointment of a new ecclesiastical representative and I am sure he will be only too pleased to guide you on the other points…([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52]).

Resolution passed at meeting called by Westminster Catholic Parents’ Association, Saturday 24th May 1952:
RESOLVED

That this conference of Catholic Parents’ Associations drawn from the Dioceses of Westminster, Southwark and Brentwood, being convinced that bad housing is one of the principal causes of deterioration of moral standards; that sound family life in the broadest sense of the term can only be propagated in adequate and satisfactory dwellings profoundly deplores the cessation of slum clearance operations and the insufficient maintenance of an incalculable number of dwellings: earnestly represents to the responsible authorities the paramount need for a positive policy for sweeping away the slums and for practical measures to arrest the decay of existing dwellings ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52]).

In an extract from a Draft Message To Rally – Catholic Parents’ Association, Tottenham Town Hall, Sunday 13th January 1952, the following appears:

Though I welcome the assurance recently given that your members will place themselves unreservedly at the disposal of parish priests in the work of raising monies for the Central School Fund, the Association must concern itself with all family problems; in particular, with the problem of broken homes with the problem that is concurrent in many cases with broken homes, namely, housing ([AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1949-52]).

AAW Gr 2/73 The Vaughan School 1944-1956


For some time past I have meant to write to you about our declaration of trust, dated 30th April 1914. I think I am right in saying that you hold the original. As I write, I have a copy in my hand. The trustees were Francis Cardinal Bourne, Henry Duke of Norfolk and Lord Edmund Talbot (now Lord Fitzalan in his own right). Would you please look into the matter and tell me what should be done about appointing new trustees? The matter might become urgent almost at any time.

Yours sincerely,

John G. Vance ([AAW Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1944-47]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/73</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School 1944-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/73</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School 1948-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/73</td>
<td>Cardinal Vaughan School 1950-56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 Dated handwritten annotation, 26th May 1952, “Shown to H.E. & approved by him. Mr Murphy informed accordingly by telephone. P.A.”
Within the relevant files archived, it is evident that Governors' Meeting in the 1940s and 1950s were held at Archbishop's House, Westminster and that the Cardinal is chairman of the said Board (as referenced in a letter from Mgr. John Vance, Headmaster, 21st October 1947). In the Vaughan Magazine dated 1949 it is also recorded that Archbishop Amigo is a member of the Governing Body. In the agenda for the meeting scheduled, 29th May 1947, topics ranged from:

- a) the place and future of the Vaughan School in the London Development Plan;
- b) new governors to be appointed;

to, reports on:

- a) on the finance of the school (1946-47);
- b) the state and studies of the School;
- c) Instruments and articles of government.

The contents of the file are fascinating from advice being sought over significant policy issues such as, the London Development Plan. In his letter to Cardinal Griffin, Mgr Vance writes "The protests, naturally, are not based upon any antagonism to London County nor to its plan, but upon the sheer impossibility of Governors committing themselves now to a hypothetical plan for reconstruction or to new schools which may not be built for ten or fifteen years." Speaking on behalf of the other Catholic Grammar Schools, Mgr Vance concludes, "The Governors of the schools are both alarmed and anxious; though at some moments they cannot be certain whether the London Development Plan is conceived in the spirit of comic opera or farce!" ([AAW Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1944-47], 20th May 1947).

To a request for direction over damage to a rather fine staircase mirror measuring 5'x6' and whether the matter should be handed over to the school's solicitors. The mirror was damaged by a boy "throwing a satchel at someone else" and the parents were unwilling to reimburse the school. (Letter from Mgr John Vance to Richard P. Riley esq., 25, Sandilands Road, S.W.6 [father of the nameless, recalcitrant pupil] [AAW Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1944-47]). There is no record of the Cardinal's reply.

Correspondence from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin (20th November 1946), and the latter's reply (26th November 1946), over the forthcoming religious inspection and priests inspecting priests. Cardinal Griffin is keen to avoid nepotism. He introduced a new inspection system for religious education in all grammar schools and was not persuaded
by Mgr. Vance’s special pleading on behalf of Cardinal Vaughan. He ends his letter of 26th November 1946 with the following anecdote “You may be interested to know that St. Edmund’s College is also coming under the scheme ([AAW Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1944-47])."

The third portfolio comprises documentation of the granting of voluntary aided status and annual applications for activities and amenities allowances. Commissioning building work in the early 1950s was fraught with difficulties, as captured in Fr. Reginald Butcher’s letter to the Cardinal, 11th January 1951, in which the new headteacher writes: “I cannot help thinking that [the Education Officer] has grave doubts whether any building will start in 1956, especially as no. 89 is a branch of the Russian Embassy. We have been asked to keep this information as confidential ([AAW Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1950-56]).”

MORE DETAILED NOTES ON THE VAUGHAN SCHOOL & GRIFFIN ARCHIVES
AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47
The first batch of papers in this portfolio give an interesting insight into how the Catholic community attended to the appointment of a new headmaster at Cardinal Vaughan in 1948; clearly the issue of cultivating Catholic leadership is not new. What is apparent is the personal cost paid by long serving and respected members of staff during the war years. Several experienced members of staff seek permission to retire after the War; often on the grounds of exhaustion. While the L.C.C. insisted initially on the school advertising the post; correspondence between the Governing Body and the L.C.C proposes that the school should be allowed to operate outside normal conventions. The governing body’s grounds are rehearsed in a letter dated 17th December 1947 to Mr J. Brown, Assistant Education Officer. While this letter is unsigned, it is presumably written by the Clerk to Mr. Brown. The special circumstances cited are:

