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Abstract

First Volume
This year marks the seventieth anniversary of the passing of the Education Act, 1944. This thesis explores the negotiations surrounding this piece of adaptive legislation at the end of the Second World War from a Catholic perspective. It focuses on the educational entries found in the Archive of the Archbishop of Westminster for Cardinals Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin\(^1\) respectively and assesses the changing ecclesiologies and anthropologies described therein. These papers have never been read systematically. Consequently, the Catholic memory in current academic literature is often drawn from either secondary sources or folklore. At a time of neoconservative structural change to the education system, it is important to rediscover what actually happened in 1944, to discern how decisions were made within the Catholic Hierarchy, how the Church negotiated with His Majesty’s Government (HMG) and to penetrate how both sides learnt to compromise.

In the first Chapter I examine the strengths and weaknesses of the methods used to interpret the Archive and how the Catholic community together informed systemic education reform and established denominational schools with a generative Catholic curriculum to challenge competing totalitarian narratives. In the second chapter I set the scene, examining the tides of educational reform, ecumenics and parenting at a time when alternate generations had been lost on the battlefields of Europe. From this turmoil arises an ‘Augustinian’ epistemology of peace deeper than a negation of war borne of personal, collective and institutional diffidence.

In the third chapter I examine how Hinsley and Griffin help build a generative theo-political consensus around the Education Bill, 1944 for universal maintained ‘Catholic’ education up to the end of secondary school age (thus distinguishing the Catholic Church from the Anglican Church). Hinsley brought about conciliation between Church and State drawing on Catholic spirituality and doctrine, whereas Griffin brought a spirit of proto-aggiornamento to the negotiations. In the fourth chapter, I examine how other members of the Hierarchy, religious, parents, young people, service men, Catholic politicians and officials, and clergy helped the Cardinals interpret the place of the Church towards the end of the Second World War. This experience helped Hinsley and Griffin translate Church teaching into an ‘espoused’ voice and ‘operant’ practice and would inform the Second Vatican Council.

In the fifth chapter I examine how the multi-layered natures of the four voices, namely ‘normative’, ‘formal’, ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’, have helped to interpret this theo-political journey, led to changing identities within the Catholic community and cautions us to look beyond the flexibility and apparent attractiveness of contract law concerning the devolution of school governance to the theological and fiscal principles that informed the compromises made during the passage of the Education Act, 1944.

Second Volume
This Volume 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. 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.

\(^1\) Cardinal Bourne 1903-34, Cardinal Hinsley 1935-43 and Cardinal Griffin 1943-56.
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Chapter One Entering The Maze

1.1 Introduction

This year marks the seventieth anniversary of the passing of the Education Act, 1944. This legislation brought about adaptive change in the life of the Church and the State in England and Wales at the end of the Second World War. It also marks a shift in the ecclesiology apparent between the First Vatican Council and the Second Vatican Council. During this period the Church alienated by the growing secularisation of the State turned towards the Papacy and away from the world (Ultramontanism). It devoted itself to establishing a parallel world of Catholic “schools, universities, hospitals, sports clubs, charities, cinemas, unions, political parties, newspapers, magazines” all instruments of catechesis. This approach did not stop two world wars and in 1944 the Catholic Church in England and Wales increasingly saw the democratic ‘confessional’ State as an ally rather than an adversary as it sought to rebuild its mission amid the shattered remains of war. These instruments of catechesis became instruments of evangelisation and a means of dialogue between Church and State. After the humiliation of the Enlightenment through the folly of generational warmongering the Church sought to retrieve the natural law tradition that it had itself fashioned. Yet unlike continental Europe and the Americas, the Catholic Church in England and Wales had the added difficulty of having to engage with ‘established’ Anglican prelates as well as politicians; the outcome of a confessional state. This was achieved through a recovery of the role of the lay person within the life of the Church locally. As Pius XII would reflect a few months after the enactment of the Education Act, 1944:

The Church has the mission to announce to the world…the call to be sons of God.\(^5\)

State absolutism and the catastrophe of war could only be avoided in the future if the Church and states found new ways of working together to build the dignity of man. This experience would inform the theological reflection of the Second Vatican Council and pre-echoes of this Council resonate throughout the papers of Cardinals Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin.\(^6\)

One of the great anomalies in the canon of academic literature on this piece of legislation is the paucity of material drawn from Catholic ‘primary’ sources. This thesis attempts to address this omission. The Archive of the Archbishop of Westminster (AAW) contains the


\(^5\) Pius XII, *Democracy And A Lasting Peace*, Christmas Message, 1944, § 84.

\(^6\) Cardinal Bourne 1903-34, Cardinal Hinsley 1935-43 and Cardinal Griffin 1943-56.
Catholic papers of the Cardinals involved in the negotiations of this Act. To date, these have never been read systematically. Consequently, the Catholic memory has been atomised and often founded on folklore. Now, at a time of neoconservative structural change to the education system, when the competencies for initial teacher training no longer require student teachers to examine the Education Act, 1944, it is important to rediscover what actually happened in 1944, to discern how decisions were made within the Catholic Hierarchy, how the Church negotiated with His Majesty’s Government (HMG) and to penetrate how both sides learnt to compromise.

The AAW holds the ‘national’ Catholic papers for the early part of the twentieth century. After the restoration of the Hierarchy, and before the establishment of the Bishops’ Conference following the Second Vatican Council, the Westminster Archive de facto is the ‘national’ Catholic Archive. The papers contained therein illustrate how “the [Catholic] Church [in England and Wales] carrie[d] the responsibility of scrutinising the signs of the times and interpreting them in the light of the Gospel.” This thesis will unearth new and as yet unexamined material from the AAW and challenge ‘received’ wisdom from encyclopaedic commentaries such as Jedin et al. It will focus on the educational entries found in the Archive for Cardinals Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin respectively and describe changing ecclesiologies and examine changing anthropologies. While care must be taken in “using cross-sectional data” obtained from a single source, this particular source is matchless and deserves to be read in a singular fashion. This was a deliberate research decision since many have already read and commented on the political record of the negotiations lodged at the National Archive at Kew or on secondary Catholic sources and

---

7 After the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965).
8 Gaudium et Spes, § 4.
published biographical material. This doctorate represents unashamedly the first systematic study of the loosely catalogued papers kept at the AAW concerning The Education Bill, 1944 and The Education Act, 1944. It does so mindful of the eschatological nature of Church History since Church history is more than a narrative arranged around great men and events.\(^\text{12}\)

### 1.2 Key To The Maze

The Westminster Diocesan Archive is a treasure-trove of material. Portfolios from the early to mid-part of the twentieth century are loosely-catalogued therein. The connection between titles and content is often tenuous and frequently misleading. Therefore to assist the reader of this thesis, references in footnotes and the bibliography at the end of Volume I are colour-coded, along with Volume II. 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. Interestingly, it was not until Cardinal Hume’s time\(^\text{13}\) that the files of the preceding Cardinals were closed and new working files established; perhaps the first sign of an abbot-Cardinal.

Perhaps the best metaphor to describe the Archive is one of railway lines. The lines run parallel to each other in correlated portfolios, sometimes converging and occasionally leading to turntables. I often asked three questions when in the Archive:

- who selected the pages lodged in the Archive and why?
- who handled this page before me?
- what was not lodged in the Archive and why?

I was also left implicitly with a fourth question, over how I would now write the narrative of this Archive. The primary challenge was to bring order to the portfolios lodged in the

---

\(^{12}\) Church history has largely been presented in a manner analogous to secular history, arranged around great men and events – in the case of the Church around popes and councils with little credence given to its eschatological nature (Glenn W. Olsen, Christopher Dawson And The Renewal of Catholic Education: The Proposal That Catholic Culture And History, Not Philosophy, Should Order the Catholic Curriculum, Logos A Journal Of Catholic Thought and Culture, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN, Volume 13, Number 3, Summer 2010, page 18).

\(^{13}\) 1976-1999.
Archive of the Archbishop of Westminster that would respect the historical, political and theological strands, or lines, contained therein. Mindful not to fall into historicism or historical revisionism\(^{14}\) and try to read what was written with the eyes of those who first read the respective memorandums and minutes and to hear with the ears of those who first heard the respective speeches and homilies. From such a platform comes this new interpretation.

What became critically important in this venture were the ‘real-time’ asides in the margins and amendments to speeches and homilies made by participants engaged in the negotiations. I will refer to these as and when appropriate. My primary objective throughout has been to examine the surviving contemporaneous documentary Church record identifying how the ipsissima verba of the participants shaped their ‘ipsissima’ vox; disambiguating their “subjective meanings, actions and social contexts.”\(^{15}\) Like Keith Jeffery\(^{16}\), who undertook a similar first read of the British Secret Intelligence Service: 1909-1949 Archive, I have used memoir material very sparingly. As Jeffery writes, “although often revealing on the personal side, the recollection of events and emotions, sometimes many years after, presents critical problems of interpretation and assessment for the historian.”\(^{17}\) Some of the discoveries are previously unseen and some are revelatory.

The multiple genres used within this thesis may cause the reader frustration; for this I beg your forbearance from the beginning. This is due to the loosely-catalogued nature of the Archive as well as to the transient nature of War and post-war thinking. To interpret the multifaceted nature of the negotiations, the researcher and reader, has to look simultaneously through theological, historical and political lenses. Through three different lenses, one begins to glimpse the world as observed by the characters of the day and not clouded by hindsight. For the record, the writer of this thesis is formed scholastically by the decisions made in 1944.

\(^{14}\) As aptly put by James “soldiers are always preparing to fight the last war;[…]and politicians and students of politics are always preparing to avoid the last war (Robert Rhodes James, Churchill: A Study in Failure 1900-1939, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1970, page 226.”

\(^{15}\) Ellie Fossey, Carol Harvey, Fiona McDermott, Larry Davidson, Understanding and Evaluating Qualitative Research, Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry 2002; 36:[page] 717.

1.3 Main Characters

Hinsley and Griffin not only steered the Church but engaged with the State to bring about transitional adaptive change that would lead to transformation of the national education system. Ad intra communio was built between a predominantly aristocratic ‘Old’ Catholic constituency and an ever-increasing Catholic ‘migrant’ constituency. During the thesis, we read of the developing role of the Catholic laity first expressed ecclesiologically in Rerum Novarum and subsequently in Gaudium et Spes at the Second Vatican Council. Hinsley and Griffin while recusant in character were proto-‘ressourcement’-like in temperament. Their common intuition drew on the dutiful consensus of recusant times and the theology of patristic times which they applied to the sitze-im-leben they faced to rebuild the Church after two world wars placing Christ at the centre of all teaching. Clergy, religious and laity together developed a generative Catholic curriculum, founded on a Christian anthropology, which challenged competing totalitarian narratives.

Schools with a religious character are an existent reality nowadays accounting for a third of the maintained schools’ estate and two-fifths of the independent schools estate. While in public discourse, such schools are ‘fine’ if they do no harm and teach, in the maintained sector, the ‘national curriculum’. Their position, as generations of post-War politicians have come to recognise, is structurally embedded. The Exchequer could not afford to buy and replace a third of the maintained schools’ estate. This has not stopped successive politicians trying to reform the educational system and improve standards therein. Control is at the heart of this reform. As is the change of name used by HMG in public discourse when referring to local education authorities (LEAs) and dioceses; shifting from ‘partners’ to ‘stakeholders’. The former suggests ‘equivalence’, the latter neoconservative ‘contingency’.

\[\text{\footnotesize 18} \text{§43 “Since they have an active role to play in the whole life of the Church, laymen are not only bound to penetrate the world with a Christian spirit, but are also called to be witnesses to Christ in all things in the midst of human society.”} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize 19} \text{“it starts from Christ and leads to Christ” taken from Stanislaus J. Grabowski, St. Augustine and The Doctrine Of The Mystical Body of Christ, Catholic University of America, page 101.} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize 20} \text{HMG Department for Children, Schools and Families, Faith In The System: The Role Of Schools With A Religious Character In English Education and Society, Nottingham, 2007, page 3.} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize 21} \text{This term was abolished in Education and Inspections Act, 2006, § 162.} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize 22} \text{This has been brought into sharper relief this year by an announcement by David Laws, the current “Liberal Democrat schools minister, [asking] for OfSTED to be given new powers to directly inspect academy chains for the first time (Graeme Paton, The Daily Telegraph, 9th March 2014).” It is unclear the consequence this will have on groups of ‘Catholic’ academy schools and whether diocese will be inspected.} \]
1.4 Reading the Archive

The educational settlement of 1944 aimed to address systemic inequality, build a broader middle class, assist in the project of reconstruction and resolve perceived economic and religious injustice. It was also generative, focusing on the whole, rather than sectional, ‘economic’ development of the child.

At the end of the War, the Church as well as the State was changing; for the second time since the beginning of the twentieth century a generation had been slain. Through individual bishops, the insight of religious sisters, the wisdom of ‘Catholic’ political advisers, the tenacity of Catholic politicians and through the sacrifice of lay Catholics who died on the battlefields with such great honour, renewed ecclesial models of Church emerged. Through the negotiations around the Education Act, 1944 the Church learnt how to hold in tension orthodoxy and compromise in political debate. While Hinsley’s greatest challenge would be building a consensus towards educational reform across the Hierarchy, Griffin’s greatest challenge would be marshalling the Catholic community to pay for this reform. Both were necessary steps for meaningful engagement with the State.

During the Second World War, the ecclesial communion between Catholics across Europe was breeched by excessive nationalism, militarism and systemic deformation of the young. The story of how the Catholic community in England and Wales set about healing this rift through the negotiations around the Education Act, 1944 is quite remarkable. Twenty years before the opening of the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic community in England and Wales not only engaged in dialogue with the elected Government of the day but committed itself to decisions over the denominational provision of education, in and of, its own right. There are clear experiential signs in the Archive of communio, proto-subsidiarity and solidarity first seen in recusant times, restored in wartime and articulated at the Second Vatican Council.

The multiple genres used within this thesis are due to the loosely-catalogued nature of the Archive as well as to the transient nature of war and post-War thinking. To interpret the multifaceted nature of the negotiations, the researcher and reader has to look simultaneously through theological, historical and political lenses. Through each lens, one glimpses the world as observed by the characters of the day, their ‘theological’ or ‘political’ intuitions and their preliminary ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ voices unclouded by hindsight. In

---

23 Helen Cameron, Deborah Bhatti, Catherine Duce, James Sweeney and Clare Watkins, Talking About God In Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology, SCM Press, Norfolk, 2010, especially chapters 3 and 4. See below.
wartime the place ‘systemic’ theological reflection and renewal is less significant, not because it is less important, but because theologians and believers were striving to survive. They, like the rest of humanity, intuited their own personal (and societal) ambiguities. Consequently readers who read in peacetime should not place unrealistic expectations on the Archive or characters found therein. One senses their neophyte ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ theses, which would lead contemporaneously to adaptive social and ecclesial change. Necessary parts, some twenty years later, of an ‘epideictic’ narrative of, and for, the Church in the modern world at the Second Vatican Council. This continuity is not sequential, but nor was the theology at that time. Members of the Hierarchy, clergy and laity drew on snatches of their theological past and of their childhood piety, constants in the face of warfare. This is not a reflection of poor academic formation but a reflection of the time and the Archive. For this I ask the indulgence and understanding of the reader.

Any claims which seem extravagant probably are, yet they often represent the unmediated and eclectic ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ phrases of the time. Without appreciating this, we will learn little from the Archive and our focus will remain occluded. Paradoxically, the civic affinity engendered by wartime led to ecumenical rapprochements, while the sacrifices made ad intra would lead to experiences of communio reminiscent of recusant times. Within this transient sitze-im-leben came educational and health reform at the end of War in the later half of the 1940s.

Nowadays equivalent discourses\textsuperscript{24} no longer take place as easily. Religion has not disappeared from the public sphere but it has become radicalised for many since 9/11. In 1944 the State and Church shared the same moral imperatives and their respective leaders shared a common vision\textsuperscript{25}; schools would teach pupils the difference between ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ and protect them from the spread of totalitarian ideologies. Universal education and health reform in the 1940s were part of a wider project of reconstruction. This project’s authority was cross-party and supported by the churches. It increased the opportunity for many to join the ‘professional’ middle classes.

In 1947, after the end of the War, pupils up to fifteen years old would be offered universal education in a variety of settings. Schools aimed to educate and not to indoctrinate children and young people as happened in 1930s Germany. To do this effectively, Hinsley

\textsuperscript{24} In contemporary public discourse citizens now only listen to religious leaders because they believe them to be right rather than because they have authority.

\textsuperscript{25} Churchill’s vision borne of a theistic anthropology and Hinsley’s borne of a Christian ‘humanist’ anthropology.
and Griffin argued for diversity of educational provision. This enabled children and young people to be secure in their own identity and learn an alternative ‘revealed’ Christian anthropology regardless of their religious heritage. Such a formal and informal curriculum across the system would acknowledge ambiguity and encourage children and young people attending schools after the War to engage in informed dialogue. This narrative of transformation was born of hope in a more just future and recognition of the importance of religious freedom in civic discourse. The dual system enshrined within the Education Act, 1944 aimed to help all pupils face down radical evil and recognised implicitly the Church’s right to educate as enunciated by Pius XI in Divini Illius Magistri, 1929.27

For the Church denominational education was a matter of right and ‘conscience; and for HMG a matter of wartime realpolitik. By the end of the Second World War, the Catholic community had moved from the margins and was now central to Churchill’s primary hope of winning the War and defeating Nazism. He was astute enough to realise that he could not alienate Catholics before D-Day. Butler’s Education Bill would become a matter of confidence for Churchill. Although reticent over embarking on educational reform, Churchill threatened to force a confidence vote in the ‘national Government’ in the House of Commons if the Education Bill was not passed therein. He knew how important it had become for maintaining ‘Catholic’ morale.

During my three years in the Archive, as I have intimated above with my use of ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ voices, I became increasingly reliant on the four voices contained in Cameron et al’s, Talking About God In Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology28 to organise the Archive. These four voices are ‘normative’, ‘espoused’, ‘formal’ and ‘operant’ and below is the working definition that I used when classifying individual voices:

**Normative Voice** = enunciation of Church Teaching by the Magisterium in encyclicals and joint pastoral letters;

**Formal Voice** = theological and educational treatises;

---

26 Both inside and outside the classroom.
27 §25 The extent of the Church’s mission in the field of education is such as to embrace every nation, without exception, according to the command of Christ: “Teach ye all nations [Matthew 28:17]; and there is no power on earth that may lawfully oppose her or stand in her way. In the first place, it extends over all the Faithful, of whom she has anxious care as a tender mother (Pius XI, Divini Illius Magistri, 1929).
28 Helen Cameron, Deborah Bhatti, Catherine Duce, James Sweeney and Clare Watkins, Talking About God In Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology, SCM Press, Norfolk, 2010, especially chapters 3 and 4.
Espoused Voice = interpretation of the above in prevailing settings; (found especially in correspondence and through other media);

Operant Voice = Interaction between theology and politics, often leading to adaptive change.

This organising tool draws much of its method from action research.\textsuperscript{29} Pastoral theology aims to help scholars analyse ‘faith-in-action’\textsuperscript{30} “drawing on postmodern epistemologies that privilege contextual, situated enquiry and the reflexivity of the researcher”\textsuperscript{31}, what social scientists would now call a new historicism\textsuperscript{32}. While there can be no distance between the researcher and the researched in this model, I have adapted the model to help interpret, in a meaningful fashion, the development in conversations recorded across the various constituencies ad extra and ad intra. This interpretative method respects the integrity of theological, political and historical genres found in the Archive, acknowledges the experiences of the participants, orders the untidy nature of the compromises made in the negotiations and helps to identify anew the decisions made by the participants and the ‘operant’ boundaries within which these decisions were made.

While this amended interpretative method is iterative, the voices open to the reader the place of intuition, the articulation of ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ phrases along with problem-solving and policy reformulation during the negotiations. This allows the reader to assess the data against two axes. On the one axis is found the immediate response of historic figures, such as Hinsley and Butler, in the negotiations, and on the other axis is found the theo-political principles that gave rise to the agreements and compromises made. Is this method perfect? No, but the ‘Four Voices’ proved useful in examining positions that were neither formed nor predetermined. The rip-tide of new socio-political, anthropological and theological perspectives provides the energy whereby ‘existent’ policy is eroded and reformed. As is the way with rip-tides, they are found below the surface. With the benefit of hindsight, one can look back and see both the intended and the unintended consequences of the Education Act, 1944, and how politicians wrote regulations to meet the logistical and financial challenges perceived and experienced. However, at the time, these consequences were less clear to the participants than they are to us today.

\textsuperscript{29} Elaine Graham, Is Practical Theology A Form Of ‘Action Research’?, International Journal of Public Theology, Brill (De Gruyter Online), 2013, 17(1), page 148.
\textsuperscript{30} ibid, page 158.
\textsuperscript{31} ibid, page 152.
\textsuperscript{32} New Historicism is a literary theory based on the idea that literature should be studied and interpreted within the context of both the history of the author and the history of the critic/reader. There is no such thing as a ‘neutral’ interpretation.
This amended method allows the researcher to engage in a double hermeneutic\textsuperscript{33} whereby he/she can interpret the data presented, and through it, come to a deeper understanding of his/her world.\textsuperscript{34} Cameron et al’s ‘Appendix 11’\textsuperscript{35} provides a particularly helpful tool in this

\textsuperscript{33} A desire to achieve such experiential insights is not limited to sociology and history but can been seen in other disciplines such as the field of exegesis through the work of ‘reader-response criticism’ and the field of psychology through ‘interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA)’.

\textsuperscript{34} Jonathan A Smith & Mike Osborn, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis, page 53.

\textsuperscript{35} Guide to Reading and Interpreting Data Collected in the Action Research: Church and Society (ARCS) Project (Helen Cameron, Deborah Bhatti, Catherine Duce, James Sweeney and Clare Watkins, Talking About God In Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology, SCM Press, Norfolk, 2010, page 178).

This document is designed to help the internal research team within your organisation read and interpret the data gathered from the ARCS research. It provides a framework for this discussion to take place. This is an important step in the research cycle. It enables learning and informs future action. In doctoral research this has to applied to your specific setting with the team reduced to the student, the home team being the family/proof readers you may engage and the Outsider/Researcher being your supervisor.

Before your team meets to look at the data, we recommend that you and your colleagues read through the data individually and thoroughly, looking for phrases and quotations that illumine themes and/or issues of importance within the context of your particular role within the organisation. It may be helpful to have a highlighter pen and for each member of the internal research team to have a copy of the remit document and ARCS Set-up Questionnaire.

In the meeting itself, we suggest you appoint a note-taker to record as much of the discussion as possible. The ARCS team will follow a similar process, before both teams meet together to share the fruit of their reflections.

\begin{itemize}
  \item How does the data help answer the research question? [Thus establishing what insights the data offers (ibid, page 103)].
  \item Is there anything that surprises/strikes you about the data?
  \item What kind of beliefs and values are embodied in this data? [This question starts to describe the [formal]/operant theology embedded in the practice (ibid)].
  \item Is there anything that seems to affirm the beliefs and values of your organisation? [This question invites a comparison with the espoused theology (ibid)].
  \item Is there anything that seems to challenge the beliefs and values of your organisation? [This question invites a comparison with the espoused theology (ibid). In an addendum to their commentary on this question, and the previous question, on page 103 Cameron et al encourage researchers to return to what was stated at the outset of the research. This discussion, they believe, should identify both where operant and espoused theologies align and where they differ. These differences are crucial as a spur to further reflection].
  \item Where do you see God in the data? [This question helps identify ‘silent’ voices, or those voices of the marginalised, within the data. (ibid and Carolyn Steedman, Dust, Manchester University Press, Manchester 2001, page 145.)]
  \item What learning might you be keen to draw from this material for people involved in your organisation? What actions would you be
endeavour, whereby the reader/researcher move from analysis to reflection assessing whether the data answers the original research question.\textsuperscript{36} In applying this method to the Archive, the researcher, as well as being internal to the dynamics of the Archive, also remains outside, reading the data found assessing the ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ theologies and gaps between the two.\textsuperscript{37} The four voices are not discrete, separate from one another; each voice is never one-dimensional. We can never hear one voice without hearing the echoes of the other three. This needs constantly to be borne in mind as we describe the impact of normative and formal voices on contemporaneous discernment of the sitz-im-leben, recognising that such discernment innately involves a double-hermeneutic since both participants and researchers are bearers of praxes.

The potential of the Archive cannot be realised while it remains locked away. The story can only live in the hands of a reader\textsuperscript{38}. However, just because something is found in the Archive and supported by “the testimony of two independent witnesses not self-deceived”\textsuperscript{39} does not make it above further examination.

By examining the Archive one can surmise how individual post holders were influenced by the papers of their predecessors, memoranda, and accounts of particular events lodged in their files. One can hypothesise how the theo-political trends of the day influenced the thinking of individual bishops. However, one does not know with certitude who has handled the papers previously and who made decisions to keep copies, to send copies to other parties or to discard material. Such decisions may have been informed by the emerging ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voice of the respective Archbishops or by the judgement of personal secretaries, as well as other administrative officials.

All the above, and all that follows, is conditional given the current organisation of the Archive: other unseen papers may be found which may modify the theses proposed here and this realisation freed me from concerns over missing something and freed me to decide to stop reading in the Archive. Perfection was unachievable. On a purely practical

keen to take forward? [These questions help identify strand(s) of new operant theology and practice in the data (Helen Cameron, Deborah Bhatti, Catherine Duce, James Sweeney and Clare Watkins, Talking About God In Practice: Theological Action Research and Practical Theology, SCM Press, Norfolk, 2010, pages 103-104.)]

\textsuperscript{36} ibid, page 99.
\textsuperscript{37} ibid, page 104.
point, paper and ink were rationed during and after the War and incidental events may not have been recorded through this medium. After all it was a time of ‘waste not, want not’.

Carolyn Steedman in Dust\textsuperscript{40} examines the place of sound and silence within history and in an Archive.\textsuperscript{41, 42} While the Archive is revivified by the reader, facts do not speak for themselves.\textsuperscript{43} The character or thing that is found in the Archive “is always something else, a creation of the search itself and the time the search took.”\textsuperscript{44} The shift from chirographic to typographic to technologic allows for new insight on behalf of the reader and means that no one interpretation is privileged. Humanity, Kundera\textsuperscript{45} argues, “is separated from the past (even from the past only a few seconds old) by two forces that go instantly to work and cooperate: the force of forgetting (which erases) and the force of memory (which transforms).”\textsuperscript{46} Kundera examines the literature that emerged from slavery and how the past can be forgotten: “Guillotined by a long journey in ships’ holds, among corpses, screams, tears, blood, suicides, murders; nothing was left at the end of the journey through hell; nothing but forgetting: fundamental and foundational forgetting (sic).”\textsuperscript{47} However, the need to identify our homeland, to ground our identity, outside our “introspective memory”\textsuperscript{48} is powerful. For Hinsley Christian identity, in England and Wales, lay beyond the destruction of war, the melancholy of the potato famine and the nostalgia of recusant days. He intuited a new ‘etiological’ homeland within patristic theology and scripture.

Institutional memories and forgetfulness in Church-State discourse are sometimes conflicted. While ‘institutional’ memory informs perspectives in negotiations, so do

\textsuperscript{40} Carolyn Steedman, Dust, Manchester University Press, Manchester 2001.
\textsuperscript{41} ibid, page 145.
\textsuperscript{42} The nature and scope of ‘quasi-national’ or ‘formal’ archives is not equivalent to local record offices or coeval manuscript collections. Such archives may not be ordered but are collective, quantitative and qualitative.
\textsuperscript{43} The theological reader, Lonergan believes, has to be attentive, to be intelligent, to be reasonable and to be responsibly mindful that he/she is not constrained by what is there to be seen but must interpret what motivates and inspires the characters. To do this, the reader must have good peripheral vision and be aware of other conversations and events ad extra, as well as, ad intra. It is here that the wider interface takes place between archival research, political philosophy and theological understanding. In a fascinating exchange Einstein and Freud examine the evils of war and how ‘aggression’ and ‘love’ are in a complex unitive relationship within the human psyche (This exchange was published in 1933 entitled Why War?)
\textsuperscript{44} ibid, page 148.
\textsuperscript{45} ibid, page 158.
\textsuperscript{46} ibid, page 161.
'nostalgia'\textsuperscript{49} and ‘melancholy’. Memory unlike nostalgia is transformative and gives hope providing a generative epistemology to interpret the current sitz-im-leben of participants. Hinsley, Cardinal Henri de Lubac (1896-1991), Father Gaston Fessard (1897-1978), and Jacques Maritain (1882-1973) drew on Augustine’s treatise of the ‘just’ war to nurture and sustain believers in wartime Europe in the twentieth century. This memory and spiritual renewal lay at the heart of their respective ‘espoused’ voices and ‘operant’ action in war and peace. The Fathers of the Second Vatican Council would draw from such experiences of proto-‘ressourcement’ as they sought to describe a new way forward (aggiornamento). Experience of, and response to, ‘total’ war and peace preceded a theological articulation thereof.

In any story there will be silence and fissures in records. The voices of the great and the good, along with the poor and the marginalised, must be afforded commensurate weight. Politics is shaped by such inchoate stuff; as is the Church’s response to the World. At the beginning of the twentieth century it is apparent\textsuperscript{50} that the Church’s ‘normative’ voice struggled to be heard amid the din of war, economic depression and the remnants of Enlightenment thinking. Through their respective episcopacies at Westminster, Hinsley and Griffin found an epideictic voice that helped bring about adaptive change to the country’s education system ad extra and ad intra.

This was a ‘prerunner’ to the voices of the Second Vatican Council\textsuperscript{51} and will be attended to more in the fifth chapter of this thesis. What is clear now is that a richer reading of the Archive is achieved by an appreciation of intertextuality between different responses to HMG’s educational proposals. In the 1940s the Church in England and Wales learnt how to build consensus and weave together Cardinal Hinsley’s principled co-operation with the ‘nation’ state and Archbishop Richard Downey’s\textsuperscript{52} innate suspicion of the State’s intention in light of serial civic breeches to concordats in mainland Europe between the Church and individual countries during the nineteenth and early-mid twentieth century.\textsuperscript{53}


\textsuperscript{50} AAW Hi 2/162 1922, 1935-40.


\textsuperscript{52} Richard Downey, Archbishop of Liverpool, 1928-1953.

\textsuperscript{53} This lack of trust in politicians by those who signed concordats with the Church, is rehearsed in an undated paper entitled: \textit{The Papacy & The “Temporal Power”} lodged in the Hinsley Archive. In this paper, a nameless author writes:
By examining the Archive one can read how individual post holders were influenced by the papers of their predecessors, memoranda, and accounts of particular events lodged in their files. One can interpret also how the theo-political trends of the day influenced the thinking of individual bishops. However, one does not know with certitude who has handled the papers already and who made decisions to keep copies, to send copies to other parties or to discard material. Such decisions may have been informed by the emerging ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voice of the respective Archbishops or by the judgement of personal secretaries, as well as other administrative officials.

All the above, and all that follows, is conditional given the current organisation of the Archive: other unseen papers may be found which may modify the theses proposed here. On a purely practical point, paper and ink were rationed during and after the War and incidental events may not have been recorded through this medium. After all it was a time of ‘waste not, want not’. What is apparent, even from a cursory read of the Archive, is that by 1944 the Catholic community was more articulate and politically adept. What this adapted method has added is a new tool, to assess in particular intuitive thought and embryonic policy formulation, especially in wartime.

Chapter Two Scene Setting

The interpretative influence of religious sisters on the Church’s ‘formal’ voice, growing collegiality among members of the Hierarchy in the negotiations, using members of the laity to advise and articulate, along with an effective use of the radio by Hinsley in ‘espousing’ a humane spirituality that appealed to Catholics and non-Catholics54 all led to a growing civic recognition of the loyalty and valour of Catholics.

---

54 “An R.A.F. officer and his bomber crew had heard one of Hinsley’s talks on the importance of youth and wrote from Yorkshire to thank him for his inspiring words. As they flew over the North Sea the crew recalled Hinsley’s words: ‘God’s greatest gift to us was the joy of youth, and the greatest gift we could offer to God was the service of our youth’. They remembered,
2.1 Educational, Ecumenics and Place of Parents

The beginning of the twentieth century was characterised by a global inability to establish peace.\footnote{Wilhelm Weber, Society And State As A Problem For the Church, in Hubert Jedin, Konrad Repgen and John Dolan editors, translated by Anselm Biggs, History Of The Church Volume X – The Church In The Modern Age, Burns & Oates, London, 1981, page 229.} Wilhelm Weber, in Jedin \textit{History Of The Church}, argues that “the world economic crisis [of the 1930s] mark[ed] the end of the era of liberal economics and the beginning of a national state policy of controlling and standardising...The crisis \textit{in (sic)} the system became a crisis \textit{of (sic)} the system.\footnote{ibid, pages 229-230.} To appreciate the context in which the negotiations over the Education Act, 1944 took place one has to evaluate three strands, namely ‘educational history’ within England and Wales, the influence of ‘ecumenics’ in a confessional state and the role of parents in political and theological discourse.

It is as well, at the beginning to rehearse the principle on which much of what follows is founded. Denominational education was an issue of conscience for the Catholic community. After the First World War the need to protect Catholic children from the unbridled power of the State\footnote{In \textit{Divini Illius Magistri}, on 31\textsuperscript{st} December 1929, Pius XI wrote: “...it is clear that there can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end, and that in the present order of Providence, since God has revealed Himself to us in the Person of His Only Begotten Son, who alone is "the way, the truth and the life," there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education (§7).”} and the increasingly technocratic needs of the economy made this right evermore pressing. Articulation of this right was drawn from both ‘normative’ and ‘formal’ sources in religious and civic domains\footnote{Marie De Saint Jean Martin OSU, in papers edited by her for the Ursuline Education Convention of 1940, rehearses that “lessons in morals and virtue will have no efficacy if not confirmed by example (Marie De Saint Jean Martin OSU, \textit{Ursuline Method Of Education}, Quinn & Boden, New Jersey, 1946, page 12).” This was not a form of denominational determinism to counter Nazism but a reminder that each child is “a free being (ibid, page 30).” This Ursuline pedagogy encouraged teachers “to insist with kindness on the correct use of words from a very early age, and to watch the grammatical construction of their little phrases.” Between, and after the World Wars, protecting the integrity of linguistic meaning and averting its corruption through the misuse of words, sometimes with catastrophic consequences, was highlighted in civic discourse by philosophers of logic such as Wittgenstein (1889 – 1951) arguing that the meaning of words is constituted by the ‘ordinary’ function they perform within any given language-game. The denominational curriculum would teach children both a narrative of revelation and how “to will and to will well (ibid, page 30).”} with the memory of what Chesterton wrote as early as 1914, before he had converted to Catholicism, that if
Germany prevailed in the First World War “there will be no history any more. There will only be an enormous fable eating up all the facts.” For both Church and State, the school would be the driver towards social re-construction after the Second World War and a place where totalitarian ideologies, of left and right, evaluated in a prudent manner.

