

# Journal of Education & Christian Belief

Vol 10 No 2 (Autumn 2006)

## Contents

Contributors	2
<i>David I. Smith, John Sullivan and John Shortt</i> Introduction: Connecting Spirituality, Justice, and Pedagogy	7
<i>Nicholas Wolterstorff</i> Teaching Justly for Justice	23
<i>Glenn E. Sanders</i> Exposing Students to Intractable Problems: Christian Faith and Justice in a Course on the Middle East	39
<i>Philip Fountain and Chris Elisara</i> Being Is Believing? Out-of-the-Box (Subversive) Education	63
<i>Doug Blomberg</i> The Formation of Character: Spirituality Seeking Justice	92
<i>Steven H. VanderLeest</i> Teaching Justice by Emphasizing the Non-neutrality of Technology	111
<i>Louis B. Gallien and LaTrelle Jackson</i> Character Development from African-American Perspectives: Toward a Counternarrative Approach	129
<i>Bradford S. Hadaway</i> Preparing the Way for Justice: Strategic Dispositional Formation Through the Spiritual Disciplines	143

# **Journal of Education & Christian Belief**

**Vol 10 No 2 (Autumn 2006)**

## **Book Reviews**

**THIS ISSUE DOES NOT INCLUDE ANY BOOK REVIEWS.**

# Journal of Education & Christian Belief

Vol 10 No 2 (Autumn 2006)

## Introduction: Connecting Spirituality, Justice, and Pedagogy

“Those who are into spirituality are usually not into justice and those who are into justice are usually not into spirituality.”<sup>1</sup> This comment was made by Nicholas Wolterstorff during his plenary address to the recent conference “Spirituality, Justice, and Pedagogy,” sponsored by the Kuyers Institute for Christian Teaching and Learning, from which the papers in this volume (including that plenary address) are drawn. A similar suspicion lay behind the conception of the conference. There is voluminous discussion of spirituality in education these days, running the full gamut from plans for explicit faith formation through efforts at a mediating “phenomenology of the distinctively human”<sup>2</sup> to maximally generic ideas of spirituality as a “heightening of awareness” and the like.<sup>3</sup> There is also a wide literature discussing educational justice, attending to matters such as discrimination and representation in relation to various aspects of personal identity and the ways in which educational provision and educational assumptions follow the paths of social privilege. An important area of intersection between these discussions does exist (see, for instance, the recent writing of David Purpel<sup>4</sup>), but nevertheless a common pattern is for writings concerned with educational justice to treat faith and spirituality with indifference, or even hostility, and for writings on spirituality in education to focus on inner realities to the exclusion of the social, and even sometimes the ethical.<sup>5</sup> These two tendencies, of course, easily become mutually reinforcing. The aim of this volume, and of the conference that gave rise to it, has been to resist the dichotomy and explore places where spirituality, justice, and pedagogy might constructively interact, with a particular focus on Christian spirituality.

Both the above comments and Wolterstorff’s talk of what is “usually” the case point to the existence of exceptions. There have indeed always been exceptions; brief exploration of a few examples from the history of Christian reflection on education may help to set the stage for the contemporary reflections in the essays that follow, and to set aside any impression that the conjunction of themes explored in them is radically new.

### Comenius and the Garden of Delight

Consider first John Amos Comenius, one of the most significant figures in the history of Western education and a Moravian bishop. His 17<sup>th</sup>-century writings had a long-term influence on Western schooling, and his textbooks were used by children for two centuries after his death. One of the things for which he is most commonly remembered is his commitment to universal education. Comenius argued that education had to be provided in common to both rich and poor, to those of both greater and lesser intellectual ability, and to both boys and girls, lest false distinctions of worth between these groups should lead to pride.<sup>6</sup> His educational program was explicitly grounded in “the expressed wish . . . for full power of development into full humanity not of one particular person, but of *every single individual*, young and old, rich and poor, noble and ignoble, men and women—in a word, every being born on earth, with the ultimate aim of providing education to the entire human race regardless of age, class, sex and nationality.”<sup>7</sup> This opposition to prejudicial treatment extended to his pedagogical goals, as he argued that “[b]ias towards persons, nations, languages and religious sects must be totally eliminated if we are to prevent love or hatred, envy or contempt, or any other emotion from interfering with our plans for happiness. . . .”<sup>8</sup> It is also reflected in the content of his school textbooks. His famous language textbook, the *Orbis Pictus*, includes a chapter on the virtue of justice, admonishing students not only that there is a sword of retribution “to punish and restrain evil men,” but that they should “stand to their covenants and promises” and “deal candidly” with their neighbor.<sup>9</sup>