1. The Governors of the School will not readily appoint anyone to its Headmastership who is not in Holy Orders. This is the tradition, nor could they lightly be induced to depart from it.
2. The clergy who might be nominated must come from the Diocese of Westminster. While there are many other clergy who are both suitable and competent in other dioceses, they are wanted for headmasterships in those dioceses. As the Vaughan School is in the Diocese of Westminster, the Headmaster will be drawn from the ranks of its clergy. This limits the choice considerably.
3. The Reverend Reginald Butcher MA (Cantab) aged 42, has been on the staff of this school from September 1942. From September 1945 till September 1946 he asked to be allowed to have parochial experience before settling down, for a long spell, to the work of teaching. He studied
at Downside and afterwards spent six years at his Divinity studies before going to Cambridge where he obtained a First Class in the Historical Tripos. He has been teaching for some years, and here at the Vaughan for several years with distinction. He enjoys the confidence of the boys, the Staff, the Headmaster; and the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who is the Chairman of the Governing Body, has assured me that Father Butcher also enjoys his full confidence. The Governors desire to appoint Father Butcher, and when the present headmaster spoke of his retirement through ill health, Father Butcher was appointed Second Master, in order that there might be someone officially in charge if the Headmaster’s health should fail. The suggested appointment is therefore far from being the routine promotion of a senior or a second in command.

4. Among the Governors there are several who are unusually busy men….While all the Governors are anxious to do whatever the Council considers necessary, they would esteem it both a courtesy and a favour if they were not convened to unnecessary meetings, seeing that for good reason they have already selected their candidate.

The letter concludes by a rehearsal of the particular reasons for this request again and an acknowledgement that “we do not wish to set a precedent (Letter to Mr J. Brown, Assistant Education Officer, 17th December 1947, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], pages 1-2).” In an exchange of letters between Mgr John Vance and Cardinal Griffin, 30th January 1948 (from Mgr. Vance), and 31st January 1948 (from Cardinal Griffin), respectively, we read the Local Education Authority ceded to this request to dispense with advertising. The Cardinal wrote in his letter of 31st January 1948 “Thank you for your letter of 30th January and for letting me know that County Hall has agreed to the suggestion that [an] advertisement regarding the position [of headmaster at Cardinal Vaughan School] may be dispensed with ([AAW Gr 2/73 1948-49]).” Fr. Butcher was duly appointed.

In a letter dated 17th December 1947, Cardinal Griffin acknowledges the contribution made by old boys during the War and their “magnificent achievements” since ([AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School]).

Mgr John Vance describes in great detail in this file the character of the boys, nature of their behaviour and standards achieved by them in the years immediately after the war. In a report “made by the form-masters with the knowledge & assistance of the Staff entitled Report On General Condition Of [The] Boys (70 in number) Who Entered The School In September 1946, ([AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School]) we find recorded under: ‘Attainment: Oral Work and Reading’:

The general standard was poor. They gave the impression that the previous six school years had included too little training and exercise in reading aloud, recitation of poetry, and declamation of good prose.
Many had an ingrained habit of ungrammatical expression. Some were inclined even to be proud of their cockneyisms. Others, without trace of self-assertion or of misgiving, were able to address a query to a Master in the form of: ‘Say it ain’t nowhere in the book?’ And they failed so lamentably in English as sometimes to greet a Master’s remark with ‘I don’t get yer!’ (Report on general condition of boys (70 in number) who entered the School in September 1946, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1).

Later in the same report we find recorded under ‘Behaviour’ an absence of a spirit of co-operation and a lack of social sense or community spirit; and under ‘Character’ the teachers report:

The most marked characteristic was a lack of (1) goodwill to overcome difficulties, and (2) of a just pride in themselves. So many readily gave up in face of a difficulty and say ‘I can’t’. The rest are too easily satisfied and complacent. There was, too, a lack of attention and, in consequence, of memory. Sometimes one felt an absence of real parental interest and encouragement (Report on general condition of boys (70 in number) who entered the School in September 1946, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 2).

Vance in his covering letter to Cardinal Griffin, as Chairman of the Governors, indicates that the report “is more than depressing it is grim (Letter from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin, 7th February 1947, Newcomers to the School, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1).” He goes on to qualify the letter by suggesting that Cardinal Griffin, as Archbishop of Westminster, may wish to consider “what happens in our elementary schools (Letter from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin, 7th February 1947, Newcomers to the School, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1).” The war seems to have taken its toll on Mgr Vance. His spirit of empathy and stamina, evident in previous correspondence, seems to have been dulled. Cardinal Griffin’s response draws from his years of experience in social welfare.65

---

65 And also builds on Cardinal Griffin’s letter of welcome to the school, 19th September 1945 ([AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School]):

Dear Monsignore and my dear boys,

I only wish I could be present in person to welcome you all back to London. At the moment I am in France and from there I am going to Belgium, Holland and finally to Germany, but shall not be away very long. After my return I hope to come to pay you all a personal visit.

Today, I want to say how much I rejoice with you at your return to the old school. For six years you have been in exile and I am sure you will want to thank Father Helsham and the Jesuit Fathers at Beaumont who so kindly made provision for you whilst you have been away.
I should imagine that a good deal of the trouble has been caused by the abnormal life the boys have been forced to live during the war, in their being sent away from home and especially in the break-up of real family life. Our elementary schools, too, are labouring under great difficulties, most of which can be attributed to post-war conditions.

I do appreciate the feelings of your good self and the staff but I hope I am not too optimistic in thinking that this bad spirit has now reached its downward trend and that matters will improve. (Letter from Cardinal Griffin to Mgr Vance, 13th February 1947, Newcomers to the School, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1).