The beginning of the twentieth century in Europe was a time of transition. The main characters present in the Archive were trying to interpret the economic and political events they were party to across Europe. In the First World War and its aftermath there had been over sixteen million deaths with twenty million soldiers and civilians either wounded or enfeebled by an influenza pandemic. Through a chiefly ‘monarchic’ ecclesiology, the Church engaged with a kaleidoscope of political and economic sitze-im-leben outside the Flaminian Gate. The Church sought to establish itself anew and engage with modern societies, whether democratic or totalitarian. This re-alignment was not one-sided. The recent certainty of the Enlightenment was undermined by the trauma of modern warfare and empirical confidence was replaced by epistemological reticence.

Onto this ‘Westminster’ stage came Churchill and Hinsley; both were elder statesmen when elected and appointed respectively. They became kindred spirits and were able to draw on the successes and failures of their own lives already lived to remain ‘here firm, though all be drifting.’ They knew when and how to compromise.

Political rapprochements and reform are often founded on personal relationships. Neither Hinsley nor Churchill engaged in the detailed drafting of legislation nor in the writing of

---

60 This desire will have been formed by ‘formal’ voices within the Catholic community such as G. K. Chesterton, a lay theologian, novelist and poet, who converted to Catholicism in 1922. He, and other members, of the later Oxford Movement, accepted Catholicism “not because it told the truth, but [because it] has revealed itself as a truth-telling thing (G.K. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, page 157).”
61 A challenge made famous by Cardinal Wiseman’s first pastoral letter, as Archbishop of Westminster, 7th October 1850, after the restoration of the Hierarchy in England and Wales by Pope Pius IX.
62 Churchill succeeded Chamberlain when sixty-six and Hinsley was appointed to Westminster when seventy years old.
64 According to James Hagerty, in his recent biography of Cardinal Hinsley entitled Cardinal Hinsley Priest and Patriot: “when looking for a successor to the late Archbishop Lang of Canterbury, Prime Minister Churchill is reputed to have said: ‘Why can’t we have the old man at Westminster?’” This is taken from a secondary source, namely, Moloney, Westminster, Whitehall and The Vatican, pp.168-172, but is anecdotal evidence of the growing regard Churchill had for Hinsley.
curricula - that was left to their respective Ministers and officials. This policy-space gave them freedom to be epideictic in their oratory.

There now follows three subsections, the first, on educational history in England and Wales leading to the Education Act, 1944, the second addressing early-ecumenics in the twentieth century along with the abdication of Edward VIII and the third, the place of parents in theological and civic discourse.

2.2 Educational
Historically, the Catholic Church saw (and sees) education as part of its ‘normative’ heritage as rehearsed by Pius XI in Divini Illius Magistri, 1929. In England and Wales this teaching charism stretches back before then to Saxon times. Education, before and after the Reformation, was undertaken for a few in abbeys and convents, and in the nineteenth century it was opened to more Catholic children through Grant Aid and the establishment of a wider network of schools.

Increasingly within the nineteenth and early twentieth century the ends of education became binary. It prepared children with the skills to live life to the full on earth as well as in Heaven. This was necessary in response to illiteracy found in the ranks during the Boer War and the demands of the industrial revolution with its move from agrarian to industrial. Much of what follows in this sub-section relies on Cruickshank’s narrative found in Church and State in English Education: 1870 To The Present Day. The justification for this reliance is simple; this account was written with the support and advice of Mr Butler who wrote the foreword. In one publication one reads a history written from an ‘establishment’ perspective inclusive of Anglican and State interpretations.

2.2.1 Nineteenth Century
With the introduction for the first time of financial support for schools in 1833, mostly with a religious character, questions of governance and accountability emerged. Such questions underlined sectional divisions especially in the Church of England. “While the Evangelicals

---

66 First issued to Catholic schools in 1847.
67 W O Lester Smith, Government of Education, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965, footnote 1, page 106 notes that Dr M Cruickshank's Church and State in English Education was written with “Mr Butler's information and advice.”
wanted co-operation with the State, the Tractarians, led by Archdeacons Denison and Manning, stood for exclusive clerical control over the schools.\textsuperscript{68} Alongside this the non-Conformists adapted their principle of free trade in food and in commerce to education. The Wesleyans set about expanding their existent estate of two hundred and ninety self-funded day schools. In 1847, they agreed to accept public aid. The same year saw the publication of the Wesleyans’ Education Committee’s report which rehearsed the inseparable bond between the building of chapels and the building schools: “no chapel will be complete in all the great practical objects for which chapels are, or ought to be intended, unless there be found in immediate connection with it an efficient day school.”\textsuperscript{69}

The 1851 census describes the educational landscape of England & Wales thus:\textsuperscript{70}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>Day Schools</th>
<th>Day Scholars</th>
<th>Sabbath Schools</th>
<th>Sabbath Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>10,555</td>
<td>929,476</td>
<td>10,427</td>
<td>985,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Presbyterian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregationalists</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>50,188</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>343,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9,390</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>186,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Methodist</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>41,144</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>429,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanist</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>41,382</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>33,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4,309</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Schools</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>82,597</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wesleyan missiology is similar to the priority rehearsed by the re-established Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales in its First Synodal Letter of Westminster, 1852.\textsuperscript{71} Therein, the bishops urged the Catholic community to establish parishes, build schools and then erect churches. The major difference between the denominations was demographic. While there was a connection between Wesleyan landlords and their tenants, the Catholic poor were predominantly from Ireland, starving and far removed from the recusant roots of ‘old’ English Catholicism. Eighteen years before the Education Act, 1870, the Catholic Hierarchy defined education as a right not a privilege and began to identify the responsibilities implicit in communio – a precursory sign of what would follow at


\textsuperscript{70} Taken from George Bradshaw, Illustrated Handbook To London and Its Environs, 1862 reprinted Conway (imprint of Anova Books Ltd.), London, 2012, page 286.

\textsuperscript{71} The First Synodal Letter of Westminster, 17th July 1852.
the Second Vatican Council and, more recently, in the fourth chapter of Pope Francis’ apostolic exhortation.\(^\text{72}\)

In November 1868, the first Liberal (as distinct from Whig) Government was returned at the General Election and William Ewart Gladstone became Prime Minister for the first of four times. In the following year two organisations to campaign of universal education were launched, [namely, the National Education League, Birmingham and the National Education Union, Manchester]. The former campaigned for free, compulsory and ‘unsectarian’ education, the latter campaigned for the existing village school system. While both wanted universal education they diverged on ways and means. It is dangerous to characterise the different constituencies that ‘Voluntaryist’ schools served. However, while the majority of the Anglican schools were in villages, the majority of non-Conformist schools taught children from the trading classes and the remainder taught the poorest children in newly fashioned industrial conurbations. This last group was made up of ‘ragged’ schools and Catholic schools.

Whereas ragged schools were charitable non-denominational schools dedicated to the free education of destitute children, urban Catholic schools drew from the Irish immigrant community. There were significant gaps in provision. In the words of William Edward Forster, a Liberal M.P. for Bradford who in 1868 was appointed Vice-President of the Privy Council “in helping those only who help themselves or who can get others to help them we have left unhelped those who most need help.\(^\text{73}\)” Tentatively central Government’s engagement in education moved from that of vicarious observer to engaged participant. The need to develop a more efficient workforce to compete with other European countries such as Prussia was changing the political landscape. However, Forster, like his forebears,

\(^{72}\) In the fourth chapter of Evangelii Gaudium (Apostolic Exhortation), Saint Paul’s Publishing, London, 2013, Pope Francis examines the social dimension of evangelisation because “God in Christ redeems not only the individual person, but also the social relations existing between men ([cf. Pontifical Council For Justice And Peace, Compendium Of The Social Doctrine Of The Church, 52] (§178)).” The tangible consequence of this tenet means, according to Pope Francis that “each individual Christian and every community is called to be an instrument of God for the liberation and promotion of the poor and for enabling them to be fully a part of society (§187)...”the more fortunate should renounce some of their rights so as to place their goods more generously at the service of others ([cf. Paul VI, Apostolic Letter Octogesima Adveniens, 14\(^\text{th}\) May 1971] (§178)).” A proto-model of this can be seen within the Catholic community of England and Wales in 1944. Catholic Schools were built through the generosity of the whole Catholic community, many paying for provision that they would not directly benefit from.

“adopted the typically English expedient of compromise by retaining the old system and grafting on it a new.”74

2.2.1.1 Cardinal Manning and the Elementary Education Act, 1870

The negotiations surrounding Elementary Education Bill, 1870 and subsequent Acts, as found in AAW would provide sufficient material for another Doctorate. Suffice to write that Forster and fellow members of the Government wished to supplement and fill the gaps in educational provision. Could this be best done centrally or locally? HMG proposed to leave such decisions to local determination through the establishment of local school boards. HMG envisaged that such boards would have a twofold role: to supplement extant grants for the extension of denominational schools and to commission the building of new ‘secular’ schools. Such permissive sectarianism and permissive secularism was distrusted by all sides alike for different reasons. The non-Conformists and secularists feared that the system would be ‘Anglicised’ in the country areas and Anglican Church leaders feared that it would be ‘secularised’ in urban areas. Faced with this dilemma the debate in the House was volatile and resolved by the adoption of the Cowper-Temple Clause of the Elementary Education Act, 1870: “No religious catechisms or religious formulary, which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in school.”75,76 This clause only referred to board and rate-supported schools.

Alongside the debate over who should pay for the building of schools, the nature and scope of the curriculum taught therein, and more specifically the nature of the ‘religious’ curriculum, had also to be resolved. Mr. W. F. Cowper-Temple suggested a compromise on the floor of the House between 17th June 1870 and 24th June 1870. In turn, this was amended three-times and recorded in the Catholic press thus:

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. [Second] 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

---

74 ibid, page 37.
76 This Act was drafted in response to the perceived advantage enjoyed by Prussia on the battlefield by virtue of its system of mass education.
Part of the Anglican community, along with the Catholic and the Jewish communities objected incrementally to each amendment. The latter expressed perhaps most cogently by Disraeli in the House on 20th June 1870:

[the teacher] cannot teach, explain and enforce the Holy Scriptures when he reads ... without drawing some inferences and conclusions, and what will these inferences and conclusions be but dogmas?...You are inventing and establishing a new sacerdotal class.

Interestingly, a copy of the above article was present in full in the handover papers given to Archbishop Griffin in January 1944. This simple administrative act helped inform and shape the Catholic community’s ‘collective’ memory. The literature that discusses the 1870 Act has a wide range of perspectives, including the impetus of the 1867 Reform Act as well as Prussian economic development. The arguments in Parliament were habitually Anglican (often called ‘Churchmen’) against non-Conformist, closely linked to but not quite equating to Conservative against Liberal, with strong overtones of the Corn Law debates of 25 years earlier. It is easy for a Catholic commentator to look at events from a Catholic perspective and hence fail to see the full contemporary political interplay taking place. It would be too easy for the reader to presume that the Catholic community’s opposition to the Education Act, 1870 was absolute.

While historians generally agree that the Catholic community, and her absentee bishops, opposed the Education Act, 1870, at the time the compromise achieved was thought good enough, and better than, what was originally proposed. It was a case of circumstance and unintended consequence that caused the Catholic community such angst. A case of circumstance, the bishops were in Rome at the First Vatican Council defining the organising principle of papal infallibility, and a case of unintended consequence with the uneven application of the Elementary Education Act by local ‘Board’ officials.

Cardinal Manning, like his successors Cardinal Hinsley and Cardinal Griffin, saw “Christian education as the tap root of Christian society.” Drawing on the Church’s
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77 How the Schools Injustice began Cowper-Temple-ism, undated and reprinted from the Catholic Times by Nuneaton Newspapers Ltd located in AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944, page 3.
78 The First Vatican Council was convoked by Pope Pius IX on 29th June 1868, opened on 8th December 1869 and adjourned on 20th October 1870.
80 1865-1892.
‘normative’ teaching Manning articulated an ‘espoused’ voice that described Christian education as the genus and denominational provision as the species.\textsuperscript{82} This model was adopted later by Hinsley and Griffin. A superficial read of the correspondence that survived the journey to and from Rome suggests that there was no unanimity within the Hierarchy. Much to the opposition of Ullathorne (of Birmingham), Manning accepted “that denominational inspection was unlikely to survive any measure of educational reform. Significantly, [Manning] never raised the issue in any private letter to Gladstone in 1870\textsuperscript{83}\textsuperscript{e} but accepted its passing. According to Selby, Ullathorne and the majority of the Hierarchy, considered this “Manning’s ‘Act of Surrender’.”\textsuperscript{84}\textsuperscript{e}

From a distance, Manning’s primary rearguard action before the passing of the Bill was to safeguard Catholic schools from the possibility of interference by local School Boards. Manning feared that hostile Boards might abuse their power of the ‘purse’ as articulated in Clause 22 of the Bill, in order to win some measure of control over denominational schools. In his letter to Gladstone dated 7\textsuperscript{th} March 1870 Manning rehearsed the suggestion he had put to the Catholic, Lord de Grey, “‘t[he Reformatory Schools Act gives a basis on which we can unite with the Government. It secures our teaching and management: it gives full guarantee to the Government in the Secular part of education.’ The same letter warned the Prime Minister that if the integrity of the Catholic schools was compromised the Bishops would be forced to follow the example of their counterparts in America and sever education relations with the State.\textsuperscript{85}\textsuperscript{e} Given the unrest in Ireland this threat must have focused Gladstone’s mind. Politically compromise in education policy is often won because of perceived consequences outside the field of education, to write nothing of prior unintended regulatory consequences.

Manning entered into further negotiations with Gladstone reflecting the mood of the Hierarchy, in which he expressed a willingness to ‘forego the School Rate’ and remain under the auspices of the Privy Council [as established in the December 1847 concordat].\textsuperscript{86}\textsuperscript{e} Individual bishops were wary of how they would pay for the necessary improvement and expansion of the Catholic schools’ estate to meet the political imperative of universal elementary education. Manning asked Gladstone for proportionate help to assist the Catholic community in assimilating large numbers of migrant children. As he

\textsuperscript{82} ibid, page 200.
\textsuperscript{83} ibid pages 203-204.
\textsuperscript{84} ibid, page 203.
\textsuperscript{85} ibid, page 206.
\textsuperscript{86} ibid, page 207.
wrote to Gladstone on 20th March ‘The time ought to be largely extended and ought to be not dial (sic) time but moral (sic) time’.\(^87\) It is apparent that the Catholic community embodied two growing moieties: namely, an Old Catholic ‘established’ constituency and an Irish ‘migrant’ constituency. Paradoxically, “the Government amendments of 16 June [1870], which went some way towards placating [non-]Conformist opinion, also met Manning’s most serious reservations over the Bill. By adopting the ‘Cowper-Temple’ Clause and by omitting Clause 22 Gladstone had in effect severed all financial relations between the School Boards and the denominational schools.\(^88\) Gladstone was not a disinterested onlooker in such matters making clear his own reservations over Pius IX’s Syllabus of Errors in a tract, he wrote, entitled the Vatican Decrees In Their Bearing On Civil Allegiance: A Political Expostulation, 1874.

While the Cowper-Temple clause can be described as an expression of non-Conformist tolerance, the religious education curriculum was founded on the lowest common denominator, namely, scripture without ‘Anglican’ formularies. This did allow for the possibility of compromise and the proto-“establishment of the dual system in English education.\(^89\) In the future there were to be two types of elementary schools different in character, funding and governance. In the words of The Guardian the Education Act, 1870 gave “fair play and no favour.”\(^90\) This lofty aspiration fell foul of distrust locally between those who ran schools with a religious character and the newly established school boards. Instead of being partners in the work of education, they were often “rivals and competitors.”\(^91\)

The First Vatican Council was examining how the Church would relate to a range of post-revolutionary and post-imperial states.\(^92\) The political structures of the French revolution aimed to replace the descending thesis of the ‘Ancien Regime’ with the ascending thesis of the Revolution “where once the people had been answerable to their parish priests and the priests to their bishops, the Assembly [now sought] to subordinate priests and bishops

\(^{87}\) ibid.
\(^{88}\) ibid, page 210.
\(^{90}\) 13th July 1870.
alike to the people,\textsuperscript{93} asserting the sovereignty of the citizen. The society of orders divided into three estates of ‘clergy’, ‘nobility’ and ‘common people’ was flattened to be composed of equal citizens. Such equality presupposed a direct relationship between the State and the individual “as well as the exclusion of any intermediate bodies that might introduce tiresome differences and thus in effect resurrect old hierarchies and privileges.”\textsuperscript{94} The Church was suspicious of any political reasoning that reduced the believer to the citizen, asserting that the ecclesial structure of the Church “had been laid down by Christ.”\textsuperscript{95} An appreciation of French political history is important because of Hinsley’s own experience in Africa as Apostolic Visitor and then Delegate working with French religious orders and his appreciation of the strands of French political discourse along with his experience, while retired in the Vatican, of the unification of Italy and loss of the Papal States in 1848.

This Council accepted the divide between State and Church across large parts of Europe. Catholic monarchs were not invited. The doctrine of ‘papal infallibility’, asserted the Church’s right to speak with authority on spiritual matters and not feel constrained by the power of technocratic states.\textsuperscript{96} Nineteenth century and early-twentieth century Ultramontanism sought to strengthen the independence of the Church’s spiritual power. “The stronger the papacy, and the more directly the church hierarchy depended upon it, the less the church depended on kings, princes, barons and the laity in general.”\textsuperscript{97} Politicians, such as Gladstone\textsuperscript{98} looked on with some bemusement in 1870 as did Churchill in 1944. The work of the First Vatican Council would not be completed until the calling of the Second Vatican Council nearly twenty years after the passing of the Education Act, 1944 where the Church would reflect, through its four constitutions, on the role and function of other constituencies within the Church.

Until then, the reading of politics, economics and theology that characterised Church-State relations in the last part of the nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century was often tentative. This was as true in public life outside the Church as inside, and is best characterised by the writings of Carl L. Becker, an American protestant historian, who reflected in 1926 that “for four hundred years the world of education and knowledge rested securely on two fundamentals which were rarely questioned. These were Christian

\textsuperscript{93} ibid, page 7.
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\textsuperscript{98} Gladstone wrote a tract in response to the Syllabus of Errors entitled the Vatican Decrees In Their Bearing On Civil Allegiance: A Political Expostulation, John Murray, London, 1874.
philosophy (sic) and Classical learning (sic). At the beginning of the twentieth century this was no longer the case and these fundamentals had been replaced by naturalistic science whose veracity was also being undermined by physico-chemico-libido psychology.

As a result Becker concludes that there were no longer certainties either in life or in thought. Into this maelstrom the contemporary ecclesial debate over Revelation and continuity in Church tradition between councils and papacies finds particular resonance. The Church’s normative voice renewed by espoused ‘normative’ expression in the face of local pastoral situations is unified by the centrality of the papacy. This has seen an increase in papal teaching through papal encyclicals and papal audiences over the last century. Subsidiarity within this ecclesial model does not lead to atomism but attentiveness “to a duty of scrutinising the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel.” Change is as much part of orthodoxy as passivity; with praxis, as in England and Wales in 1944, preceding ‘normative’ expression thereof.

After the passing of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, school boards carried out a census of the child population. The result was stark. “London had 120,000 [children] who were unprovided for, Leeds 20,000 and Birmingham 16,000.101 Between 1870 and 1880, without the help of parliamentary grants, the Catholic community more than doubled the number of its schools from 350 to 758102.

Politicians of all parties watched the disparity between board and voluntary schools increase, a Royal Commission of twenty-three members under the chairmanship of Viscount Cross, was established in 1885. In 1888, the Commission published a majority report and a minority report; while there was substantial agreement on educational matters the Commission failed to reach agreement on religious matters. The most significant change was the Methodist decision in its evidence to the Commission to support the establishment of school boards everywhere “and the placing of a Christian ‘unsectarian’

100 Gaudium et Spes, §4.
101 Although Forster predicted that the education rate would not exceed 3d, by 1880 the London rate had risen to 5½d. During the decade after the passing of The Elementary Education Act, 1870 there was a growing imbalance between per capita expenditure on children in board schools (£2 1s.11½d) compared to children attending denominational schools (£1 14s. 10½d). The former was financed through the rates, the latter through congregations. (Marjorie Cruickshank, with a Foreword by The Rt. Hon R. A. Butler, C.H., M.P., Church and State in English Education: 1870 To The Present Day, Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London 1963, page 39).
102 Figures taken from the Education Department files at the Public Record Office, Kew.
school within a reasonable distance of every family especially in the rural districts. This was momentous since for the last two decades the Methodist community had split its energies between providing its own denominational schools and encouraging the expansion of the school board system.

As the months and years went by, the Catholic community under the weight of double-liability became more suspicious of the organisational powers afforded to the school boards and the decisions individual boards were making, especially in response to the increasing tide of migrant Catholic workers, and their families, in conurbations. The Catholic Hierarchy perceived that the Catholic community had become entrapped in a perfect storm of paying a local education rate for a service they did not use and being subject to perverse administrative decisions by school boards.

2.2.2 Twentieth Century
2.2.2.1 Cardinal Vaughan and the Education Act, 1902

The Catholic community spent the next thirty years, until 1902, fighting a rearguard action and searching for its own voice, a voice that was able to translate theological tenets into political discourse, thereby challenging the current narrative of tolerance. In the years following the Royal Commission, the Catholic Church stood resolutely for rate-aid to fund its schools, whereas the Anglicans had a multitude of separate voices. This Catholic policy did not change with the accession of Cardinal Vaughan to the See of Westminster after Cardinal Manning’s death. Frederick Temple’s accession to Canterbury led to greater unity within the Anglican Communion in support of rate-aid. Frederick Temple had been headteacher of Rugby School between 1858 and 1869. He understood the logistics of running a school and appreciated that the Anglican position was untenable ecclesiastically and financially. In November 1896 it was agreed at a joint Convocation of Canterbury and York
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104 Of universal rates and weekly offerings to pay for denominational education.
106 Popularly known in educational literature as the Balfour Act.
that rate aid would become “the accepted policy of the Established Church." At last Anglican denominationalists could speak with one voice.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the locus of the industrial revolution moved from Britain to Germany and America. By 1900, Britain had fallen to third place in the production of steel, and the new industrial bourgeoisie lobbied for better ‘universal’ technical education of older children in England and Wales. Britain’s destiny depended as much on ‘school power’ as on ‘sea power’.109

This need coupled with the “Cockerton Judgment”110 of 1901 prompted political change. This reform would address inequality in funding, the need to raise the school leaving age and to standardise local administration. It is likely that if county councils had existed in 1870, discrete school boards would not have been established. School boards were no longer fit for purpose. Robert Morant, Secretary to the Vice-President of the Committee on Education111, Sir John Gorst, was the moving spirit in drafting the new legislation. Morant wanted current systemic ambiguities removed and replaced by ‘complete rate maintenance’112 of schools leading to commensurate remuneration for teachers. Cardinal Vaughan welcomed the proposals “as a distinct step in the right direction”.113 Through the Bill and Act of 1902, education was brought into the mainstream of local government. County councils and borough councils were to be the new local education authorities (LEAs) responsible logistically for all kinds of statutory education in their area: ‘voluntary’ or ‘non-provided’ schools along with ‘local authority’ or ‘provided’ schools. “These LEAs were in charge of paying teachers, ensuring that teachers were properly qualified and providing necessary [and commensurate] books and equipment. They paid the teachers in the church schools, with the churches providing and maintaining school buildings and providing the religious instruction.”114 However, LEAs were responsible for fair wear and tear.

110 National Archive, ED 24/83. This judgement called into question the legality of "higher grade schools" for children over 12, a temporary fix that allowed elementary schools to teach older children for one year without having to build a new senior school.
111 Soon to known as the Board of Education.
113 Ibid, page 81.
The Bill received Royal Assent on 18th December 1902. The Bill's successful passage was due to the careful and detailed planning of Morant on the one hand and to the skilful political strategy of Balfour on the other way.\textsuperscript{115} This model was replicated in 1944 by Butler, and as is the way both Acts are popularly named after the politician who brought them through Parliament. Hence in political discourse the Education Act, 1902 is often known as the ‘Balfour Act’, and the Education Act, 1944 as the ‘Butler Act’. Catholic implementation of the ‘Balfour Act’ in the African colonies would be monitored for the Church by the newly appointed Apostolic Visitor, Arthur Hinsley.

In January 1906 the Liberals were elected with an overwhelming majority and Augustine Birrell, son of a Baptist Minister, was appointed the new President of the Board of Education. Birrell introduced a new Education Bill which aimed to abolish the dual system set up in 1902 and establish a single system of schools under complete public control. Birrell’s primary desire was to remove Anglican educational dominance in the countryside. However, this ‘undenominational’ Bill, had consequences for the Catholic community, and roused its ire. Opponents in Parliament called Birrell’s proposal a new form of religion, ‘Birreligion’. The Bill was significantly amended during its passage through both Houses of Parliament, leaving Birrell to describe his Bill on its return to the Commons as “‘a miserable, mangled, tortured twisted tertium quid’.\textsuperscript{116}” The mutilation of this Bill made educational reform then, and for much of the time in between the wars, toxic. What was also apparent was the growing influence of the Catholic community and unwillingness on the part of all political parties to stir up unintentionally the ‘Irish Question’.

Three successive Liberal Presidents of the Board of Education tried and failed to abolish the neophyte dual system. As Cruickshank concludes rightly amidst all this machinations and recriminations “the 1902 settlement was working well...making good the arrears of past neglect.\textsuperscript{117}”

2.2.2.2 The Education Act, 1918

The First World War soon crushed national confidence. The early optimism felt as troops marched off to war was shattered in the face of an enemy who was better educated in the

\textsuperscript{116} ibid, page 99.
\textsuperscript{117} ibid, page 112.
new classics of science and mathematics. Half way through the War David Lloyd George appointed Herbert Fisher as his President of the Board in 1916. His Bill addressed the functional gaps in numeracy and literacy experienced in the British trenches. The Education Act, 1918 focused on extending education by raising the school leaving age, through expanding current provision and establishing new secondary provision\textsuperscript{118}. After its enactment Fisher returned to the thorny issue of reforming dual control. Before long any semblance of co-operation between Anglicans and non-Conformists apparent in 1918 perished. On the whole, the Catholic community was on the margins of this dialogue until the Hadow Report (1923). HMG, the Anglican Church and non-Conformists were aware of the Catholic Church’s ‘normative’ commitment to denominational education for Catholic children and that this ecclesiology was sacramental and lived out, not aspirational. The enunciation of rights was reinforced by an acknowledgement and meeting of responsibilities by the Catholic community, parents and others alike, to subsidise denominational provision.

In 1926, two significant reports were published. The first, was a memorandum of ‘black listed’ schools, held at the Board of Education. These were schools with defective premises “in the ‘blackest’ category[,] the non-provided schools were twice as numerous as the provided schools.”\textsuperscript{119} The second, the Hadow Report, suggested separate schools for juniors and seniors. If this were adopted the financial settlement of 1902 would be completely outmoded. After its publication, the Government changed in 1929, Ramsay MacDonald becoming Labour prime minister for the second time. He appointed Sir Charles Trevelyan, a former Liberal and now Labour M.P., as his President of the Board of Education. The Government presented a Bill to Parliament in May 1930, aiming to implement Hadow’s proposals. Anglicans, non-Conformists, Catholics and LEAs all had serious logistical reservations and unresolved grievances with the Bill. Trevelyan would see this Bill and two subsequent Bills fail to reach the Statute Book.

Oliver Stanley, Conservative President of the Board of Education\textsuperscript{120}, in the subsequent National Government\textsuperscript{121} resolved these logistical reservations and unresolved grievances

\textsuperscript{118} This Bill received its Royal Assent on 8\textsuperscript{th} August 1918, which coincidentally marked the opening day of the Allied offensive later known as Germany’s black day and the beginning of the ‘hundred-days offensive’ which ultimately led to the end of the First World War (David Lloyd George, War Memoirs of David Lloyd George: Volume II, Odhams Press Ltd, London, 1938, page 1993).


\textsuperscript{120} 1935 until 1937.
and presented a Bill to Parliament. His Bill had “two main features, the raising of the school-leaving age to fifteen and, as a corollary, a temporary adjustment of voluntary schools liabilities.” The latter allowed LEAs, pro tem, to subsidise up to 75% of building costs for a non-provided senior school. Within the Bill, Stanley under Lord Halifax’s tutelage, also skilfully resolved outstanding logistical issues in single-school areas between Anglicans and non-Conformists. Children could follow either an agreed syllabus in religious education or a denominational curriculum in religious education. This Bill was enacted in 1936. As a result within three years, five hundred and nineteen applications for senior schools were successfully submitted; two hundred and eighty-nine by Catholics and two hundred and thirty by Anglicans. One area where there was local difficulty was Liverpool. The Catholic Church was overwhelmed by the number of Catholic ‘migrant’ children domiciled within the City and the sectarianism operative in the LEA. Finally, it was resolved through a Parliamentary measure in 1939 which allowed a ‘civic finance initiative’ scheme whereby the Authority could build the necessary schools and lease them back to denominational managers at rentals of between 25 percent and 50 per cent of the loan charges.

The educational imperatives of equality enunciated by Hadow allowed for new thinking. Politicians, administrators and churchmen co-operated in ways unknown since 1902 and they would return to unfinished business in the dark years of wartime.

2.2.2.3 Outbreak Of The Second World War & Unfinished Business

The Second World War, like previous wars, “impelled men to think about the needs of the future, since totalitarianism threatened more than mere physical existence and challenged the very idea of [liberal] democracy…Evacuation in particular revealed conditions of squalor and ignorance which few had dreamt existed, for the filth, malnutrition and indiscipline of many of the young evacuees came as a severe shock, a shameful reminder that even in the twentieth century Disraeli’s ‘two nations’ still persisted.” While Education Act, 1902 brought about improvements to the schools’ estate, it was “responsible for the
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123 Not that different to the private finance initiative (PFI) scheme used by HMG to fund the re-building of schools and hospitals at the end of the twentieth century and beginning of the twenty-first century in England, and sometimes, in Wales.
growth of the middle class outside the Catholic community.\textsuperscript{125} Six subsequent Bills, three Liberal and three Tory, either side of the First World War had failed to be enacted.

By the beginning of the Second World War "[t]he number of Roman Catholic schools had increased from 1,000 to 1,200 since the beginning of the century. They now formed 12 percent of the voluntary schools and were educating 8 per cent of the total child population.\textsuperscript{126} The striking difference between the Anglican schools’ estate and the Catholic schools’ estate was that the former was often older, rural and smaller whereas the latter was newer, urban and larger. This was a consequence of the Reformation and the ongoing demographic resettlement. The significance was that the single-school area schools were predominantly Anglican and subject of aforementioned side-conversations between the Anglican and non-Conformists communities. This dialogue was polemical and stymied the possibility of broader educational legislation.

In Spring 1941, when France had been defeated and America was yet to enter the War, Britain stood alone yet within the Board of Education, officials drew up a provisional scheme for reform entitled \textit{Education After The War}, known colloquially as the ‘Green Book’. Although a clean sweep would appeal to administrators and Free Churchmen, “abolition of the dual system was not considered practical politics.\textsuperscript{127}” In Chapter IX officials explored the possibility of trading abolition of the Cowper-Temple clause for the establishment of provided-only secondary schools. This chapter, and the remainder of the paper, would be set aside within twelve months, since it threatened to open up old wounds within society and the Catholic community concerning the \textit{Elementary Education Act, 1870}.

Just after circulation of the Green Book, Mr. Butler was appointed by Churchill as President of the Board. He was joined at the Board by Mr Chuter Ede his Labour Parliamentary Secretary and John Maud, the Education Board’s first Permanent Secretary\textsuperscript{128}. Butler brought diplomacy, Ede brought classroom ‘nouse’ and Maud brought administrative adeptness. Ede was a former teacher and National Union of Teachers (NUT) official. Like Balfour and Morant in 1902, they understood the importance of
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preparation and collaboration. Both Butler and Ede were committed to extensive preliminary negotiations “so that all the mistakes could be made in private and not before the public eye.” When framing the 1944 Bill, Butler and Ede had in effect to decide whether the dual system should continue and, if so, on what terms.

By Spring 1942 the Green Book had been set aside and officials led by Chuter Ede, drafted a “White Memorandum” that was circulated to all who had received the Green Book. These next two years would see a time of transition among the Principals engaged in these negotiations. Archbishop Cosmo Lang of Canterbury would give way to Temple briefly before the latter’s untimely death and Hinsley would give way to Griffin.

On 5th June 1942, Rab Butler in a discussion with Archbishop Temple shared with him the costs of upgrading the Anglican schools’ estate drawing on the black list. Butler records this as a successful meeting since it was garnered by a spirit of pragmatism by Archbishop Temple after his initial shock. The Board of Education examined closely the report of the National Society and the “President [of the Board of Education] endeavoured to ‘dovetail’ official policy with the proposals of the National Society so that the latter could come forward publicly with a scheme which the Government could accept. [Butler’s] main concern was to modify the stringency of the first alternative of the White Memorandum [whereby in single-school areas owners of non-provided schools would compulsorily hand over their schools for use as council schools], to eliminate the note of compulsion in order to make it more acceptable to Anglican opinion. The result was that in September, when the Anglican representatives came for official discussion before submitting their draft report to the Church Assembly, the President was able to lay before them the revised version of the White Memorandum. Although these discussions were confidential, the Archbishop of Westminster was apprised of their scope and the concessions offered as they were being made. There is no record, in either primary or secondary sources, who informed
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130 This took place after Ede had decided to stay on at the Board of Education. According to Howard “on 4 February 1942 Churchill summoned Chuter Ede to No. 10 to offer him a move to the Ministry of War Transport where his departmental head would be in the House of Lords and where he would, therefore, have a fuller role to play in the House of Commons. Ede, greatly daring, asked permission to refuse the offer” (Anthony Howard, RAB The Life of R.A. Butler, Jonathan Cape, London, 1987, page 119) and stayed at the Board with Butler to finish work undone.

131 By convention any set of negotiations with HMG has Principals and officials; intervention and decision-making by the former and negotiation by the latter.

Hinsley of these concessions. One might suppose Major Morton of Churchill’s private office. Hinsley objected to the lack of transparency; this was not 1870 and the Catholic bishops were neither absent nor would they be sidelined by the established Church. The Catholic voice would be heard and given parity of esteem.

Temple still had to build consensus within the Anglican community. While he was admired for his realism in the press, others within the Anglican Communion were unimpressed and suspicious “that everything had been arranged by ‘a back stage concordat’. After the debate within the National Society Lord Selborne wrote to Mr Butler “‘I don’t think Temple could possibly carry the Church in conceding anything else’. A necessary part of facilitating successful negotiations is to know the boundaries which confine participants while not alienating other constituencies. Butler now turned to Westminster seeking to rebuild relationships with the Catholic community.

“Throughout the discussions the Roman Catholics showed less devotion to their school buildings than did the Anglicans.” While many Anglicans regarded the transference of their schools as a betrayal of their [respective] parochial trust deeds, Roman Catholics were not concerned about keeping possession of their school premises but of meeting the needs of a growing Catholic population, the State could take everything it wanted, what was more important to the Catholic community was that Catholic children were educated in schools with a Catholic curriculum and atmosphere wherever these were located.

