

REALISM, FREEDOM, AND THE INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE HUMAN PERSON: A CATHOLIC VIEW OF EDUCATION

MICHAEL SCAPERLANDA[†]

The illusion of freeing oneself from all dependency, even from God, always ends up in new forms of slavery, violence and suppression. This is confirmed by the experience of each human being, by the history of blood shed in the name of ideologies and regimes that wished to construct a *new humanity* without God. On the contrary, in order to be authentic, freedom must measure itself according to the truth of the person, the fullness of which is revealed in Christ, and lead to a liberation from all that denies his dignity preventing him from achieving his own good and that of others.¹

As a child, I remember vividly watching in awe and wonder as Neil Armstrong bounced onto the lunar surface, uttering his famous words: “One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.” What kind of creature would dream of traveling to an inhospitable rock hundreds of thousands of miles from home? And what type of creature would assemble a team and the resources to make this dream a reality? Here in Oklahoma, my four children vividly remember the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building, which they heard and felt from their Catholic school in Oklahoma City. What type of creature would wreak havoc on members of its species by intentionally and ruthlessly

[†] Gene and Elaine Edwards Family Chair in Law and Associate Dean for Research, University of Oklahoma College of Law. I would like to thank Professors Randy Lee and Greg Sisk for reviewing the draft and providing insightful comments that have substantially improved the paper. I would also like to thank Professor James Dwyer for agreeing to respond to this paper and Professor Rob Vischer for putting this symposium together, inviting me to participate, and providing substantive criticism that helped develop the paper.

¹ ZENON CARDINAL GROCHOLEWSKI, CONGREGATION FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION *CONSECRATED PERSONS AND THEIR MISSION IN SCHOOLS: REFLECTIONS AND GUIDELINES* ¶ 37 (2002) [hereinafter *CONSECRATED PERSONS*], available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_20021028_consecrated-persons_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

killing hundreds (thousands and even millions) of innocents? This creature we call the human being is capable of scaling seemingly impossible heights and descending into unspeakable horrors.²

Reacting with amazement at the vastness of the universe, we send probes into deep space seeking contact with other life forms billions of miles from home. Some of our species spend their entire lives studying our own origins or the origins of our universe. Others spend their lives attempting to construct theories of justice to protect society's weak and marginalized. Still others dedicate themselves to practicing mercy and charity, picking the leper out the gutter and taking him home to care for him in his final hours. Some, like the firefighters and police officers entering the World Trade Center's Twin Towers on September 11, risk their own lives for the sake of strangers. Others labor to bring beauty into the world, transforming blocks of stone into sculptures like "David."

Questions of truth, goodness, justice, and beauty also permeate the more private sphere of each person's life. Young lovers raptly give themselves to each other. Parents sacrifice so that their children can have a better life. Children learn the lessons of sharing a bucket of Lego's or a carton of ice cream. Children suffer the consequences of not sharing or of taking another's toy. A family visits great-grandma and listens to her memories. A family at Yellowstone gazes at the millions of

² The founding generation recognized this tension in the human person. Compare THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE (U.S. 1776), available at <http://www.law.ou.edu/hist/decind.html> (last visited Mar. 18, 2005) (demonstrating that the framers viewed the human person as possessing inherent dignity flowing from the Creator: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."), with THE FEDERALIST NO. 51 (James Madison):

[W]hat is government itself but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

Id. See generally Michael A. Scaperlanda, *Replies to Professor Chemerinsky: In Defense of Representative Democracy*, 54 OKLA. L. REV. 38 (2001).

brilliant stars in the sky or stands mesmerized observing the paint pots, geysers, and fumaroles pouring forth from deep within the earth's belly. A small child delights as she gazes on her first Monet on a trip to the museum. Fear and excitement build in young and old alike as good struggles against evil in the "Lord of the Rings." These are all life lessons in truth, goodness, justice, and beauty. At times, however, falsehood, evil, injustice, and ugliness darken these more private moments, causing a great dissonance in the person and those around them. The wounds caused by broken marriage vows, absent fathers, abusive parents, and the lonely isolation of a nursing home are not easily healed. What type of creature is capable of tender love, cold indifference, and heated hatred?

I. EDUCATION REQUIRES A PUBLIC ANTHROPOLOGY

The educator's task is to participate in the formation of this magnificent creature. Testifying to the human person's inherent worth and dignity, the world community agrees with the Catholic Church that human persons "have an inalienable right to an education."³ This nearly universal consensus on the paramount importance of education, however, masks deep disagreement over education's end or goal. In confronting these differences, we unmask deeper and more fundamental disagreements over the nature of the human person. Education, precisely because it involves the nurturing and fashioning of human beings, will reflect the anthropological assumptions of a given society or of a given educational theorist.⁴ These assumptions may be explicit

³ PAUL VI, DECLARATION ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION *GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS* ¶ 1 (1965) [hereinafter *GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS*], available at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_gravissimum-educationis_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005); see e.g., THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS Art. 26 (1948) (stating that education should be free and compulsory at least in the lower grades and that "[p]arents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children"), available at <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html> (last visited Mar. 18, 2005); see also UNESCO, *Right to Education, Constitutional Provisions*, available at http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=9133&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005) (providing an overview of foreign constitutions that provide for a right to education).