In 1946 there was much discussion in correspondence over “the question of the payment of [teachers’] salaries”. In a letter from Mgr. Vance to Cardinal Griffin, 22nd October 1946, ([AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1), Mgr Vance expressed his concern: “If the Local Education Authority pays the salaries of Masters in a school, let us say, like the Vaughan and other grammar schools, those Masters will more and more, naturally, regard themselves as servants of the Authority. Moreover the old rule runs that ‘those that pay the piper...’ (Letter entitled Instruments and Articles of Government).” Vance was reluctant to see a distance established between the payment of teachers’ salaries and their respective Governors. At the time of writing the letter Masters continued to be paid by the School itself in the name of the Governors. While Vance acknowledges that this was a virtual reality since “the money was collected from the Local Authority in the usual way and that the charge was shared between the [respective] Authority and the Ministry, [the fact remained that] the Governors actually pay the Masters. (Letter from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin, 22nd October 1946, Instruments and Articles of Government, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1).”

Amidst the debate over methods of funding; grammar schools, through ‘The Incorporated Association of Head Masters’, argue against systemic homogeneity. In a pamphlet entitled The Threat To The Grammar Schools, the Association asserts “Of one thing we are certain, [that the distant goal of perfection] will never be reached by imposing on all

I am glad to know from the reports that whatever inconvenience you have suffered through the transfer of your school, your studies have maintained the same high standard and that you have been most successful in your examination results. I offer my congratulations both to you and your devoted staff

You now look forward to a period of peace, but I hope also to a period of real hard work. We can achieve very little either for the Church or for our fellow men unless we are prepared to put our whole heart into our work and to do it for God. At the same time we must have complete confidence in God’s help and he will see that our efforts are successful...
schools the same dead level of uniformity. Equality of opportunity in education is a worthy aim; equality in education is sterile doctrine (The Threat To The Grammar Schools, 1946, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 4)."

A small untitled note, dated 7th November 1945, is found in this portfolio from Cardinal Griffin to Mgr Vance, to which there is no record of a reply. Consequently, it is difficult to surmise whether the site was too expensive, the Sisters decided not to sell or whether there was resistance to moving of Cardinal Vaughan School to a new location:

Dear Mgr. Vance

I do not know whether you have heard that the training college in St Charles’ Square is removing to Roehampton, and [if] the Sisters will consider the sale of the property.

As you are looking for a future site for the Cardinal Vaughan School it struck me that this might be just the very thing we were looking for. I have told the Sisters that I must have first refusal of the site, and at present am going into the question of its valuation.

With every kind wish and a blessing...(AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School).

In correspondence between Mgr Vance and Cardinal Griffin, 14th May 1945, Vance reports to the Cardinal that hopes of retaining the current arrangements for a Preparatory Department on a sliding scale were fading. This model did not fit into the County’s Development Plan. In the letter, 14th May 1945, Vance comments “We are allowed to have a special Training Form for one year and one year only, from September 1945-46. In this Special Training Form I can take boys from about the age of ten. After September 1946 the whole intake will be of boys who are to proceed immediately to their Grammar school education. The decision is probably inevitable, though a matter of real regret. Some of the best students we ever had, and those that secured the finest scholarships at Cambridge had been through our own Preparatory department (Letter from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin, 14th May 1945, Education Act, 1944: Development Plan, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], pages 1-2).” This disappointment may explain the tenor of the aforementioned internal report with covering letter, 7th February 1947, concerning the first cohort of boys admitted under the new “secondary arrangements.”

In a letter to Rab Butler, the Minster of Education, dated 14th February 1945 the Acting Clerk to the Governors of Cardinal Vaughan School “applies...for acceptance as a Voluntary Aided School under the Education Act 1944 (Letter from Acting Clerk to the
Governors to The Right Honourable, the Minister of Education, 14th February 1945, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1)."

In the Archive there is a copy of a letter written by Mgr Vance to Mr. Butler (27th October 1944) and the Minister's reply (4th November 1944). In the former Mgr Vance wrote as Chairman of the ‘Association of Convent Schools and the Conference of Catholic Colleges’. He asks the Minister the following question on behalf of the Association: “Are there any considerations or conditions which are likely to exclude a number of our direct-grant schools from participation in Scheme A? Alternatively, is your Ministry preparing regulations which are likely to exclude a number of our Catholic direct-grant schools from the list of those that will receive grants of money? (Letter from Mgr. John Vance to the Minister of Education, 27th October 1944, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School]).” The reply from the Minister is revealing and suggests that although the legislation was now on the statute book; the regulations were still fluid:

The Government are pledged to continuing a system of Direct Grant Schools, but the details of this policy have yet to be settled. The Fleming Committee put forward in Scheme A certain recommendations which clearly merit careful consideration; but it is already clear that these recommendations involve certain difficulties, which are acutely felt by some of the Governors and Headmasters. It should not therefore be assumed that these recommendations will necessarily be adopted, and I do not exclude the possibility that recognition may be continued for direct grant schools on some such lines as the present. This is a general matter on which a decision will be reached as soon as possible when I have heard the views of the interested parties.

I have, however, made it clear on several occasions that schools, which are to receive direct grant, must be fully accessible to pupils of all degrees of income and that the Local Education Authority must be in a position to count on a reasonable number of vacancies to assist in meeting local needs (Letter from the Minister of Education to Mgr. John Vance, 4th November 1944, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 1).