These emphases in Comenius are explicitly grounded in his theology. He saw the need for universal education as grounded in the creation of each individual in the image of God. God “has frequently asserted that with Him there is no respect of persons” and “wishes to be acknowledged, to be loved, and to be praised by all upon whom He has impressed his image”—accordingly, to treat any individual injuriously, or to deny them the benefits of education, is to “commit an injury not only against those who share the same nature as ourselves, but against God Himself.”<sup>10</sup> The existence of each individual as a

being with spiritual needs, worth and potential left no room, he argued, for arbitrary exclusion of some learners: “there is no exemption from human education except for non-humans.”<sup>11</sup>

A second important thread in his thinking, not only linking theology, justice and education, but also connecting these to the desired outcomes of educational formation, is his central use of the image of the “garden of delight” as a normative image for schools, classrooms and individuals. This image is drawn in the first place from the creation story in Genesis 1, where the description of the “garden of delight” (a translation of the more familiar phrase “garden of Eden”) gave rise to a long tradition of associating that image with teaching and with spiritual formation—the individual was not only created to *indwell* a garden of delight, but to *become* one by being made just through cultivation by God.<sup>12</sup> The image is also mediated through the Old Testament prophets, where the idea of the *community* as a garden of delight is bound up with matters of justice, as when the Israelite community is spoken of as a vineyard in Isaiah 5:

The vineyard of the Lord Almighty  
is the house of Israel,  
and the men of Judah  
are the garden of his delight.  
And he looked for justice, but saw bloodshed;  
for righteousness, but heard cries of distress.  
(v. 7 NIV)

The garden of delight thus does not represent a mere nostalgia for origins, but rather an eschatological horizon of possibility to which schooling is to be held accountable.

This yoking of justice and delight with spiritual growth is reflected at many points in Comenius’ educational writings. He describes the purpose of human existence as being “that we may serve God, his creatures and ourselves, and that we may enjoy the pleasure to be derived from God, from his creatures and from ourselves.”<sup>13</sup> Schooling is to pursue this threefold service and delight as its goal. Pleasure in self is defined as “that very sweet delight which arises when a man, who is given over to virtue, rejoices in his own honest disposition, since he sees himself prompt to all things which the order of justice requires.”<sup>14</sup> This definition both draws virtue into close contact with Comenius’ view of piety as delight in God’s goodness, and points spiritual growth beyond the individual’s inner life. Youth must be taught from the beginning, he urges, “that we are born not for ourselves alone, but for God and for our neighbour, that is to say, for the human race.”<sup>15</sup> Comenius goes further: the end of education should be that “the entire world should be a garden of delight for God, for people, and for things.”<sup>16</sup> Spirituality, pedagogy, and social and environmental wellbeing are drawn together in Comenius’ theologically rooted vision of the high calling placed upon educators.

### **Freire, Easter, and Resurrection**

Turning to a different, time, a different place and a different, more politically radical vision of education, the work of the celebrated Brazilian educator Paulo Freire likewise exhibits connections between a vision for social justice, a concern for educational reform, and roots in Christian spiritual concerns. Freire is widely known for his focus on developing a pedagogy with and among the oppressed that would avoid transmitting to them and reproducing the social conditions of their oppression. Instead, Freire worked towards a “conscientization” that takes shape in a combination of critical awareness of social injustices and concrete action towards their removal.<sup>17</sup> He sought a pedagogy in which learners would be able to become conscious subjects and agents, rather than passive objects and recipients of static pictures of reality.

Freire’s passionate calls to commitment to the oppressed in Latin America and elsewhere combine the Marxist language of dialectic and revolution with the language of hope, love, and the heart, and his work has overt connections with Catholic Christianity and liberation theology. While harshly critical of the socially conservative role of particular churches and of any spirituality that would divorce the inner and the transcendent from concrete involvement in history and concrete identification with human suffering, Freire maintained that “the original Christian position is itself prophetic, at whatever point in time and place”<sup>18</sup> and wrote of the need for a “real Easter” that would not be “commemorative rhetoric” but rather, through the pursuit of liberation of the oppressed, “the death which makes life possible.”<sup>19</sup> This life-bringing resurrection stands opposed to “the lust to possess” that substitutes having for being and treats people as objects.<sup>20</sup> Freire’s emphasis on a humanizing pedagogy is explained by him as reflecting our relationship with our Creator, which is not one of dominance but rather one in which “humans have their return to their Source, Who liberates them.”<sup>21</sup> On a more personal note, Freire wrote of “the fundamental