Some members of the Catholic community, especially those in the Northern Province, looked towards the Scottish Settlement of 1918. Perhaps because of suspicion on
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- Catholic schools were to be funded by the State and open to inspection by HMIs;
behalf of bishops mindful of concordats made with the Church and not adhered to by national governments, loss of ownership and therefore authority, and the religious character of the English and Welsh populace which was more culturally and religiously heterogeneous than Scotland, neither Hinsley along with Griffin nor Butler believed that the Scottish settlement fitted south of the border. The Catholic community wanted control of their schools not just supervision of them. However, this did not stop others, such as the Bishop of Salford, petitioning for the Scottish settlement within the English and Welsh Hierarchy:

As far as I am concerned, when [the Education Bill, 1944] 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.\footnote{Letter from the Bishop of Salford to Cardinal Griffin, 27th January 1944, AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC, page 1.}

William Francis Brown, Bishop of Pella and Auxiliary Bishop of Southwark, had been appointed as Apostolic Visitor to Scotland by the Holy See during the ‘Scottish’ negotiations. Bishop Brown doubted if this settlement could be transferred easily in 1944. Religious education in equivalent ‘controlled’ schools in 1944 would be delimited by the Cowper-Temple clause of 1870 that forbade denominational education therein. Politicians and Catholic churchmen recognised that abolition of the Cowper-Temple clause in 1944 was politically toxic. For the Bill to progress through the House a parallel or a ‘dual’ system was needed.

With Hinsley ailing, Butler turned to Archbishop Downey and Archbishop Amigo. In both cases the discussion focused on ‘ways and means’. A counterpoint to these intermediary discussions was Churchill’s decision in Spring 1943, for the first time, to give some public indication of Government plans for reconstruction after the War. Churchill was aware that “as head of the war cabinet he could not risk any revival of the domestic conflict which, by
dividing the nation, might imperil the whole war effort.\textsuperscript{141} Butler went to Chequers to see Churchill in March 1943, ten days before Churchill’s speech on 21\textsuperscript{st} March 1943. In between this visit and delivery of the speech, Hinsley died. On the day before he died Hinsley drafted a note to Churchill which was delivered posthumously to Churchill on the morning of Hinsley’s death.\textsuperscript{142} While Churchill linked education to the welfare services, he also touched on the importance of religion as the ‘‘fundamental element in school life’ and welcomed the progress made by all the religious bodies ‘in freeing themselves from sectarian jealousies and feuds’ while preserving fervently the tenets of their own faith.\textsuperscript{143} The War Cabinet jointly decided not to present a Bill before the summer but to bring out a White Paper. To steamroller a Bill through Parliament could be interpreted as history repeating itself and rekindle feelings of injustice within the Catholic community. Antipathy towards the \textit{Elementary Education Act 1870}, with the absence of Catholic bishops from these shores, had entered into Catholic folklore. Churchill wanted Catholic servicemen to focus on the ‘primary’ task in hand, that of defeating the enemy in Germany, Japan and beyond. He now needed the assiduous support of clerics, parents and servicemen.

The White Paper entitled \textit{Educational Reconstruction} was published in July 1943 and in Chapter 4, Plan III the choice between two ‘voluntary’ alternative strategies was rehearsed the first to be called ‘controlled’ status, the second ‘aided’ status. Debate within the Anglican community continued in 1943 with rather colourful reporting in the \textit{Church Times} suggesting on 23\textsuperscript{rd} July 1943 that “Temple and Cowper-Temple have kissed each other.”\textsuperscript{144} Butler’s apprenticeship at the India Office and Foreign Office served him well. Even this spat was “soluble.”\textsuperscript{145}

Amid the sound and the fury, Butler was committed to the principles enunciated within the White Paper and Bill; namely, that the dual system should continue, and that voluntary schools should receive more state aid and, in return, accept more state control. Temple was quite sure “that continued teaching on the lines of a good [locally] agreed syllabus\textsuperscript{146} [in other maintained schools], and some of them are very good indeed, will do more for


\textsuperscript{142} 17\textsuperscript{th} March 1944.

\textsuperscript{143} The Times, London, 22\textsuperscript{nd} March 1943.


\textsuperscript{146} A non-denominational religious education syllabus agreed under the auspices of the Local Education Authority.
religious knowledge in later life than can be done by the best Church school ending its work at fourteen.  

With the appointment of Griffin as Archbishop of Westminster negotiations could begin again in earnest. Griffin was already an able administrator in the fields of social work and public health intertwining welfare and educational narratives ad intra, assuaging the pecuniary concerns of religious orders, while engaging in dialogue ad extra with Ministers and officials. Griffin was not intimidated by ‘operant’ decision-making.

Butler guided the Education Bill skilfully through the House. Ironically, “the Bill occupied the Lower House only [nineteen] days, whereas the 1902 Bill had occupied it 59 days and the 1870 Bill [twenty-eight] days. Remarkably enough, in view of the past history, the House was left with a day or two to spare at the end of the discussion. The spectre of a common enemy had focused the minds of all parties, allowing for principled compromise.

Not all the rights enshrined in this legislation were absolute; efficiency still trumped parents’ rights to have their child educated in accordance to their wishes. This legislation did not provide full justice to the Catholic community but it was the beginning of some justice. After ‘total’ war, for the third time in over half a century, this Act offered denominational places for Catholic children to ‘wonder’ and learn anew. This Act would nurture a Catholic middle class amid the wider social and educational project of developing a home-owning middle class. As this Catholic middle class became more established, so Catholic social teaching would find expression in social policy. Through these negotiations the Church would experience communio not borne of pecuniary benefit but responsibility for others within the ecclesial community. Catholic parents, and those without children, paid for Catholic children to receive a Catholic education. From these roots the Catholic community would be sustained and formed. Through the negotiations and pastoral praxis, the Catholic community would experience a sense of ‘communio’ and ‘solidarity’ later enunciated at the Second Vatican Council.

---

149 Hansard, Parl. Deb., Commons, 5th Ser., vol. cdii. col. 968.
150 Concepts such as ‘subsidiarity’ and the ‘common good’ would be colonised into mainstream political discourse.
151 The Catholic community’s ongoing approach to the education question in the 1940s was informed by its collective memory of the 1870 negotiations, feelings of perceived injustice and subsequent encyclicals such as, Divini Illius Magistri.
This theo-political narrative is perceptible throughout subsequent educational history. In 2007, HMG, acknowledged “faith organisations have a long and noble tradition in education in this country – from medieval times, through the Reformation, to the present day.” Then as now this narrative is not inert.

2.3 Ecumenics and the Abdication of Edward VIII

2.3.1 Ecumenics

By the middle of the nineteenth century in England and Wales, the Catholic population was expanding and changing. It embraced two growing moieties: established ‘old Catholic’ and migrant ‘new Irish’.

Ecumenical affairs after the First World War were defined by two events; the ‘Malines Conversations’ and the abdication of Edward VIII in 1936. The counterpoint to these events was the proposed amendments to the ‘Revised Prayer Book' which occupied the Anglican Communion and strained relations with both Houses of Parliament.

The Malines Conversations – held consecutively on December 6-8, 1921; March 14-15, 1923; November 7-8, 1923; May 19-20, 1925; and October 11-12, 1926 – were a series of ecumenical discussions between English representatives of the Anglican Church and representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. Except for the last Conversation, they were held under the presidency of Désiré-Félicien-François-Joseph Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Mechelen-Brussels. The Conversations marked the first time since the sixteenth century that Anglican and Roman Catholic theologians had gathered around the same table, proving that ecumenical dialogue was possible.

A competing dialectic between individual conversion and corporate reunion characterised ecumenical endeavours at the turn of the twentieth century; the spirit behind the Malines Conversations was common to the time “when men of learning and ability

---

153 One of the outcomes of the Education Act, 1944 was to build tangible bridges between these two constituencies.
154 On the Catholic side, representatives were mostly drawn from Continental Europe.
155 The legacy of the gestures performed between the representatives was as significant as their dialogue. “In 1966 when Pope Paul VI placed his episcopal ring on the finger of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Arthur Michael Ramsey, he was repeating a similar gesture performed by Cardinal Mercier, on his deathbed, when he gave his ring to Lord Halifax (J.A. Dick, The Malines Conversations, Uitgeverij Peeters, Leuven, 1989, page 11).”
would gather in charity to make peace not war. Unity was the guiding theo-political driver of this period and the Conversations were paradigmatic. They offered a model for public and interdenominational discourse.

The difficulty facing the Malines Conversation for the Anglican community was well summed up in The Tablet when it commented on Halifax’s book on the First Conversation in its 11th November 1922 edition: “nobody could unite with the Anglican Church, as an organic whole, without facing three ways at once.” The Tablet believed that Halifax only spoke for one of these three constituencies: the Anglo Catholics. What is interesting about the Conversations is that the senior British clerics on both sides, respectively Bourne (Catholic) and Davidson/Lang (Anglican), were on the outside. This omission entered into the collective memory of both national hierarchies as evidenced later by the ‘Athenaeum Club’ agreement between Hinsley and Lang over what information to share with Archbishop William Godfrey, Apostolic Delegate.

Hinsley and Lang agreed to refer all matters of common interest to each other before forwarding them to Archbishop Godfrey, the Apostolic Delegate. The principle of ‘no surprises’ established between the prelates, gave Hinsley leeway in subsequent negotiations between members of the Catholic Hierarchy, the Government and the Curia. This ecumenical entente cordiale does not seem to be in the spirit of the Codex Iuris Canonici, 1917. Legates with the title of Apostolic Delegate, according to Bouscaren and Ellis, are sent to countries that do not have diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Their office is almost purely supervisory; and they too have certain delegated faculties (c.267). The faculties and office of Legates do not as a rule expire on the vacancy of the Holy See (c.268). Legates do not interfere with the government and jurisdiction exercised by Ordinaries of places (c.269). Godfrey did not supervise negotiations over education with HMG. It is unlikely that this omission was accidental and one can only assume that Hinsley was well aware of what he was doing.

These pro tem arrangements have led to a significant exception in the Diocesan archive. Both in Hinsley’s time and the first five years of Griffin’s time there is little on education in the Apostolic Delegate Portfolio of the Archive apart from arrangements for the consecration of bishops, pastoral care of Catholic soldiers with the British military and

---

157 ibid, page 23.
158 Appointed on 21st November 1938.
159 Code of Canon Law, 1917.
Catholic prisoners of war. Until, that is, Fr. Worlock became private secretary. Up to this point, there is no correspondence on education between Victoria and Wimbledon lodged in the Archive, apart from one document concerning the establishment of an ‘Institute of Education’ founded in Durham for the training of teachers and the likely impact thereof on neighbouring Catholic Teacher Training Colleges.\(^{161}\) Silence and gaps are not always nothing. As in this case, they are sometimes, something.

This arrangement between Westminster and Wimbledon established in Hinsley’s time remained unchanged until 1949. This is significant considering Rome’s intervention in the earlier Scottish settlement. Bishop William Brown, Bishop of Pella recalls “Card De Lai insisted on the Scottish Catholic Education Commission ([S]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! (sic)\(^{162}\) During the negotiations surrounding the Education Bill, 1944 and Education Act, 1944, Rome was kept out of the loop. This is not due to the War as diplomatic channels between (the Archdiocese of) Westminster and Rome remained open.\(^{163}\) It seems as if, Hinsley chose not to use them; just as Rome chose not to use them during the establishment of the Malines Conversations. As a former Apostolic Delegate to Africa, charged with oversight of implementing the ‘Balfour’ Education Act, 1902 across Catholic dioceses within Africa, Hinsley will have known from personal experience, the proper role of an Apostolic Delegate.

Notwithstanding, Mercier wanted reassurance from Rome of its support for the Malines Conversations and on 25\(^{th}\) November 1922 he received the following note “The Holy Father,” wrote [Cardinal] Gasparri (Secretary of State) “authorises Your Eminence to tell the Anglicans that the Holy See approves and encourages your conversations and prays with all its heart that God will bless them.\(^{164}\)” Dick believes that it is significant that this authorisation is written in the name of the Holy See and not Pius XI. These conversations were more than a personal theological dalliance. Thus participants in the conversations would begin to examine the possibility of “corporate reunion”, not only personal conversion, as a way forward.

\(^{161}\) AAW Gr 2/38 Apostolic Delegate 1944-63.
\(^{162}\) AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944.
Many within the Roman Catholic community in England and Wales were suspicious of the Conversations. They looked back to halcyon days. No more so than Joseph Keating, SJ, editor of The Month. He used this journal to counter what he believed to be Halifax’s mischievous misreading of Mercier’s intent, namely, that Roman Catholics should consider “how they can assist in bringing about the corporate reunion of the Church of England with the Holy See, rather than merely considering how best to secure individual conversions.” Such disquiet was fuelled by rumours of endorsement, or not, by Rome for the Malines Conversations. As is the way with theological and political reform the interaction between the primary figures involved is important.

Bourne, and elements of the Catholic Hierarchy, felt quite isolated from the Conversations and this perhaps explains twenty years later the course of events. In the 1940s, Hinsley and the Hierarchy discerned Church teaching, applied these principles to their ongoing negotiations with HMG on educational provision and informed the Holy See after the settlement was made.

On 15th December 1925, Cardinal Bourne met with the Pope to discuss the Malines Conversations. On his scribbled aide-mémoire we find five points, namely,

1. Setting aside the English Roman Catholic hierarchy.
2. Re-opening the issue of Anglican orders.
3. Effacing of Papal infallibility.
4. If Anglican orders were recognised and teaching authority placed into the episcopacy, the Anglican[s] would have gained all they wish[ed].
5. The Archbishop of Canterbury as Papa alterius orbis.

---

165 ibid, page 125.
166 An account of an interchange between Cardinal Mercier and Lord Halifax is revealing and gives an insight into the nature of their relationship. “Seeing we were alone Mercier said: ‘May I ask something of you?’ Lord Halifax [replied] ‘Nothing would give me more pleasure, than to have you treat me with all confidence’. Mercier [continued] ‘Well then I think you ought to make your submission’. Lord Halifax [responded] (I remember his exact words) ‘Your Eminence it would be quite useless. Newman was a giant in his day, he made his submission. What came of it? Nothing. If I made my submission it would be meaningless. It would not affect the English people in the least. It would not make any change in my life or in my belief’ (J.A. Dick, The Malines Conversations, Uitgeverij Peeters, Leuven, 1989, page 130. Here Dick references D. Verhelst, Lord Halifax And The Scheut Father Aloïs Janssens, Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 43 (1967),page 242).” What is equally interesting is that Lord Halifax tutored Richard Austen Butler during his time in the Foreign Office and will, one would have imagined, past on to his understudy his experiences of negotiating with the Catholic Church.
167 AAW Bo III/124/4.
This meeting was a turning point and would lead, in time, to Pius XI’s encyclical Mortalium Animos, 6th January 1928. Pius XI drew on the teaching of Cyprian\textsuperscript{168}, and the Fathers of the Church, as he looked forward to unity beyond artificial, forced uniformity. Pius XI asserted a clear denominational Catholic identity. Paradoxically, the desire for unity borne of the trauma of the First World War was generational, sustained and entered into the collective memory of the English and Welsh Hierarchy.

Cardinal Hinsley drew on this memory when he established ‘The Sword of the Spirit’, a lay organisation, intent on putting into effect Christian teaching. Under the auspices of the ‘The Sword of the Spirit’ a two day conference was held on 10th and 11th May 1940 at the Stoll Theatre, London. The Cardinal chaired the first day, entitled: ‘A Christian International Order’ while Archbishop Lang chaired the second day, entitled: ‘A Christian Order for Britain’. On the night in between the two meetings the Luftwaffe launched its final blitz on London, starting over two thousand fires, killing more than three thousand Londoners and laying waste to the House of Commons. Hinsley’s concluding remarks the following day could not have been clearer:

> Our unity must not be sentiment and in word only; it must be carried into practical measures. Let us have a regular system of consultation and collaboration from now onwards, such as his Lordship the Bishop of Chichester has suggested, to agree on a plan of action which shall win the peace when the din of battle is ended.\textsuperscript{169}

Yet it was Hinsley’s ‘sacramental’ gestures that spoke louder than any of his speeches at this Conference. Hinsley recited the Lord’s Prayer with Catholics and non-Catholics alike and blessed the gathered delegates. Through these ‘sacramental’ gestures Hinsley united Christ and the Catholic Church with the suffering of the British people in war. This expression of solidarity provided the gateway to educational reform and reflected Churchill’s own small, but significant, gestures of unity.\textsuperscript{170} In the public space, Catholics were no longer perceived as aliens from a foreign land but fellow citizens who had

\textsuperscript{168} Pius XI, Mortalium Animos, 6th January 1928, §10, “So, Venerable Brethren, it is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics: for the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it. To the one true Church of Christ, we say, which is visible to all, and which is to remain, according to the will of its Author, exactly the same as He instituted it. During the lapse of centuries, the mystical Spouse of Christ has never been contaminated, nor can she ever in the future be contaminated, as Cyprian bears witness: ‘The Bride of Christ cannot be made false to her Spouse: she is incorrupt and modest. She knows but one dwelling, she guards the sanctity of the nuptial chamber chastely and modestly (cf. De Cath. Ecclesiae unitate, 6).”


\textsuperscript{170} HMG decision to hold the First Reading of the Educational Bill, 1944 until after the episcopal interregnum at Westminster and Griffin’s enthronement.
suffered. Hinsley must have known the ecclesial significance of this act: a striking gesture of hope and solidarity. “Hinsley never uttered anything that was incompatible with his faith but often he spoke not as a Bishop teaching his flock but as a Catholic Englishman testifying to his sense of spiritual communion with Englishmen outside the Fold.”

The ‘Sword of the Spirit’ was momentous not because of its success but in giving birth to “the major interdenominational nucleating force of its generation." Intuitively Hinsley understood that neither peace nor the Catholic Church would be the same after the Second World War. He set about building a Catholic middle class through the establishment of a universal, denominational model of education. This model saw children as more than instruments of production or purely citizens of the ‘nation’ state but as ‘free’ human persons. Poignantly, Hinsley never saw the fruits of his labours in education come to pass.

2.3.2 Abdication

The abdication of Edward VIII in 1936 was equally unsettling for Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, and for the Anglican Communion. It also perhaps gives us an insight as to why and how the Anglican Communion was marginalised in the preliminary negotiations over the Education Bill, 1944.

Relations between Bourne and Lang were polite but formal. Lang perceived his ministry as twofold, to embody the Christian voice of the Realm and to protect the pre-eminence of the Church of England in its institutions. The latter aim became unstable and left Lang very isolated and exposed during the abdication crisis.

The memoirs of the Duke of Windsor, published in 1951, give a rather unflattering depiction of Lang’s role in his abdication “from beginning to end [Prince Edward] had a disquieting feeling that [Lang] was invisibly and noiselessly about.” A common feature among members of the establishment at this time was a lack of political dexterity and emotional insecurity; perhaps a vestige of the First World War. This left politicians, such as Baldwin, inert and religious leaders, such as Lang, angst-ridden.

Baldwin sought counsel to help resolve the abdication crisis and invited Lord Fitzalan, former Conservative chief whip and viceroy of Ireland, the Duke of Norfolk, Lord Salisbury and Lord Kemsley, a press magnate, to Cumberland Lodge in Windsor Great Park on 16-18 October 1936\textsuperscript{175} to discuss the crisis. It is ironic that the first two of these grandees were Catholics; perhaps Eamon Duffy’s thesis that England never truly converted to Protestantism under Henry VIII is not far from the mark.

One solution found outside of the Church of England was the possibility of a morganatic marriage between Mrs Simpson and Edward VIII. “Deriving from Germanic Salic law, this meant that they would contract a marriage of unequals: Mrs Simpson would become Edward VIII’s wife but would not become queen-consort and any children of their union would not inherit the throne.”\textsuperscript{176} According to Beaken, Baldwin after advice was of the view that amending legislation would be needed for such a settlement. While Churchill supported the King, Lang was hostile to this resolution and Queen Mary thought it would lead to “‘a Court within a Court’.”\textsuperscript{177} Beaken records that Churchill “advised the King to temporise”\textsuperscript{178} yet the emotional strain was telling on the King.

\subsection*{2.3.3 New Rapprochements}

During the abdication crisis, Churchill was cautious. Lady Violet Bonham Carter believed that Churchill’s response belied “his noble qualities – his romantic and protective loyalty and his emotional sympathy with the human needs of his young King [along with his inability at times] to gauge or guess at the reaction of the ordinary man and woman.”\textsuperscript{179} On 7th December 1936, the House shouted Churchill down when he rose yet again to plead for delay and with this Churchill’s political reputation reached its nadir. On 10th December 1936 Edward VIII signed the Instrument of Abdication. Churchill rendered one last invaluable service to the King, by assisting him with his farewell broadcast to the nation. Churchill’s view of England was romantic and Arthurian, here and later, Churchill would play the role of a knight of the ‘Round Table’. Churchill found it difficult to forgive Lang’s perceived hardheartedness, especially in Lang’s counter-broadcast concerning the Edward

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{176}ibid, page 103.\\
\textsuperscript{177}ibid, page 109 - here Beaken references \textit{Lang Papers,} vol. 318, f. 84-5).\\
\textsuperscript{178}ibid, page 112 - here Beaken references Montgomery Hyde, \textit{Baldwin,} page 489).\\
\end{flushright}
VIII’s abdication. However, in Hinsley, Churchill found a more forgiving, empathetic and natural ally.

Regardless of the rights and wrongs of Edward VIII’s abdication, Lang’s lack of empathy affected adversely his relationship with Churchill. Political influence is not founded on truth but on strong personal relationships. Churchill trusted Hinsley more, and hence increasingly, turned to him in matters of war and peace. Lang was neither a consensus-builder nor a reformer and lacked “what might be described as ‘sustained pushfulness’;”¹⁸⁰ he became somnambulant and weary. However Hinsley, the consummate diplomat, did not leave Lang isolated.

2.4 Place of Parents in Theological and Civic Discourse

2.4.1 Church Teaching and Jurisprudence

The right of Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools was a question of conscience for the Catholic Church. Its success in having this right enshrined in legislation within England and Wales was mixed. Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin won the argument with the establishment of the dual system of universal education in principle but its application outside the industrial conurbations was patchy due to war damage and economies of scale. Their commitment to this right follows both papal teaching and American jurisprudence. Pius XI in Divini Illius Magistri, writes of parents ‘particular’ rights over the ‘denominational’ education of their child. In referring to a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, Pius XI reminds readers that responsibility for the education of a child is not proper to the State but to the child’s parents. This is put succinctly in the following extracts of the aforementioned Supreme Court Judgment:

The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments of this Union rest excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only…

The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him (sic) and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.¹⁸¹

This final tenet is rehearsed by Pius XI in Divini Illius Magistri, 31st December 1929, in paragraphs 35-37 inclusive and 81-82 inclusive. In these paragraphs, one can begin to see the exchange of ideas and interpretation of Natural Law and Revelation, in and between,

¹⁸¹ The Supreme Court of the United States of America, Pierce v Society of Sisters, 1925.
Magisterial Teaching and ‘Civic’ Jurisprudence. Interestingly the ‘normative’ voice of this right, as expressed within this encyclical, and following on also from the teaching of Leo XIII was not limited to a child’s religious instruction:

§ 36: It must be borne in mind also that the obligation of the family to bring up children, includes not only religious and moral education, but physical and civic education as well, principally in so far as it touches upon religion and morality.

§ 37: This incontestable right of the family has at various times been recognized by nations anxious to respect the natural law in their civil enactments. Thus, to give one recent example, the Supreme Court of the United States of America, in a decision on an important controversy, declared that it is not in the competence of the State to fix any uniform standard of education by forcing children to receive instruction exclusively in public schools, and it bases its decision on the natural law: the child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty, to educate him and prepare him for the fulfilment of his obligations.

In this encyclical Pius XI goes on to remind national governments to respect parents’ rights in their legislative enactments. This right was rehearsed and tested particularly in American jurisprudence with the establishment of a new federation of states and the election of George Washington as the first president in 1789. It was not until 1870 that the Federal Justice Department was established. Individual states were asserting their independence amid the growth of a new federation. Education was seen as a means to establish a unitive narrative. Gradually responsibility for public education was transferred from churches to local and federal civic government. Within American jurisprudence, the Supreme Court offers a ‘normative’ commentary of the Constitution. The Court defines the inner spirit of the Constitution, applying it to the changing realities of American life. The separation of church and state was not drafted to be injurious to religion as recognised by the Supreme Court in the Zorach case. The whole intent of the First Amendment, Murray argues, was to protect the interests of religion in American society.

The Supreme Court in this judgement followed the principles enunciated in the Pierce judgement and differentiated between right and location thereof. "This ‘released time’ program involved neither religious instruction in public school classrooms nor the expenditure of public funds." Justice William Douglas wrote thus for the majority opinion:

182 The Supreme Court of the United States of America, Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306 1952. By a 6-3 vote, the Court held that non-coercive off campus “released time” programmes are permissible accommodations of the religious needs of students, and do not violate the Establishment Clause.

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for a wide variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary. We sponsor an attitude on the part of government that shows no partiality to any one group and that lets each flourish according to the zeal of adherents and the appeal of its dogma. When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities, it follows the best of our traditions.\textsuperscript{184} This majority opinion was a living reminder of Lincoln’s pithy description of America as “this nation under God.”\textsuperscript{185}

The provision of denominational education squares with, and is not in opposition to, the diverse educational needs of a pluralist society. The ‘doctrine of accommodation’ enunciated in the majority opinion of the Zorach judgement is perceptible in the establishment of the dual system of education in England and Wales in 1944. The significant demographic movement during and after the War led to cross-fertilisation of Church teaching with civic discourses across national boundaries. This cross-fertilisation was adaptive. Liberal democracies incorporated civic responsibility to peoples of faith into its legislation, while the Church recognised the rights of others in their negotiations.

\section*{2.4.2 Diocesan Confraternities}

This also led to a change in ecclesial structures, with for example in England and Wales, many dioceses establishing a Catholic Parents’ Association (CPA); these became a forum for the emergence of espoused-operant voices. Below is a copy of the preliminary constitution of the Westminster Diocese Catholic Parents’ and Electors’ Association (CPEA)\textsuperscript{186}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Title} The organisation shall be called the Catholic Parents’ and Electors’ Association.
  \item \textbf{Definition} It is a lay organisation, free from political affiliation, functioning with Ecclesiastical (sic) approval.
  \item \textbf{Aims and Objects}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item (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.
      \item (b) To give attention to the welfare of Catholic Youth.
      \item (c) To encourage Catholics to play their part in civic life and to make their full contribution to the common welfare.
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{184} The Supreme Court of the United States of America, Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306 1952.

\textsuperscript{185} John Courtney Murray, SJ, We Hold These Truths: Catholic Reflections On The American Proposition, Sheed & Ward, Oxford, first published 1960, page 146.

\textsuperscript{186} The inclusion of the ‘qualifier’ ‘Electors’ into the titles was a matter of dispute and was eventually deleted in the final set of Diocesan Constitutions dated 21\textsuperscript{st} February 1945.
(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.\(^{187}\)

The inclusion of the conjunction “and Electors” was deleted in the final version of the Westminster Diocesan Constitution dated 21st February 1945; its inclusion here is important as it acknowledges parents’ power and mandate as citizens. The correspondence between bishops over the working title of the Association refers to its remit and membership, authority and the collateral hazards of war.\(^{188}\) Significantly, this constitution also reflects a new ecclesiastical reality; absent Catholic parents\(^{189}\) and an acknowledgement of the role of non-Catholic spouses and partners in the formation of Catholic children. Hence the constitution for the Westminster Catholic Parents’ Association included non-Catholic parents within its constituency. Bishops hereby acknowledged the rights of others ad intra and the need to listen and speak to them.

What is apparent on individual slips of paper in the Archive 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

\(^{187}\) AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1943-45.

\(^{188}\) Letter from the Bishop of Nottingham to Archbishop Griffin, 13th October 1944, in which the Bishop of Nottingham concludes, “I hope that despite the “doodle-bugs you are in good health (AAW Gr 2/62 Catholic Parents’ & Electors’ Association 1943-45).”

\(^{189}\) The letters of Helen Murtagh to Cardinal Griffin give a fascinating social commentary on the family in 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 of interest is the perception held by Mrs Murtagh and that Archbishop Griffin expressed no surprise thereof in his reply. In a letter dated 5th October 1944 Murtagh writes how Dr Leslie George Housden, The Parents’ Responsibility, National Association of Maternity, London, 1943 and member of a newly established committee on maternity care established by Mr. Butler and Mr Henry Willink (Minister for Health 1943-45), came to stay with Mrs Murtagh. “He said he simply could not get over the fact that a Nun was so good at her job [in maternity care] and he was going to tell Mr Willink about it (AAW Gr 1/21f Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48, page 5).” The status quaeestionis on the nature of the family was lithe in post-war public policy debate and development. It was the ‘operant’ action of religious sisters that came to influence more and more the State’s ‘espoused’ voice on such matters and members of the laity were their heralds; an example of a growing social ‘Catholic’ communio.
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.190

The second motion addressed the need for a ‘formal’ voice through the establishment of a Central Committee of educational experts, representing the whole of Catholic England and Wales under the 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.”191

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...

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.”192

In this talk, Griffin rehearsed how Catholic education was always at the service of the family, and this would mark his time at Westminster.

191 ibid.
2.5 Shift From Espoused To Operant

In speeches Griffin drew on Church teaching to remind listeners that peace should be inclusive and unconditional, while increasingly drawing on espoused-operant voices heard within the Catholic community. Griffin looked beyond the immediate, believing that the Church’s mission in education served both the family and the nation.193 While Griffin expresses ambivalence towards the Association in correspondence with his closest advisers, he knew that the Church needed to find new ecclesial forums, or new ‘models’ of Church, as Avery Dulles would write nearly thirty years later.194 There are diverse sources for the provenance of theological themes present in the Archive. The principles of Pius XII’s voice can be heard in Griffin’s nuanced approach to post-War social re-construction as can his pastoral experience of working with the disenfranchised and poor in Birmingham. Durable re-construction needed to involve education, support for the family and improvements to the housing stock. This was not always straightforward and Griffin was also aware of conflicting theo-political strands within political discourse. While the trauma of war united the whole of society, what would unite society in peace? Answering this question has animated public discourse in many guises to the present day.

The passing of the Education Act, 1944 was not the end of this four-voice conversation. Griffin understood that it was the first step; justice and social reformation, would be won in the regulations and amending legislation that would follow.

Onto this stage, around the cross and the Flag of Saint George, would come the principal characters of Hinsley and Griffin along with the whispered voices of the Catholic community. Together they would experience what would later come be called the ‘People of God’ at the Second Vatican Council.
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Chapter Three: Voices
During this time different voices within the Catholic community emerged. An operant ecclesiology reconciled the papal primacy of the First Vatican Council with the democratic mandate of the citizen. Hinsley, drawing on his missionary experience and exposure to French theological thinking in Africa, and Griffin, through his lived experience of subsidiarity working with religious orders to support the family, negotiated the terrain between the First and Second Vatican Councils and the political shift from subject to citizen. The discovery of a local espoused voice nurtured by a sacramental spirituality and the voices of others in the Catholic community made it more difficult for the State to ignore the Catholic Church in the field of educational reform. Hinsley and Griffin held the Hierarchy together, spoke with increasing authority and built collegial praxis. This collegial praxis was contingent on their unitative interpretation of theology and politics. While in the beginning this was tentative, Griffin built on this praxis after his appointment to Westminster.

During this chapter I will try and order the significance of both primary and secondary voices. The greatest challenge facing the Church, and paradoxically liberal democracy, in the early to mid-twentieth century was a new found self-referential individualised freedom borne of the Enlightenment. This theo-political narrative denied God and was easily manipulated by totalitarian regimes.195

3.1 Principal Characters: Cardinal Hinsley and Cardinal Griffin
The principal characters in this story are Arthur Cardinal Hinsley and Bernard Cardinal Griffin. Hinsley and Griffin built a generative consensus around the Church's mission in education. The Catholic community endeavoured to establish denominational schools with a religious and civic curriculum founded on a Catholic, Christian anthropology, that sought to challenge self-referential epistemologies. For Chesterton this “truth-telling thing” was both apostolic and pan-generational, not just bits of additional catechetical knowledge but sacramental, ecclesial and lived.196 Universal maintained Catholic education up to the end of secondary school age, as introduced in Education Act, 1944, aimed to build a confident Catholic middle class; unifying existent ‘established’ and ‘migrant’ moieties within the Catholic community. These schools sought to help Catholic children, and their parents, to

look beyond the boundaries of self-referential nationalism and learn to speak and act ‘epideictically’.

A cursory read of the Archive makes the reader aware of the demands made on Cardinal Hinsley\(^ {197}\) and his ability to interpret these in an adroit way. He realised that true justice is not parochial nor could he be concerned solely for his ‘Catholic’ flock at home. From his desk he would make representations to HMG for Irish prisoners and from his pulpit, and confident use of radio, argue against the Nazi persecution of the Jewish community.

The feel of the ‘education’ papers in the Griffin annals is different to those of Hinsley. Hinsley brought about conciliation between Church and State drawing on Catholic spirituality and doctrine, whereas Griffin brought to the negotiations a spirit of proto-‘aggiornamento’. Just as the French religious influenced Hinsley through their intuitive ressourcement thinking, so Griffin was influenced by the principled, organisational pragmatism of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul.\(^ {198}\) Griffin worked with these Sisters at Father Hudson’s Homes, Coleshill before he was transferred to Westminster. The Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul gave the Church’s mission a tangible place in the public space through liaising with civic authorities in the work of education, healthcare and supporting Catholic families in distress. Mother Geneviève Dupuis, foundress of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul, believed that teaching was an apostolic work in the social field. Catholic children had a right to ‘Catholic’ education and encouraged her Sisters to “show a mother’s love and anxiety for the little ones of Christ”,\(^ {199}\) so the Sisters would cook before they would teach and established communities for Catholic orphans.

3.1.1 Arthur Hinsley

Arthur Hinsley was born in Carlton, near Selby in Yorkshire and was appointed as Archbishop of Westminster at the age of seventy. He was the first Yorkshire-born cardinal since Saint John Fisher. In him, the Catholic Church and country found “a champion as spiritually young as he was physically venerable.”\(^ {200}\) Hinsley was placed in “the midst of a

\(^ {197}\) Hinsley was created Cardinal-Priest of Saint Susanna by Pope Pius XI in the consistory of 13 December 1937.

\(^ {198}\) With whom he worked while in Birmingham at Father Hudson’s Homes, Coleshill.


\(^ {200}\) A.C.F. Beales, ‘The Struggle For The Schools’ in George Andrew Beck, ed., Foreword by Cardinal Griffin, *The English Catholics 1850-1950: Essays To Commemorate the Centenary*
cisalpine and traditionally introspective Hierarchy. In opting for Hinsley the Holy See chose a cleric with experience of dealing with British officialdom locally as headteacher of St. Bede's Grammar School, Bradford and internationally as Apostolic Visitor to the British colonies in Africa and then as Apostolic Delegate to British Africa. Hinsley's time in Bradford and Africa was formational and left him suspicious of a lack of communio between neighbouring bishops. As a head teacher he was frustrated by what he saw to be arbitrary decisions on the funding of individual schools by neighbouring bishops, and as Apostolic Visitor (and Delegate), he saw how a lack of 'Catholic' consensus hindered negotiations between Church and State. Experiences such as Hinsley's were replicated across the Church and would lead at the Second Vatican Council, drawing on the teaching of Rerum Novarum to enunciate the principle of subsidiarity. This reform was drawn from the collective experience of the Church between the First and Second Vatican Councils as it sought to help believers navigate their way between the competing geopolitical forces of capitalism and communism.