Butler continues by recognising that it will generally not be possible to settle the status of a particular school in advance of the submission of the development plan by the Local Education Authority. Although he hoped that the majority of existing Direct Grant Schools "will recognise the logic as well as the financial advantages of accepting maintained status. In the second page of his letter he rehearses what these advantages are:

1. the present position will be materially altered by the abolition of fees in all maintained secondary schools. At the present time those 75 Catholic Secondary Schools which receive direct grant are in no very different
position as regards fees from the remaining 20 which receive their aid through the Local Education Authority. It would manifestly be unfortunate if, in any large number of cases, access to Catholic schools for Catholic children were to be prejudiced by the retention of fees;

2. fees, [Butler comments, in Catholic schools are relatively low] and it will be a question for you whether with increasing costs your schools will be able to meet the expenses of maintenance from fees and direct grant without an appreciable increase in the rate of fees and consequent hardship to Catholic children;

3. [a recognition] "that capital expenditure on repairs, alterations and improvements has in the past largely been met by contributions from the funds of Religious Orders or from private sources. You will be in a better position than I am to forecast how far these sources will be in a position to continue to bear expenditure which in a maintained school would to a considerable extent fall either on the Local Education Authority or the Exchequer (Letter from the Minister of Education to Mgr John Vance, 4th November 1944, [AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School], page 2).

Mgr John Vance, whether speaking as headmaster of the Vaughan School, or Chairman of the ‘Association of Convent Schools and the Conference of Catholic Colleges’, is cautious in correspondence when authority is delegated from National Government to LEAs; Vance upholds the Catholic school’s right of independence in governance and mission.

AAW Gr 2/73 1948-49

In this portfolio there is the school’s one-page record of a HMI inspection conducted on 6th-9th December 1949 which made comment on the ‘Buildings’, ‘Staff’, ‘Teaching’ and ‘The Boys’ The buildings were described as “thoroughly inadequate. The classrooms are not big enough to hold the number of boys in them and boys' promotions had sometimes to be deferred for lack of sufficient accommodation (HM Inspection of Cardinal Vaughan School: 6th-9th December 1949, [AAW Gr 2/73 1948-49 The Vaughan School]).” There is also a record that the Inspectorate thought “that the quality of the boys now coming to the school ha[d] changed greatly from what it was at the time of the last inspection…in view of this great handicap it was recognised reluctantly that there must be a lowering of standards, though it was agreed that we were doing our very best to see that the lowering was as slight as possible (HM Inspection of Cardinal Vaughan School, 6th-9th December 1949, [AAW Gr 2/73 1948-49 The Vaughan School]).”

In an enclosure of letter dated 2nd February 1948 from Mgr. Vance to Archbishop Griffin the following is recorded:

Vaughan School Priests during Twenty Years of Mgr. Vance’s Headship:
Secular Priesthood: 23 Religious Orders: 11
University Scholarships & Exhibitions During Those Twenty Years: 69

War Honours in the Second World War: 13, including first V.C. awarded to airman (Donald Edward Garland V.C.) in war (36 Old Boys killed in war).

Realm of Sport: Cricket & especially Association Football, where the school has produced several Amateur Internationals.

NB. Difficulties of war evacuation to Windsor (Beaumont) ([AAW Gr 2/73 1948-49 The Vaughan School]).

Although there is no record in this file of any trust deeds concerning 31, Holland Park Gardens, there is a considerable amount of correspondence concerning the presence and eradication of dry rot in the aforementioned house and other remedial building work on the site. The cost was settled through a contribution from the LCC and representations being made to the Cardinal by Fr. Butcher. As is the way it is difficult to ascertain whether the Cardinal was approached as Chairman of Governors or Ordinary, either way, he sent a cheque of £500. However, what is interesting is the extract recording the view of an education officer concerning ‘dry rot in 31, Holland Park Gardens’:

In reply to your letter of the 26th January, I have to inform you that authority is being sought for the expenditure of a total amount of £2,300, plus Architect’s fees amounting to £138. Of the £2,300, about £287 covers work in part of the Teachers’ living accommodation, and this is not considered to be the responsibility of the Council. Therefore, the amount which it is hoped will be approved for grant purposes, is £2,013, plus £121 for the Architect’s fees for this proportion of the work. I will notify you when final approval has been received (Letter from Fr. Butcher to Cardinal Griffin, 7th March 1949, [AAW Gr 2/73 1948-49 The Vaughan School], page 1).

This commentary would suggest that the LCC at this time perceived 31, Holland Park Avenue as being a constituent part of the school building.

On 16th July 1948 Mgr John Vance wrote this personal note to the Governors of Cardinal Vaughan School:

Before I actually leave the School it is both a duty and a pleasure to thank the Governors as a body and each of them personally, for their great kindness and consideration to me, across a long period of years. No Headmaster could have been helped more effectively, whenever possible, by each of the members of the Governing Body, including many who have now retired and some who have gone to their reward.
With a profound feeling of gratitude, therefore I take my leave and wish the School, to which we have all been devoted, every success and the continued blessing of Almighty God.

**AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56**

Records the London Development Plan and notice to rebuild, part or all of the Vaughan School; throughout it is apparent that negotiations are ongoing to improve the terms of governance for future aided schools. As Fr. Reginald Butcher comments in his letter to Cardinal Griffin, dated 1st April 1950:

> ...The matters which are under discussion are chiefly concerned with preservation of the rights of Governors to fix holidays within the limits allowed by the Ministry; to control the expenditure of monies on behalf of the schools; and to buy their own supplies and not be compelled to acquire everything out of L.C.C stock... (Letter from Fr. Butcher to Cardinal Griffin, 1st April 1950, [AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], page 1).

The somewhat confused state of the post-war Church is revealed in a follow-up letter from Fr. Reginald Butcher to Cardinal Griffin, 4th April 1950:

> ...I am somewhat puzzled by Your Eminence’s reference to the necessity of filling up Form 18 within six months. I understand that this Form was completed some years ago and countersigned by Your Eminence, though there is no record here of what information was conveyed to the Ministry on the Form... (Letter from Fr. Butcher to Cardinal Griffin, 4th April 1950, [AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], page 1).