importance of my faith in my struggle for overcoming an oppressive reality and for building a less ugly society, one that is less evil and more humane. All arguments in favor of the legitimacy of my struggle for a more people-oriented society have their deepest roots in my faith.<sup>22</sup> Here again, in a different idiom, a different branch of the Christian church (Comenius led the United Brethren, Freire's roots were Roman Catholic), and with a different political vision of justice, we find spirituality, justice, and pedagogy coming together in a fertile mix.

### **Trends in Catholic Education**

Connections between spirituality, justice, and pedagogy have also been reflected in much Catholic reflection on education in recent decades. In parallel with increasing social integration of Catholics, Popes, beginning with Leo XIII in the 1890s, issued statements about social matters, with implications for the involvement of Catholics in society. The Second Vatican Council (1962–65) was the most significant event that moved Catholics from being an inward-looking community, focused on a vertical relationship between God and the soul as central to the life of faith, to being a community with a concomitant horizontal dimension. Since love of God must be demonstrated by love of neighbor, participation in the world became the order of the day. The windows of the church were thrown open, dialogue and cooperation with people of all faiths and none became an imperative. Soon afterwards, in various major meetings of the bishops, promotion of justice and peace came to be treated as constitutive elements in communicating the Gospel. Catholic teaching during the past forty years has become increasingly saturated with such themes as justice, the common good, human dignity, solidarity, subsidiarity, recognition of the relative or derived autonomy of the secular order, stewardship, human rights, and liberation from all that prevents human flourishing. Spirituality, far from being other-worldly in orientation, became world-affirming and a spur to political action on behalf of the needy. In political theology, Johann Baptist Metz and in liberation theology, Gustavo Gutierrez became influential figures in Catholic theology, taking much further than had their predecessors, Jacques Maritain and Karl Rahner, the implications of Christian faith for social involvement and critique.<sup>23</sup>

It followed, from this shift in church teaching, that Catholic education should give more explicit attention to education for social engagement as an integral part of the duties of disciples, and that spirituality should embrace a concern for justice.<sup>24</sup> Many new resources for Catholic schools have become available that summarise, explain and explore the ramifications of Catholic social teaching.<sup>25</sup>

Thomas Groome has been an influential contributor to this stream of Catholic educational thought.<sup>26</sup> Groome, adapting ideas from Jürgen Habermas (learning for emancipation), from Paulo Freire (raising consciousness leading to greater humanization), and from Latin American liberation theology (starting from experience and committed to transforming the world in the light of the Gospel), made the promotion of justice, peace, and freedom central aims within Catholic religious education, integrated within an approach that he calls shared Christian praxis. A warm, fluent, accessible, and inspiring communicator, Groome has attracted a wide following among academics and teachers at all levels in Catholic education, from primary/elementary through to university, although his approach has not been without critics.<sup>27</sup>

As the teachings of the Second Vatican Council became more embedded in church life, one of the fruits in Catholic universities was the major effort put into promoting service learning and education for social justice as integral to the mission of Catholic institutions.<sup>28</sup> A few examples can illustrate the links being made (in Catholic educational literature) between religious and spiritual priorities on the one hand, and a love that seeks justice for our neighbour in need on the other hand. First, a political scientist, reflecting on the relationship between a sacramental perspective and what goes on in institutions, reminds readers that “Representation of Christ occurs, not in mission statements, lectures, or exhortations, but in the daily work of nurses, aides, social workers, administrators, physicians, and pastoral staff.”<sup>29</sup> Thus words about Christ must be enfolded by living out what they imply; only then do they communicate effectively. Second, a commentator on Catholic schools in Canada argues that students in such schools should “scrutinize our politics, economics and culture through the lens of the beatitudes. . . . [There should be] a strong social justice component based on ‘kingdom economics’ integrated into every economics, business and technology course whose textbooks are most often based on ‘the economics of the empire.’”<sup>30</sup> Thus Catholic education, far from being other-worldly, should be counter-cultural and prophetic. Third, with regard to students who have engaged in service learning, one observer maintains, “they have at times discovered life among the dying, happiness among the poor, joy and hope among the oppressed, and nobility among the suffering.”<sup>31</sup> This type of educational experience seeks to overturn customary ways of thinking and valuing promoted by an acquisitive society. Fourth, another champion of Catholic education suggests that “social analysis goes beyond service and being kind. It requires individuals to study the