In Africa, Hinsley came into contact with French missionaries and their theological schools of thought struggling to interpret the transient nature of French political life with its serial dismantling of civic authority. Just as the Second Vatican Council was informed by the French 'ressourcement' movement, so the First Vatican Council was informed by the French 'ultramontanist' movement. Within the life of missionary schools in Africa there existed conflicting priorities, those of evangelisation and changing educational ordinances. Before his deployment to Africa, Hinsley spent time preparing in England by

---


204 The principle of subsidiarity is best summed up in §1894 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church: "neither the state nor any larger society should substitute itself for the initiative and responsibility of individuals and intermediary bodies."

205 Led by theologians such as Henri de Lubac.

206 Led by theologians such as Joseph de Maistre.

207 "There were 111 Catholic mission territories in Africa on Hinsley's appointment in 1927 and of these 51 were under the British flag. Nineteen of these were subject to the Apostolic Delegate for South Africa, Mauritius and the Seychelles; also under British rule were the only two sees ruled by Ordinaries. In British East Africa there were twenty major missionary territories and ten in British West Africa. Generally speaking, West Africa came under the French sphere of influence; the Congo was under Belgian control, whilst East Africa was predominantly British. These three states together with Italy, Portugal and Spain, controlled 95% of the continent; the remaining 5% was made up of Abyssinia, Liberia and Egypt (James Hagerty, Cardinal Hinsley: Priest & Patriot, Family Publications, Oxford, 2008, page102).
meeting with missionaries either on leave or studying in England. “Among these was Fr
Caysac Joseph of the Spiritans’ seminary at Castlehead in Lancashire, with whom he
discussed the [I]nstitute’s recent ordinations and general missionary issues.”

French Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (OMI) also had missions with schools in Africa. By
1927, the latter numbered 120 and one seminary at Roma, Basutoland (southern
Africa).

Through correspondence during Hinsley’s visitations we can see him rehearsing the
Church’s normative voice. In a letter to Bishop Mathurin Guillaume a French White Father
who was Vicar Apostolic of Nyasaland, Hinsley wrote: “the school is the vestibule into
the church. The sacraments are given in the church, but it is in the school that you prepare
the subjects of the sacraments. Therefore at the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation
of the Faith I have been told to state clearly that where a choice is to be made between
building a church and building a school, it is the school that is to be chosen.”

Concerns over governance exercised Hinsley, the Ordinaries and Religious Superiors. There
emerged a common educational policy, which insisted that Catholic schools could not be
managed, or dictated to, by non-Catholic organisations. That said the Catholic community
“recognised the value of government educational reforms, despite their initial unpopularity,
pledged collaboration, and placed the school at the centre of Catholic action.”

This policy, addressing the forty-fifth error enunciated by Pius IX in his Syllabus of Errors (8th
December 1864) had Hinsley’s imprint all over and would be replicated in England and
Wales within twenty years. It also perhaps explains Hinsley’s suspicion of the reduction of
Church ‘control’ to ‘supervision’ within Scottish settlement, 1918.

Hinsley’s intuition was informed by the proto-‘ressourcement’ method he had observed and
heard about in French-Africa. Hinsley applied this approach to Westminster. He would see,

---

209 Known as Lesotho since independence in 1966.
210 Known as Malawi since independence in 1964.
211 ibid, page 125.
212 ibid, page 118.
213 In the sixth chapter of this Syllabus or Errors, Pius IX rehearses the errors about civil
society, considered both in itself, and in its relation to, the Church. In forty-fifth point Pius IX
writes:

The entire government of public schools in which the youth of a Christian state is
educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and
ought to appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority
whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the
schools, the arrangement of the studies, the conferring of degrees, in the choice or
approval of the teachers. - Allocations Quibus luctuosiissimis, Sept. 5, 1851, and In
consistoriali, Nov. 1, 1850.
judge, (build consensus) and act. When he was Apostolic Visitor, then Apostolic Delegate, to British Africa Hinsley was approached by a Mother Superior to help improve the conditions under which African women were giving birth. “Hitherto it was considered unseemly for a nun to attend a confinement. However, Hinsley saw the problem faced by both mothers and nuns and sensibly (sic) advised the Mother Superior that, whilst attendance would be a strict contravention of the Rule, the virtue of charity could not be ignored.” Hinsley approached Rome over this issue and in 1936 the prohibition was lifted.

The provenance of this method was a response to Rerum Novarum and became the motto of the Young Christian Workers, founded in the 1920s by Father, later to be Cardinal, Joseph Cardijn (1882-1967). Cardijn influenced the Council Fathers in their drafting of Gaudium et Spes. The method of see, judge act, drew elements from both the Church’s Tradition and post-First World War believers. It was sacramental, unitative and revealed the influence of continental theology on Hinsley.

One of Hinsley’s final acts in Africa in light of the nationalism prevalent during and after the First World War was to set about de-nationalising missionary terminology. However much of a reformer he may have been, he was always Catholic. “Instead of referring to the ‘Italian Catholic Mission’ and the ‘Austrian Catholic Mission’, Hinsley insisted that they were in future to be known as ‘the Roman Catholic Mission’. He also set up links between the missionary houses and teacher training colleges in England offering one-year courses “in modern teaching techniques, the use of English, and an understanding of the English educational system.”

Hinsley’s ability to interpret was recognised also outside Church circles as found in Douglas Newton’s entry in the Dictionary of National Biography, London 1950. There, Newton writes:

Hinsley’s work in Africa was regarded both in Rome and in British colonial circles as an achievement of the highest order. His belief in personal contact, his sympathy and tact, no less than his administrative ability, won a happy cooperation among various nationalities making up the missionary body, as well

215 ibid.
216 Dorothea McEwan, A Catholic Sudan, pages 185-186.
as with colonial officials, and proved of inestimable value both to native education and to Roman Catholic missions generally.\textsuperscript{218}

Hinsley was the only British-born Apostolic Visitor of his time. “From the outset, Hinsley’s almost uncritical acceptance of the benefits of British imperialism and his unwavering Catholic faith and service to the Church led him to make straightforward pronouncements on complex issues.”\textsuperscript{219} This binary capacity to see complex issues simply was something he shared with Churchill.

Hinsley’s primary task in Africa was harmonising sometimes conflicting Vatican and British educational policies. He was recognised in L’Osservatore Romano, 25\textsuperscript{th} May 1934, as a “faithful interpreter.”\textsuperscript{220} On 2\textsuperscript{nd} April 1935, in an unusual mark of respect and approval, the Pope personally conferred on Hinsley the pallium, representing the fullness and authority of the metropolitan archiepiscopal office.\textsuperscript{221} Pius XI did this before Hinsley left Rome and Hinsley would have cause to remind Archbishop Downey of his seniority among equals in a spat over the granting of an indulgence. Hinsley through his appointment had “certain privileges and distinctions of pre-eminence. He was Praeses Perpetuus Angliae et Cambriae (sic), or permanent president of the English and Welsh Hierarchy…”\textsuperscript{222} something HMG appreciated intuitively and respected. Thus, after Hinsley’s death, HMG used Parliamentary conventions to delay progress of the Education Bill through the Houses of Parliament during the interregnum, until Griffin’s appointment. Although Hinsley was formed scholastically, he sought a theological language that would enable him to engage in different discourses at Westminster as he had done in Africa, leaving the way open for others to participate in future negotiations.

\textbf{3.1.2 Bernard Griffin}

Bernard William Griffin was born in Birmingham, educated at Cotton College, Oscott, the Venerable English College and at the Beda College. He served as Secretary to the Archbishop of Birmingham and became Chancellor of the Diocese at the age of thirty and became a notable administrator of the diocese’s charitable homes (Fr. Hudson’s Homes). Griffin was consecrated auxiliary bishop of Birmingham before the beginning of the Second

\textsuperscript{218} ibid, pages 184-185, where Hagerty cites the Dictionary of National Biography, London 1950.
\textsuperscript{219} ibid, page 112.
\textsuperscript{220} ibid, page 184.
\textsuperscript{222} James Hagerty, Cardinal Hinsley: Priest & Patriot, page 200.
World War at the age of thirty-nine and was appointed to Westminster in 1943 at the age of forty-three. Although young, after five years his time at Westminster Griffin was blighted by ill-health and he died at the age of fifty-seven. Like Hinsley he achieved much in his time at Westminster.

His experience locally and nationally in social welfare helped this able administrator become an effective negotiator with HMG. Griffin helped underpin the denominational response to post-War reconstruction. In the Minutes of the Fourteenth Annual General Meeting of the Catholic Welfare Council held at the Dorchester Hotel on 28th September 1944 the following is recorded of Griffin:

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.223

Like Hinsley, Griffin attended to a kaleidoscope of policy issues. Griffin supported tangibly and catechetically the family through denominational education and healthcare and making representations to HMG over social housing. While Hinsley was a Catholic orator, Griffin was a Catholic guardian seeking to provide universal, inclusive care for all Catholics whatever their age, means or nationality.

In a personal letter dated 3rd January 1944, Rab Butler welcomed Bernard Griffin to Westminster. The sense of relief is tangible. Butler assures Griffin that he would be welcome at Butler’s home to “discuss matters”224 with him. In the middle of Butler’s principal speech during the Second Reading of the Education Bill, 1944 in the House of Commons, Griffin snuck into the Strangers Gallery where he was seen by Butler who at the time was trying to assuage the concerns of critics of the Bill by quoting a verse from the hymn:

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take,  
The clouds ye so much dread  
Are big with mercy, and shall break  
In blessings on your head.225

---

224 Personal 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].
The following morning Griffin despatched to Butler a copy of his namesake’s Lives of the Saints. Appreciation for this witty afterthought by Griffin is recorded in Butler’s autobiography. Griffin knew the rules of the game and through this simple gesture negotiations with the Catholic Church could begin again in earnest.

Griffin realised the importance of unity and that all members of the community whether at home, in church, in Parliament or on the battlefield had their part to play. This body had Christ at its head. Griffin showed empathy, humour and determination. He built capacity within the Church anecdotally representing those who were voiceless amid and beyond the negotiations.

After the passing of the Education Act, 1944 there was protracted discussion over the standardisation of school holidays across the maintained estate, including holydays of obligation. Griffin engaged in such conversations drawing on his childhood memories. In a letter to I. J. Hayward, Chairman of the Local Education Committee on 30th November 1945 Griffin wrote ‘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 (AAW Bo1/191: XIV Post-1944 Education Post-1944 [1945-1954]).’ Such ‘skirmishes’ belied a narrative of competing models of anthropology, denominational schools after the War modelled God’s presence in work and rest. Griffin’s pastoral concern and sense of humanity consistently mediated the Church’s ‘normative’ voice. Griffin intuited that life would be different after the war; the trauma of war had touched children as well as adults. Many ‘Catholic’ children were returning to their families after six years away.

Like his predecessor, Cardinal Griffin served as Chairman of the Governing Body of The Vaughan School. In the year after the re-opening of the school at Stewart's Grove, Chelsea (after its wartime sojourn with the Jesuit Fathers at Beaumont), Mgr John Vance, headteacher, writes to the Cardinal enclosing a copy of an internal report written by the boys' tutors. The picture painted is grim. Teachers express concern over the bad behaviour and poor standards of new boys.

Poignantly the form tutors wrote:

The most marked characteristic [is the boys] 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 [is], 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, page 2, AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School).

Cardinal Griffin acknowledges the emotional cost of peacetime; with children returning home to re-constituted, and newly established, denominational school communities. As he writes in his response to Mgr Vance, 'I hope I am not too optimistic in thinking that this bad spirit has now reached its [nadir] and that matters will improve. (Letter from Cardinal Griffin to Mgr Vance to dated 13th February 1947 entitled ‘Newcomers to the School’, page 1, AAW Gr 2/73 1944-47 The Vaughan School).

British youth had also been damaged by the execution of the war as had German youth by its ideological origin and destructive conclusion; healing was necessary for victor and
Griffin exercised and fostered humour and resilience in equal measure. Parish priests were trying to implement the provisions of the Education Act, 1944 while meeting the needs of a transient community amid bomb damage. He became a guardian to both his priests and the wider Catholic community. Interestingly there is no evidence in the Archive, of perceived shortcomings of the Education Act, 1944 being held against Griffin personally within the Catholic community.

The first contact between Churchill and the new Archbishop was initiated by Churchill. Shane Leslie wrote to Archbishop Griffin’s private secretary suggesting a luncheon meeting between the two of them not “to discuss the Education Question” but the prosecution of the War. The relationship between the State and the Church was never limited to one issue but education became the litmus test through which the wellbeing of this relationship could be assessed then as now.

3.2 The Growing Standing of the Catholic Community under Hinsley

Hinsley’s experience in Africa taught him the importance of developing a clear conduit to senior officials and Ministers. He had to marshal concerns ad intra so that they may be understood ad extra. This was critical to ensure that the Catholic voice was not ignored as many in the Catholic Church perceived it had been in 1870.

At the beginning of the Second World War, elements of the British establishment still remained suspicious of Catholic intentions and loyalty. The Catholic Hierarchy was only re-

vanquished. The Catholic denominational school and family became the loci of ‘formational’ grace.

228 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 [now Commercial Road] 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...all that we can to help them (Letter from Fr. Thomas J. Fitzgerald to Archbishop Griffin, 18th March 1947, page 2, AAW Bo1/191: XV Post-1944 Education 1946-1954).” It took ten years, for the foundation stone of the new school to be laid in May 1955 and the parish school opened again in July 1956 (Jean Maynard, A History of St Mary & St Michael's Parish, Terry Marsh Publishing, Essex, 2007).

229 Sir John Randolph Leslie, known as Shane Leslie, was an Irish-born diplomat and writer. He was first cousin to Winston Churchill and worked in his private office. In 1908, Leslie converted to Catholicism and supported Irish Home rule.

230 Letter from Shane Leslie to Archbishop’s Griffin’s office, 26th January 1944, AAW Hi 3 [AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC, pages 1 & 2.
established in England and Wales in 1850 and in Scotland in 1878. Relations between the United Kingdom and Free State of Ireland were up-and-down and Irish migration had influenced appreciably relations between Great Britain and America. Joseph P. Kennedy, American ambassador to the Court of Saint James signified the ambivalence present in Anglo-American, Anglo-Irish and Anglo-Church relations. HMG’s reservations over the loyalty of the Catholic Church were assuaged by Kennedy’s recall to Washington after allegedly expressing pro-Nazi sympathies, Pius XI’s sceptical response to the Munich settlement and Hinsley’s clear public support for the Allies’ ‘just war’.

Hinsley supported the war effort in speeches and sermons to the troops and wider Catholic community. He provided a spiritual justification for the War. On Sunday 4th August 1940, Hinsley broadcast to the forces “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.” This Yorkshire “bluntness” found resonance with Churchill and many outside the Catholic community. Comparing their fight to that of the Archangel Michael against Lucifer, Hinsley uses a tale 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.” Yet Hinsley was aware that the servicemen 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

---

231 On 29 September, 1850, by the Bull, Universalis Ecclesiae, Pius XI restored the Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales.

232 Between January 1938 and 22nd October 1940.

233 As Sir Andrew Noble recorded in his minute which followed the Munich settlement of September 1938: “The Vatican is deeply distrustful of the spiritual and political aims of the totalitarian States and within the limits of what is possible for a spiritual Power situated in an enemy country, is acting on lines that conform generally with our own. The Pope [Pius XI] is personally largely responsible for this policy. Religion apart, he is one of the most remarkable men in the world today and, though he may not unfortunately have much influence on Fascist policy at the moment, he might have at some important juncture in the future, if he is spared... [found in FO 371/22416, R 9517/23/22 (page 119)].” This sentiment is echoed by Lord Halifax in his tribute to Pius XI after his death on 11th February 1939 “the brave stand which the Pope made against Nazi doctrines and more recently against the anti-Jewish measures in Italy has done much to diminish anti-Roman Catholic feeling in this country (Thomas Moloney, Westminster, Whitehall and the Vatican: The Role of Cardinal Hinsley 1935-43, Burns & Oates, 1985, page 120).”

234 Cardinal Hinsley, Broadcast to the Forces, 4th August 1940, page 1, AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued AAW Hi 3.

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.\textsuperscript{236n}

This led Hinsley to reflect on the nature of the enemy. National Socialism, engendered greater ‘Germanisation’ through all its public agencies. By construing everything as political, the Nazis set to work eradicating diversity in formal and informal educational provision\textsuperscript{237} and marginalising the mission of the churches. Salvation is found within the Germanic race and State. Hinsley argued that “a training of youth, in which physical and intellectual development is divorced from a thorough moral and religious formation,”\textsuperscript{238n} is essentially flawed. While soldiers fought in the trenches, Hinsley at home would fight for the establishment of this ‘true’ education, drawn from the Church’s Tradition whereby Catholic children and young people would be taught an interpretative ‘Catholic’ method:

\begin{quote}
the whole atmosphere of the school must be penetrated with the sweetness of faith. Our training of youth is a \textit{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.\textsuperscript{239}
\end{quote}

Hinsley envisaged that Catholic schools, founded on the “the Holy Eucharist”\textsuperscript{240}, would become a place where pupils would learn the teaching of Our Lord and not, in the words of the Bishop of Lancaster, descend to the “hatred of [our] enemies.”\textsuperscript{241} Such a sacramental pedagogy would counter disunity and hatred.\textsuperscript{242}

Hinsley restates “that there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education”\textsuperscript{243}; the antecedents of this teaching can be traced back to Leo XIII in \textit{Militantis Ecclesiae}, 1897 and Pius XI in \textit{Divini Illius Magistri}, 1929. For Hinsley the curriculum had to be Catholic “permeated with Christian piety.”\textsuperscript{244n} The need for this is seen in what was happening in Germany where the de-Christianising of education was almost complete; replacing, in the words of Hinsley, a systematic study of Christ and his virtues with “the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[236]{\textit{ibid}, page 5.}
\footnotetext[238]{Moloney, Westminster, Whitehall and The Vatican, page 204.}
\footnotetext[239]{Hinsley, \textit{Suggestions for Teachers for those using the New Syllabus of Religious Instruction in Westminster and Southwark}, 16\textsuperscript{th} March 1942, \textit{AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43}, page 2.}
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\footnotetext[241]{Bishop of Lancaster, Pastoral Letter for Lent 1942, entitled \textit{The National Youth Movement}, \textit{AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43}.}
\footnotetext[242]{Hinsley, \textit{Suggestions for Teachers for those using the New Syllabus of Religious Instruction in Westminster and Southwark}, 16\textsuperscript{th} March 1942, \textit{AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43}, page 2.}
\footnotetext[243]{Speech given by Cardinal Hinsley to LCC Teachers, 29\textsuperscript{th} June 1939, entitled \textit{The Key Position of the Christian Teacher in the Renewal of Order}, page 3, \textit{AAW BoI/159 (1) 1935-43} also catalogued \textit{AAW Hi 3 A}, ibid, pages 3-4.}
\end{footnotes}
Hinsley offered a vision of an alternative “Christian” society and school. “Christianity alone is the basis of an ethical and social system which is absolute, rational, objective and personal.” Each of these attributes comes from God and Hinsley was clear that “we want our boys and girls to grow up [as] 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.” This was in opposition to what Hinsley saw in Nazi Germany where older children were reduced to citizens and agents of the State. The journey to citizenship for men and women in Germany was self-referential. “The young [male] subject of German nationality is obligated to undergo schooling prescribed for every German. He thus submits to education to make him a racially conscious and patriotic national comrade. Later he must perform the supplementary physical exercises prescribed by the state, and finally he enters the army…Thereupon, after completion of his military duty, the right of citizenship (sic) is most solemnly bestowed on the irreproachable, healthy young man.”

The above provides a lens through which to view the negotiations. The fight for education was not simply a Church matter but an attempt to protect society from the invidious consequences of self-referential totalitarianism, where training replaced education and the State usurped the place of the child’s parents.

Negotiations concerning the Education Bill, 1944 were shaped by earlier legislation, ecumenical relations and trust. Lord Halifax, President of the Board of Education, prior senior to R.A.B. Butler at the Foreign Office, and participant in the earlier Malines Conversations writes to Cardinal Hinsley on 4th June 1935:

---

245 ibid, page 4.  
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248 ibid, page 6.  
249 ibid, pages 6-7.  
...I ought perhaps to say again – what I did say when we discussed these things [last week] – 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.\textsuperscript{251} 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.\textsuperscript{252}

In 1935, an election was called.\textsuperscript{253} At the heart of the debate on education between Church and State were questions of authority, freedom, governance and a fear of shifting sands on both sides. Under Hinsley’s leadership the bishops agreed a ‘common’ question that should be put to prospective parliamentary candidates:

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?\textsuperscript{254}

Along with this is a second undated single page, written by the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, to help Catholics act in “conformity with Catholic teaching\textsuperscript{255}” in the forthcoming General Election. Three points address the matter of education:

1. It is no part of the \textit{normal (sic)} function of the State to \textit{teach (sic)}.
6. The teacher is always acting \textit{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.\textsuperscript{256}

This page echoes Church teaching and the principles found in the \textit{First Synodal Letter of Westminster}, 1852, and rehearsed in the Pierce v Society of Sisters judgement of the Supreme Court of the United States\textsuperscript{257} and in \textit{Divini Illius Magistri} respectively. While the State may subsidise provision, it could not usurp the God-given role of Christian parents.

\textsuperscript{251} Both Hinsley and Halifax would have been aware of the influence of the non-Conformist constituency in the drafting of the earlier Cowper-Temple amendment.
\textsuperscript{252} Letter from Lord Halifax to Cardinal Hinsley, 4th June 1935, pages2-3, AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40.
\textsuperscript{253} Although there was a change in prime minister, and a unity government because of the Second World War, the 1935 House sat until 1945.
\textsuperscript{254} Letter from Mgr Valentine Elwes, Archbishop Hinsley’s Personal Secretary, to Mr Blundell, Secretary to the Catholic Education Council, 24th October 1935, AAW Hi 3 (AAW Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box AAW Hi 2/191-196.
\textsuperscript{255} AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40.
\textsuperscript{256} ibid.
\textsuperscript{257} 1925.
This election led to a change of Government. In a letter from Stanley Baldwin, the new Prime Minister, to Archbishop Hinsley dated 8th November 1935, 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.” He also indicates that “any attempt to re-open the settlement of 1902 is impracticable.

Hinsley was unconvincied, and in an incomplete and undated response to a letter from the Bishop of Shrewsbury (not in the Archive), Hinsley refers to the Education Act, 1936 so:

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 where 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 [the] Westminster Synod’s appeal to parents against sending [their] sons to Eton and Harrow. We yield only to ‘force majeure’ as the German Catholics.

Perhaps from this moment, Hinsley realised that a new educational settlement would be necessary, since the current arrangements left significant gaps in Catholic provision across the growing, and increasingly Catholic, industrial conurbations. There is significant debate post-1936 over how “Catholic” senior schools would be staffed and the need for a common and unified voice across the Hierarchy. Would any compromise be principled or piecemeal? Here, more than anywhere else, we glimpse how consensus was built across the Hierarchy and the emergence of a singular, common voice. Thomas Henshaw, Bishop of Salford, writes to Archbishop Hinsley on 10th February 1937:

---

258 Letter from Stanley Baldwin, the new Prime Minister, to Archbishop Hinsley, dated 8th November 1935, AAW Bo1/184 Various Papers Relating to Education (Chiefly 1931 & 1936 Acts), page 1.
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261 Incomplete and undated letter from Cardinal Hinsley to the Bishop of Shrewsbury, AAW Bo1/184 Various Papers Relating to Education (Chiefly 1931 & 1936 Acts), page 5.
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.²⁶²

The Bishop of Salford intuitively understood the importance of unity within the Hierarchy as it sought to find a collective ‘operant’ voice. Localised demographic variables, and an increase in the school leaving-age in 1936, placed differential pressures on individual dioceses. A credible common voice in negotiations with the Board of Education required unity that respected local determination. Through the experience of these negotiations the Hierarchy of England and Wales learnt that they were only as strong as each other. This experience of ‘solidarity’ would lead to the enunciation of the doctrine and method of collegiality at the Second Vatican Council.

3.3 Negotiations Begin
To record each stage of the negotiations would be a mammoth task, considering the lack of order in the Archive. However, the ‘normative’, ‘formal’, ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voices appear throughout the negotiations often alongside each other. What is particularly interesting is the interplay between the ‘normative’ and ‘espoused’ voice as participants aim to enunciate an ‘operant’ voice. Sometimes this interplay takes place in private correspondence ad intra and ad extra and at other times in more public forums. In the bibliography to this thesis I have provided a colour-coded digest of what is lodged therein and used the same colour-coding in Volume II. In the text of the thesis, I have recorded sometimes verbatim, significant letters and contributions. What is fascinating is to read what is lodged in the Archive, what has been saved, and to track how the working files of predecessors are used by their successors. There is clear intertextuality between the files of the Anglican Church and HMG, which is to be expected due to the institutional character of the former, and more surprisingly, between the papers of Hinsley, Roosevelt and Churchill. Hinsley announces the right of the Catholic Church to educate, whereas Griffin acts as guardian of that right. Hinsley enunciates that it should take place and Griffin how.

²⁶² Letter from the Bishop of Salford to Archbishop Hinsley, 10th February 1937, AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34.
On 10th May 1940 Churchill became prime minister. Churchill was not a natural educational reformer, well aware that it could stir up dormant sectarian and partisan bad feeling that may undermine the war effort. Churchill wanted Catholic soldiers to focus on the ‘primary’ task in hand of defeating the Nazis and not to become distracted by concerns over the education of their children. Churchill would not presume the support of the Catholic community, remembering personally how he had done so before losing his Manchester North West seat in 1908 “to the sudden and organised transference of between four and five hundred Catholic votes, always hitherto regarded as an integral part of Liberal strength in Manchester, to the Protectionist side, upon grounds quite unconnected with the main issues.”

Archbishop Hinsley was conscious of how momentous the Hierarchy’s deliberations over education were; in an undated handwritten note, he records that the forthcoming meetings of the Hierarchy on 14th-15th April 1942 and/or 24th June 1942 respectively are “perhaps the most critical of our generation.” This note is either a crib sheet for, or personal note from, one of these meetings. The first took place at St. Edmund’s College, Ware and the second at Archbishop’s House, Westminster. Towards the end of the note, Hinsley lists the “the maximum we wish to obtain by negotiation and the minimum we will accept.”

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 (sic) 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.

Along with building a consensus ad intra, Hinsley became aware in 1942 of prior side-conversations between the Anglican Church and the State. Proposals over subsidies and

264 Undated note, AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196], page 1.
265 ibid.
266 ibid.
the appointment of teachers were being presented to the Catholic Church after they had been rehearsed and agreed privately with the Anglican Church. So the first two points of an interim report, entitled *The Dual System*, published by The National Society in October 1942, appeared word for word a month earlier in a personal letter, marked ‘Private’ from the President of the Board of Education to Archbishop Amigo, dated 16th September 1942. In October, the National Society presented the following arrangements to the Autumn Session of the Church Assembly, which because of their importance, are replicated in full:

---

267 The Central Council of the [Anglican] Church for Education.
268 In a personal letter, dated 16th September 1942, marked ‘Private’ from Richard Austen Butler, 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 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, dated 16th September 1942, Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box Hi 2/191-196], page 2).
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].

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.\footnote{269}

This wording must have been agreed with the Anglican Church before Butler's letter to Archbishop Amigo. This meant that either Butler was intent on steamrolling through his own ‘compromise’ proposals or that he perceived the Catholic community as playing a less significant role. Given Catholic perceptions surrounding the Elementary Education Act, 1870, this was dynamite and the Catholic Hierarchy would have been chary of playing second fiddle to anyone this time round.

Butler will have become aware, or been made aware, that Hinsley had access to paperwork outside of his Communion and of his irritation. Restoration needed to take place in the relationship between the Catholic Church and Butler. Archbishop Amigo met with Butler in his bomb-damaged house at Southwark. Butler records the meeting thus in his autobiography:

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

\footnote{269 The National Society (The Central Council of the [Anglican] Church for Religious Education), The Dual System, October 1942, AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196].}
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.270

This vignette entered Butler’s memory. Amigo underscored the loyalty of the Catholic Church. Politically, this engagement was quasi-liturgical with a bishop beside his bombed-out cathedral and a politician seeking vicarious absolution for his ineptness. Here, trust between Butler and the Catholic Hierarchy is being restored, first in private, then more publically when, on 31st October 1942, Cardinal Hinsley writes to The Times, weaving the principles of ‘The Atlantic Charter’ into the Church’s narrative:271

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

270 R.A. Butler, The Art Of The Possible, page 106.
271 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.”
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

However, Hinsley’s minatory words in the final sentence of this letter must have fulfilled all of Churchill’s original forebodings of upsetting the Catholic community, “there could, he resolved immediately, be no question of introducing an Education Bill that session – a message he is said to have delivered to [Butler] by having the Archbishop’s letter cut out, stuck on a piece of cardboard and sent around to him with a message scribbled on it, ‘There you are, fixed, old cock.’ However, for Butler this was not the end and he humbly continued his discussions with Hinsley, to which Hinsley replied in writing on 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 Thursday, to

\begin{itemize}
\item[(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;
\item[(b)] two representatives – one secular, one regular – of the Conference of Catholic Colleges;
\item[(c)] two representatives of the Association of Convent Schools;
\item[(d)] the Bishop of Pella, Lord Southwell, Lord Rankeillour and Sir John Shute as representatives of the Catholic Education Council;
\item[(e)] one Catholic Labour Member of Parliament;
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[272] AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43.
\item[274] The relevant Acta of the Annual Meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales, held on Thursday, October 29th 1942, reads:
\end{itemize}
your 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.

In his clear rejoinder buried in the second paragraph: “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”, Hinsley is seeking greater equivalence in the Government’s dealings with the Anglican Church and Catholic Church. This was not because he did not recognise the place of the Anglican Church within British society but because he was aware of the differences between the two denominations. Doors were left open and points made. The pace of the negotiations concerning educational reform now picked up and through a hand-written note from Lord Rankeillour, dated 28th November 1942, we gain an insight into Major Morton’s role in the negotiations. Major Morton, a

(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.

5. it was resolved

(a) that formal acknowledgement to Mr Butler 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 (found in AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43).”

Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Mr Butler, 3rd November 1942, found in AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43.

275
Catholic, worked in Churchill’s office at the beginning of the War. 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?

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 Mathew. Have they been tabulated and checked by experts? It might be disastrous if they were knocked out by the authorities at the Board.

Poignantly, elements of Hinsley’s letter to The Times, 31st October 1942 were incorporated into his last Advent Pastoral Letter. The people needed to know the stand Hinsley had taken, here also, he rehearses his 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

---

276 Hand-written note from Lord Rankeillour to Cardinal Hinsley, 28th November 1942, AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43.
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
congress to us all...

For health reasons, Hinsley moved abode from Archbishop's House, Westminster to Hare
Street House, Buntingford on 15th February 1943. Correspondence between Mr. Butler and
Cardinal Hinsley became more detailed in February and March 1943, in part, because of
the hiccup in relations in 1942 and a desire for greater certainty for other members of the
Hierarchy who would soon pick up the baton from Hinsley. Hinsley wrote to Butler which I
have copied this letter in full in the footnote below278 as this letter was sent at a seminal

277 Cardinal Hinsley Pastoral Letter, Advent 1942, page 9, found in AAW Hi 2/112 a
Education 1942-43.

278 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
moment in the negotiations and would allow for a pause rather than an impasse during the interregnum. Hinsley clearly wishes to ensure that there can be no confusion of the Catholic position at the end of his tenure at Westminster. In a rather bureaucratic letter dated 12th February 1943 from Archbishop Downey to Cardinal Hinsley, it is evident that Downey had seen Hinsley’s letter beforehand, suggested some amendments and that these amendments had been incorporated. Hinsley was writing as much to members of

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.

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 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… 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 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).
the Hierarchy who would have to conclude these negotiations as to HMG. Hinsley knew he was dying. On 17th February 1943, Butler replied in a conciliatory tone to Hinsley on Board of Education notepaper but from his own home 14, Belgrave Square, London SW1. He also did not want an impasse.

My dear Cardinal,

…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 give 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 interests concerned…

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.
To Butler’s abiding credit he intuited Hinsley’s contribution to these negotiations was coming to an end. Butler also knew that others would read this letter and make their own assumptions; so he sent a copy of the letter to Archbishop Downey. Butler sought concord with Hinsley, acknowledging what had been achieved thus far and setting the parameters for future conversations in the interregnum. It was as well for HMG that all knew where they stood at this crucial moment.

However, it was to Churchill that Hinsley dictated his last letter to HMG, acknowledging his incomplete work in education the day before he died. This unseen and unsigned note, dated 16th March 1943, provides a powerful testimony of hope of deliverance. Hinsley had done all he could:

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

Hinsley died of a heart attack on the morning of 17th March 1943. This letter was sent to Churchill on the morning of Hinsley’s death with a handwritten note to Mr. Churchill from Mgr. Valentine Elwes, Private Secretary, dated 17th March 1943, time 8.30 am, from Hare Street House, Buntingford:

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

\[280\]

\[281\]
Hinsley’s letter to Churchill takes on added significance precisely because unknown to either Hinsley or Churchill, when drafting it the letter would become the last piece of correspondence between these two interlocutors. Why has it existence not become public until now? Regardless, its sentiment is apparent in Churchill’s regular weekly radio broadcast on the Sunday following Hinsley’s death four days later:

...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. 

Churchill linked education to the welfare services, and also touched on the importance of religion as the “fundamental element in school life.” He welcomed the progress made by all the religious bodies ‘in freeing themselves from sectarian jealousies and feuds while preserving fervently the tenets of their own faith.’ In doing so, Churchill knew he would have to complete this journey without the Cardinal who had become his friend.

By the time of his death Hinsley had become a national figure “and his funeral was a remarkable ecumenical occasion with Anglican and Orthodox bishops in the choir” of Westminster Cathedral, leading the Daily Mail to comment that Hinsley was “probably the best loved [and most successful] Cardinal, England has ever.” Through Hinsley’s ‘espoused’ voice the possibility of adaptive change, born of Augustine, would renew both the Church and British society. Life after the War did not have to be the same as before and a Catholic, Christian anthropology would bring about such metanoia across the maintained sector and through denominational education. Hinsley, unbeknownst to himself, was the first post-Conciliar English prelate. His re-engagement with education in England and Wales involved gauging the cultural and political ‘sitz(e)-im-leben’, building collegiality within the Hierarchy, establishing personal links with the main players, listening to the Church Fathers and drawing on the experience of the laity. However, Hinsley never saw the fruits of his labours in education despite changing the ecclesiological and the political grammar of England and Wales.