There is no record of either this ‘Form’ or further correspondence on this topic in the Archive.

A paper drawn up by Fr Reginald Butcher over future finance to fund capital expenditure of the Cardinal Vaughan School reveals the challenges facing the new headteacher:

> ...1. (iii) Parents of boys who have come to the School recently have not paid any fees and have been most reluctant to incur any expenditure at all on behalf of the[ir] boys. Thus many expect free meals, grants for clothing, travel etc. Some have even refused to buy the School War Record and the School Magazine... (Briefing Paper written by Fr. Butcher to Cardinal Griffin, Cardinal Vaughan School: Finance, in correspondence dated June 1950, [AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], page 1).
Similarities between the educational discourse of the 1940s and today is remarkable as can be gleaned from the following extract taken from the report following the HM Inspection of Cardinal Vaughan School on 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th December 1949:

**Organisation, Curriculum and Standard of Work**

...The general standard of the work is difficult to assess as a whole, and can best be deduced from the individual subject reports which follow; the best advanced work is undoubtedly done in Classics. But the practice of taking the Higher Certificate Examination after one year in the Sixth and the preparation for the School Certificate Examination itself have had the effect of making the work examination bound, and the boys’ attitude towards it rather grim and joyless, when the freshness of the early years has worn off. What is badly needed is much more independence in learning on the boys’ part, and more adventure and enterprise in the teaching: in this way every subject of study could become its own advertisement...(page 4)

**General Conclusions**

The School has made a good recovery from the effects of the war and the losses it suffered from evacuation. One of its major problems for the future is to find a new site and a new building, both impossible at the moment. The other is to maintain its high tradition of scholarship, while at the same time making more attractive provision for the less scholarly boy. This can, and no doubt will receive, early attention (HM Inspection of Cardinal Vaughan School on 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th December 1949, [AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], page 13).

Although indisposed Cardinal Griffin sent the following message to the Old Boys’ Association of the Cardinal Vaughan School, 10th November 1951:

...The Cardinal Vaughan School must hold a special place in the heart of every Archbishop of Westminster; for my part I have followed its fortunes with the closest interest...([AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School]).

The new headteacher, Fr. Richard Kenefeck, writes to Cardinal Griffin on 20th October 1952 over the school’s newly acquired “aided” status. This was achieved on 1st October 1952. The Ministry of Education wanted to know if the L.C.C., and the Governing Body, had agreed on the following two points:

a) whether the Governors accept the financial arrangements for the administration of the School that came into operation on 1st October [?];

b) whether the Governors are agreeable to the inclusions of a draft Article giving power to the Council to prohibit the appointment of teachers employed for giving secular instruction and to give directions as to the educational qualifications of the teachers to be employed. This matter is dealt with in Section 24 (2) (b) of the Education Act, 1944...([AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], page 1).
The Cardinal accepted the first and concurred with the second.

There is a draft copy of a speech, 12th November 1953, given by Cardinal Griffin at Prize giving at the Cardinal Vaughan School. The text is annotated with handwritten amendments and offers an insight into the Cardinal's understanding of the purpose of Catholic education:

...In short, the Old Boys of the Vaughan School are playing their part in the public life both of the Church and of the State; and what is more, they have nothing but praise for their Alma Mater and gratitude for the training received here in Addison Road ([AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], page 1).

He speaks especially to those boys aged 15 years old, referring to a message that Fr. Kenefeck had already written in the soon to be published School Magazine:

I hope you will all read it and take its message to heart, especially those of you who are aged fifteen and just in the middle of the course. Many of your friends outside will have left school and started work and you must feel depressed now and then and wonder why you must stay on at school for so many years. Is it all worth it, you wonder? (page 2)

If the purpose of education were simply to train a boy for a job, then the sooner he left school and started work the better, and good luck to him. But that is not the purpose of education, at least not its chief purpose. You see, we are not robots or machines, but human persons, sons of God. Sons of God – there is the answer to it all. It is not so much what a boy knows that counts, but what he is, and the main purpose of education is to train the child to live a full human life. I do not know whether you have ever thought of this, but unless you are leading a full life you can never really be happy. A boy trained for this fullness of life will realise that he has duties to God and to his fellowmen as well as to himself. Moreover he will not be content with accepting these truths in a vague, detached sort of way; he will put them into practice, he will live them. While on this earth he will carry out his duties as a citizen, so that in the life hereafter he may be a worthy citizen of heaven (page 3).

...Almighty God has been good to you and given you certain gifts – not for your own private enjoyment but for use in His service; much has been given to you, much will be expected of you ...([AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School], pages 2-4).

In a letter to Mr. George Bellord, of Witham & Co. Solicitors, 31st October 1955, Cardinal Griffin asks that Mgr Derek Worlock be appointed a “trustee [of Cardinal Vaughan School and Playing Fields] in place of the late Archbishop Butt ([AAW Gr 2/73 1950-56 The Vaughan School])."
This portfolio has correspondence concerning:

- the provision of Catholic Approved Schools; a the problem rehearsed in a letter from Canon Bennett, (Administrator of ‘The Liverpool Catholic Children’s Protection Society’) to Archbishop Griffin dated 6th December 1944:
  
  The problem of accommodation is made particularly difficult because most of the schools are on a diocesan basis, whereas their intake is on a national basis…([AAW Gr 2/82 1944-45], page 1);

- raising the age of consent from 16 to 17 years old to address levels of promiscuity prevalent among young girls. In a statement from ‘The Catholic Child Welfare Council’ on this topic (1st April 1944) marked private and confidential; the following observation is made concerning the Education Bill before Parliament: “The present Education Bill proposes to place young people under the purview of the Education Authority until 18 years of old. It is inconsistent to recognise the immaturity of young girls up to 18 years for certain purposes and not to recognise it in the vital matter of sex…([AAW Gr 2/82 1944-45], page 2);”