causes of poverty, to work for more equitable and just treatment of people—especially the poor—and to risk their own status and standing for the sake of those less fortunate. Jesus was crucified because he spoke truth to power, and he calls those who wish to be Christians to do the same.”<sup>32</sup> Such education is self-involving even as it reaches out to others; it challenges thinking, even as it engages the heart. Spirituality calls upon the whole person; it entails a combination of passion, reason and activity. As another commentator puts it: “If we act without passion and reason, we are robots. If we act without passion, we lack energy. If we act without reason, we become dangerous fools.”<sup>33</sup> What all these writers have in common is their concern, as de Bary puts it, that “Education must make a difference. It’s not just an academic exercise.”<sup>34</sup> And the only way it will make a difference to the lives of learners is if they realize that they can make a difference in the lives of others.

New emphases in political and liberation theology have prompted Catholic educators to adopt a preferential option for the poor, to attend more closely to the conditions for just teaching, to be aware of the close relation between coming to know right teaching and coming to do the right thing in one’s life, and to be conscious of the need to model in classrooms and schools the kind of lifestyle to be pursued outside. Preparing for citizenship and being concerned for the common good are seen as integral, rather than irrelevant, to discipleship, even though there will always be tension (and sometimes contradiction) between the duties associated with the earthly kingdom and those that flow from fidelity to the Gospel. The spirituality/justice nexus is expressed in a number of related ways in Catholic education. Fresh understandings of the diverse factors that prevent full access to the goods offered in educational institutions have led to efforts by teachers towards greater inclusiveness. The experiences and perspectives of learners—and those of their families and communities—are taken more fully into account. If justice is one of the key virtues to be developed in students, then schools and colleges must exhibit justice in their operation, in student admissions, in staff selection and deployment, in designing curriculum, in assessing progress, in regulating community life, in celebrating worship, in the allocation of (human and material) resources, and in evaluating quality. One cannot teach justice (explicitly) if one fails to teach justly (implicitly). One cannot engage and develop the whole person in students without attending to their full personhood; this requires a discerning and open-hearted hospitality. The social and moral consequences of what is taught should be kept in mind. Special priority should be given to the needs of the disadvantaged and the stranger. Students should be encouraged to engage in acts of service that function simultaneously as occasions for learning. Collaborative learning is to be fostered, rather than merely individualist competition. Problems in the real world should be explored within the curriculum. Students should be helped to develop a sense of vocation, responsibility, and compassion.

### **Wolterstorff and Education for Shalom**

Moving back across the Christian spectrum, Reformed Christianity has a strong history of investing in Christian schooling, and of debating the proper aims and means of Christian education. The recently collected writings of Nicholas Wolterstorff, with whose comments regarding the separation of spirituality and justice we commenced these reflections, are referenced by several authors in this volume, as well as being expanded by his own essay. Those writings put forth a case for thinking of the aims and means of education in the light of the biblical vision of *shalom*. This Hebrew term, commonly—if thinly—translated as “peace,” expresses a broad vision of human flourishing that refuses dichotomies between the spiritual and the social.<sup>35</sup> Wolterstorff’s characterization of *shalom* reiterates many of the themes already mentioned:

There can be no *shalom* without justice. . . . In *shalom* each person enjoys justice. . . . *Shalom* goes beyond justice, however. *Shalom* incorporates right relationships in general, whether or not those are required by justice: right relationships to God, to one’s fellow human beings, to nature, and to oneself. The *shalom* community is not merely the *just* community but is the *responsible* community, in which God’s laws for our multifaceted existence are obeyed. It is more even than that. We may all have acted justly and responsibly, and yet *shalom* may be missing: for the community may be lacking *delight*. . . *shalom* incorporates *delight* in one’s relationships. To dwell in *shalom* is to find delight in living rightly before God, to find delight in living rightly in one’s physical surroundings, to find delight in living rightly with one’s fellow human beings, to find delight even in living rightly with oneself.<sup>36</sup>

Taking this vision of human flourishing as a starting point, Wolterstorff argues that Christian education needs to expand its horizons beyond a focus on academic excellence and personal piety to include education for compassion and for just action. This draws in pedagogical questions, such as how to call forth empathy and compassion on the part of students, how to confront them with the human faces of

suffering, the role of modeling, and how to connect an emphasis on spiritual growth with the ability to lament. Here, once again, spirituality, justice, and pedagogy become intertwined.