282 Sunday, 21st March 1943
283 AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43.
284 The Times, London, 22nd March 1943.
Hinsley with Churchill understood that the Second World War would lead to change and that education would allow for a change marked by eternity not ideology. Often in his talks and in his sermons, Hinsley spoke of the return of peaceful cooperation between nations. In a broadcast to the Eucharistic Congress in Wellington on 2nd February 1940, Hinsley reminisces of a time of healthy competition in sport where “strife without slaughter and art without malice” inspired the world...instead of the barbarism of warfare. In June of the same year, in an ‘Overseas Broadcast’, Hinsley reflected on how the world ended up at war. While making no explicit allusion to education; he deliberated 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 (sic), 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.

The rise of National Socialism stood as proof to Hinsley of the peril of omitting God from the school curriculum. It neither served the State nor young people. “The Nazi youth, made drunk for success, are slaughtered for avowed pagan ideals.” This clarity of thought provided Churchill with a grammar for reconstruction. Hinsley was not arguing for a return to the status quo but announcing a better and more just world. Hinsley focused on moral renovation and Churchill, with Griffin, focused on social restoration allowing the ache of God to penetrate the numbness of history. Nazism had to be seen to be vacuous on the battlefields and in the homes and in the schoolrooms of Europe. Soldiers and civilians had seen, experienced and been party to wrongs during the war. They knew firsthand the consequence of a political narrative that denied God.

---

287 Cardinal Hinsley, A Broadcast to the Eucharistic Congress in Wellington, New Zealand on the Occasion of the Centenary Celebration, 2nd February 1940, AAW Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued AAW Hi 3.
289 ibid.
290 ibid, page 55.
292 Rankin acknowledges in Ian Fleming’s Commandos: The Story Of 30 Assault Unit in WW II the devastation wrought on Germany in the last days of the war. “One third of the 600,000 German civilians killed by Second World War Allied bombing died in that final year of the war...A massive police state was crumbling from below at the same time as it was being systematically pounded by bombing from above (pages 275-276).”
This endeavour was informed by formal voices drawn from theology. What Hinsley and Churchill attempted to address in wartime “was the malaise of our world: *seinsvergessenheit* (sic) – a forgetfulness of being.” Life did not have to be this way and another generation did not need to die.

### 3.4 Interregnum

On 6th February 1943, five weeks before Hinsley’s death, it was announced that membership of the Catholic Education Council (CEC) would be extended by the Hierarchy “to form a Council fully representative of parents, teachers, Members of Parliament and of School Conferences.” Richard Downey, Archbishop of Liverpool, oversaw negotiations with HMG during the interregnum and was chairman of this new ‘extended’ Council. The terms of reference for this group were thus:

- 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. [to organise] conferences with M.P.s on decisions taken by the Bishops;
- d. The function of the Committee is to be advisory.

In the midst of adversity, Catholic churchmen and coalition politicians overcame mutual suspicion; both came out of their respective catacombs and learnt to work together. Hinsley read well the shift from docile conformism among the laity driven by the threat of War for the second time in two generations. This time, the laity would not be passive participants in the re-ordering of spiritual and temporal affairs.

In the last weeks of Hinsley’s life and during the interregnum there was an “endless and apparently self-generating series of variously constituted negotiating bodies marching and counter-marching through the Board of Education before the quizzical, baffled and eventually astounded gaze of R.A. Butler.” Perhaps this was indicative of the Catholic

---


294 The Following Statement has been issued from Archbishop’s House, Westminster, dated 6th February 1943, AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box AAW Hi 2/T91-196].

295 At the bottom of the sheet the following comment is made within parentheses: ‘Extracted from *The Tablet* February 6th, 1943.’

296 *Lumen Gentium*, chapter 4, §31.

community’s misgivings, outside of the South of Westminster and outside of the North of Downey. The CEC was not yet embedded, and without Hinsley (or Westminster) it seemed to flounder. When Butler sought counsel from senior Catholic peers progress remained elusive. In a record of a meeting with the eighty-eight year old Viscount Fitzalan, Butler writes: “Lord Fitzalan staggered into my room and, drawing himself to within an inch of my face, said that he greatly distrusted Archbishop Downey and could not hear what I said.”

Conversations between Butler and Downey were consumed by detail. Butler wrote a detailed, four-page, single-spaced letter to Archbishop Downey, five weeks before Hinsley’s death. In it, Butler thanked the Archbishop for the recent meeting with him and his accompanying committee on 3rd February 1943. Butler’s prose with Downey is more guarded than with Hinsley. However, Butler comes to the heart of the issue in the fifth, sixth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth (a), fourteenth and sixteenth paragraphs of a holding letter where he describes his perceptions of preliminary negotiations thus far, rather than identifying the next steps.

---

298 Taken from Minute by Butler, 18th November 1943, ED 136/412.
299 As evidenced above, this circumspection towards Archbishop Downey is not restricted to Butler.
300 ...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 reconstruction 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:-
In an additional holding 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.”

In Advent 1943, Downey, not to be outdone, wrote a fourteen-page Joint Pastoral Letter in which he offered an encyclopaedic appraisal of the Church’s position addressing the following areas:

a. Extension of Public Control
b. Unfair Differentiation
c. Impossible Financial Burden
d. Brand New Schools
e. Three Principles

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, 1939, 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 ...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 Mr Butler to the Archbishop of Liverpool. 8th February 1943, AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43).”

301 Reprographic Note from Mr. Butler to the Archbishop of Liverpool, 8th February 1943, AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43.
f. A Plea for Simple Justice\textsuperscript{302}

The patience of even the most ardent of parishioners must have been tested; a clear case of ‘more’ meaning ‘less’. Substantive negotiations would only begin again with the appointment of Griffin to Westminster.

While Hinsley achieved conciliation between State and Church, the new Archbishop needed to possess the administrative skills to align the aspirations of the Catholic community with the pragmatics of reconstruction and channel the growing spirit of civic and ecclesial aggiornamento. Griffin brought to the negotiating table experience of achieving this locally with officials in the field of social welfare.

3.5 Negotiations Resume: The Drafting of Primary Legislation under Griffin

Hinsley’s charismatic leadership established patterns of collegiality and subsidiarity pre-1944, Griffin was able to actualise these patterns in the life of the Church and build on these as he attended to a similar kaleidoscope of policy issues; from putative fathers\textsuperscript{303}, care for displaced children and adults\textsuperscript{304}, the catechetical welfare of Catholic prisoners of war\textsuperscript{305} to the place of religious orders within education and health provision. Inclusive care

\textsuperscript{302} 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]).

\textsuperscript{303} AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62.

\textsuperscript{304} From the British Zone of Occupation in Germany, AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1946-47.

\textsuperscript{305} In a covering letter to Governors of Prisoner of War Camps, holding German prisoners, Cardinal Griffin writes:

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
Archbishop of Westminster (AAW Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48).

The response of Lt. Col. M. G. Beckett, Governor of 73 P.[o.]W. Camp, Storwood Camp, Melbourne, Yorkshire, shows that the hoped for transformative effect of social policy was not limited to either school education or the Church:
for all Catholics whatever their age, means or nationality would become a defining characteristic of Griffin’s time at Westminster. Catholic education would support restoration of the family.

In a personal one-page letter dated 3rd January 1944, Butler welcomes Bernard Griffin to Westminster. Griffin received many other letters of welcome from members of the Hierarchy, clergy and laity, along with aide-mémoires from fellow bishops describing the political aptitude of individual Catholic politicians along with pen sketches of their orthodoxy. Griffin asked Colonel Sir John Shute MP on 6th January 1944 “to invite the

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 (dated 28th March 1947, AAW Gr 1/41 b American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48).

306 The most comprehensive of these, lodged in the Archive, was supplied by Bishop David Matthew who worked informally with Catholic parliamentarians during the passage of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1937 and The War Damage Act, 1941 through Parliament:

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); divorcée, remarried, sits till next election for strongly Catholic Salford constituency.
J. Tinker (Lab); staunch old Lancashire Catholic, deeply respect Trade Union figure.
members [of both Houses]" to a meeting on the Educational Bill after the recess and replied on the following day to Butler’s personal letter. In this letter Griffin rehearsed Catholics’ expectation over the universality of Catholic schools for Catholic children. Any settlement had to make place for Catholic provision beyond eleven years old. The Catholic community’s expectation of primary and secondary schools had to be factored into any legislation and financial model:

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.\(^\text{308}\)

While education was "at present…in the hands of Parliament"\(^{309}\), Churchill would soon have to intervene to bring order to the Commons and assuage potential unrest in the ‘Catholic’ ranks.

Griffin and Joseph McCormack, Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, met with Rab Butler and officials on the morning after the Second Reading of the Bill. A record of the meeting was drafted by the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle on the train back to Newcastle. In a handwritten covering letter to Archbishop Griffin, McCormack writes:

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….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.

---

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]).

307 An intimate of Archbishop Downey, in writing to Shute, Griffin knew he was writing to Downey and showing him due respect for the work he had done in this field.

308 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].

309 Letter from Shane Leslie to Archbishop’s Griffin’s office, 26th January 1944, ([AAW Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC), pages 1 & 2.
I think the observations of the Catholic Education Council would be worth having...\textsuperscript{310}

McCormack realised that the greater equivalence sought in negotiations by Hinsley between Anglicans and Catholics would build collegiality ad intra and confidence ad extra. Through this memory and experience, models of ecclesial cooperation would change and subsidiarity would find expression. Griffin appreciated that any epideictic voice needed to be succinct and founded on consensus. This was also recognised by Downey who offered to resign as chairman of the larger educational group founded on 29\textsuperscript{th} October 1942, and extended on 6\textsuperscript{th} February 1943. In a letter to Archbishop Griffin, dated 29\textsuperscript{th} February 1944, Downey writes:

...Your grace will recall that at the meeting of the Hierarchy on January 4\textsuperscript{th} 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...\textsuperscript{311}

This change ensured that Westminster not Liverpool became the conduit for negotiations between Church and State. Interim arrangements for monitoring the Education Bill, during the last months of Hinsley’s tenure and during the subsequent interregnum, had not served the Church well. Downey’s loss of sway is best observed in the response of individual bishops to a proposed “monster” meeting to garner support for the Catholic Church. While perhaps most of the Northern bishops constituted the main body in favour of such a meeting, other voices within the Hierarchy were more cautious. These other voices influenced Griffin more and included, the Archbishop of Birmingham, who wrote on 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 by his postscript in which Thomas Leighton Williams\textsuperscript{312} writes: “p.s. ...such a meeting...may easily do more harm than good.\textsuperscript{313}a The Archbishop of Cardiff was also ambivalent to this proposal; in his response dated 19\textsuperscript{th} January 1944 he writes that he doubts that HMG would be influenced by such a meeting “in their dealings with us.”\textsuperscript{314}a The proposed meeting was not held.

\textsuperscript{310} Letter from Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Archbishop Griffin, 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
\textsuperscript{311} Minutes of meeting of Hierarchy, 4\textsuperscript{th} January 1944, Acta 8, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944.
\textsuperscript{312} The third Archbishop of Birmingham between 1929 and 1946.
\textsuperscript{313}a Letter from the Archbishop of Birmingham to Archbishop Griffin, 25\textsuperscript{th} January 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
\textsuperscript{314}a Letter from the Archbishop of Cardiff to Archbishop Griffin, 19\textsuperscript{th} January 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
Griffin’s first job was to bring clarity once more to the negotiations. Griffin abridged Downey’s fourteen-page Pastoral Letter to one-page where he summarised the three principles enunciated deep within Downey’s Pastoral Letter; namely, the rights of parents, the right to equal opportunity and the rights of partners in the educational field, namely parents, Church and State:

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 cooperation 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.

Griffin was left a rich capital of goodwill by Hinsley. He and Catholic politicians, like the Duke of Norfolk, drew on this in their dealings with both the prime minister and ministers.

---

316 Letter from Archbishop-Elect Griffin on behalf of the 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].
Norfolk writes to Churchill of Hinsley’s educational hopes on 2nd February 1944. This letter from Norfolk to Churchill is significant, as are others he wrote during 1944. For the

317 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
first time Fitzalan acknowledges that only Churchill can broker a resolution to the outstanding issues in the Education Bill debate. Hinsley had intuited this in his last unsigned letter to Churchill. Fitzalan is present throughout this round of negotiations, acting as a ‘political’ Janus figure, offering counsel and directing both sides. Griffin’s promised clarity, as exhibited by his first pastoral letter on this subject, is appreciated by Catholic parliamentarians.318

3.6 Proto-Operant Spine Of The Negotiations

Much of the Church’s communication ad intra and ad extra at this stage of the negotiations has been lost. Therefore, I have tried to re-create this trail verbatim and ask the reader’s patience, for this provides the ‘operant’ spine of the agreement made. What follows are copies (or part copies thereof) of significant correspondence, and aide mémoires, in sequential order drawn from different portfolios in the Archive.

Griffin wrote 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 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 ((sic) AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944).

318 While the promise of this order was appreciated particularly by Catholic parliamentarians they also asked for the bishops’ trust in the negotiations, as can be seen from a note of thanks to Archbishop Griffin by Richard Stokes MP, who expressed his fears thus: “I was depressed beyond words at the meeting tonight 10th 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 (AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196]).” Recognising such equivalence of role would be important in shaping future ecclesial models of Church.
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. .... 319

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...

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. 320

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." 321

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... 322

On 17th February 1944 the bishops received a paper they had commissioned from Arthur Collins entitled The Education Bill, 1944: Financial Aspects for Consideration by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. This detailed memorandum aimed to estimate future post-war building costs. 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

319 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].
320 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].
321 Letter from Archbishop Griffin to an unnamed bishop, 12th February 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
322 Letter from Archbishop Griffin to an unnamed bishop, 16th February 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
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.\textsuperscript{323} Collins contests the approximations of the Board of Education, believing 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, + 1/9\% (15) = £150 post war cost adopted).\textsuperscript{324} Such calculations informed what would follow over financial liabilities.

The Duke of Norfolk also writes to Griffin on 17\textsuperscript{th} February 1944 suggesting that the following amendments to the Bill be proposed; all these were accepted by HMG. One senses at a distance the implicit agreement of 10 Downing Street (Major Morton and therefore Churchill) to these amendments before they were proposed to Griffin:

\begin{quote}
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)\textsuperscript{325}
\end{quote}

In an aide mémoire (author and recipient unknown), dated 19\textsuperscript{th} February 1944, the resentment of the Catholic community to the perceived injustice of the Education Bill is rehearsed:

\begin{quote}
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
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{323} Arthur Collins entitled The Education Bill, 1944: Financial Aspects for Consideration by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944, §19.
\textsuperscript{324} ibid, §21.
\textsuperscript{325} Letter from the Duke of Norfolk to Archbishop Griffin, 17\textsuperscript{th} February 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
schools if the Bill goes through in its present form...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.\textsuperscript{326}

The unknown author knew that unrest in the ranks would gain Churchill’s attention.

On 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 1944 the following notice for the Press Association is released by the
Hierarchy:

The Catholic Hierarchy wish it to be known:-

1) that the Scottish System\textsuperscript{327} or similar system is acceptable as was
declared in the Joint Pastoral Letter of Advent 1943.
2) That 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.\textsuperscript{328}

In a handwritten letter from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, 55, Whitehall, SW.1,
dated 14\textsuperscript{th} 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 then be decided in
the next two weeks.

Yours sincerely,

Norfolk\textsuperscript{329}

\textsuperscript{326} AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944.
\textsuperscript{327} From other correspondence and notes in the Archive it is clear that neither Hinsley nor
Butler would have concurred with the first phrase of this press statement. Both felt that such a
settlement was not transferable to England and Wales.
\textsuperscript{328} Hierarchy, Notice for Press Association on Education Bill, 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 1944, AAW Bo
1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-T96].
\textsuperscript{329} Letter from the Duke of Norfolk to Archbishop Griffin, 14\textsuperscript{th} 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.330

This letter seems to be in addition to a Memorandum issued by Mr. Butler, dated 8th March 1944. Archbishop Griffin was asked to raise the following point 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.331

In conclusion of the discussion at the Meeting the following resolution was proposed and adopted unanimously:


331 Ibid.
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 8\textsuperscript{th} 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.\textsuperscript{332}

Interestingly, all reference to “the Scottish System” has gone and the next resolution reflects the amount of time bishops, both individually and collectively, had 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.\textsuperscript{333}

While the person advising Griffin over the choreography of these negotiations is unknown, he/she is forming Hinsley’s ‘epideictic’ words into nuanced operant phrases and sentences.\textsuperscript{334} This allows Griffin to describe a more financially equitable system. Throughout he, and other members of the Hierarchy, remain concerned over how exposed any financial settlement would leave the Church.

In a handwritten note by Lord Rankeillour to Archbishop Griffin, Rankeillour argues for “a payment per caput of school places”\textsuperscript{335} believing that such a settlement would “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.\textsuperscript{336} Whether by happenchance or in response to such concerns, notes of comfort to Catholic politicians over financial aspects of the 1944 Bill begin to come from officials at the Ministry of Economic Warfare as well as the Board of Education.\textsuperscript{337} It is interesting to note that the prominent, but discreet Catholic,
Major Desmond Morton, served in the former before transferring to 10, Downing Street with Churchill on his personal staff; suffice to write he knew who to approach in his old ministry. There will be more on him later.

While the Bill was still passing the later stages of the House, Butler wrote to Archbishop Griffin in July 1944. The Minister was sensitive to the economic constrictions facing the Catholic Church:

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

I can assure you that the Government is in sympathy with the general sense of the amendment which Lord Rankeillour moved at the [Committee] stage of the Bill…

3.7 ‘Operant’ Breakthrough

These ‘espoused’ voices led to a seminal, ‘operant’ compromise on behalf of HMG that changed the fiscal landscape for the Catholic community. Fortwith a consolidated diocesan trust could underwrite the liability of governors of an individual denominational school; just as local education authorities could spread the liability of individual maintained schools against general rates. This equivalence gave the Hierarchy the requisite financial leeway necessary to build maintained schools for Catholic children of all ages, as opposed to Anglican model founded on individual parochial trusts that did not provide sufficient assets against which to build maintained secondary schools:

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.

338 Letter from Rab Butler to Archbishop Griffin, 25th July 1944, AAW Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1943 (Aug)-44 found in [Box AAW Hi 2/191-196.}
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 experience...³³⁹

Lord Rankeillour congratulated Griffin in a brief note over his success in eliciting from Butler these assurances. Butler, knowingly or unknowingly, disregarded parliamentary convention and bound his successors to promissory words in the Act.³⁴⁰

Embedding the words of this ‘Loans Clause’ into regulations took over three years. Sir William Cleary, an official of the Ministry involved in the negotiations surrounding the Education Act, 1944, wrote to Cardinal Griffin on this matter on 27ᵗʰ February 1948. He was mindful that individual bishops were chary of accepting incalculable financial liability. Cleary proposed the following wording over individual schools seeking the support of the Local Ordinary before a proposal is submitted to the LEA and Ministry. This met the proper discharge of the Minister’s statutory obligation, found favour with Cardinal Griffin and provided a useful check and balance:

³³⁹ ibid.
³⁴⁰ Note from Lord Rankeillour to Archbishop Griffin, 27ᵗʰ July 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944.
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.\footnote{Letter from Sir William Cleary, of the Ministry to Cardinal Griffin, 27\textsuperscript{th} February 1948, AAW Gr 2/21 1948.}

This arrangement was modelled on the practice of those dioceses who had registered as Corporations under the \textit{Companies Act, 1929}. This arrangement protected Church assets civilly, while avoiding alienation of goods canonically:

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 was an insuperable difficulty because no parish priest was \textit{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 \textit{voluntarily} (sic).\footnote{Letter from Cardinal Griffin to Archbishop Godfrey, 4\textsuperscript{th} March 1947, AAW Gr 2/38 1947-48.}

Canon Wood who represented Cardinal Griffin at a meeting with Sir William Cleary, Ministry of Education on 22\textsuperscript{nd} October 1947 to discuss the operational elements of implementing the \textit{Education Act, 1944} made the following observation in the fourth bullet point of his notes:

(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.\footnote{AAW Gr 2/21B 1947.}

Through subsequent reforms, regardless of political party, HMG has sought to extricate maintained schools from consolidated diocesan and religious trusts. While the Ministry accepted this compromise, it was suspicious of, or some may say hostile to, its novelty. This apprehension, either knowingly or unknowingly, entered into the State’s institutional memory. After the Second World War, in various guises, the State has sought to establish separate educational trusts, the latest regulations referring to the establishment of ‘Academy’ schools, or strands thereof, is another expression of this suspicion. This aspiration is rooted in a gradual recovery of ‘control’ and reclamation of ‘accountability’, an innate part of the State’s institutional memory. While pragmatically the State accepted this concession and the Church’s right to educate, it still strives to achieve homogeneity in fiscal governance across the maintained sector and continues to strive to shift the Church’s role from one of ‘control’ of her schools to one of supervision of her schools similar to the earlier Scottish settlement.
Organisation of governance of groups of ‘Catholic schools’ was envisaged in an internal
Ministry paper published a few months after Hinsley’s death. However, this was not so
internal that a copy of it was not lodged in the AAW.

In May 1944, the Board of Education published Principles of Government in Maintained
Secondary Schools. In the thirteenth paragraph we read:

§13. Grouping: - 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. 344

Many dioceses had registered already as Corporations under the Companies Act, 1929
and bishops were able to assuage the concerns of the Holy See over alienation of parish
assets since “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.” 345

This concession may seem insignificant, but operational resolutions have consequences
for following generations. Schools within the Anglican Communion were, and remained,
the property of the parish in 1944, whereas diocesan trustees owned Catholic schools.
Individual Catholic Bishops entered into arrangements with the Ministry over the
countersigning of applications for new Voluntary Schools. An unintended consequence of
this arrangement was the establishment of a larger proportion of Catholic senior schools
within the Catholic schools’ estate compared to the Anglican schools’ estate. Alongside the
Loan Clause concession was the development of an ecclesial infrastructure that would
service the management of such loans. The tide of the Education Act, 1944 brought the
Catholic community together, the rip-tide thereof found in this fiscal concession binding
discrete ‘established’ and ‘migrant’ ecclesial moieties into an ecclesial communion.

Aware of the unintended consequences of proposed primary legislation and regulations,
diocesan officials wrote to Griffin. The scope of this correspondence ranges from transport,
maintained boarding fees, admission of Catholic children to Catholic schools in neighbouring authorities to appointments’ procedures. Correspondence over the training, quality and appointment of teachers to Catholic schools appears across the Archive. Religious orders, lay associations and diocesan officials identified the need for “a permanent[,] national and satisfactory settlement” of such matters. Paradoxically, although dioceses sought to protect their own independence and local determination, the Catholic community was becoming wary of increasing variance in provision for ‘free’ transport, subsidy of boarding fees, cross-boundary admission of Catholic children to Catholic schools and appointments’ procedures across local authorities across the maintained schools’ estate.

The subtly of these negotiations, involving both behind the chair and direct contact with HMG nationally, and LEAs locally, is not always appreciated even by eminent Church Historians such as Robert Trisco, in his essay entitled The Countries Of The English-Speaking Area, in Hubert Jedin’s comprehensive History Of The Church. Below is a verbatim copy of Trisco’s commentary on the Education Act:

> Before a law was introduced in parliament there were long discussions with the president of the Board of Education, R. A. Butler, and representatives of the Anglicans, the Catholics, the Free Churches, and the teachers. However, the Catholic speakers were isolated, for the Anglicans had acquiesced, and the Free Churches and the professional associations had the upper hand. Because the Catholics failed to obtain even the slightest concessions, they opposed the law until parliament had passed it. The results showed that the

346 For example E. Mahoney, Secretary to Southwark Schools’ Commission, notes in his letter to Archbishop Griffin, 26th February 1944, that the wording of the Bill over providing ‘free’ transport to the nearest Catholic school is “merely permissive” (AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944).”

347 Resolution from Executive, 7th January 1936, presented to the Annual Meeting of the Catholic Education Council, 21st April 1936, pages 3-4, AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box Hi 2/191-196. This resolution was passed unanimously at the Annual Meeting.

348 To attend to such anomalies and service the management of diocesan school loans, changes to local ecclesial infrastructures were formalised through the establishment of diocesan schools’ commission, firstly, in Leeds and then across the country with the responsibility to plan:

> 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 care of seculars or regulars.

The Ad Clerum goes on to describe how this new commission will liaise with local clergy:

> 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. (Ad Clerum from the Leeds Diocese, 22nd June 1944, entitled “The New Education Act” announces the appointment of a Leeds Diocesan Schools Commission, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944).
people in England and Wales, who differently from Scotland, were already de-Christianised, could not appeal to an influential public opinion which was convinced that religion formed the heart of education; one could claim only “equality of opportunity,” the right of parents to have their children educated in their own faith and at no greater cost than what their non-Catholic neighbour had to pay.\textsuperscript{349}

Trisco, an American scholar, shows a profound misunderstanding of the English parliamentary system and how law is drafted at Westminster, ignores ownership of the existent school’s’ estate by the Anglican and Catholic Churches, the content of different models of religious education and the nature of the general curriculum proposed in the Education Act 1944. Trisco goes on to describe the three categories of denominational schools prescribed in the Education Act, 1944, namely ‘voluntary aided schools’, ‘special arrangement schools’ [more popularly known as special agreement schools] and ‘controlled schools’.\textsuperscript{350} The Catholic Church was suspicious of the last category, even though many elements were similar to the Scottish settlement of 1918 because it did not ensure denominational religious education. In such schools, children would follow a religious education syllabus written by an agreed syllabus committee of the local education authority which would be monitored by civic inspectors. Although the Church could supervise ‘Catholic’ controlled schools it did not have sufficient control thereof.

Griffin after his enthronement set about building capacity within the Catholic community. He realised the importance of unifying members of the community from both moieties\textsuperscript{351} whether at home, in church, in Parliament or on the battlefield had their part to play. This body had Christ at its head. Griffin showed empathy, humour and a determination to speak with one voice.

Griffin built on Hinsley’s espoused solidarity within Hierarchy seeking to foster collegiality therein, with individual bishops supporting each other from perceived hostile forces outside the Church and sceptical forces within their own dioceses. It is apparent from the Archive that some bishops were suspicious of the State’s willingness to compromise and felt vulnerable. 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 claiming that there is


\textsuperscript{350} ibid, page 620.

\textsuperscript{351} Established and migrant Catholics.
discontent up and down the country [within the Catholic community] over [our] failure to improve the Bill."  

The Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle replies on 12th May 1944 and copies his reply to Archbishop Griffin; clearly, he does so with ‘collegial’ concern for a fellow bishop and

---

352 There follows a verbatim extract from the letter:  
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. (Letter from William Brown, Bishop of Pella to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, 10th May 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944).

353 Extracts of the reply follow:
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, priests 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…

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 journalese, - 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
perhaps, a greater feel for the art of the possible and the game afoot. In private, there is still ambivalence towards the Bill among those members Hierarchy under the influence of Downey, annoyance still with the perceived duplicity of the Anglican Hierarchy in 1942, and a growing acknowledgement of the role of the Catholic laity in negotiations.

Through such experiences, concerns over north-south divisions within the Catholic community were being addressed gradually and an innate sense collegiality is fostered across Hierarchy. This approach informs subsequent ecclesial practice. When Griffin left Westminster to receive his red hat from Pius XII along with thirty-one other new Cardinals at the consistory in January 1946, he wrote beforehand to Bishop Joseph McCormack to represent the Church’s interests in person with Ministers and officials in ongoing discussions on regulations and amending legislation. Yet he would not leave this Weberian-like, charismatically qualified northern sage\(^{354}\), isolated as can be read in his letter to McCormack:

> 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…\(^{355}\)

Griffin proposes that William Lee of Clifton should act as McCormack’s wing man, not Downey; a bishop from the North and a bishop from the South-West. The Church’s collective memory of what happened in 1870 when senior members of the Hierarchy were absent at the First Vatican Council during the passing of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, and drafting of subsequent regulations continued to shape ecclesial practice some seventy years later. However, these proto-signs of collegiality did not sanitise debate within the Hierarchy. Griffin understood that competing discourses ad intra allowed for the emergence of a stronger common operant voice in negotiations with HMG ad extra. There 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 (Letter from the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to Bishop of Pella, 12th May 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944).

---


\(^{355}\) Letter from Archbishop Griffin to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, 23rd January 1946, AAW Gr 2/21 1945-46.
is no evidence in 1946 in either the AAW or in the National Archive, Kew, of ministers or officials being unclear of the Church’s position. Following Griffin’s example, missives betweenOrdinaries became more succinct and reflected a growing recognition that this settlement would change operant ecclesiology. Archbishop Williams of Birmingham, signals that parochial patronage was not sustainable after the War. Teachers could no longer be seen as adjunct curates whose promotion was “dependent on the favour of the P[arish].P[riest].”

3.8 Rebuilding

The re-constitution and re-generation of families would reform parochial communities, the Church and wider society. Griffin sought to build consensus within the wider Catholic community by representing the voiceless, through vicarious acts of his clergy who stood with their parishioners amid the damage of war and by listening to the experience of Catholic laity emerging from ‘total’ War.

Social reconstruction after the Second World War was neither sectional nor purely material. The Educational Act, 1944, transformed education outside denominational schooling. The Education Act, 1944, placed a duty on all local education authorities to attend to the “spiritual, mental and physical development of pupils under their care. This was no longer a Catholic experiment but part of society’s ‘operant’-policy voice. The prospect of learning the grammar of such a voice exercised local authorities and led to the publication of pamphlets such as RELIGIOUS EDUCATION A Message to London Teachers (sic).

356 Letter from Archbishop Williams to Archbishop Griffin, 25th January 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944, pages 1-2.
357 “The Young Christian Workers (YCW), wrote a paper describing the formation of those too old to attend school. Its members were not part of the 1944 experimental group, yet understood the importance of personal education believing it “to be a training for (sic) life, in (sic) and through (sic) life (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, §4).” Paradoxically, the authors of this paper appreciated how mass education could be a force for either cohesion or discord. “The problem of mass education cannot be solved by extending the opportunities for “university education” any more than [a] social problem can be solved (ibid, pages 1-2)” solely by the creation of individualised wealth. A point picked up the Council Fathers some twenty years later when they wrote “God…does not make men holy and save them merely as individuals, without bond or link between one another (Second Vatican Council, Lumen Gentium, 21st November 1964, § 9).”
358 Education Act, 1944, Part II, 7.
While the above 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. 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.

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.” Methodologically, the cross-over of proto-‘ressoucement’ intuition from theology to politics is apparent. In the face of war, the Church needed its ‘saints’ and the State its ‘heroes’.

3.8.1 The Irish Question

There are detailed papers within the Archive charting the persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland since its establishment in 1922. An undated memorandum with no author entitled Grievances and Disabilities of Catholics in The Six Counties of Northern Ireland offers an interesting historical vignette. A pencil note in the margin indicates that the figures herein refer to 1941. Rather discontentedly the anonymous 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.” What is interesting is that this ‘sectarian’ arrangement was tolerated by Westminster who a decade later would pass legislation for England and Wales

360 This aspiration would be enshrined in the 1944 Act.
that would lead to the establishment and expansion of maintained schools with a religious character. Within the social history of England, Catholics were no longer “tolerated outlaws”\textsuperscript{364} but increasingly politically adroit citizens able to articulate their rights in the public space.

How great a paradigm shift this achievement was can be appreciated by the vitriol present in Northern Irish politics in the 1930s. Even on 12\textsuperscript{th} July 1931 Lord Craigavon\textsuperscript{365} would comment “Ours is a Protestant Government and I am an Orangeman.\textsuperscript{366}”

The establishment of the first “secularised” school system in the United Kingdom was proposed for Northern Ireland. Persistent agitation by the Catholic Bishops resulted, after seven years, in the system being modified by the Amending Education Act, 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 in Northern Ireland.

This success, while partial, would provide a prototype for the Catholic community in England and Wales whereby it was able to define itself within public debate as a socio-demographic cohort as well as an ecclesial reality. This growing self-confidence would find acknowledgement in subsequent Education Acts in England and Wales in 1936, in Scotland in 1940 and England and Wales in 1944. Each time the settlement would become more generous for Catholic tax payers. After the passing of the Education Act 1944 Griffin spoke about Northern Ireland in a speech entitled Freedom from Fear at ‘Council of Christians and Jews’ on 7\textsuperscript{th} November 1944. 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.\textsuperscript{367}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{364} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{365} Lord Craigavon was Prime Minster of Stormont until December 1940.
\item \textsuperscript{366} No Author, 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.
\item \textsuperscript{367} AAW Gr 1/37 e Persecution of Catholics in Northern Ireland: 1941-47.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
3.8.2 Learning When To Speak

Alongside debate over the Education Act, 1944, Griffin had to contend with residual anti-Catholic rhetoric in the public space; often conflated with the Irish question which was expressed in the writing of individual polemists such as C.R. Boyd Freeman who wrote Papists are Traitors, an undated pamphlet that was circulated to parliamentarians and by members of the Press. This was sent to Archbishop’s House by Alfred Denville on 2nd March 1944 with a covering note “Just as well to know our “friends” isn’t it? There is no record in the Archive of Griffin responding to Boyd Freeman, however, that was not always the case.

While Griffin did not wish to give individual, theological polemicists the oxygen of publicity, he did respond to occasions of either intended or unintended editorial (or institutional) misinformation in the Press. Griffin appreciated that this could generate suspicion and smother the Church’s newly found ‘operant’ voice. On the Feast of the Assumption, 1944 Griffin met with Pius XII in Rome returning home with a letter from the Pope to the Catholic community in England and Wales. While there is no evidence in the Archive of detailed discussions between the two men over the recently enacted Education Act, 1944, beyond

---

368 In Papists are Traitors Boyd Freeman wrote “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 (C.R. Boyd Freeman, Papists are Traitors, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944).

369 Note from Alfred Denville to Archbishop Griffin, 12th May 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File D: Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944.

370 In which Pius XII wrote:

§. 5 … 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…

§. 7… We exhort you to seek in humble prayer guidance from Christ for your rulers and for yourselves, so that the re-organis[ation], 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 (Letter from Pius XII to Archbishop Griffin, 15th August 1944, AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944, §§ 5 & 7).
a copy of the Press Association notes. Griffin was clearly perturbed by some of the press coverage of this letter and trip, one such example was coverage by The Sunday Express. 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.

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...

371 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”:

…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.
“I TOLD THEM”, HE SAID, “I WOULD URGE THE PEOPLE AT HOME TO WRITE AS OFTEN AS THEY COULD AND THAT THE PEOPLE OF LONDON WERE NOT GIVING WAY UNDER THE FLYING BOMB ORDEAL.
“I STRESSED THAT THE RESCUE SQUADS WERE QUICKLY ON THE SPOT AND THAT DAMAGE WAS SPEEDILY REPAIRED. THE MEN SEEMED INTENSELY RELIEVED.
“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…(sic) (AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944).

372 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.
get in touch with mine (Victoria 4717) to arrange a time convenient to both of us?\textsuperscript{373}

The meeting between Griffin and Beaverbrook took place on 20\textsuperscript{th} September 1944. Unfortunately, there is no record of it in the Archive. Griffin understood that if his neophyte operant voice was to be heard amidst the clamour of latent ‘institutional’ prejudice, the latter had to be challenged and the story of how Catholics citizens had sacrificed their lives in the war told.