- information on ‘Care of Children Committee’ a Government Committee of Enquiry under chairmanship of Miss Curtis (Extraordinary Meeting of ‘The Catholic Child Welfare Council’, 3rd May 1945, to attend to the remit of this Committee, share information and nominate delegates to address the ‘Care of Children Committee’ on behalf of the Catholic Church);

- housekeeping concerning the organisation and operation of ‘The Catholic Child Welfare Council’. Cardinal Griffin remained as chair of this Committee; believing its work central to the life of the Church and responsible for him being translated to Westminster;

- the boarding out of the O’Neill children with non-Catholic foster parents – which became quite a cause célèbre at the time;

- establishment of a comprehensive Health Service attending to the curative and preventative aspect of health care and the impact of this Service on the existent work of religious orders. Mrs Murtagh, the Chairman of the City of Birmingham Maternity & Child Welfare Committee, in a paper for a Conference held in Coleshill, Birmingham on 13th March 1945 argues that “the sections in the new [Health] Act dealing with the preventative aspect will materially affect our outlook…(Copy of Talk presented by Mr Murtagh, 13th March 1945, [AAW Gr 2/82 1944-45] page ii)”; 

- curriculum for standardised training of Child-Welfare Workers in Residential Homes of ‘Associated Council of Children’s Homes’ (of which the Catholic Child Welfare Council, along with other equivalent bodies from other religious faiths and denominations, was a member).

This portfolio also comprises a response to Ministry of Health Circular no. 2866 dated 1st October 1943 ff. addressed to ‘Welfare Authorities (England) and the London County Council’ entitled The Care of Illegitimate Children:
1. I am directed by the Minister of Health to state that he has had under special consideration the problems arising under war conditions in regard to illegitimate children. He referred this matter for consideration to one of the Sub-Committees of his Advisory Committee on the Welfare of Mothers and Young Children and he has taken into account recommendations recently made by them...

3. It is clear that there can be no complete solution of the problem, since every child needs both a father and a mother, affection, security and the shelter of a normal home, but the successful work of voluntary agencies and moral welfare workers attached to diocesan and other religious bodies has shown that much can be done to help the mother and to safeguard the child...

4. …welfare authorities should co-operate with and reinforce the work of existing voluntary moral welfare associations, and he suggests therefore that every welfare authority should formulate a scheme for this purpose.

The Minister proposes in the remainder of the fourth and fifth paragraphs the appointment of a worker to coordinate this work locally and collaborate with Health Visitors. What is interesting in the next sentences is the manner in which work with the Church and other voluntary societies is expected. He suggests making links with the 'Evacuation Welfare Service' or the social worker whose appointment was recommended in Circular 2834, 23rd July 1943. Consequently, Circular 2866, lists the duties of such a person as:

(a) Wherever possible to persuade the girl to make known the circumstances to her parents and, if the home is likely to be a satisfactory one, to persuade the grandparents to make a home there for the little one.
(b) Advising the expectant mother on suitable accommodation before and immediately after confinement.
(c) Assisting the girl to obtain an affiliation order or otherwise to secure assistance from the father of the child.
(d) Assisting the mother to find employment, preferably with her baby, in an institution or in private employment.
(e) If a home cannot be found for the baby with the girl’s relatives (see (a) above), finding lodgings for mother and baby when the mother desires non-resident work. This accommodation might be in a special hostel set up by a voluntary body or by the welfare authority itself. If in ordinary lodgings it would be necessary to arrange for the baby’s care by day, e.g. in a war-time nursery.
(f) Finding a suitable foster mother if it is necessary for mother and baby to be separated. In such cases it may be desirable for the authority to guarantee payment to the foster mother, recovering from the mother. (This scheme works satisfactorily in Birmingham).
(g) Arranging for places in a residential Nursery or Home, for babies whose mothers cannot look after them and for whom accommodation cannot be found by other means.
(h) In special cases, e.g. where the mother is very young or is the wife of a man not the father of the child, giving advice about legal adoption ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62]).

This portfolio has papers concerning the work of individual diocesan Child Welfare Societies. Clearly Griffin was committed to this work and his experience in this aspect of the Church’s mission informed other areas of work. In the Minutes of the Fourteenth Annual General Meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council held at the Dorchester Hotel, 28th September 1944, the following is written:

His Grace the Archbishop (sic) expressed his sincere thanks to Mgr. Craven and all the Members, and assured them that he was quite willing to remain as Chairman indefinitely, if such was the wish of the Council. This statement was greeted with unanimous approval. His Grace said that he regarded his appointment as a tribute to the important work on which the Council was engaged – a work which he regarded as second only in importance to the education of Priests (Minutes of Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council, [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62], page 1).

In the minutes to the Council’s 15th Annual General Meeting, held at the Grand Hotel, Birmingham, Tuesday, 23rd October 1945, the close association between the Council’s work and that of individual diocese’s work in education is raised in matters arising:

5.b) Provision for imbecile and physically incurable children (sic). The Chairman pointed out that by the recent Government circular concerning handicapped children (1945. No. 1076 [Handicapped Children and School Health Service]) the Government is prepared to make special grants to religious orders starting Homes up to 75% of the cost of the building, up to the full cost of the extensions and a substantial contribution towards the maintenance of such children. The Ministry of Education is prepared to go as far as it can in giving grants. The members felt it was too big a problem for each diocese to face separately and it was suggested that the matter be tackled on a national basis. For this purpose it was agreed that the numbers of all (sic) Catholic handicapped children be obtained by each Secretary for his own diocese and sent in to Fr. Murphy (Minutes of Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council, [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-45], page 1).