The point of this brief catalogue of examples is not to suggest that the views of the educators cited are uniform, to endorse their particulars, or to imply that they are the only relevant examples, but rather simply to illustrate the fact that the essays in this volume are contributions to a continuing tradition of linking spirituality, justice, and pedagogy. That tradition may be in some ways countercultural in the present (or perhaps any) context, but it is nevertheless long and substantial. Each essay in the present volume tackles some particular aspect of the complex of issues raised by linking these matters—either by focusing on some particular area of teaching and learning, such as teaching engineering or history, or by questioning some particular part of the teaching and learning process, such as character formation or the role of spiritual disciplines in learning, or often both—and locates it against a backdrop of a faith-informed concern for the well-being of creation, both human and non-human.

The volume opens with the paper cited above, “Teaching Justly for Justice,” in which Nicholas Wolterstorff argues for what he terms “primary justice” and its importance both as a main goal of teaching and a main characteristic of how we should teach. He says that Christian thinking about justice is too often limited to something that is meted out or the system that metes it out. But justice that is meted out presupposes the violation of primary justice (i.e., the justice that should characterize all our relationships at all times). It is this kind of justice that God loves and this kind of justice for which we should hunger and thirst. As a characteristic of relationships, justice focuses on the worth of the other. Teaching that is characterized by justice is therefore attentive to the worth of the other and to all the ways in which the other can be wronged, whether the other is the student or those about whom we learn in the classroom, whose writings we read, whose languages we study or whose art we enjoy. Justice is not only a characteristic of good teaching, it is also a goal of teaching. We should aim at developing in our students a love of justice so that they think in terms of justice, are alert to the presence of injustice and are disposed to pursue justice passionately.

Glenn Sanders’s paper describes an attempt to do just that — to develop in his students a concern for justice through a course on the culture and politics of the modern Middle East. He was concerned not only to introduce the students to the Middle East region and to the Islamic faith of the majority of its people but also to provide opportunity for the students to reflect on why the issues met should matter to them and what it means to live justly. Making use of the work on Sharon Parks on spiritual development in young adults, Sanders aimed to develop what Parks terms a “mentoring environment” in which to develop “probing commitment.” The course included provision for optional reflective journals on issues of justice in relation to the material being studied and group presentations to other students and to the wider college community which provided opportunity for the students to give expression to their developing commitments. Sanders’s paper includes discussion of ways in which the course was successful and ways in which it failed to achieve its objectives. He concludes with evident faith in the value of the course and determination to improve upon it in future years.

The next paper in this collection also describes a pedagogical work in progress in the form of a case study of the Creation Care Study Program in Belize. The authors, Philip Fountain and Chris Elisara, see this program as an example of Wolterstorff’s shalom model of education and they argue that “being there” through study abroad and field education may facilitate belief in an “earthy faith” that has space for an “earth justice” and an “earth spirituality.” Fountain and Elisara see empathy as not only feeling for the wounded of the world but also as relationship “with places and people that are whole, delightful and joyous.” They contend that empathy can be encouraged pedagogically through field-based experiences “that enable students to see deeply, perceive interconnectedness, and comprehend creation in a sacramental light.” Their paper concludes with an outline of a research project which would provide data to support their belief that this is so.

Doug Blomberg, in “The Formation of Character: Spirituality Seeking Justice,” discusses what he sees to be major limitations in Howard Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences even though it has made a major contribution in setting forth “some of the rich complexity of being human.” For all Gardner’s talk of the intelligences as virtues, Blomberg argues that he focuses on “intellectual character” to the detriment of the moral and spiritual dimensions of humanness and human flourishing. Blomberg finds a needed reorientation in recent discussions of “virtue ethics” and goes on to advocate the integral perspective of a Christian holistic virtue ethic which is centrally concerned with restoring relationships and therefore with both spirituality and justice. Character is situated in “a creational, community context,” and education should aim at the formation of character in such a context.