**Chapter Four Lives Lived**

One of the most notable features of the Archive is the influence of both the religious and the laity. Drawing deeply on their faith they strove to interpret their ‘sitz(e)-im-leben’ informed by and informing the ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voices of the Church. These voices are not just the voice of the Hierarchy but of the whole Mystical Body, experienced in recusant times and in wartime. The kaleidoscope of Christian hope, expressed through the anthropology of women religious, the sacrifice of servicemen and the eschatological insight of Catholic officials would bring relief to the shadow of war and acuity to peace.

\textsuperscript{373} Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Lord Beaverbrook, dated 9\textsuperscript{th} September 1944, AAW Gr 1/27c London, Pius XII’s message to 1944.
4.1 Whispered Voices of the Mystical Body

Members of the Hierarchy, religious and laity were active in advising Cardinals Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin after their respective appointments. Evidence of this is found in archival tidbits scattered too widely and too numerously to mention individually. Their contribution helped the Cardinals interpret the place of the Church in a changing world, helping them to translate Church teaching into an ‘espoused’ or ‘epideictic’ voice and then ‘operant’ practice. This interpretative response to the social doctrine of “personalism” of Leo XIII (Rerum Novarum), Pius XI and Pius XII was expressed in England and Wales structurally through denominational education. Such an approach was generative and cohesive leading to the development of an increasingly literate and numerate Catholic middle class.

In 1944, denominational education provided common cause for the Catholic community, allowing ‘Catholic’ recusancy to give way to civic engagement in the newly established democratic space of post-War Britain. This, along with similar movements across Europe, allowed for the ecclesiological blooming of the People of God at the Second Vatican Council.

4.2 Religious [Order] Educators

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. Religious orders, gave women a platform on which to express their educational and administrative charism in the public space. Often the provenance of their thinking was French with their anthropology influenced by, and influencing, thinkers such as Jacques Maritain\(^{374}\), who wrote of the importance of integral humanism. A modern Catholic curriculum did not require “men [and women] to sacrifice themselves to the imperialism of the race, of the class, or of the nation: integral humanism demands self-sacrifice for a better life for this brotherhood of fellow men, and for the substantial good of the community of human persons.”\(^{375}\) This curriculum was personalist, unitive and influenced broader educational discourses.

Hinsley, in his time in Africa as Apostolic Delegate, and Griffin, as auxiliary bishop in Birmingham, were influenced by such women religious. The matriarchal nature of this ‘formal’ voice was founded on a Catholic, Christian anthropology and reformed the

\(^{374}\) 1882-1973.
Church’s mission in healthcare and education. Their seminal insights on human development shaped public policy as well as Church thinking across the Empire.

The tenets of the ‘formal’ voice of women, religious who were educators, interpreted prior ‘normative’ teaching and shaped both the Church’s espoused voice and civic educational discourse before, during and after the Second World War. “Everything social is related to the person and must promote its perfection. In other words, society has no end in itself, it is no domineering superego but has a[n organic] ministerial character.” An antidote to the super-ego of the state was the pre-eminence of the family, in Rerum Novarum, we read: “since domestic life, according to both the notion and the reality, is earlier than the civic community, so too its rights and duties have precedence, because they are closer to nature.” Logically, this would lead to the principle of subsidiarity in later conciliar teaching but would find first-expression in denominational schools through “the structure of smaller life groups, whose rights to life must not be curtailed by encroachments of more extensive social organisations (“statism”).” The Church asserted its right to educate and parents’ right to choose. Efficacy did not depend on improving technology, reducing the human person to a means (of the economy) or to the quantitative measurement of knowledge but to the healthy formation of the human person. Christian education served first the family not the State.

4.2.1 Ursulines
The ethos of the modern school has been colonised from sixteenth century Italy, the locus of the foundation of the Order of Ursulines by Saint Angela Merici with its primary charism of teaching. Threads of her anthropology and pedagogy are found in the Order’s first constitution and reflected in an address given Mother Mary Angela Boord O.S.U., at the behest of Cardinal Bourne, on 11th June 1932 to the National Association of Headmistresses. Mother Mary Angela Boord adeptly weaves the threads of Christian anthology into the tapestry of civic education. Saint Angela Merici planned in the sixteenth

---

377 Rerum Novarum, § 10.
379 In records this name is spelt either Mother Mary Anglea Boord or Mother Mary Angela Boord.
century to form for the Church “wives and mothers with thoroughly Catholic minds.” This was not a passive model of domesticity but involved formation of the intellect, will, body and heart in due order. Ursuline study plans from the very beginning were localised and according to Marguérie Aron, “completely determined...by a desire to prepare Catholic wives and Catholic mothers, fully enlightened as to their duties and capable of accomplishing them.” Saint Angela Merici gave proof of a clear and powerful intellect and of extraordinary foresight and courage, when she prescribed to her daughters “to dare to make new ordinances (sic), to dare to modify (sic) the Rule given by her, if the times and their needs called for it (sic). Has the foundress of any other order been so clear[-]sighted.”

Ursuline plans of study are characterised by three progressive degrees, namely, memory is trained, judgement is formed and higher order critical skills of review, analysis and synthesis are taught. The great Ursulines, Marie De Saint Jean Martin proposes, taught their pupils “to dare to face contradictions in order the increase their certitude.” Criticism is not negative if taught well but fosters “a power of intellectual sympathy, which gives discernment and reveals the smallest truths, hidden beauties, and secret harmonies, giving value to these treasures and setting them off beautifully and conspicuously.” This education formed 'confident' Catholics who could dialogue with civic partners.

So nearly three centuries later, Mother Mary Anglea Boord was able to identify that one of the oldest problems in education is that of training of character – “and none which ha[s] given rise to deeper and more constant thought.” Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U. was correct. Mother Mary in the first part of the century identified that the major fear facing her audience was “the mass-production of character” in larger educational communities. This she believed had lead to the development of “new education” with its characteristic doctrine of self-expression of which she was suspicious. Mother Mary Anglea proposes that the method of character-training most fitting to a school is found in the petition of an

---

381 ibid, page 61.
382 ibid, page 59.
383 ibid, page 66.
384 ibid, page 68.
386 ibid, page 1.
ancient prayer: “‘intellectum illumine, affectum inflamma’ – enlighten the understanding and inflame the will.”\(^{387}\)

Mother Mary Anglea believed that the task of educators “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.”\(^{388}\)

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.\(^{389}\) The echo of Mother Mary Anglea’s attitude towards education is heard and extended in both the voices of Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin and contemporaneous civic discourse. Hinsley, in writing to the Catholic Education Council, would reflect on the importance of 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.”\(^{390}\)

Four years after Mother Mary Anglea’s talk the Education Act, 1936 raised the school leaving age, twelve years later the Education Act, 1944 would enunciate “the duty of the local education authority…to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental and physical development…”\(^{391}\) and over fifty years later the Education Reform Act 1988 outlined that the curriculum in a maintained school should be “balanced and broad”\(^{392}\) promoting the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society and preparing children and young people for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life.\(^{393}\)

---

\(^{387}\) ibid, page 9.
\(^{388}\) ibid, pages 3-4.
\(^{389}\) ibid page 9.
\(^{390}\) AAW Hi 3 (Bo1/185) Education CEC 1935-37 found in Box Hi 2/191-196, page 5.
\(^{391}\) Education Act, 1944 Part II, 7.
\(^{392}\) Education Reform Act 1988, Part I – Schools – Chapter I, 1.
\(^{393}\) ibid, Chapter I, 2a.
Mother Mary Anglea’s treatise is a remarkable example of interpretative theology in the public space. It gives a fascinating insight into the mind of a Catholic educator in the 1930s, but what is equally remarkable is her capacity to translate this voice into operant action after the passing of the Education Act, 1944. A memoir in her Order’s own Archive at Brentwood marks how Mother Mary Anglea worked collaboratively with the neighbouring Catholic boys school\(^{394}\) to make sure “that by September 1\(^{st}\), 1945, St Angela’s [Girl’s School] would be able to provide education of the three types laid down in the education act (sic); grammar, modern and technical. Without knowing it, she was pioneering comprehensive education, blazing a trail which other catholic (sic) schools throughout the country were able to follow in the years that lay ahead.\(^{395}\)

This ‘formal’ voice continues to inform Church teaching and modern expressions thereof. Pope Benedict XVI, when addressing Educators and Religious at Saint Mary’s University on his recent State Visit to the United Kingdom articulated it thus:

> …the task of a teacher is not simply to impart information or to provide training in skills intended to deliver some economic benefit to society; education is not and must never be considered as purely utilitarian. It is about forming the human person, equipping him or her to live life to the full – in short it is about imparting wisdom. And true wisdom is inseparable from knowledge of the Creator, for “both we and our words are in his hand, as are all understanding and skill in crafts” (Wis 7:16).\(^{396}\)

### 4.2.2 Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul

This wisdom would sometimes be imparted in unconventional ways. So it would be that, what is now known as ‘Further Education’ originated in the work of Mother Geneviève Dupuis\(^{397}\) and the trade unions. Geneviève Dupuis understood intuitively, like the Ursulines, that she must go out to Catholic children and young people where they were.

The Congregation, founded by Geneviève Dupuis, was committed to increasing access to Catholic education for girls and women. In Banbury, were Mother Geneviève established the Order’s first house in England and Wales, she held night classes. After a day’s work,

---

394 Saint Bonaventure’s, Forest Gate.
396 Pope Benedict XVI, Address to Teachers and Religious, Chapel of Saint Mary’s University College, Twickenham, 17\(^{th}\) September 2010.
397 Foundress of the English Congregation of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul, the Apostle.
the children and young people of Banbury were too hungry to learn, so Mother Geneviève made toast and tea, then invited them back into the classroom to engage in further education. Having been fed they learnt basic skills in literacy and numeracy.

Even in the severest weather [Mother Geneviève Dupuis] 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 day-time. 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…

Dupuis impressed upon the Sisters “the spiritual dignity of the child, and a genuine love for the children. “Love,” she said, “is the first principle of success”398 and at the heart of Chesterton’s truth-telling thing. The ‘normative’ and ‘formal’ voices of education would unite in practice to endorse an ‘operant’ ecclesial voice. For English and Welsh Catholics, commitment to denominational schools gave them, an identity during and after both World Wars. Catholic engagement in the public space was no longer dependent on the Papal States but expressed through their lives. Through working with the Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul at Coleshill, Griffin before he came to Westminster learnt the tenets of principled pragmatism. Engaging with civic authorities while not colonising the State’s narrative of individualised rights and thus smothering unthinkingly the rights of the family in education, care and housing. The Church helped set the agenda of post-War reconstruction as well as being an auxiliary partner, not stakeholder, in these negotiations.

4.3 The Laity

Lay people also contributed to this expression and the Church’s espoused voice. In the face of an increasing bureaucracy, the Church drew on the technical expertise of other members of the Body of Christ. Perhaps this is seen no more clearly than in the ‘quiet’ contribution of Major Morton. Morton’s involvement, even to the present day, is shrouded in mystery.

399 Ibid.
4.3.1 Major Morton

Churchill and Morton first met each other during the First World War and their paths crossed again in 1922, both became residents in the village of Chartwell.\(^400\) Often Morton’s contribution to wartime government and beyond goes unnoticed by, historians and commentators, as characterised by the title of Gill Bennett’s recent biography of him, Churchill’s Man of Mystery Desmond Morton and the World of Intelligence. Like others of his generation Morton embraced, and converted to, Catholicism on the battlefields of the Somme. Upon his return after the First World War, Morton worked in the shadowy world between officialdom and espionage. With the permission of Ramsay MacDonald and subsequent prime ministers, from 1932, Morton shared with Churchill informally certain reports compiled for the Committee of Imperial Defence. On Churchill’s arrival in Downing Street in April 1940, Morton was transferred from the Ministry of Economic Warfare, where he served as Principal Assistant Secretary, to the 10 Downing Street staff acting as “personal liaison between Churchill and the SIS”\(^401\) becoming Churchill’s Personal Assistant.\(^402\)

Churchill in the early months of his premiership relied heavily on the friends and the advisers he brought with him to No. 10 Downing Street. Morton was part of a trio (accompanied by Bracken\(^403\) and Lindemann) “described by Hugh Dalton, the new Minister for Economic Warfare, as the Brains Trust; while Colville, who had been working in Chamberlain’s Private Office since October 1939, compared their arrival in Downing Street with that of the Horsemen of the Apocalypse.\(^404\)” Bracken\(^405\) functioned as an informal

\(^{402}\) PREM 7 Prime Minister’s Office: Sir Desmond Morton, Personal Assistant to Prime Minister: Correspondence and Minutes, National Archives, Kew.
\(^{403}\) One of Churchill’s constant supporters in the House of Commons was Brendan Bracken. According rather fancifully to the actress Maxine Elliot, Bracken was Churchill’s illegitimate son. In fact he was introduced to Churchill by Oliver Locker-Lampson in 1923. By then Bracken was twenty-two years old. He hailed from County Tipperary and was educated by the Christian Brothers, and briefly, by the Jesuits. Before entering Parliament he spent time in the worlds of journalism and banking impressing the right people. Bracken won North Paddington in the 1929 election for the Conservatives and spent much of the 1930s content to be with Churchill during his wilderness years. Like Morton, he moulded contacts by his own accord and through association with Churchill. He died of cancer in 1958 a bachelor and also like Morton left explicit instructions in his will that his papers were to be destroyed. Both Bracken and Morton were Catholics and men of mystery. Their allegiance to Churchill lasted beyond the grave.
\(^{405}\) Of whom, there is an interesting aside in Anthony Howard’s biography of Richard Austen Butler, published in 1987, where Howard comments: “There is, in fact, good reason to believe that [Bracken] was responsible for Rab’s own appointment: certainly, he had been busy
Parliamentary Private Secretary and was appointed to the Privy Council while “Major Morton and Professor Lindemann were both formally appointed as personal assistants to the Prime Minister. Morton acted as a foil with soon-to-be comrades to drive forward progress before the establishment of more formalised mechanisms at the beginning of Churchill’s Government.

Morton had a reputation for being gracious but intractable, opening doors and making things happen. His absence from much of the educational literature associated with the passage of the Education Bill, 1944 is to type; he was after all inscrutable. In the Diocesan Archive and in newspapers, at significant moments, he appears as a gatekeeper, counsellor and ‘Catholic’ advocate in both Church circles and civic circles. The aforementioned hand-written note from Lord Rankeillour to Cardinal Hinsley dated 28th November 1942 helped rebuild trust between Hinsley and Butler in 1942 and begins:

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...

and through a letter published on 26th February 1999, in The Catholic Herald, we have confirmed Morton’s influence on Churchill:

Sir,

During World War II it was Sir Desmond Morton who reassured Churchill of the loyalty of The Catholic Herald and its editor, Count Michael de la Bedoyere, who had written an editorial containing reservations about the Anglo-Soviet Pact. Had he not done so, [The] Herald might have been closed and Michael the second of your predecessors to be imprisoned – the other being the first Editor, Charles Diamond, who got 2 months in 1920 for an editorial aimed against the Viceroy of Ireland, Lord French, called “Killing no Murder”!

Yours faithfully,

Stephen De La Bedoyere, London SW17.

promoting it throughout the previous six months and was probably the source of the original newspaper predictions that had surfaced in January [1941] (Anthony Howard, RAB The Life of R.A. Butler, Jonathan Cape, London, 1987, page 106).”

This is particularly noteworthy since Howard’s biography is the first written with access to Butler’s personal and political papers.


Hand-written note from Lord Rankeillour to Cardinal Hinsley, 28th November 1942, AAW Hi 2/112 a Education 1942-43.
In the words of Ernest Cuneo, a US lawyer advising Joseph Kennedy\footnote{US ambassador to the Court of Saint James, 1938-late1940.}, Morton had a ‘through wire’ to Churchill.\footnote{Gill Bennett, \textit{Churchill’s Man of Mystery Desmond Morton and the World of Intelligence}, Routledge Taylor & Francis, London, 2009, page 253.} Morton became Churchill’s eyes and ears in those quarters he did not have time to inspect personally entering into those policy areas where either Churchill was a novice or as yet undecided. Morton was also fluent in French, so could engage directly with the Free-French in London after the fall of France.

Morton’s contribution to the war-effort and his role in the development of Government policy is at times unclear. As Gill Bennett in her biography of Morton notes, he remained a ‘man of mystery’.\footnote{Gill Bennett, \textit{Churchill’s Man of Mystery Desmond Morton and the World of Intelligence}, Routledge Taylor & Francis, London, 2009, page 321.} Churchill knew well of Morton’s personal limitations, yet he trusted Morton’s judgement in negotiating and acting as a mediator between disassociations. Morton was loyal to Churchill and to God, he understood the Free-French and Catholics, and accompanied Churchill to Casablanca. During their trips together such as the one to Casablanca in January 1943, it is likely that Churchill and Morton discussed Butler’s education project.\footnote{The White Paper titled \textit{Educational Reconstruction} was published in July 1943; the Bill received its formal first reading in December 1943 and the second reading, where it would be debated for the first time in the House of Commons was set for 19 January 1944. Morton would have been aware of the need for an appointment to Westminster by then and Churchill would not want go forward until after then.} Morton would alert Churchill to consequences of his actions in this field and how they may be interpreted within the Catholic community. This would have been purely ‘political’; allowing Churchill to appreciate the espoused ‘memory’ of the Catholic community. Morton fulfils his dual role as unofficial guide to areas unknown and as official representative of Churchill at Hinsley’s funeral.\footnote{The Tablet, 27\textsuperscript{th} March 1943, page 8.}

Morton was skilled at fusing the ‘normative’, ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ voices of both sides during negotiations. However, at the end of the Second World War, Morton realised that without Churchill his influence would wane. As Enoch Powell wrote in his 1977 biography of Joseph Chamberlain “all political lives, unless they are cut off in midstream at a happy juncture, end in failure, because that is the nature of politics and of human affairs.”\footnote{Enoch Powell, \textit{Joseph Chamberlain}, Thames and Hudson, London,1977, p. 151.} What is true of politicians is equally true of their personal advisers; something Morton knew intuitively in 1945 with Churchill’s defeat at the polls.
After the War, Morton remained a quietly spoken éminence grise in Catholic circles and fittingly Cardinal Heenan celebrated Morton’s Funeral Mass at Westminster Cathedral on 15th September 1971. The Catholic Herald marked Morton’s death with a comment piece on 6th August 1971 that captures well this man of discretion:

As Personal Assistant to Sir Winston Churchill, he was in a position to write personally on a number of post-war biographies, and he could have contradicted statements in these books, because he himself had been present on the occasions in question, but he refused to do so. He also refused, despite many attempts by different publishers, to be persuaded to “Write his Story.”

May he rest in peace.\(^{415}\)

Just as the religious sisters added an interpretative Christian anthropology and renewed pedagogy to the Church’s ‘operant’ missiology, so Morton added political astuteness, operant eschatology, conciliation and conjunction. The project of educational reconstruction in England and Wales after the War would involve HMG and the Church in a meaningful and achievable way.

### 4.3.2 Catholic Officials

Morton was not alone. Officials within other Departments of HMG understood how elemental the right to Catholic education was to the Church’s mission. There is a suite of papers in the Archive concerning where Catholic boys and girls should go if ‘approved’ education was deemed necessary by the courts. Before 1944, the Home Office along with “the War Office and Colonial Office”\(^ {416}\) concede the right and jurisdiction of the Church to educate denominationally. The discussion was not one of ‘if’ but ‘how’. During the preliminary negotiations around the **Elementary Education Act, 1870**, Cardinal Manning wondered in correspondence with the Catholic, Lord de Grey, whether the **Reformatory Schools Act, 1866** might provide a satisfactory model to meet the political imperative of universal education for all children. Such a model would respect extant arrangements for rate aid and respect Catholic governance thereof. As Selby rehearses, the **Reformatory Schools Act, 1866** “obliged a magistrate to send a child to a school conducted in accordance with the religious persuasion of the parents or guardians if they so demanded,


and required that the child’s school expenses should be paid by the local authority. The Archbishop saw the Act (and similarly the Industrial Schools Act of the same year) as establishing the principle of rate-aid to denominational schools on the basis of their secular efficiency.\footnote{D.E. Selby, Henry Edward Manning And The Education Bill of 1870, British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol 18. No 2 (Jun 1970), University of Birmingham, page 200.}

In a letter from Mr Henderson at the Home Office to Cardinal Hinsley, dated 15\textsuperscript{th} November 1935, the number, capacity and sustainability of Catholic Approved Schools is raised. What is apparent, in this correspondence, is the State’s acceptance that Catholic boys and girls, sentenced by a Juvenile Court to time in an Approved School, should attend a Catholic Approved School. During this time the average period of detention was two-and-a-half years. The Home Office was aware of the incumbent cost for the Church.

In a briefing letter from the Rt Hon Sir Thomas Moloney, former Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, to Cardinal Hinsley dated 19\textsuperscript{th} October 1938 Moloney describes existent provision and policy 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 involving boys, may come in waves difficult to [approximate], while in recent years the accommodation available for girls has either exceeded the demand or has been readily procurable when required.\footnote{Letter from Sir Thomas Moloney to Cardinal Hinsley, 19th October 1938, AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40, page 2.}

Later in the letter there is an exclamation mark in the margin next to 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, \textit{if and when the need arises} (sic).\footnote{Ibid, page 5.}

Officials at the Home Office were aware of the fiscal and personnel challenges confronting the Church. Paradoxically, HMG for the first time, through this Department, acknowledged the right of Catholic parents to educate their ‘wayward’ children denominationally. This
precedent is noteworthy, not lost on Hinsley and fashioned what would follow. Either knowingly or unknowingly, the State tested the ‘espoused’ response of the Church and came to appreciate the ‘universal’ hopes enshrined in the First Synodal Letter of Westminster, 1852. 420

Although papers from Sir Thomas Moloney were received too late to be placed on the agenda of the meeting of the Hierarchy on 25th October 1938, Hinsley consulted with some fellow bishops who agreed that

the question of approved schools for R.C. boys should be entrusted to a small Committee with [Sir Thomas] 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?421

This is a material example of what would come to be known, at the Second Vatican Council, as subsidiarity and collegiality in practice within the Hierarchy, or then Conference of Bishops. The bishops in 1938 recognised Sir Thomas Moloney’s competence in such matters and nominated him to become chairman of one of their own working committees. This was a new ecclesial method for the Church that would be mirrored in the Second Vatican Council some twenty years later, with bishops drawing on ‘specialists’ or ‘periti’ from outside the Curia because of their competence in such matters. This model led to reform. The English and Welsh bishops were able to do this because they had done so before relying on aforementioned ‘formal’ voices and Catholic officials and politicians during the negotiations surrounding the Education Act, 1944 and the establishment of the ‘National Health Service’.

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 how:

…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

420 The Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales was reconstituted in 1850 and this document emerged from its first synod. It sets forth the pastoral priorities of the Catholic Church in England and Wales.
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...\textsuperscript{422}

Within the same portfolio, there is also a letter dated 2\textsuperscript{nd} April 1942 from S.W. Harris to the aforementioned Sir Thomas Moloney on the issue of Catholic Approved Schools:

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.\textsuperscript{423}

In other parts of the Archive, Hinsley’s concern for another marginalised group, those of migrant children, is equally apparent. In Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62, similarly Griffin indicates that he is “naturally anxious to consult both our own Hierarchy and that of Australia\textsuperscript{424} about\textsuperscript{425} the mass movement of Catholic children through planned migration schemes. The tension between delegation of responsibility and abdication of responsibility becomes increasingly apparent in the building of consensus across the Hierarchy, securing an 'espoused' model of subsidiarity and developing ‘operant’ collaboration with civic authorities across national boundaries. There is evidence in the correspondence that both Hinsley and Griffin were conscious of “the inalienable right[.] as well as the indispensable duty of the Church, to watch over the entire education of her children.”\textsuperscript{426}

\textsuperscript{422} Approved School Accommodation Needed for Roman Catholic Boys, March 1942, page 1, AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40.

\textsuperscript{423} AAW Hi 2/198 1938-40.

\textsuperscript{424} In a circular letter from Brother Conlon to ‘Diocesan Secretaries and Homes' in the United Kingdom, dated 10\textsuperscript{th} July 1947 and forwarded to Cardinal Griffin with a covering note on 12\textsuperscript{th} July 1947 he writes: “the first batch of about 150 migrant children will sail for Western Australia, 21\textsuperscript{st} 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, 7\textsuperscript{th} November 1946, page 3, of Bishop Craven wanting reassurance asking for “first hand information of the conditions in Australia” and a belief that those 16+ should “be considered under the Adult Scheme (AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62).” An extraordinary meeting was held by The Catholic Child Welfare Council, Thursday 13\textsuperscript{th} June 1946. The minutes are marked ‘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 (found in AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62).”

\textsuperscript{425} AAW Gr 2/82 Catholic Child Welfare Council 1944-62.

\textsuperscript{426} Pope Pius XI, \textit{Divini Illius Magistri}, Vatican, 31\textsuperscript{st} December 1929, §23.
children involved, no matter how persuasive the Christian Brothers, other religious orders and civic authorities, were in their representations to individual members of the English and Welsh Hierarchy. It is interesting to read how in this period of social and cultural change a local Church sought to respond to a new pastoral situation. This is not a revisionist interpretation of the Archive but an acknowledgement of the resonance of a common ‘normative’ voice through the noise of war and peace.

Increased political astuteness by Morton and other members of the Catholic community was underpinned by an ecclesial narrative of proto-subsidiarity and solidarity seen in recusant times and restored in wartime.

4.3.3 Catholic Victoria Cross Holders
Through their experience of living out the Catholic faith, lay men and women proclaimed their faith to the next generation yet remained loyal to the State. Many died the King’s faithful servants, but God’s first and their example was persuasive to Churchill. The Archive contains the working files of the respective Cardinals, with information to assist them in negotiations before and after the passing of the Act. Under Hinsley’s direction the narrative concerning the Catholic community changed. The ‘political’ Establishment came to recognise that the Catholic community incorporated loyal and brave servicemen prepared to die for their country. In a single-page letter written to Archbishop Griffin’s private secretary by Maurice Quinlan, of The Universe he lists the names of the twelve Catholic men who were awarded the Victoria Cross and the reason for its validation. Given its order in the Archive and its placement in a separate portfolio, this list of men was clearly to hand in the negotiations of the regulations following the enactment of the Education Act, 1944.  

427 AAW Gr 1/27c Twelve Catholics who won the Victoria Cross 1944.
428 Namely,

- 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.
- Capt. Fogarty Fegen: “Never was the Victoria Cross more deservedly bestowed than upon Capt. Fogarty Fegen”, said the Daily Telegraph in a
Members of the Catholic community had fought with valour in the War. The rights of Catholic parents, and the rights of all who had sacrificed so much since the beginning of the century, resonated with Churchill. Churchill did not want to upset the Catholic community and undermine the war-effort as the complexity of drafting regulatory instruments to implement the newly passed Education Act began. The Catholic community was becoming increasingly aware of its political power and transposed latent feelings of unfairness concerning the regulations which followed the enactment of the Elementary Education Act, 1870 into a Catholic allegory of equality and justice:

Your Grace,

...Democracy pronounces itself the Champion of Minorities, but what travesty of the Truth this trumpeting is...  

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 [defeated] the Graf Spee in South American waters (AAW Gr 1/27c Twelve Catholics who won the Victoria Cross 1944).  

Letter from Commander George Atwood (The Royal Navy Base, Holyhead) to Archbishop Griffin, 15th January 1944, AAW Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C: Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944.
This collective memory drew together people from all parts of the Catholic community and provided common cause from the Catholic community as recusancy gave way to civic engagement, history to the possibility of a Conciliar Council. Hinsley’s espoused voice and Griffin’s operant voice became the voice of the Mystical Body.

Chapter Five Changing Identities

5.1 Introduction

At the beginning of the thesis, I begged the reader’s forbearance for the multiple genres used within it and the need to look simultaneously at the material through theological, historical and political lenses. I also highlighted the use of voices to organise the Archive and the role of denominational education in the general shift between Vatican I and Vatican II thinking. The four voices - ‘normative’, ‘formal’, ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ - taken from Theological Action Research, provide a method to interpret the three genres present in the Archive at their various stages of articulation. I have used the four voices to organise the data found in the Archive and marshal a narrative that respects the provenance of the theo-political themes found therein. In the Archive it is apparent that these voices are not always discrete; and actors and participants do not move through them sequentially. Guardians of the ‘normative’ voice, speak in ‘espoused’ and ‘epideictic’ ways, drawing on Tradition, to attend to the world they lived in desiring to make all things new (Rev 21:5).

In the 1940s we observe emerging ecclesial experiences charting how the Church locally engaged with the democratically elected nation-state. Through the negotiations surrounding the Education Act, 1944, the Church and the State learnt something about what religious freedom meant for both entities respectively. Within public discourse the State acknowledged the right of parents to oversee the education of their children and Christian anthropology was applied to the development of the post-War curriculum. Paradoxically, at this time, like the time of the early Church, the Church in England and Wales was less preoccupied with distinctions within (sic) the community than between the Christian community as a whole and the world in which Christians lived. Accordingly, differences between lay and cleric were eclipsed by a concern for the common demands of discipleship and the reconstruction of peace.431

430 Namely, historical, theological and political.
The negotiations surrounding the *Education Act, 1944* and the Second Vatican Council critiqued Modernity's secular soteriology. This was neither sequential nor achieved by abandoning the language of natural law but by opening up "a new site of public discourse in terms of [the] nature, meaning and purpose of the human person and human life." 'Formal' reflection and 'espoused' articulation by Hinsley, Griffin and others from across the Church at the beginning of the twentieth century shaped 'operant' voices that would lead in time to a generative theology of kenosis. This theological expression was founded on a secure 'Catholic' spirituality. It reformed the Church *ad intra* while allowing for radical openness *ad extra*. Kenosis in the 1940s and in the 1960s, as the second decade of the twenty-first century, often acts in ways unbeknownst to the participants. It opens up the possibility that a further shore is reachable from here. Such a response is always open and not closed making a successful shift from 'espoused' to 'operant' possible.

Denominational schools were critical to this project since the children who attended them were not taught a closed ideology but the principles of a systematic, soteriological reading of the world. Learning that was more than incarnational in nature but eschatological. "The [C]hurch whole and entire lives in history but looks to the eschaton and the consummation of history." Education was thus freed from the tyranny of self-revelatory epistemologies and the denominational school, at the service of the family, became a sacramental, visible 'society' within the civic domain. A place where children learn[ed] to live in a community and God was regarded.

In this closing chapter of Volume I of this thesis, I hope to identify what has been thus glimpsed, namely, the impact of the 1944 negotiations on the Second Vatican Council and on the current ecclesiology and missiology of the Church in these lands. By its very nature this chapter will indicate avenues of, and for, further study.

---

433 ibid, pages 65-67.
5.2 Theological Interpretations and Implications for the Present & Future

In *Lumen Gentium* the Church answers “the basic question with regard to its own existence: “Quid dicis de teipso? – What do you say of yourself?” The Church was asked to [re-]present itself by speaking of its innermost being, first to Catholics, and then to the wider world. Twenty years prior, as the horrors of the Holocaust were revealed to ‘Allied’ soldiers opening the gates of German concentration camps and soldiers began their journey home, the Catholic Church both in Germany and in England and Wales asked of itself the same question. What peace would the Catholic community help build? Just as the constitutions of the Second Vatican Council record the Church’s response to this question in the 1960s, so the loosely catalogued papers of the Archive of the Archbishop of Westminster around the Education Act, express the ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ response to this question in 1944. Philosophical thinking at the beginning of the twentieth century was conflicted; confidence in post-Enlightenment thinking was diminished by the consequences of ‘total’ war.

Individual believers in their diverse fields of influence were nudging the Church to retrieve a sense of ‘mysterium and communion’. With the benefit of hindsight these trends are also evident in the Conciliar constitutions. Between the 1940s and 1960s there was a desire for new civic and ecclesial interpenetrative grammars that would not lead inextricably to the death of another generation but would lead humanity to a sense of what it meant, in a post-Enlightenment world, to be truly human. Such a metanoia took the form of social reform in the civic realm and a growing experience of aggiornamento in the ecclesial realm, contributing to the shift between the First Vatican Council and the Second Vatican Council.

Before the Second Vatican Council the hierarchical understanding of the Church as a ‘perfecta societas’ was drawn from Bellarmine’s writing. Cardinal Bellarmine (1542-1621) developed this in response to the struggle against absolutist Gallicanism. The concept of the Church as a “perfect society” was retrieved in the 1850s and 1860s after a long period of obscurity in response to the growing divide between Church and State. The phrase “perfect society” – a technical term meaning that a society is self-sufficient in terms

---


438 Robert Bellarmine, *De Defin Ecc. Bk 3 ch 2*. 
of the ends it pursues, not that it is without sin or blemish – neatly sums up the Church’s self-image in the nineteenth century. The Church is animated by the interior gifts of the Holy Spirit - ‘faith’, ‘hope’, and ‘love’, yet this was insufficient to counter Hitler’s colonisation and corruption of these virtues in Mein Kampf after the First World War. Totalitarian anthropologies, at the beginning of the twentieth century, became unknowingly attractive to different constituencies within the Church, hence the perceived importance of denominational education at the end of the Second World War to help build a lasting peace. Through their experience of the Second World War, the Catholic community realised that “humanity can neither understand itself nor have any hope of realising its potential if it reads itself independently from God” or His intra-relations. Such a ‘dynamic, open ontology’ is relational. This relationality is a reflection of the imago dei. This was experienced and known intuitively at the end of Second World War and was understood theologically at the Second Vatican Council. This theological ‘sensum’ of the laity along with the Church’s magisterial teaching were seen and understood as constitutive parts of the same teaching Church. This teaching carries the memory and the truth of what it means to be human and also the echo of the voice of those who died in previous generations.

The English and Welsh Hierarchy ‘espoused’ its right to establish more denominational schools where Catholic children could learn about their faith and where morality was not reduced to vague sentimentalism. This complemented the civic desire to expand the maintained system. ‘Formal’ Catholic voices in the 1940s influenced the development of a renewed Christian anthropology and thus pedagogy. This shaped practice across the system. Hinsley provided a holistic Christian, personalised vision of education contrary to what he read in reports from Germany. He was less interested in protecting individual institutions than bringing about systemic reform. Hinsley rejected, at every stage, a settlement whereby an increase in subsidy by HMG was aligned to a loss of control for the Church on the content of Catholic religious instruction and scope of a Catholic curriculum. The right of conscience applied to both assets and to any creeping ‘Cowper-Templarism’.

441 ibid, pages 58-59.
442 ibid, page 63.
Across the continent of Europe, alternate generations had been slain since the Franco-
Prussian War – to what end? Personal trauma had turned from Enlightenment hope to
inanition. In ‘The Third Reich’, education gave way to training in an autogenic outlook
necessary to sustain the nation state. This inanition was not confined to Germany. In
1940s England and Wales, the Catholic bishops reflected generally on the place of
Christian anthropology within the post-War education system, then on the contribution of
denominational ‘education’ in a time of reconstruction to that system, and then on
protecting individual ‘schools’. The Hierarchy recognised that others in the community,
such as parents and parish priests, would speak for their own schools. Such subsidiarity
allowed for ecclesial reformation before the enunciation of a renewed ecclesiology at the
Second Vatican Council twenty years later. It also led to adaptive social change in England
and Wales. At kairos moments of adaptive change within the history of the Church, this
has always been so. Whether it is the conversion and healing of Saint Paul, the baptism of
the gentiles or the Council of Jerusalem, believers and apostles first experience then
reflect theologically on that experience together. Only later do they write. Bourne, Hinsley
and Griffin did not become sidelined by bureaucratic detail, nor were they overwhelmed by
it. In the concluding stages of the Second World War ecclesial and civic reconstruction
was founded on the elemental communio of the family.