The Council provided a forum whereby colleagues could discuss and agree a means for meeting the needs of a transient Catholic population; concerning evacuees, as agreed at the beginning of the war, “the responsibility rests with the Rescue Society of the diocese from which the child was evacuated (Letter From Archbishop Griffin to Fr Murphy, Catholic Child Welfare Council, Birmingham [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-
The national Catholic Welfare Council’s work was not limited to these shores as evidenced by point 10 of the Minutes:

10. PUTATIVE FATHERS IN UNITED STATES [OF AMERICA] ARMY (sic)
Fr. Leahy (sic) [Clifton] reported many such cases handled by his Society and that it was impossible to get Army Authorities to make a grant. Several members agreed that such private and unofficial arrangements which were reported were quite unsatisfactory, and His Grace (sic) offered to place the matter before Archbishop Spellman, the Chaplain General to the American Forces.

Fr. Hardwick (sic) [Northampton] said that the same difficulty did not apply to the Canadian Army, which would make payment if the mother applied (Minutes of Fourteenth Annual meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council, [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62], page 4).

The minute (section 14) of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council, on ‘Case Responsibility’, was amended at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting held at the Grand Hotel, Birmingham, Tuesday, 23rd October 1945, to read as follows:

The expectant (sic) unmarried mother should also be the responsibility of the diocese in which she is living when the first application is made (Minutes of Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council, [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62], page 1).


In this portfolio, there is also correspondence from across the 1940s about Child Emigration to Australia; on 10th June 1940 Cardinal Hinsley writes to Bishop Griffin, in response to his letter to him on 8th June 1940, concerning an article that appeared in The Times from its Melbourne Correspondent, 4th June 1940, Australian Homes for British Children: Plan To Adopt 50,000:

The article begins:

Individuals and organizations continue to offer to adopt war orphans and other children from Great Britain... [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62].
Cardinal Hinsley replies:

I am naturally anxious to consult both our own Hierarchy and that of Australia[66] about this question, but I am forced to consider that there may not be time to do so...[AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62].

Towards the end of this portfolio there is a copy of a Memorandum submitted to the ‘Care of Children Committee Enquiry’ on behalf of the Catholic Child Welfare Council: Catholic Homes (Reference 45/6) which identifies ‘special groups’ that these Homes and how they attend to children’s needs through their ‘Orthopaedic’ provision[67] “for crippled children (sic)...[AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62]).” Along with Minutes of a Meeting held in Birmingham of “Religious and Others Engaged in Child Welfare Work in the Archdiocese of Birmingham”, Tuesday 13th March 1945, at which Councillor Mrs. Murtagh’s paper on the ‘Minister of Health’s new Health Plan’ is read. The purpose of this paper was to try and explain the part Denominational organisations will play in the new Health Plan. At the time of the paper the ‘Plan’ was still at the ‘White Paper’ stage:

In this free and democratic country there is a good deal of respect and admiration for voluntary effort, for private enterprise, and all that comes from individual thought. The Minister of Health shows a deep respect for all Voluntary bodies emphasising the place such organisations may be expected to take in his scheme. He says that it is not the Government’s wish to change a very good system already in existence, but to strengthen what he terms the present “structure”, so that all Local Authorities will find it possible to carry the weight of a greater responsibility.

...As Catholics we shall accept the outline and co-operate as long as co-operation is not directly against religious principles.

[66] In a circular letter from Brother Conlon to ‘Diocesan Secretaries and Homes’ in the United Kingdom, dated 10th July 1947 and forwarded to Cardinal Griffin with a covering note on 12th July 1947 he writes: “the first batch of about 150 migrant children will sail for Western Australia, 21st August 1947...[AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62].” There is evidence in the minutes of the ‘Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Child Welfare Council’, Dorchester Hotel, 7th November 1946, of Bishop Craven wanting reassurance asking for “first hand information of the conditions in Australia” and a belief that these 16+ should “be considered under the Adult Scheme ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62], page 3).” An extraordinary meeting was held by The Catholic Child Welfare Council, Thursday 13th June 1946, with the minutes being marked as “Strictly Confidential. There was concern expressed by delegates that the “rights” of Catholic children be recognised by civil authorities and attended to through sufficient Church supervision of Catholic candidates [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62]).

[67] At Saint Gerard’s Coleshill and Pinner.
The White Paper\textsuperscript{68} envisages a comprehensive Health Service, that is to say it covers the curative and preventive aspect of health. We are familiar with the curative, but we are not familiar with the preventive or social aspect, and it is this social aspect which is so relevant to us as guardians of children… (Councillor Mrs. Murtagh, Minister of Health’s new Health Plan, Tuesday 13\textsuperscript{th} March 1945, part of Minutes of Meeting Held at Fr. Hudson’s Homes, 13\textsuperscript{th} March 1945, [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62], page i).

AAW Gr 2/82 1946-47

A four-page letter from Archbishop Simonds, (Coadjutor Archbishop of Melbourne and secretary to the Hierarchy of Australia) to the Hon Arthur Augustus Calwell, M.H.R., Minister for Immigration, Canberra, 21\textsuperscript{st} May 1946, was discussed at a meeting of The Catholic Child Welfare Council at Archbishop’s House, Westminster, 13\textsuperscript{th} June 1946. In this letter Archbishop Simonds signals the Australian Church’s willingness to work with Catholic agencies in England:

…the [Australian Catholic] Bishops have signified their willingness to accommodate and train 5,000 migrant children in their own Institutions and other training centres, provided they are given the necessary financial and other helps needed to enable them to provide facilities for the accommodation and training of the migrant children ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1946-47], page 1).