Steven VanderLeest turns our attention in his paper, “Teaching Justice by Emphasizing the Non-neutrality of Technology,” to a particular relationship, that between justice and technology. He sets out to describe ways of teaching this relationship to students and of encouraging them to just action. VanderLeest argues that technological products are not neutral: they are designed, manufactured, distributed and regulated so that their use has specific consequences. Technology is therefore biased and this bias can lead to injustice; norms of justice should therefore be applied to technological designs. VanderLeest goes on to list some case studies from the classroom that identify justice issues in what at first appear to be purely technical problems (e.g., reasons for the “digital divide,” less energy-intensive lifestyles, alternative renewable energy resources, and the honesty of advertisements for computers). He also suggests some classroom activities and techniques to help in teaching of this kind.

In “Character Development from African American Perspectives: Toward a Counternarrative Approach,” Louis Gallien and LaTrelle Jackson call for character education programs for black urban youth in the USA that are culturally mediated and responsive in that they are “steeped in the history, literature, cultural and religious values of African Americans throughout American history.” This entails a “counternarrative approach” that is in sharp contrast to the majority culture European American meta-narrative in which character education is usually located. The rich resources of oral tradition need to be explored for stories “of courage and character endemic to the history of African Americans,” stories told and retold within the community, stories that facilitate the making of meaning by helping children and young people to say who they are and that promote a sense of direction by helping them to discover who they can become.

The final paper in this collection is Bradford Hadaway’s “Preparing the Way for Justice: Strategic Dispositional Formation Through the Spiritual Disciplines.” Hadaway argues that standard service learning courses encourage a student to practice just actions and may only be successful as transformational pedagogy if the student is already disposed to take justice seriously. Drawing upon certain aspects of Kant’s view of the role of dispositional states, aspects that would bring Kant closer to advocates of virtue ethics, Hadaway distinguishes three kinds of disposition: “helping dispositions” that play a positive role in moral development; “uprooting dispositions” that undermine disruptive and destructive tendencies; and “bulwark dispositions” that counter and resist such problematic tendencies. He goes on to suggest that the spiritual disciplines of Trappist monasticism, especially as set forth by Thomas Merton, can provide models for a form of moral education that takes the student’s whole dispositional set into account. For example, the spiritual discipline of simplicity can provide a bulwark against the negative disposition to take more than our share of available resources and thereby “prepare the way” for justice.

It is our hope that these essays will play their role in helping to “prepare the way” for justice and for spiritually responsive pedagogy in our classrooms, pointing us to fresh avenues of both thinking and doing.

**David I. Smith, John Sullivan & John Shortt**

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Wolterstorff, Nicholas, “Teaching Justly for Justice,” this volume.

<sup>2</sup> Hill, Brian V., “‘Spiritual Development’ in the Education Reform Act: A Source of Acrimony, Apathy or Accord? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 37:2 (1989) pp. 169–182.

<sup>3</sup> Hay, David & Rebecca Nye, *The Spirit of the Child* (London: Fount, 1998).

<sup>4</sup> Purpel, David E., & William M. McLaurin, *Reflections on the Moral & Spiritual Crisis in Education* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Priestley, J., “Towards Finding the Hidden Curriculum: A Consideration of the Spiritual Dimension of Experience in Curriculum Planning” in *British Journal of Religious Education*, 7:3 (1985) pp. 112–119.

<sup>6</sup> Keatinge, M. W., *The Great Didactic of John Amos Comenius*, 2nd ed. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967) pp. 61–69.

<sup>7</sup> Dobbie, A. M. O. *Comenius' Pampaedia or Universal Education*. (Dover: Buckland, 1986) p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Comenius, John Amos, *Panegersia, or Universal Awakening*, trans. A. M. O. Dobbie, (Shipston-on-Stour: Peter I. Drinkwater, 1990) p.70.

<sup>9</sup> Comenius, John Amos, *The Orbis Pictus of John Amos Comenius*. (Syracuse, NY: C. W. Bardeen, 1887) p. 146.

<sup>10</sup> Keatinge (1967) p. 66.

<sup>11</sup> Dobbie (1986) p. 31.

<sup>12</sup> Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, trans. J. H. Taylor, vol. 2 (New York: Newman Press, 1982) pp. 51–52.

<sup>13</sup> Keatinge (1967) p. 72.