At the end of the Second World War, education was seen as an important catalyst by both
the State and the Church to bring about such reconstruction: to eradicate illiteracy and to
foster moral literacy. As in other conflicts, before and after, parents and children resumed
civilian/post-war life at the end of the Second World War seeking to contend with their own
darkness both personally and collectively. They were forced to question their own
complicity in violence assessing how their passion and action “might look in the light of
eternity.” Educational reform would in part assuage this sense of ambiguity and guilt,
offering their children a renewed epistemology for such a journey.

Mindful of the threat to Christian cultural values across Europe and North America from
liberalism and Modernism, the Popes of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries

444 This is similar to the attitude of ‘σκληοκαρδία’ (sclerocardia) found in Deut 10:16; Jer 4:4
Sirach 16:10 and Matt 19:8; Mark 10:5, 16:14.
445 Malcolm Guite, Faith, Hope and Poetry: Theology and the Poetic Imagination, (part of
446 Ibid, page 212.
447 Ibid.
raised the demand for ‘material’ Catholicity in civic educational provision. In a plural society the Church sought the protection of the State to educate, encouraging Catholic parents to work for the establishment of more denominational schools. The establishment of the ‘dual system’ recognised that education, across the estate, needed to attend to children’s spiritual and moral development. Hinsley would find in Churchill a ‘closet’ deistic collaborator who wished to establish schools where children would learn the difference between right and wrong. Although this curricular principle was agreed across the dual system in 1944, a national curriculum would not be written until the Education Reform Act, 1988.

During the part and complete German occupation of France between 1940 and 1945, de Lubac (1896-1991), Fessard (1897-1978), and Maritain (1882-1973), emphasised the importance of “spiritual resistance” to Nazism, something Hinsley recognised in his radio talks and through seeking to establish more denominational schools. Christian learning was not individualised, self-referential nor consequential. Catholic theologians and bishops repudiated the Pétainist political theology that sought to justify the loss of political independence, the German occupation, and the politics of collaboration in essentially theological terms. Even within Germany, the Catholic Hierarchy and tertiary academic life did not succumb totally to ‘The Third Reich’.

---


450 Historians, such as Maurice Cowling, believe that Churchill was attracted to Gibbonian deism as an early adult, which as Churchill himself acknowledged, “would have been troublesome politically if he had insisted on it in the Conservative party later on (Maurice Cowling, Religion And Public Doctrine In Modern England, Volume I, Cambridge University Press (paperback), Cambridge, 2003, page 285).”

451 Sixteen faculties of Catholic theology were still functioning in ‘The Third Reich’ in 1945 (Robert A. Krieg, Catholic Theologians in Nazi Germany, Continuum, New York, 2004, page 29). On 18th February 1946, along with Bernard Griffin, Pius XII named to the College of Cardinals three German bishops who had publically opposed ‘The Third Reich’: Galen, Preysing and Frings. “In singling out these three leaders, the pontiff implicitly affirmed that the Church’s mission included pursuit of social justice (ibid, page 162).” In effect, Pius XII acknowledged, Krieg believes, “that the Church is not only a societas perfecta (sic); it is also a moral advocate, a servant of justice and truth for all people (ibid).” Church leaders in West Germany from the 1950s helped through their social engagement to convey an acceptance of secular ‘democratic’, as opposed to totalitarian, government (ibid, page 164).

Krieg outlines three competing models of ecclesiology operating within the German and Universal Church prior to, during and immediately after the Second World War. These were a societas-perfecta model of ecclesiology, a moral-advocate model of ecclesiology and a Body of Christ model of ecclesiology. Whether the word ‘model’ is too strong is beyond this thesis, yet the ‘formal’ voice as described by Cameron et al is helpful here. The ‘formal’ theological voice operative within Catholic circles in Germany (and across Europe) led to different conclusions during the War. For some, like Karl Eschweiler, Joseph Lortz, and Karl Adam, the ecclesiology of the mystical body appears to have offered the possibility of, or justification of,
the Church’s accommodation with ‘The Third Reich’. As Alois Baumgartner pointed out the organic idea of community centring itself on the mystery of the Body of Christ offered finally a theological justification for the ideas of race, ethnicity, and nation that came with National Socialism and its seizure of power (cf. Alois Baumgartner, Sehnsucht nach Gemeinschaft, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 1977). But for others, like Romano Guardini and Engelbert Krebs, the same theology highlighted the contradictions between Catholicism and National Socialism. For Guardini “the people [Volk] is a human society which maintains an unbroken continuity with the roots of nature and life, and obeys intrinsic laws. [Not delimited to the Third Reich]. The people contains...the whole of mankind, in all its variety of ages, sexes, temperament, mental and physical condition; to which we must add the sum total of his work and spheres of production as determined by class and vocation (Romano Guardini, The Church And The Catholic, And The Spirit Of The Liturgy, trans. Ada Lane, Sheed & Ward, New York, 1935, 23, 19).” This appreciation for the solidarity of all women and men in Christ equipped Guardini to maintain critical distance from talk of an ethnic-racial people; he dedicated himself to the strengthening of European culture (Robert A. Krieg, Catholic Theologians in Nazi Germany, Continuum, New York, 2004, page 167). The Church brings to every culture and nation the God-given supernatural essence “that exists beyond ethnicity and race, beyond culture and beyond time (page 168).”

Recognising this necessary stand of ‘universalism’, Pius XII in his encyclical Mystici Corporis Christi, 29th June 1943, guards against the misappropriation of the doctrine of the mystical body of Christ by secular and political agendas of the time. Pius XII, drawing on his experience of being nuncio to Germany at the time Pius XI wrote Mit Brennender Sorge, emphasised again in Mystici Corporis Christi the transcendent nature of the Church, and its mission to all humanity. Thereby Pius XII corrected the tendency to place a ‘formal’ ecclesiology at the service of nationalist politics. Pius XII stressed the Church’s universality, its union with all people regardless of ethnicity and race, and stressed “that the body-of-Christ-ecclesiology should recognise the [C]hurch’s institutional, [universal] hierarchical and juridical” (Robert A. Krieg, Catholic Theologians in Nazi Germany, Continuum, New York, 2004, page 169) character. Bellarmini’s meta-model of the Church as a perfect society could not be reduced to a nation (in this case The Third Reich). There is no such equivalence between the Church and the self-referent nation state. This doctrine would be further articulated, twenty years later, in the constitutions of the Second Vatican Council.

The aforementioned intuitive ecclesiological reduction of Eschweiler, Lortz and Adam meant that certain members of the German Hierarchy, in good conscience, did not look beyond institutional self-protection during much of ‘The Third Reich’. Paradoxically, these voices were founded on glimpses of the Church’s ‘normative’ voice. The ‘formal’ voices of these German theologians and some Catholic German politicians influenced the ‘espoused’ voices of some German bishops. However, these ‘national’ Church voices remained unmediated by the Universal Church. The equivalent dynamic between ‘normative’, ‘formal’, ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voices led to different conclusions between the Hierarchies of Germany and of England and Wales.

Krieg goes on to identify individual cases which he believes show that the reason for the German Church’s inadequate response to ‘The Third Reich’ was because that for ‘a century, the papacy and episcopacy had stifled scholars’ intellectual freedom, thereby preventing them from critically reflecting on the character of modernity and on the Church’s nature and mission in the contemporary world (ibid, page 171).” While there are elements of truth in this thesis, it borders on theological-historicism through ignoring the role of the rise of German nationalism following the unification of Germany in 1870, the spread of the industrial revolution, increasing universal emancipation and growing universal education at this time. Rahner’s reflection on the Church’s response to ‘The Third Reich’ is perhaps more tentative and authentic: he rehearses how the self-preservation of the Catholic community became the over-riding concern of the majority of the German Hierarchy and that the Church became too protectionist and “should have done more to protect also the skins of other people, of non-Christians, than we in fact did (cf. Karl Rahner, Karl Rahner, Bilder eines Lebens, Herder, Freiburg, 1985, page 37).” Understanding this one omission became the avid concern a generation of German Catholic theologians and German prelates after the War.
Denominational education would strengthen the boundaries between the spiritual and political spheres, and stem secular colonisation and totalitarian dilution as took place in Christian Europe. The ‘spiritual’ for the Church could not be individualised nor the denominational part of education split from post-war educational renewal. The shift between the First and Second Vatican Councils is most apparent in the way that the ecclesial order is no longer seen as a rival to the civic order.\textsuperscript{452}

The Church’s mission in education was material and persuasive. It sought to support the family, to inform and enlighten children’s consciences and not to overshadow them\textsuperscript{453} as happened under totalitarian régimes. As Saint Augustine wrote long before, the Church “does not hesitate to obey the laws of the earthly city by which are administered those things that promote the sustenance of mortal life.”\textsuperscript{454} The State should protect the right of individual conscience and not reduce the ‘person’ to the status of the ‘individual citizen’. This personalist anthropology would animate and sustain the Second Vatican Council as it strove to define the proper role and vocation of the lay person within the People of God. This missiology, founded on Augustine was intuited by Pius XII in his Christmas message for 1944, was in turn built upon by the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council:

---

Peacetime would offer sufficient space for more considered ‘Catholic’ theological reflection taking cognisance of the post-war ecumenical movement, other religions and liturgical reform. The calling of a Conciliar Council by Pope John XXIII aimed, among other things, to complete the work of the First Vatican Council and to mediate ‘formal’ national theologies that had emerged since 1870. Drawing from their experience before, during and after the War, theologians and prelates from all sides would make a significant contribution to the Second Vatican Council.\textsuperscript{452} Perreau-Saussine believes that the seminal point of the Second Vatican Council was a deliberate omission of Church-State relations. The Council Fathers “no longer saw the ecclesiastical order as a political rival to the civic order. From now on, the ecclesiastical order would back away from the political limelight except where it impacted on its mission in education and healthcare. In contradistinction, the Council emphasised the importance of lay activity in the temporal sector:

A secular quality is proper and special to laymen. It is true that those in holy orders can at times engage in secular activities, and even have a secular profession. But by reason of their particular vocation, they are chiefly and professedly ordained to the sacred ministry...But the laity by their very vocation seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God.

This is predicated on a place of formation, the Catholic school, and an understanding of the place of conscience in the life of the believer (cf. \textit{Lumen Gentium}, chapter 4 §31, in Emile Perreau-Saussine, \textit{Catholicism and Democracy: An Essay In The History Of Political Thought}, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2012, pages 117-118).\textsuperscript{ibid, page 118.}

\textsuperscript{454} Saint Augustine of Hippo, \textit{City of God}, XIX.17, Hendrickson, Massachusetts, 2009.
In the sinister light of the war that engulfs them...people are at last awakening from a protracted slumber. They are adopting a new attitude in the face of states and governments, questioning, critical, distrustful. Taught by bitter experience, they set their face against dictatorial, unaccountable, monopolies of power, and they call for a system of government that is more compatible with the dignity and liberty of citizens.455

Denominational education offered an opportunity to build social and economic capacity within the Catholic community *ad intra* and *ad extra*. Denominational schools were established and members of the Catholic Hierarchy did not encumber themselves, like their Anglican confrères, with protecting individual parochial trusts. Rather they reflected on and enunciated the Catholic Church’s mission in education456 remaining free to expand the estate of Catholic schools across phases. While the Anglican Communion focused on its extant ‘primary’-age provision, the Catholic community focused on the principle of providing denominational education for all Catholic children whatever their age and in whatever setting. The Anglicans focused on ‘schools’ and the Catholics on ‘education’. Anglican bishops focused on the ‘means’ of education: the Catholic bishops addressed the ‘ends’ of education.

Pre-echoes of ‘sustainability’ informed this ‘Catholic’ approach, resonating with later Conciliar and post-Conciliar teaching. Again it was another example of ecclesial experience informing Catholic theology. Sustainability has ecological, economic, political and cultural dimensions drawing the ‘proto-spoused’ voice and ‘operant’ praxis of Bourne, Hinsley and Griffin into dialogue with the world. Freedom to assess the Church’s contribution to reconstruction allowed for the possibility of change, Chesterton’s truth-telling thing – this dialogue of life is “the task of constructing an ecology of daily living, characterised by loving tenderly.”457 Just as justice was sought by the Catholic community, so it had to be just in its dealings with others.

This subsequent narrative of sustainability is linked with Catholic assimilation into the British middle classes after the Second World War. Neither the middle classes nor the Catholic community are static social realities. With the building of industrial conurbations and significant post-War Irish migration, these social changes "dissolved many of the

barriers to social interaction. Longitudinal data of the Catholic population in England and Wales in the twentieth century is often myopic and occasionally episodic. However, important indicators of assimilation appear in the General Household Survey, 1979 and 1980 “(drawn from a nationally representative sample of 11,000 households in Great Britain)...among the married first-generation immigrants from the Irish Republic, under half the males and two-fifths of the females married Irish-born spouses. This growing cohesion began with the mass-movement of children in the War through their evacuation to the countryside and war-time nursery provision. This first occurrence of universal ‘nursery’ education brought about adaptive, comprehensive social change. Across England and Wales many had experienced education. This ‘lived’ experience raised expectations and led to the universalising and expanding of access to education and health at the end and after the War. Hornsby-Smith’s analysis of the inter-religious and religious-state ‘sitz(e)-im-leben’ after the Second Vatican Council is now out-of-date, yet it records the demographic mechanics of ‘Irish’ Catholic integration into British society and a model of how ‘migrant’ poverty was overcome.

Perreau-Saussine rehearses the continuity between First and Second Vatican Councils. While the former Council recognised the demise of monarchical (confessional) states, the Second Vatican Council recognised increasing universal suffrage and the power of democracy and liberalism in the light of totalitarianism. Denominational education was a model drawn from the Church’s ‘normative’ teaching but fit for purpose in 1940s England and Wales which settled between monarchical and confessional liberal democracy. It respected the right and duty of Catholic parents to choose a Catholic education for their children and the responsibility of the State materially to assist them. The Council Fathers in the 1960s followed this insightful intuition by no longer hankering after a closed

---


459 For those from Northern Ireland, the proportions were about one-fifth for both sexes. However, by the second generation, only 4% of the males and 7% of the females who were married had a spouse who was born in Ireland...In sum, the assimilation of Irish Catholics is not a simple process but is mediated in particular by the patterns of social and religious endogamy and exogamy. While social mobility and assimilation are accelerated by national intermarriage, religious convergence and assimilation to the norms of English Catholicism are accelerated by religious intermarriage. Since the rates of exogamy have been increasing rapidly in the past two decades, the ease and speed of assimilation of Irish Catholics seem likely to increase (Michael P. Hornsby-Smith, Roman Catholics In England: Studies In Social Structure Since The Second World War, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987, page 120, page 123 and page 132.

460 Of left (Communism) and right (Fascism).
confessional state but by acknowledging the “the right to religious liberty” for all citizens.\textsuperscript{461} This could not take place without a ‘religiously’ educated laity.

The prospect of alternate, generational destruction led to the emergence of a proto-’epideictic’ voice. This voice comprises ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ threads that can be traced back to pastoral practice before the Second Vatican Council across nation states. The Church in her conciliar teaching moved “from content to form”\textsuperscript{462}; the Council Fathers sought “to touch hearts”\textsuperscript{463} to allow hearers to look beyond the boundaries of self-referential nationalism. This required the forgetting of past wrongs and forgiving thereof.

The shadow of brutal inhumanity experienced in the trenches, streets and concentration camps of the Second World War could not be dispelled by epistemologies of stalemate. The meta-narrative of the Council was one beyond self-preservation and was founded on generative intuition and eschatological hope. A hope, that twenty years earlier, healed the ambivalence felt by many at the end of the Second World War.

In current negotiations with HMG, the Church should draw on this experience of engaging with a liberal confessional democracy remembering the State’s desire for systemic homogeneity. While this democracy may be becoming increasingly secular, current debate over the nature of governance and management is not driven solely by secularisation but by a latent desire for systemic homogeneity. Before drawing positions, it is as well to remember the debate on such matters at the beginning of the twentieth century. The danger of professionalising governance, and conflating governance with management, was rehearsed by Carl Becker in a letter to James W. Gleed, of the Visiting Committee to the Alumni Association of the University of Kansas, dated 20th November 1916. In it Becker writes “a paid board, I say a \textit{paid (sic)} board and not a single board is a great mistake. The reason is simple. First, you cannot get the ablest men in Kansas to abandon their professions…second, those who do take the positions, giving all their time and receiving a high salary…know no other way to do it except by taking an active and responsible part in the management of the university, in directing its policy, in employing its faculty, in applying its funds.”\textsuperscript{464}


\textsuperscript{463} ibid.

Good governance is destabilised by pecuniary interest. The proposed models of governance and oversight of current individual academies, or groups of academies, across the maintained and Catholic estate will only be sustained by increasing professionalisation and bureaucracy. The conflating of governance with management through regional boards of directors, or other arrangements, interrupts the ‘charismatic’ voice of the founding diocesan trusts and militates against operant subsidiarity. In part this is because it removes the elemental, sacramental and material aspect of denominational education from the ‘core’ diocesan trust and diminishes the necessary distance from management required for episcopal oversight and good governance.

Knowingly or unknowingly, civil servants since the passing of the Education Act, 1944 have sought to achieve systemic homogeneity in the guise of localised differentiation. Such a reform is not equivalent to ad-intra ecclesial subsidiarity between the Ordinary and individual governing bodies465 but places quasi-diocesan trusts in a subordinate, unequal relationship with the State and open to inspection by the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED). Such bureaucracy is often closed, leads to micro-management, reduces flexibility and inhibits the Church’s ability to respond to demographic change and meeting the rights of all Catholic children and young people, even the poorest, to a denominational education.

Hinsley and Griffin understood this and resisted attempts by the Ministry to introduce the same funding and trust model for all communities. Put simply, without their foresight it is unlikely that the Catholic community would have had sufficient consolidated assets against which to set loans to build secondary schools. While the Church must engage in dialogue with officials and newly-elected Ministers, or changing Ministers, it would do well to remember Griffin’s measure of benefit. Through this one amendment the 1944 settlement remains generative until this time. The current diversity in practice across dioceses, concerning ‘Academies’, is not an expression of ‘radical’ subsidiarity but a reduction of principle to provision. This protectionism is delimiting the Church’s capacity to find a common espoused voice in the public space to rehearse the benefits of Christian anthropology to general and denominational education – something which has become apparent in Birmingham in these past months. As Churchill and Butler understood in 1944, understanding the desire of parents for schools with a religious character for their children is not part of the problem but part of the solution.

465 Or groups thereof.
In 1940s and 1960s the Church’s quasi-epideictic voice was heard amid competing and conflicting voices by, and in, a world searching for meaning and peace. While secularisation may not have overwhelmed different religious traditions in the Third Millennium, civic society is still wary of perceived religious ‘fundamentalism’, as evidenced by the current moral panic over the ‘Trojan’ threat to “Islamise” state education in inner-city, East Birmingham.\(^{466}\) By happenchance, this current theo-political debate takes place in the same city where military casualties are received from the theatre in Iraq and Afghanistan. Elements of the Muslim community now feel as voiceless as the Catholic community did in England and Wales in the early twentieth century. Hinsley’s epideictic voice reshaped public discourse on education in the 1940s. He spoke of unconditional justice not conditional fairness and spoke of the rights of all parents, not just Catholic parents, providing a material conduit to adaptive civic change.

Intuitively, seventy years later, Pope Francis draws on the same sources as Hinsley believing:

> that openness to the transcendent can bring about a new political and economic mindset [and organisation] which would help to break down the wall of separation between the economy and the common good of society...Migrants present a particular challenge for me, since I am the pastor of a Church without frontiers, a Church which considers herself mother to all. For this reason, I exhort all countries to a generous openness which, rather than fearing the loss of local identity, will prove capable of creating new forms of cultural synthesis.\(^{467}\)

The model of denominational education proposed by Hinsley and Griffin was incarnational and transformative helping to integrate the families and children of Irish migrants into the industrial cities of the North and of the Midlands. It took place in a time of educational reform which it helped inform. Through universal, denominational education, part funded by those within the Catholic community of England and Wales for whom there would be no direct benefit, a generation of Catholic children made the journey out of poverty. It would be unfortunate if this distinctive, selfless act was lost amid the seemingly worthy intention of protecting current provision.

\(^{466}\) “Schools in Birmingham are illegally segregating pupils, discriminating against non-Muslim students and restricting the GCSE syllabus to ‘comply with conservative Islamic teaching’, an official report leaked to The Telegraph discloses....Department for Education inspectors said that girls in a schools at the centre of the so-called ‘Trojan Horse’ plot were forced to sit at the back of the class, some Christian pupils were left to ‘teach themselves’ and an extremist preacher was invited to speak to children (Andrew Gilligan, ‘State Schools Isolate Non-Muslims’ The Daily Telegraph, 18th April 2014).”

The theo-political setting of this educational reform, and of the Second Vatican Council, was common. Nation states engaging in, or threatening to engage in, ‘total’ war. Catholic Christian education offered children, young people and their families an alternative eschatological narrative of hope. Through this narrative children would learn a new operant, Catholic voice.

5.3 How Total War, And Threat Thereof, Transformed the Church and World
As the Council Fathers gathered in Rome the Cuban Missile Crisis was coming to a head. Although this may not have had direct theological influence on the Council, those who attended, watched and listened there, and across the world, would have been mindful of events many miles from Rome.

How to reconcile and build a sustainable peace engaged politicians and the Hierarchy in England and Wales in the 1940s as well as politicians and the Council Fathers in the 1960s “…the (eschatological) expectation of a new earth must not weaken but rather stimulate our concern for cultivating this one. For here grows the body of a new human family, a body which even now is able to give some kind of foreshadowing of the new age.” As the Council Fathers drafted Gaudium et Spes they would have been aware of the quasi-Catholic contribution of President John F. Kennedy in his [Spring] Commencement Address at the American University, Washington D.C., 10th June 1963. In this speech he argues that, ‘conditional’ tolerance rather than ‘unconditional’ love, is

---

469 John Fitzgerald Kennedy served as the thirty-fifth President of the United States of America between 1961 and 1963 and attended Holy Trinity Catholic Parish, Georgetown while at Congress and in The White House. The following Memorial is found at Holy Trinity Parish:

Within the hallowed walls of this historic church of The Holy Trinity in Georgetown D.C. worshipped the late president of the United States John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The first Catholic to hold that exalted office. This martyred chief executive also prayed in this church as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a United States Senator when he resided in Georgetown. It was here that he attended his last Mass in Washington on the Feast of All Saints, November 1, 1963 shortly before his untimely death by an assassin’s bullet on November 22 1963 at Dallas, Texas. May he rest in peace eternal.

“Home is the Sailor, home from the sea, and the hunter home from the hill (from Robert Louis Stevenson’s poem Requiem).”
470 “…World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbour – it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement…( President John F. Kennedy, [Spring] Commencement Address at the American University, Washington D.C., 10th June 1963, §15).”
sufficient to bring about peace. The Council Fathers knew this intuition was incomplete. Meaningful collaboration needed more than tolerance, as Chesterton so wisely commented, “tolerance is the virtue of people who do not believe anything”\textsuperscript{471} and it was this omission that Hinsley and Griffin sought to address through universal, denominational education some twenty years earlier.

Denominational education should not be reduced to either a narrative of ‘fairness’ or confessionalism; a more principled approach to education is required. In a comment piece in \textit{The Daily Telegraph}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2013, Terrill\textsuperscript{472} writes about the similarity between moments when servicemen return home from combat\textsuperscript{473}, the moral ambiguity they carry and the forthcoming sentencing of a marine found guilty of murder in Helmand Valley: “Marines are among the finest soldiers in the world but they are still men. And men make mistakes.”\textsuperscript{474}

Current theological reflection on, and interpretation of, this ‘personalist’ ambiguity is similar to the debate over social and educational reform of the 1940s\textsuperscript{475} in England and Wales and the political debate in America over war in Vietnam from the 1950s to the 1970s, along with the Cuban Missile Crisis in the 1960s. After over ten years of hidden ‘total’ war in Iraq and Afghanistan, vibrant denominational education beyond tolerance is just as necessary now within the field of education in England and Wales as it was in the 1940s. The Church should not be constrained by fears of academy-led protectionism nor the State side-tracked by fears of religious fundamentalism. Peter Clarke in his report\textsuperscript{476} on the ‘Trojan Horse’ investigation of Birmingham Schools undertaken in the summer of 2014\textsuperscript{477} writes in his conclusions of the danger of a reductive, quantative model of education onto which religious studies, as opposed to religious education, is attached:

\textsuperscript{472} An ‘embedded’ anthropologist, who joined a Royal Marine Commando brigade, during their tour of Afghanistan.
\textsuperscript{473} Proportionately, the recent and current engagement of British forces in Iraq and in Afghanistan has led to attrition rates equivalent to, and above, those of the Second World War. Towards the end of the Second World War and now soldiers’ moral reasoning is being questioned; whether German or British, whether Auschwitz-Birkenau or Dresden. How do modern ‘Enlightened’ education systems not prepare people to live?
\textsuperscript{474} Chris Terrill, Marine A: Criminal or Casualty?, \textit{The Daily Telegraph}, London, 2\textsuperscript{nd} December 2013.
\textsuperscript{475} As it was at the beginning of the Second Vatican Council with the Cuban Missile Crisis.
\textsuperscript{476} Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM, \textit{Report Into Allegations Concerning Birmingham Schools Arising From The ‘Trojan Horse’ Letter}, Department for Education, OGL (Crown Copyright), July 2014.
\textsuperscript{477} Peter Clarke was appointed Education Commissioner for Birmingham under the provisions of section 497A of the \textit{Education Act, 1996}. 
although good academic results can be achieved through a narrowing of the curriculum, it comes at a cost. The cost is that young people, instead of enjoying a broadening and enriching experience in school, are having their horizons narrowed. They are not being prepared properly to flourish in the inevitably diverse environments of further education, the workplace or life outside predominantly Muslim communities. They are thus being potentially denied the opportunity to prosper in a modern multi-cultural Britain.

The Second Vatican Council, Schloesser argues, took place at a time of diminishing European hegemony and increasing geo-political realignment. Consequently, Sacrosanctum Concilium (4th December 1963) states, in the first sentence to be promulgated by the Council, that it wants “to adapt more closely to the needs of our age...to foster whatever can promote union (sic) among all who believe in Christ.” Postwar decolonisation and recolonisation meant that the Church instead of imposing a unitary ultramontanist culture on the world would seek to listen, appreciate and inculturate anew the Gospel of Christ. This renewal involved members of the laity as well as the clergy.

Interestingly, the Council Fathers did not become sidelined by bureaucratic detail but addressed the much larger questions facing the world in 1962, such as the one that opened Nostra Aetate, “what is the ultimate mystery, beyond human explanation, which embraces our entire existence, from which we take our origin and towards which we tend?” In returning the reader to ultimate sources, epideictic rhetoric allow[ed] for a rethinking of the world and, if necessary, radical revisions. It is a literary genre with a sharp ethical edge. Such a method is etiological and affects speaker and hearer; just as the regaining of Saul’s sight affected Ananias and Saul: both experienced and were transformed by God’s grace. Past memories were acknowledged but both received and accepted God’s grace to set them aside. This praxis and attention to the larger questions was learnt by prelates during the War.

478 Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM, Report Into Allegations Concerning Birmingham Schools Arising From The ‘Trojan Horse’ Letter, Department for Education, OGL (Crown Copyright), July 2014, page 95.
480 ibid, page 104.
481 ibid, pages 105-106.
482 Nostra Aetate,§1.
Theologically and ecclesiologically Nostra Aetate, and the work of Austin Bea, provided the grammar for much of what would happen at the Second Vatican Council. Newman’s notion of evolution of doctrine moved from the margins to mainstream Catholic thinking with the Church’s growing appreciation of temporality – the fact of change in human history. Julien Louis Geoffroy, a French royalist critic wrote in 1800 after the trauma of the French Revolution (1789–1799), that the notion of “human perfectibility was a “fatal chimera” that had covered the earth in blood and crimes. This chimera held sway in Nazi ‘Catholic’ Germany as well as other parts of Germany and the Church during and after the Second World War realised she needed a new ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voice.

De Lubac, the French theologian and future Cardinal who influenced the Second Vatican Council profoundly, wrote “Man starved of myths is a man without roots. He is a man who is ‘perpetually hungry’, an ‘abstract’ man, devitali[s]ed by the ebbing sap in him.” The influence of recusant French theology and German theology on the Second Vatican Council is well known. The origins of both in Africa and Europe influenced Hinsley’s praxis helping him to develop an ‘espoused’ spirituality for the Allies’ engagement in a ‘just’ war. For both Hinsley and De Lubac the first step of opposition was an authentic Catholic Christian spirituality; of being “freed [from determinism] into the freedom of the infinite God.” From the darkness of these “rubbled-over” hearts arises first intuition, then praxis, the ‘formal’ and ‘espoused’ phrases and then a renewed ‘systemic’ theology. “The Council’s call for the Church to be a “human[ising]” force was an ethically necessary response to a century that had been, in Nietzsche’s ironic phrase, “human, all too human”. The model of universal denominational education, ‘operant’ in England and Wales, provided a model whereby future generations could become aware of humanity’s
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484 ibid, page 119.
487 In his writings in an underground journal called Témoignage Chrétien, or Christian Witness.
responsibility to guide aright the forces which humanity had unleashed. For as Gaudium et Spes recognised these forces could either enslave or minister to humanity.\textsuperscript{491}

It is not possible to establish absolute anticipation of the Second Vatican Council in the Archive and continental theology\textsuperscript{492} during the Second World War. But echoes of the voices of those in the Archive can be perceived in the words of the Council. Although an articulated post-Conciliar theology was not in existence in the 1940s, the experience of collegiality and subsidiarity, across the Church, was. The Council did not impose a new ecclesiology on the Church but was an occasion for the Church to express its practical memory.

**5.4 Curriculum vs Resources**

The curriculum vision of the Hierarchy in the 1930s and 1940s was shaped by Hinsley’s experience of school. Individual members of the Hierarchy set a curriculum in their respective dioceses, trusted the community to write schemes of work and resources, and did not engage in the instrumental micro-management and delivery thereof.

To this end, several portfolios contain syllabi by phase. AAW Hi 2/181 1928-34 comprise The [Religious Education] Syllabus for Infant Schools\textsuperscript{493} written by Canon Wood. The aims of teaching religion captures much of the sentiment of Hinsley’s preaching at the time and the hope of the triumph of good over evil and the teaching of ‘objective’ right and wrong. This syllabus is founded on Church teaching, reminding readers that the aim of Christian Education\textsuperscript{494} is ‘to co-operate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian.’ 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.

\textsuperscript{491} Gaudium et Spes, §9.
\textsuperscript{492} Robert A. Krieg, Catholic Theologians in Nazi Germany, Continuum, New York, 2004.
\textsuperscript{493} The draft was sent to Cardinal Hinsley on 20\textsuperscript{th} April 1940.
\textsuperscript{494} Pius XI, Divini Illius Magistri.
or practice. Teaching should be simple and direct to suit the simplicity of their minds.  

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 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.

The paper 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.

For Hinsley, both the formal and informal curriculum in a Catholic school was drawn from Tradition and taught children and young people an interpretative ‘Catholic’ method, similar to that of the Ursulines. Such a denominational curriculum opened the present to the past. Each constituency had its proper part to play echoing the covenant of trust, between clerics and lay people, which sustained the Catholic community through recusant times and the War. Where this trust is lost, subsidiarity withers and institutional bureaucracy takes over, leading to inanition as so aptly portrayed in an exchange between Jim Hacker and Sir Humphrey in Yes Prime Minster: The National Education Service (#2.7, 1988):

[discussing Hacker’s proposal to allow parents to choose their children’s school]

Sir Humphrey Appleby: In any case, we’re not talking about health; we’re
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talking about education. And, with respect, Prime Minister, I think that the DES will react with some caution to your rather novel proposal.

**James Hacker:** You mean they'll block it.

**Sir Humphrey Appleby:** I mean they will give it the most serious and urgent consideration, and insist on a thorough and rigorous examination of all the proposals, allied to a detailed feasibility study and budget analysis before producing a consultative document for consideration by all interested bodies and seeking comments and recommendations to be included in a brief for a series of working parties who will produce individual studies which will provide the background for a more wide-ranging document considering whether or not the proposal should be taken forward to the next stage.

**James Hacker:** You mean they'll block it.

**Sir Humphrey Appleby:** Yeah.

Interestingly, in the same episode, Sir Humphrey describes the education system as having “responsibility without power - the prerogative of the eunuch throughout the ages.”

Individual bishops commissioned the writing of syllabi with lay people and religious writing resources against such syllabi. Christopher Hollis of Burns, Oates & Washbourne wrote to Cardinal Hinsley 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.” Cardinal Hinsley’s response, six months before the start of the Battle of Britain, fully approves “of the scheme proposed by Messrs Burns, Oates & Washbourne to publish a series of Scripture Text Books and only goes on to make suggestions concerning the editorial board. By remaining one step removed from the writing, Hinsley would not have to recuse himself from assessing the scope and content of what the authors wrote. Through this he, and later Griffin, protected the integrity of episcopal oversight.

While Hinsley and Griffin were clear that the bureaucratic management of resources should not fall into their bailiwick, in the negotiations surrounding the Education Act, 1944 they sought to retrieve elements that many felt had been lost by Cardinal Manning in 1870 such as ‘inspections’. Cardinal Hinsley’s energy was directed towards establishing
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498 Letter from Christopher Hollis, of Burns, Oates & Washbourne, to Cardinal Hinsley, 10\(^{th}\) January 1940, page 1, AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40.
499 On 10\(^{th}\) July 1940.
500 Letter from Cardinal Hinsley to Christopher Hollis, of Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 11\(^{th}\) January 1940, page 1, AAW Hi 2/72 1931-40.
501 For perceived strategic reasons on Manning’s part, he allowed denominational inspection to fall into abeyance much to the dismay of Bishop Ullathorne of Birmingham and others (D.E. Selby, Henry Edward Manning And The Education Bill of 1870, British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol 18. No 2 (June 1970), University of Birmingham, page 203). With an extension of the Catholic schools’ estate Cardinals Hinsley and Griffin reasserted their canonical right to inspect the quality of religious instruction to the disquiet of some in the Catholic community. Correspondence from Mgr Vance to Cardinal Griffin (20\(^{th}\) November 1946), and the latter's
denominational schools, where Catholic parents could send their children to learn that ‘truth-telling thing’. Subsidiarity came out of lived experience where no decision should be made on a higher level that can be made more effectively on a lower level. This ‘animus’ brings life to the People of God. Most importantly, it allowed the Church’s ‘epideictic’ voice to be heard amid the noise of life.