On pages 3 & 4 of the letter entitled there are twelve action points identified the most interesting is annotated with the largest marginal cross is point 11 (aka k). One feels in reading this paperwork that the British bishops are feeling caught between a Commonwealth Government & HMG policy on migration and the Australian Catholic bishops:

(k) That when large numbers of Migrant children, recruited by Church and other organisations, are ready to sail for Australia, special ships be chartered for the purpose of transit, whenever this found possible, and that the children belonging to the different organisations be allotted separate sections of the ships for disciplinary and other reasons. The foregoing suggestion, if it be carried out, would have many advantages, one of the most important being that it would prevent the inconvenience to passengers on ordinary ships arising from the presence of numerous children who naturally become very active on a long sea trip ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1946-47], page 4).

\textsuperscript{68} This would lead to the National Health Service Act, 1946.
In a letter to Mgr. Craven, of the Catholic Child Welfare Council, 29th May 1946, Cardinal Griffin shares his reservations in the third paragraph:

...I did not get a chance of letting Brother Conlon [representative of the Hierarchy of Australia] know of the adverse reports we had received, but I think that before he leaves the country he ought to be made aware of this…([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1946-47], page 1).

In other correspondence Cardinal Griffin is acutely aware of the logistical challenges of placing 'displaced persons' from the British Zone of Occupation in Germany under the auspices British Control Commission as well as orphans, “saving children from undesirable parents (Minutes of 16th Annual Meeting The Catholic Child Welfare Council, Dorchester Hotel, 7th November 1946, [AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1946-47], page 4, point 10)” and destitute adults from home. The operational reservations were not considered significant enough to block cooperation with the Australian Church:

Under Rule 110 of the Statutory Poor Law Rules of 1930 no child shall be boarded out or be allowed to remain boarded out with a foster parent of a religious creed different from that of the child. Under Section 71 of the Poor Law Act 1930 provisions are made in respect of a child under the age of 12 with regard to entering the religious creed in the creed register if the child is in the workhouse or separate school, and the religion of the child shall be the religion of the father or if the father’s religion cannot be reasonably ascertained on enquiry, the religion of the mother, unless her creed cannot by reasonable enquiry be ascertained.

The creed of an illegitimate child under the age of 12 shall be the religious creed of the mother. Any question as to the correctness of an entry must be settled by the Minister of Health (Paper entitled Some Aspects of the Law Affecting The Custody and Religious Education of Children, written by Mr E. R. Hoskinson, Honorary Solicitor & Honorary Secretary of the Shrewsbury Diocesan Children's Rescue Society, read at the Annual Meeting of the Catholic Child Welfare Committee, Coleshill, November 1936, ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1946-47], page 14).

AAW Gr 2/82 1948-50

In letter from Fr Denis Murphy, Secretary to the Catholic Child Welfare Council, to Cardinal Griffin dated 20th February 1948. Murphy encloses a one-page report summarising the number of children cared for by seventeen of the eighteen constituent diocesan societies. The homes accommodate 14,728 children in 250 Homes ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1948-50]).

In a letter from Fr. Murphy to Diocesan Secretaries of ‘The Catholic Child Welfare Council’, 22nd March 1948, entitled Pembroke House, the following paragraph appears:
Children of all religious denominations are eligible for admission. Roman Catholic children will be maintained in Roman Catholic Homes recommended by the R.C. Chaplain of R. N. Barracks under the same financial agreement as for boys ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1948-50], page 1).

This portfolio contains a table collating the number of unmarried mothers who requested assistance in 1947 from eighteen Catholic Rescue Societies in England (1,538), of which 152 became pregnant in Ireland ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1948-50]).

In the record of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of 'the ‘Catholic Child Welfare Council', Llandudno, 7th-8th November 1950, the following minute appears under point 9 entitled 'Lack of Accommodation for Catholic Boys in Catholic Approved Schools And Their Admission to Non-Catholic Approved Schools':

Canon Smith (sic) [Hexham & Newcastle] said that earlier this year he received information that there were 140 Catholic boys in non-Catholic Approved Schools and there were 100 more on the waiting list.\(^69\) He had since heard that the position had deteriorated considerably. Suitable property could not be found in his diocese and he hoped other dioceses would do their utmost to help solve this problem...The Chairman [Bishop Craven for this meeting as Cardinal Griffin was indisposed] said we must all continue to search for suitable property and added that by recent legislation the Home Office would pay every penny of the cost of purchase, adaptation and equipment. Fr. Kelly (sic) said that there was a possibility of opening such a school in the Leeds diocese ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1948-50], page 4).

In this portfolio is a copy of Statutory Rules and Orders 1933, No. 787: Children and Young Persons Boarding Out. Under the Religious Persuasion section it reads

14. In accordance with the provisions of section 84 (3) of the Act a local authority in selecting the person with whom a foster child is to be boarded out shall, if possible, select a person who is of the same religious persuasion as the foster-child or who gives an undertaking that the foster-

\(^69\) Canon Smith, in a letter to Fr. Murphy, 7th May 1950, copied to Cardinal Griffin, records a meeting he attended at the Home Office concerning Approved Schools: "I pointed out at the Home Office that it was a matter of great concern that so many Catholic boys are in non-Catholic Approved Schools and that there should not be any Catholic boys in such schools. My attitude seemed to cause surprise; it seemed to be understood at the Home Office on account of what some-one had said, that so long as Catholic Boys were allowed to attend a Catholic Church and received instruction from a Priest, their being in a non-Catholic school did not matter! (sic) ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1948-50], page 2).
child will be brought up in accordance with that religious persuasion ([AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1948-50], page 2).