- <sup>14</sup> Keatinge (1967) p. 73.
- <sup>15</sup> Keatinge (1967) p. 214.
- <sup>16</sup> Dobbie (1986) p. 29.
- <sup>17</sup> Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, rev. ed. (New York: Continuum, 1996a).
- <sup>18</sup> Freire, Paulo, "Education, Liberation and the Church" in Astley, Jeff, Leslie J. Francis & Colin Crowder (eds.), *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation: A Reader on Theology and Christian Education* (Leominster/Grand Rapids: Gracewing/Eerdmans, 1996b) p. 185.
- <sup>19</sup> Freire (1996b) p.170.
- <sup>20</sup> Freire (1996b) p.170.
- <sup>21</sup> Freire, Paulo, *Educação como Prática da Liberdade*. São Paulo, Brazil: Paz e Terra, 1999) p. 48, as translated by J. Elias in *Paulo Freire: Pedagogue of Liberation* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publ. Co., 1994) and cited in Kristjansson, Carolyn, "The Word in the World: So to Speak (A Freirean Legacy)" in Smith, David I. & Terry A. Osborn (eds.), *Spirituality, Social Justice and Language Learning*. (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publ., forthcoming 2007). This section is indebted to Kristjansson's more detailed account of Freire's spirituality.
- <sup>22</sup> Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Heart* (New York: Continuum, 1997).
- <sup>23</sup> For an authoritative summary of twenty-first century Catholic social teaching, see Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004); for overviews of the connection between salvation and liberation in Catholic thought, see Brackley, Dean, *Divine Revolution: Salvation & Liberation in Catholic Thought* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004); and Martinez, Gaspar, *Confronting the Mystery of God* (New York: Continuum, 2001); for the potential of Catholic philosophy to contribute to public thinking on the common good, see Stiltner, Brian, *Religion and the Common Good: Catholic Contributions to Building Community in a Liberal Society* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999).
- <sup>24</sup> On the links between a changed understanding of the relation between the church and the world and a new concern for the common good in Catholic education, see Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press, 2001) pp. 179–187.
- <sup>25</sup> See for example Krietenmeyer, Ronald, *Leaven for the Modern World: Catholic Social Teaching and Catholic Education* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Assoc., 2000); Reidy, Pamela, *To Build a Civilization of Love: Catholic Education and Service Learning* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Assoc., 2001).
- <sup>26</sup> Groome, Thomas, *Sharing Faith* (San Francisco, HarperCollins, 1991); Groome, Thomas, *Educating for Life*, (Allen, Texas: Thomas More Press, 1998).
- <sup>27</sup> Questions have been asked about alleged defects in his ontology and epistemology, about whether he fails to do justice to the multiplicity of Christian interpretations of that faith, and about a tendency to conflate love of God and love of neighbor to love of God by love of neighbor (Martin, Robert, *The Incarnate Ground of Christian Faith*, [Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998]). He has also been accused (by Martin) of dissolving theology into anthropology, and soteriology into liberation, of inadequate treatment of the role of Christ in bringing together creatures and their creator, and by Murphy of conflating Christian education with a more universal (and abstract) understanding of religious education, and of excessive accommodation to the norms of liberal society, especially in confusing freedom with autonomy (Murphy, Debra Dean, *Teaching That Transforms* [Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2004]).
- <sup>28</sup> See, for example, Reiser, William, *Love of Learning, Desire for Justice* (Univ. of Scranton Press, 1995); Toton, Suzanne, *Justice Education: From Service to Solidarity* (Marquette Univ. Press, 2006).
- <sup>29</sup> Cochran, Clarke, "Institutions and Sacraments" in Sterk, Andrea (ed.), *Religion, Scholarship & Higher Education* (Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2002).
- <sup>30</sup> Mulligan, James, *Catholic Education: Ensuring a Future* (Ottawa: Novalis, 2005) pp. 293–294.
- <sup>31</sup> Byrne, Patrick, "Paradigms of Justice and Love" in Wilcox, John & Irene King (eds.), *Enhancing Religious Identity: Best Practices from Catholic Campuses* (Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2000) p. 276.
- <sup>32</sup> Heft, James, "Truths and Half-Truths About Leadership" in Hunt, Thomas, Thomas Oldenski and Theodore Wallace (eds), *Catholic School Leadership* (London: Falmer, 2000) p. 212.
- <sup>33</sup> De Bary, Edward, *Theological Reflection* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003) p. 111.
- <sup>34</sup> De Bary (2003) p. 164.
- <sup>35</sup> Wolterstorff, Nicholas, *Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).
- <sup>36</sup> Wolterstorff (2004) p. 23.

## Bibliography

Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, trans. J. H. Taylor, vol. 2 (New York: Newman Press, 1982).

Brackley, Dean, *Divine Revolution: Salvation & Liberation in Catholic Thought* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004).