5.5 Compromise
The logistics of reconstruction after 1944 diluted the unconditional right of parents as envisaged in the ‘normative’ voice of Papal Teaching and in the ‘formal’ voice of American jurisprudence. Consequently, although politicians rehearsed the rights of individual parents within their discourses, economies of scale after the War often took precedence. In an aide-mémoire entitled The Education Bill notes are offered to Hinsley on the scope of the Education Bill before Parliament. The author opines that nowhere in the Bill is explicit legal recognition given to the wishes of parents over the character of the school their child will attend. He goes on:

This is a serious menace. It means that if Catholic parents want a new nursery, new primary schools, new [s]enior schools, new [t]echnical schools, new [g]rammar 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.”

Attempting to address this "menace" has been at the heart of much subsequent ‘civic’ amending legislation to the Education Act, 1944. Interestingly, the latest ‘free-school’ initiative emanates from this exact same lacuna. Restoration of the rights of parents to
determine the nature of their child’s education is as elemental to liberal democracy as it is to the Church. Put simply, the school is at the service of the home.

The rights and wrongs of the Coalition Government’s espousal in 2010 of ‘Academies’ in and for all circumstances with an arrangement founded on unintended atomisation\(^504\) of localised supervision and centralised systemic homogeneity is the subject of another thesis. What is proper here is to identify the refracted memory of how regulatory precedent provided for a pattern of all-age ‘Catholic’ denominational provision, sensitive to demographic change. This helped build a more just peace and may now be being set aside in a piecemeal fashion. Paradoxically, the Education Act, 1944 came from the insufficiencies of contract law in a time of demographic change and significant migrant-movement across Europe. The Church would do well not to forget this. Capitalism is founded on reliable contract law and the free movement of labour which will always move and periodically lead to demographic aberrations. The promissory words of the Education Act, 1944 and subsequent regulations gave Catholic diocesan trusts, the critical flexibility to respond outside the confines of existing provision.

What was quite remarkable in the 1930s and the 1940s was the Church’s ability to enunciate and achieve a clear denominational vision of education while influencing general public discourse on the means and ends of education. Hinsley and Griffin, and the Church they led, were able to see beyond a response that was neither overly confessional nor overly protectionist. Paradoxically, in negotiations and in public discourse generally, whenever a partner seeks only to ‘protect’ individual institutions, or groups thereof, its influence is often marginalised. While human communities are complex realities that aim primarily at “self-reproduction”\(^505\) this is rarely achieved by institutional protectionism. The Catholic Church was so influential in the drafting of the Education Act, 1944, precisely because it was sufficiently free enough to leave its buildings, go to where the communities of Catholic children and young people were and to establish new and anew parishes and schools with a clear Catholic curriculum. In doing so it was able to enter into the wider political discourse on the ends of education.

Catholics, by the end of the Second World War, were no longer seen as a threat to the liberal (confessional) ‘Protestant’ State but central to the war effort. The Catholic
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community in England and Wales helped shore up the State by the insight of Catholic members of the aristocracy and Catholic officials during the abdication crisis, the bravery of Catholic servicemen during the Second World War, the commitment of Catholic parents to the education of their children and the spirituality of Catholic prelates. Through this synthetic counter-Reformation, the Catholic community in England and Wales became a force for civic unity.

5.6 Concluding Thoughts
The link between the negotiations engaged in by the Church in England and Wales in the 1940s and the Second Vatican Council is neither sequential nor ‘essentialist’. While both came after the Enlightenment, the latter began during the Cuban Missile Crisis with the threat of thermonuclear warfare. The antique monochromic picture of the Church and of the World that had shaped relationships between the two in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries no longer seemed sufficient. The Church’s “historical embodiment and manifestation of the universal salvific will of God in the world”\textsuperscript{506} needed to find ‘espoused’ expression and to be heard anew in the 1960s. While the Council Fathers had addressed this need locally, they now needed to find a universal ‘operant’ voice drawing on the experience of local theo-political engagement between the Church and nation states.

While Hanvey’s assessment of the strands of ‘interpretation’, ‘implementation’ and ‘plurality’ within the ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council is accurate, perhaps it does not recognise sufficiently local pastoral practices before the Council. Reading the Archive of the Archbishop of Westminster concerning the negotiations around the Education Act, 1944 suggests the development of an epideictic educational narrative of partners, ad extra and ad intra, twenty years before the Second Vatican Council. The voices and actions of members of the laity led an increasingly collegial Hierarchy to interpret and translate the Church’s ‘normative’ voice in a new civic situation and propose ‘operant’ educational action in England and Wales. Through the grace of the Holy Spirit members of the Catholic community learnt the tenets of a new ecclesiology from each other.

The Local Church adapted to an increasingly plural society by being attentive to its own experience(s) and applying models of Catholic, Christian anthropology to this experience. The theological reconceptualising of existent pastoral practice brought about order, epistemic epiphanies and more resilient ecclesial structures. The reforms of the Second Vatican Council are predicated on openness to the Holy Spirit encouraging all people to look beyond a self-referential epistemological and political tragedy that entrapped their forebears. The Church, as Hanvey recognises, “lives beyond itself as pilgrim (viator) and possessor of the fullness of Christ and his truth (comprehensor). In this sense, too, in its very mission the Church possesses its being in becoming.”

Hanvey goes on to conclude that “the Council traces the movement of salvation history within the secular history of humanity and its fractured progress…through the actions of ‘ordinary’ Christian life and through the work of the Holy Spirit, the secular, far from being a space of God’s enforced absence, becomes the realm of God’s presence.”

The Christian humanism found in the ‘formal’ voices and practices of Catholic educators such as Mother Mary Anglea Boord (Ursuline) and Mother Geneviève Dupuis (Sisters of Charity of Saint Paul) represented a theoretical and practical engagement with, and reformation of, the anthropologies of the secular Enlightenment. Reflecting on their own pastoral practice and the voices of women religious, like Boord and Dupuis, the English and Welsh Hierarchy in the 1940s and the Council Fathers in the 1960s engaged with the anthropological aporias of secular thought. Drawing on patristic theology they showed how these were destined to collapse into moral relativism and social nihilism. The consequences of these were witnessed in the first part of the century.

“This is most evident in the way in which the Council develops the emancipatory project of secular modernity and re-reads it through its Christology and ecclesiology to produce a dynamic theology of the human person: ‘Whoever follows after Christ, the perfect man, becomes himself more of a man’. Only in the fullness of body, mind and spirit can we come to appreciate ‘the telos’ or ‘the destiny’ to which the human person is called. This protects the human person from being entrapped by the illusory freedom proffered by economic systems and political ideologies. Through the Second Vatican Council, the

508 Ibid, page 56.
509 Gaudium et Spes, §41.
Church publically carried “the ‘memory’ and truth of what it means to be human”\textsuperscript{510} to contemporary culture offering a new model of power and service that was transcendent and directed towards the other.\textsuperscript{511}

Hinsley and Griffin, in the first half of the twentieth century, on the shores of peace intuited this appreciation of kenosis. This lay at the heart of Conciliar soteriology restoring and reordering relationships. “…The Church that lives out of kenosis will be a Church that lives out of its poverty – a poverty which it experiences in every aspect of its life. Constantly it will have to renew the discovery that it is this very gift of poverty that makes it a Church very free and unafraid of its history.” At all levels, Hinsley and Griffin, the Council and Evangelii Gaudium point us towards the deep work of ‘renovatio’ that is ongoing, encouraging believers not to retreat into institutional protectionism but to bring the gospel and Church teaching to public discourse.

Among the abiding characteristics of both Hinsley and Griffin was their openness and ability to articulate the theological intuition they perceived. Epideictically, Hinsley and Griffin drew on Church teaching to bring about common ‘operant’ action. They spoke confidently for the marginalised and those who were silent within the community and those outside. Their responses were principled and pragmatic, while their legacy forms part of the great tradition of Church-State relations in of England and Wales:

…”The angels looking down on us from the magnificent ceiling of this ancient Hall remind us of the long tradition from which British Parliamentary democracy has evolved. They remind us that God is constantly watching over us to guide and protect us. And they summon us to acknowledge the vital contribution that religious belief has made and can continue to make to the life of the nation.”\textsuperscript{513}

In 1944, the Catholic community was very aware of the logistics of the educational rights it sought. The principle of denominational education was argued first, and then the


\textsuperscript{511} Hanvey goes on to conclude that “The most radical theology in Gaudium et Spes and Lumen Gentium is that of kenosis. This is especially so when it is understood to be the normal mode of the Church’s existence in its own internal life and in its life in the world (ibid, page 65).” The Church is marked by the unconditional self-emptying of Christ, apparent in the Church’s performative unitative witness in the world and to the world of God’s salvific and regenerative self-communication.


\textsuperscript{513} Address of Pope Benedict XVI, Westminster Hall, Palace of Westminster, 17\textsuperscript{th} September 2010.
wherewithal of how to achieve this right was sought in negotiations and regulations. Somehow, within modern Catholic ‘educational’ discourse, this order has been reversed. Consequently, the Church has become more concerned with its institutions and less ‘free’ to articulate anthropological and educational principles in the public space, acting as a ‘stakeholder’ rather than a ‘partner’.

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 respective Secretaries of State/Ministers; whereas ecclesially, education policy is set locally by the diocesan bishop. Individual Ordinaries following separate policy schemas in response to concerns over ‘authority’ and ‘capital’ have undermined the spirit of solidarity established by Hinsley and Griffin seventy years ago.

Paradoxically, an answer to the current debate over Academies and the devolution of school governance does not lie in the flexibility and apparent attractiveness of contract law but in the theological and fiscal principles that informed the compromises made during the passage of the Education Act, 1944. This not a time for either protectionism or ‘stare decisis’, of being content that so much has already been done right, but of daring to believe that the story has not finished.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title &amp; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/26 located in [Box Hi 2/191-196]</td>
<td>Letter from Mr. Cleary of the Board of Education to Robert Mathew, dated 23rd September 1939 over impact of war on building envisaged in 1936 Act.</td>
</tr>
<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 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Personal Speeches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>A speech given by Cardinal Hinsley on 29th June 1939 entitled ‘The Key Position of the Christian Teacher in the Renewal of Order’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Hinsley A Broadcast to the Eucharistic Congress in Wellington, New Zealand on the Occasion of the Centenary Celebration 2nd February 1940 by Cardinal Hinsley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Hinsley To the Polish Nation on Easter Sunday 1940.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>An Overseas Broadcast on Sunday, 2nd June 1940 by Cardinal Hinsley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Hinsley Sermon at Westminster Cathedral on 16th June 1940 at 10.30 am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Hinsley Broadcast to the forces at 1.45 pm Sunday 4th August 1940.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>The Spiritual Issues of this War heard through The Networks of the National Broadcasting Company [Hinsley].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo1/159 (1) 1935-43 also catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Foyles Literary Luncheons: Luncheon in Honour of Free France. Speakers General De Gaulle &amp; John Gordon esq., Chairman Cardinal Hinsley at the Grosvenor House, Park Lane. 9th January 1941.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/184</td>
<td>Various Papers Relating to Education (Chiefly 1931 &amp; 1936 Acts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/186 Education X 1939 located in [Box Hi 2/191-196]</td>
<td>Notes of Meetings dated around May 1939 between Bishops and Board of Education over implementation of 1936 Act and subsequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
correspondence between Hinsley and President of the Board. Hitchings Hinsley experiencing locally with Religious Congregations and concerns over fairness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bo 1/187 Education XI 1942-43 found in [Box Hi 2/191-196]</th>
<th>Declaration on Education by the Hierarchy dated Low Week, 1929.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/188 1944 Act 1936-43 (Feb) found in [Box Hi 2/191-196]</td>
<td>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 Hierarchy on 14th-15th April 1942 and/or 24th June 1942 respectively. Papers and reports from Canon Wood on concerns over quality of student-teachers drawn from religious orders. National Society, Interim Report, The Dual System, October 1942. Letter to ‘The Times’ by Cardinal Hinsley dated 31st October 1942. Statement dated 6th February 1943, the Hierarchy decided to establish a Council fully representative of parents, teachers, Members of Parliament, bishops and religious orders514, drawing representatives from the main political parties, under the Chairmanship of the Archbishop Downey. Papers which are mainly undated and generally without authorship, they collectively embody the marshalling of the Catholic argument regarding the 1944 Act. A confidential note of meeting, 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. Aide-mémôrable provenance and date unclear entitled ‘The Education Bill’ aim to assist “in preparing your people for an approach to their Member of Parliament.” One-page paper entitled ‘School Site and Playing Fields’ which defines associated land and maintenance responsibilities as envisaged in the 1944 Bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

514 From Association of Convent Schools and the Conference of Catholic Colleges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/189</td>
<td>1944 Education Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/189 Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Catholic Education Council, A Reply to the President of the Board of Education’s Attached Statement on Catholic Schools dated 22nd September 1943.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Reply from Rab Butler to Cardinal Griffin, dated 11th January 1944.(^{515})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/189] Education XIII 1943 (September) – 1944 (February): CEC catalogued Hi 3</td>
<td>Letters from diocesan bishops dated around 25th January 1944 in response to Archbishop Griffin’s note over his interview at the Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 1/190</td>
<td>After 1944 Education Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 5/90d</td>
<td>Papacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{515}\) Frustratingly, a copy of the letter to which Rab Butler is replying is not in the Archive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title &amp; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/10</td>
<td>Association of Convent Schools &amp; Training Colleges (including talk by Mother Mary Anglea Boord O.S.U., 11th June 1932).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/31 1898, 1918, 1930, 1934-40</td>
<td>Catholics at non-Catholic Schools. This right was reserved by Cardinal Bourne to himself and delegated, except in extraordinary circumstances, by Cardinal Hinsley to Fr W.J. Wood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/69 1937-38</td>
<td>Papers concerning Archbishop Hinsley’s elevation to the College of Cardinals and Cardinal Hinsley’s election to the Athenaeum Club under Rule 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/72 1931-40</td>
<td>Paper from Bourne’s time over proposals for aid to Non-Provided Schools in meeting re-organisation and raising the school age. Undated single page written by the Hierarchy enunciating “principles which underlie the Catholic attitude to Education.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/112 1930</td>
<td>Catholic Headmasters’ Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

516 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page References</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/152 1920-24</td>
<td>Flyer for the National Union of Students dated 25th April 1924 with information of “Imperial Conference of Students” in London and Cambridge from 18th July to 31st July 1924 (Vice-President RA Butler). National Union of Teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne located Hi 2/181</td>
<td>Association of Catholic Training Colleges, dated 2nd March 1923 ‘The Question of Catholic Teachers receiving their Training in a University.’ Talk by Lord Irwin, President of the Board of Education, dated 21st January 1933 at a Conference called by the Bishop of Ripon entitled: The Place of Religion in Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/198 1938-40</td>
<td>Letter from Lord Halifax to Cardinal Hinsley dated 4th June 1935 over how new Catholic senior schools might be funded is addressed. Catholic Approved Schools/Home Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi 2/200 1928-40 The Vaughan School</td>
<td>Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne dated 28th June 1929 concerning surfeit of applications to the Cardinal Vaughan School. Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne dated 3rd April 1930 over condition of facilities. Letter from Mgr John Vance to Cardinal Bourne dated 20th May 1932 on accreditation of School Religious Syllabus. London County Council: Inspection of Cardinal Vaughan School between 26th to 29th November 1934. Across Bourne and Hinsley - notes and correspondence between Mgr Vance and the incumbent Archbishop (Chairman of Governors) over 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 controlled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

517 Records show a W. J. Lloyd was registered at Windsor House, 83 Kingsway House working for the ‘Anglo-American Asphalt Co.’. Archbishop Hinsley received several similar pieces of correspondence encouraging the Holy Father to take the lead in praying for peace. 518 Extract from Irwin’s talk: “It is a mistake not 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, [and] 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.
accountable in matters of governance and management.

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

On a separate torn sheet (marked 11) the work of the Council (presumably the CEC) is summarised. Letter to Archbishop Hinsley dated 12th October 1935 from the Bishop of Nottingham over applicability of Scottish system to England. Memorandum from Association of Catholic Colleges to Board of Education for Consultative Committee on provision for pupils beyond 11+ dated 22nd December 1935. Correspondence between Robert Mathew and Archbishop Hinsley.

Cardinal Griffin 1943-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title &amp; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/21f</td>
<td>Councillor Mrs Helen Murtagh (Edgbaston) 1944-48: Papers &amp; correspondence between Griffin and Murtagh over four years that chart development in Griffin’s thinking making connections between health and social care of young people, well being of families and importance of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/27d</td>
<td>Victoria Cross: Maurice Quinlan, The Universe, Biographical summary and list of twelve Catholics who have been awarded the Victoria Cross thus far (1944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/29a</td>
<td>Sword of the Spirit &amp; Religion and Life Joint Statement 1943-47: 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 of the Spirit. Internal papers between archbishop Griffin and seminaries, Catholic committee members editors and compilers and external papers with C. of E. and HMG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/30a</td>
<td>Annual Conference of Catholic Teachers’ Federation: Cardinal Griffin’s address to Annual Conference of Catholic Teachers’ Federation, Brighton on 2nd January 1947: Purpose and proper end of ‘Education’: operational challenges of implementing new Act (need for justice) and rights of parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/30d</td>
<td>Education Interchange Council 1947-48: This portfolio contains nothing of direct interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/30e</td>
<td>General Election – educational notes for Parliamentary Candidates, 1945: A collection of correspondence within the Hierarchy primarily between the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle and Archbishop Griffin. Drafts of notes for parliamentary candidates – apparent in writing and minds of the Hierarchy that “the “Education Question” is not (sic) settled.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1/30 f</td>
<td>Centenary of Arrival of De La Salle Brothers, 1955: Correspondence between the Congregation and Archbishop’s House over this celebration. While of no direct interest, papers within this portfolio chart the Congregation’s work in education across the British isles, including the five ‘Home Office Schools’ in Scotland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conviction and practice amongst boys from both communities being filled by respective 'Utopian' Irish Nationalist and 'Orange' cults.

| Gr 1/41b | American Catholic Welfare Committee 1944-48: Records of 'The American Catholic Welfare Committee' and 'The American Committee for Catholic British Relief' through which catechetical materials were distributed to Catholic German Prisoners of War within England. Supporting correspondence on need to provide universal, inclusive pastoral care for all Catholics whatever their nationality. |
| Gr 2/5 | Archbishop’s House 1944-50: Insight into life in post-war Britain and the shortages endured after the war from bed linen to wine. Partial paper, whose provenance is vague, entitled Central Advisory Council for Education (England): Memorandum submitted by the Young Christian Workers, dated 16th May 1947 – main hypothesis: “education” to be a training for (sic) life, in (sic) and through (sic) life; not limited to classroom. |
| Gr 2/5 | Archbishop’s House: Nothing of interest. |
| Gr 2/5 | Archbishop’s House 1951-54: Nothing of interest. |
| Gr 2/5 | Archbishop’s House 1955-56: Nothing of interest apart “armourplate[d]” entrance doors to the Library in Archbishop’s House. |
| Gr 2/20 Education Bills File C | Correspondence Jan-Feb 1944: Another copy of The Education Bill: Statement of the Catholic Hierarchy, January 1944. Letter of support for above from Commander George Atwood, The Royal Navy Base, Holyhead to Archbishop Griffin, dated 15th January 1944. Article entitled How the Schools Injustice began Cowper-Temple-ism, undated but reprinted from the Catholic Times by Nuneaton Newspapers Ltd. Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Hierarchy on 19th February 1944 over advisability of a “monster” public meeting at the Albert Hall and replies519. Record 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. Handwritten covering letter to Archbishop Griffin from the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, dated 22nd January 1944. Duke of Norfolk’s letter to Churchill, 2nd February 1944. Duke of Norfolk’s letter to Archbishop Griffin, 17th February 1944 with suggested amendments to the Education Bill re. financial arrangements. Correspondence within Hierarchy. Four-page handwritten paper proposing the establishment of ‘The Catholic Schools Penny-A- |

519 While some Northern bishops were in favour the bishops from the Midlands and the South were against. The meeting did not take place.
Week.' Letter from Association of Catholic Schools and Colleges, to Archbishop Griffin dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 1944. Letter from John Boland, as the "surviving official of the old Irish Party, to Archbishop Griffin dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 1944. Letter from exasperated Archbishop Griffin to an unidentified bishop "[Butler] seems to be continually shifting his position and that just leaves us guessing", dated 12<sup>th</sup> February 1944. Letter from Archbishop Griffin to another unidentified bishop “the P.M. has promised to talk to Butler”, dated 16<sup>th</sup> February 1944.

**Gr 2/20 Education Bills**

**File D**

Correspondence Feb-Aug 1944: Hierarchy commissioned the following paper: Arthur Collins, *The Education Bill, 1944: Financial Aspects for Consideration by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy*, dated 17<sup>th</sup> February 1944; this detailed memorandum aimed to estimate future post-war building costs. A twenty-page Lenten Pastoral Letter on *The Present Education Bill and Our Catholic Schools* the Bishop of Salford. Note sent to Archbishop Griffin from R. R. Stokes dated 25<sup>th</sup> February 1944 over the Committee discussion surrounding Education Bill. General correspondence over awareness of the impact and cost of transport. A letter from Archbishop Downing to Archbishop Griffin dated 29<sup>th</sup> February 1944, resigning from chairmanship of the Liaison Committee. Record of a meeting held on Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> March 1944 between The President [of the Board of Education – Mr. Butler] and Catholic Parliamentarians. Pamphlets describing hostility towards the intentions of the Catholic Church. Memorandum issued by Mr. Butler, dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 1944. Undated Letter (circa March 1944) to Archbishop Griffin from Butler over outstanding issues, Acta, Special Meeting of Hierarchy, Wednesday, 15<sup>th</sup> March 1944. General Correspondence. Exchange of Correspondence on success of negotiations between Bishop Pella and the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle; from the former on 10<sup>th</sup> May 1944 and the latter on 12<sup>th</sup> May 1944 (Griffin copied in). Copy of Leeds *Ad Clerum* reporting establishment of Diocesan Schools’ Commission in Diocese of Leeds to meet local challenges of implementing Education Act 1944, 22<sup>nd</sup> June 1944. Marshalled List of Amendments’ moved at the Report Stage of the Bill, primarily by Earl Stanhope and Lord Rankeillour, 11<sup>th</sup> July 1944. Letter from Rab Butler to Archbishop Griffin over the availability and administration of loans accessible to the Church, 25th July 1944 (Butler aware Griffin attempting to assuage concerns both within the Hierarchy and wider Catholic community). Comment from Lord Rankeillour, 27<sup>th</sup> July 1944, and Butler’s disregard for parliamentary convention in favour of the Church. One-line note from Dyson Bell & Co., 3<sup>rd</sup>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/20 Education Bills&lt;br&gt;File E: all no date (n.d.)</td>
<td>Miscellaneous set of papers; few with date, authorship or clear audience identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/20 Education Bills&lt;br&gt;File F: 1944-45</td>
<td>Report commissioned for the ‘Conference of Catholic Colleges’ entitled The Fleming Report and Direct Grant Schools. Letter from Archbishop Griffin to the Bishop of Shrewsbury, 4th December 1944, in which he reveals he has “inside information”. List of local difficulties from dioceses with implementation of Education Act, 1944, evidence of ‘institutional’ inequity and growing suspicion of LEA’s by dioceses. Letter from Archbishop Griffin to Hierarchy over first ‘Amending Bill’. 19th December 1945; request sought from Hierarchy for Griffin and Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle to act on their behalf in preliminary discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/21 1945-46</td>
<td>Education Bills amending Education Act 1944. Correspondence, some of which is perished, and papers on trusts, selling of property, cost of new build and use of residual income. Letter to Archbishop Griffin from Robert Mathew, of the Catholic Education Council, 29th December 1945, cautioning against vesting school managers with the power of trusteeship. In these papers ‘money’ and ‘governance’ are linked on a sliding scale of uniformity and freedom. January/February 1946: Amendments proposed to Amending Bill to secure the rights of 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. ‘Catholic’ amendments to the Bill were moved by R. A. Butler at Second Reading of the Bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/21A 1946-47</td>
<td>Correspondence on incomplete extracts of draft memorandum from Mr Todhunter on the financial arrangements associated with the Education Act. Papers attempting to differentiate between Anglican and Catholic funding methodologies for schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2/21A 1947</td>
<td>Exemplars on the need of transport; size of schools; school development plans and consistency in interim arrangements across LEA’s and provision of playing fields drawn up in preparation for meeting at Ministry of Education, Wednesday, 21st May 1947.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This paper is responding to the Fleming Committee Report, entitled The Public Schools and the General Education System, July 1944.
| Gr 2/21B 1947 | Draft Articles of Government for Catholic Voluntary Aided or Special Agreement Schools. Paperwork associated with meeting between members of the Hierarchy and Ministers on 21st May 1947 concerning: (a) Transport for Pupils to and From School (b) Payment of Boarding Fees and (c) Extra District Children. Canon Wood’s notes of interview with Sir William Cleary, Ministry of Education, 22nd October 1947, concerning misgiving of Ministry towards Diocesan Trusts. |
| Gr 2/21 1948 | Countersigning of applications for new Voluntary Schools by the local Ordinary. Agreed wording of funding application proposed in letter from Sir William Cleary, of the Ministry, to Cardinal Griffin dated 27th February 1948. Letter from H.E. Weston, Welsh Department, Ministry of Education, to the Bishop of Menevia, December 1948, on restricted resources for “erection of new Primary and Secondary schools required on denominational grounds” due to competing demands. |
| 2/62 | Catholic Parents & Electors Association 1943-63. |
| Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1944-47 | Letter dated 4th November 1944 from Ministry of Education to Mgr. John Vance over continuing a system of Direct Grant Schools indicating regulations were still fluid. A small untitled note, dated 7th November 1945 from Cardinal Griffin to Mgr Vance, suggesting that the Vaughan school move to St Charles’ Square. No record of a 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. Series of letters from the Headteacher to the Chairman of Governors over routine school matters. A report written by form masters entitled Report on General Condition of Boys (70 in number) who entered the School in September 1946. Papers over methods of funding grammar schools and the mechanisms for payment of teachers; there is a reluctance in the latter to see a distance established between the payment of teachers’ salaries and their respective Governors. Letter dated 20th May 1947 from Mgr. |

521 Cardinal Griffin’s experience in social welfare is evident in his empathetic response to the hardships experienced by pupils in the war: “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 (Letter from Cardinal Griffin to Mgr Vance to dated 13th February 1947).”
Vance to Cardinal Griffin over "sheer impossibility of Governors committing themselves to a hypothetical plan for reconstruction." Papers and correspondence between the Governing Body and the LCC over the process of appointing the new headmaster in 1948 and the intent of the governing body to appoint a priest to the role.

**Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1948-49**

One-page record of a HMI inspection conducted on 6th-9th December 1949 which made comment on the 'Buildings', 'Staff', 'Teaching' and 'The Boys'. Papers over response to this inspection but no records of ownership of schools buildings or 31, Holland Park Gardens. Note dated 16th July 1948 in which Mgr John Vance thanked the governors of The Cardinal Vaughan School for their support during his tenure as headmaster.

**Gr 2/73 Cardinal Vaughan School 1950-56**

Documentation of the granting of voluntary aided status and annual applications for activities and amenities allowances.

| 2/90 | Cathedral Choir School 1944-63. |
| 2/97 | Diocesan Inspection of Schools 1945-63. |
| 2/128 | Apostolic Delegate 1944-63. |
| 2/144 | Metropolitan Catholic Teachers' Federation 1944-60. |
| 3/6/11 | Education Bill (Miscellaneous Papers) 1944. |
| 3/10 | Education clerks in Holy Orders as Teachers 1945 [?] |
| 3/17 | Statements by the Hierarchy 1944-53. |

---

522 In the papers in this portfolio we glimpse at the Governing Body's reaction to the proposed London Development Plan. Two of the governors, Cardinal Griffin and Archbishop Amigo, helped negotiate the 1944 settlement. This portfolio gives an interesting insight into how the particular reflects the general. In the ‘espoused’ and ‘operant’ voices apparent herewith there is evidence of a commonality across the Catholic community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Title &amp; Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard One, Shelf</td>
<td><strong>Brief History of the Brentwood Ursulines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five, Box One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard One, Shelf</td>
<td><strong>Pastoral Letter by Cardinal Mercier, Patriotism &amp; Endurance</strong>, with foreword by Cardinal Bourne, 20th January 1915 in which he rehearses the importance of the State but not its absolute ascendancy. Mercier differentiates ‘patriotism’ from ‘nationalism’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three, Box One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard Two, Shelf</td>
<td>In this box there is a collation of Mother Clare Arthur’s Conference to the Ursuline Community at Brentwood. Mother Clare was first elected superior in 1904 and knew Francis Bourne as a priest. I have catalogued the below quotations as catalogued in the box:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven, Box Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5 (side annotation page 12): “You get what you give (sic) A child treated with reverence and respect will never show disrespect. They are mirrors (sic) and if we see things we don’t like, let us look in and see if they are reflecting...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5 (side annotation page 12): “…one of the causes of our success as educationalists is that we have kept abreast of the times and not remained stagnant. As times changed we adapted ourselves to them (Saint Angela made provision for this). Many changes in fifty years...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Page 17 (side annotation ‘self-knowledge’): “…Don’t shirk the humiliation of getting to know yourself – good penance (surprising how that can hurt) but the pain is good for us and we should pray for the
### Cupboard Three, Shelf Seven, Box One

- **Education Act, 1944**;
- Letter(s) from Mother Angela Mary [Harley] to pupils.
- Letter from Fr. J.B. Dockery, OFM, 4th June 1972, following death of Mother Angela Mary: “...Nobody in Brentwood knows the community without Mother Angela and the gap will never be filled...Mother Angela was not perhaps the foundress of your community; but she was its saviour on more than one occasion especially in the Thirties...(pages 1 – 2).”

### Cupboard Five, Shelf Two, Box Three

In this box, as elsewhere in the Archive, is a copy of J.B. Dockery OFM, *They That Build*, Burns & Oates, London, 1963.

Eleven years after *The First Synodal Letter of Westminster*, 1852, Cardinal Wiseman invited Ursulines from Thildonck *sic* to establish four convents in England which they did in Upton (Forest Gate) 1862; Wimbledon (1892); Brentwood (1900) and Palmers Green (1917). “In 1898 at the request of Cardinal Vaughan, the English Ursulines were placed under the jurisdiction of the English Bishops (page 239).” Between 1900 and 1904 Brentwood remained a filial house to Upton, and in 1904 a Reverend Mother was elected under the authority of the Archbishop of Westminster. From then on the Convent at Brentwood had equal status with the other two Ursuline convents in London and was recognised as part of the Thildonck *sic* Congregation until its own Constitutions were approved by the Bishop of Brentwood in 1957.

- Convent Schools’ Association (CSA) especially CSA papers associated with CSA Meetings 1946:
  Dockery in *They That Build* goes on to describe the establishment of the Convent Schools’ Association in Chapter IX. “Towards the end of the First World War Cardinal Bourne called a meeting of a few religious superiors, among whom was Mother Clare [Ursuline Convent, Brentwood], to discuss the formation of a Convent Schools’ Association (CSA). This Association was formed and its first meeting was held at the Sacred Heart

---

523 Born 6th January 1889 and died 3rd June 1972. Mother Angela Mary followed Mother Clare as superior at Brentwood; it is clear from the Archive that Mother Angela Mary and Mother Clare worked closely together. The Ursuline ethos of ‘adaptive’ change in light of circumstance shaped their respective school-ministries at Brentwood.
Convent, Hammersmith on 23rd May 1918 (page 124). Much of its early business attended to the 'professional' formation of religious sisters. Dockery reviews the past, present and future of Convent education in England and Wales. Women religious-educators aimed “(a) to produce staunch Catholics and (b) to send out into the world perfect ladies (page 134)." As he looks forward to the future he indicates "that the mania for examinations may increase, and the standard of excellence demanded [is] something that would now make us gasp. Public authorities may be more exacting and interfere in matters, at present, left to members (page 140)." Here and elsewhere there is clear suspicion of the growing dominance of the State. The Sisters would find common cause with political theorists such as Herbert Spencer. Even with their competing anthropologies, both were mistrustful of the State’s perceived overbearing influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cupboard Five, Shelf Two, Box Four</th>
<th>Catholic Education, especially Education Act, 1918 (also known as the ‘Fisher Act’ whereby school leaving age raised to fourteen).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard Six, Shelf Three, Box Two</td>
<td>Angela Merici – founder of Order of Ursulines in 1535 in Brescia - woman of vision, woman of faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard Eight, Shelf Two</td>
<td>Ancient Ursuline Rule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Bills, Acts, Judgements, HMG Papers and Commentaries, Supreme Court of the United States Judgments and President John F. Kennedy Papers by Date

Cockerton Judgment, 1901.

Education Bill, 1906.

Education Act, 1918 and Hadow Report.

Education Act (NI), 1923.

Supreme Court of the United States, Judgment Pierce v Society of Sisters, 1925.

Transcript of President Franklin Roosevelt’s Annual Message (Four Freedoms) to Congress, 6th January 1941.

*Education Act, 1944.*

PREM 7 Prime Minister’s Office: Sir Desmond Morton, Personal Assistant to Prime Minister: Correspondence and Minutes, National Archives, Kew.


*Education Reform Act, 1988.*


---

**Papal & Church Documents by Date**


Leo XIII, *Libertas*, 20th June, 1888.


Pius XI, *Dilectissima Nobis*, 3rd June 1933.


Pius XII, *Democracy And A Lasting Peace*, Christmas Message, 1944.


Congregation For The Doctrine Of The Faith (CDF), *Instruction On The Ecclesial Vocation Of The Theologian* (Donum Veritatis), 24th May 1990.


[^24]: The Green Book was drawn up with officials in the Board of Education and published in June 1941.


**Appendix 2 Secondary Sources General Bibliography**


Professor James Arthur (University of Birmingham), *What is the Point Of A Catholic School?*, The Tablet, London, 1st June 2013.


http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l_D1OjNvJ3E, radio interview with Gill Bennett author of *Churchill’s Man of Mystery Desmond Morton and the World of Intelligence*.


Bishop Terence J. Brain, Letter to Mr Kevin Quigley, Director of Schools for the Diocese of Salford, 19th December 2012, (sanctioned for circulation to diocesan schools on the same day).


Amol Rajan, Decline and Fall of that Great Craft, the Knowledge, Editorial Comment in i Newspaper, London, 13th July 2012.


Stephen Schloesser, Jazz Age Catholicism: Mystic Modernism In Post War Paris 1919-1933, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 2005.


Appendix 3 Electronic Record of ‘Catholic’ Citations for & Commentary on Catholic Holders of The Victoria Cross (VC) Awarded in the Second World War 525

archive.catholicherald.co.uk/article/10th-april-1942/1/capt-j-j-b-jackman.
ww2today.com/27th-june-1942-adam-wakenshaw-mans-his-gun-to-the-end.
www.cwgc.org/find-war-dead/casulty/2777477/Garland,%20DONALD%20EDWARD.

525 These are placed in alphabetical order of the website.
The first war knighthood went to a Catholic, Sir Henry Harwood, who beat the Graf Spee in South American waters – this event is widely regarded as the first Naval success of the War when three allied cruisers disabled the pocket battleship Graff Spee that had been raiding the South Atlantic and Indian Ocean since the beginning of the war – *The Battle of the River Plate* 13th December 1939.