- 
- Byrne, Patrick, "Paradigms of Justice and Love" in Wilcox, John & Irene King (eds.), *Enhancing Religious Identity: Best Practices from Catholic Campuses* (Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2000).
- Cochran, Clarke, "Institutions and Sacraments" in Sterk, Andrea (ed.), *Religion, Scholarship & Higher Education* (Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2002).
- Comenius, John Amos, *The Orbis Pictus of John Amos Comenius*. (Syracuse, NY: C. W. Bardeen, 1887).
- Comenius, John Amos, *Panegersia, or Universal Awakening*, trans. A. M. O. Dobbie, (Shipston-on-Stour: Peter I. Drinkwater, 1990).
- De Bary, Edward, *Theological Reflection* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).
- Dobbie, A. M. O. *Comenius' Pampaedia or Universal Education*. (Dover: Buckland, 1986).
- Elias, J. (1994). *Paulo Freire: Pedagogue of Liberation*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publ. Co., 1994).
- Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, rev. ed. (New York: Continuum, 1996a).
- Freire, Paulo, "Education, Liberation and the Church" in Astley, Jeff, Leslie J. Francis & Colin Crowder (eds.), *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation: A Reader on Theology and Christian Education* (Leominster/Grand Rapids: Gracewing/Eerdmans, 1996b) pp. 169–186.
- Freire, Paulo, *Pedagogy of the Heart* (New York: Continuum, 1997).
- Freire, Paulo, *Educação como Prática da Liberdade*. São Paulo, Brazil: Paz e Terra, 1999).
- Groome, Thomas, *Sharing Faith* (San Francisco, HarperCollins, 1991).
- Groome, Thomas, *Educating for Life*, (Allen, TX: Thomas More Press, 1998).
- Hay, David & Rebecca Nye, *The Spirit of the Child* (London: Fount, 1998).
- Heft, James, "Truths and Half-Truths About Leadership" in Hunt, Thomas, Thomas Oldenski and Theodore Wallace (eds), *Catholic School Leadership* (London: Falmer, 2000).
- Hill, Brian V., "'Spiritual Development' in the Education Reform Act: A Source of Acrimony, Apathy or Accord?" in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 37:2 (1989) pp. 169–182.
- Keatinge, M. W., *The Great Didactic of John Amos Comenius*, 2nd ed. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967).
- Krietenmeyer, Ronald, *Leaven for the Modern World: Catholic Social Teaching and Catholic Education* (Washington DC: National Catholic Educational Assoc., 2000).
- Kristjansson, Carolyn, "The Word in the World: So to Speak (A Freirean Legacy)" in Smith, David I. & Terry A. Osborn (eds.), *Spirituality, Social Justice and Language Learning*. (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publ., forthcoming 2007).
- Martin, Robert, *The Incarnate Ground of Christian Faith*, (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998).
- Martinez, Gaspar, *Confronting the Mystery of God* (New York: Continuum, 2001).
- Mulligan, James, *Catholic Education: Ensuring a Future* (Ottawa: Novalis, 2005).
- Murphy, Debra Dean, *Teaching That Transforms* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2004).
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004).
- Priestley, J., "Towards Finding the Hidden Curriculum: A Consideration of the Spiritual Dimension of Experience in Curriculum Planning" in *British Journal of Religious Education*, 7:3 (1985) pp. 112–119.
- Purpel, David E. & William M. McLaurin, *Reflections on the Moral & Spiritual Crisis in Education* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004).
- Reidy, Pamela, *To Build a Civilization of Love: Catholic Education and Service Learning* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Assoc., 2001).
- Reiser, William, *Love of Learning, Desire for Justice* (Univ. of Scranton Press, 1995).
- Smith, David I., "Biblical Imagery and Educational Imagination: Comenius and the Garden of Delight" in Jeffrey, David Lyle & C. Stephen Evans (eds.), *The Bible and the Academy* (Carlisle/Grand Rapids, MI: Paternoster Press/Zondervan, forthcoming 2007).
- Smith, David I. & Terry A. Osborn (eds.), *Spirituality, Social Justice and Language Learning*. (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publ., forthcoming 2007).
- Stiltner, Brian, *Religion and the Common Good: Catholic Contributions to Building Community in a Liberal Society* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999).
- Sullivan, John, *Catholic Education: Distinctive and Inclusive* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press, 2001).
- Toton, Suzanne, *Justice Education: from Service to Solidarity* (Marquette Univ. Press, 2006).
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas, *Educating for Shalom: Essays on Christian Higher Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).