⁴ See Rev. John Coughlin, *Law and Theology: Reflections on What it Means to be Human From a Franciscan Perspective*, 74 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 609, 610 (2000) ("Every system of law reflects certain foundational assumptions about what it means to be human."). These can be referred to as "anthropological assumptions." *Id.*

or implicit, conscious or subconscious, but they will provide the foundation for any theory of education. After all, one cannot embark on the educational process without some understanding of who is being educated or what is being trained. “Any education policy, no matter how derived, will be nonneutral”⁵—it will, of necessity, grow out of some “*explanatory hypothesis of reality*.”⁶ In other words, “[e]ach type of education . . . is influenced by a particular concept of what it means to be a human person.”⁷

Before developing my argument, it is important to note the inherently *public* nature of the educational endeavor, and, therefore, the public nature of an educational system’s anthropology. Although both liberal education and Catholic education are concerned with developing each individual pupil’s full potential, this fact does not make it a private enterprise. As already noted, the human community has made a public determination that education is a fundamental human good. Compulsory education laws impose the public’s will upon the individual, mandating that she participate, willingly or unwillingly, in this vital public project. In many societies, public financing or assistance subsidizes at least some education. Teachers, often at great sacrifice in terms of time and compensation, offer themselves as guides of various kinds to their students. On all of these accounts, the inputs into the

⁵ JAMES G. DWYER, VOUCHERS WITHIN REASON: A CHILD-CENTERED APPROACH TO EDUCATION REFORM 63 (2002).

⁶ LUIGI GIUSSANI, THE RISK OF EDUCATION: DISCOVERING OUR ULTIMATE DESTINY 118 (Rosanna M. Giammanco Frongia trans., 2001).

⁷ WILLIAM CARDINAL BAUM, THE SACRED CONGREGATION FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION *LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS: WITNESSES TO FAITH* ¶ 18 (1982) [hereinafter *LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS*], available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_19821015_lay-catholics_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005). “There is a tendency to forget that education always presupposes and involves a definite concept of man and life.” PIO CARDINAL LAGHI, CONGREGATION FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM* ¶ 10 (1997) [hereinafter *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM*], available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_27041998_school2000_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005). “Genuine education means learning how to live, and learning how to live means learning how to distinguish the important from the trivial, the better from the worse, the permanent from the transient, the questions of paramount importance from those of passing interest.” William T. Braithwaite, *Hearts and Minds: Can Professionalism Be Taught?*, A.B.A. J. 70, 73 (Sept. 1990). To make these distinctions requires a thick understanding of personhood.

educational system are public in nature. And, since the graduate will not take up residence on a deserted island, the outputs are also public in nature. Each former student will take his or her place in society; participate and cooperate in some fashion with others in the community; provide some form of work for or within the community, whether within or away from the home; and cultivate, savor, and/or consume the arts and entertainment of that community. In short, education is inherently public.

II. DWYER'S VISION OF EDUCATION

The world recognizes education as a vital public good.⁸ But, what are the goals and ends of this enterprise? The answer to this question will depend on one's concept of the human being and its place in society. We are fortunate that James Dwyer, our respondent in this symposium, has clearly articulated his anthropology—or at least the anthropology that he thinks ought to prevail in the educational process. Although Dwyer argues that “any basis for attributing personhood is arbitrary,” he wants children to be viewed as “persons rather than objects to be treated as property.”⁹ In short, he has no theory of the human person grounded in reason, experience, or reflection. But since the educational enterprise requires anthropological assumptions, he arbitrarily, by his own admission, constructs the person as a material “temporal” being whose life task is to create her own meaning and own set of values.

Dwyer sincerely desires freedom, autonomy, and happiness for each human person as she grows from childhood to adulthood.¹⁰ His fervent passion coupled with his woefully inadequate concept of the human person leads him to devise an impoverished education in what I have characterized as a liberal

⁸ See *LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 17.

⁹ JAMES G. DWYER, *RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS V. CHILDREN'S RIGHTS* 67 (1998).

¹⁰ Dwyer stated:

Freedom of the person [includes] freedom to move about, cross borders, and engage in physical activities, such as athletics or sex with other consenting persons, as well as the right not to allow public officials or private persons to harm, restrain, or otherwise violate the integrity of one's physical being. Freedom of thought and expression is the mental analogue of freedom of the person.

Id. at 155.

totalitarian state.¹¹ Dwyer would grant the state a monopoly over education and restrict the “scope of relevant considerations” to “children’s *temporal* (i.e., secular, worldly) well-being.”¹² Under his system, teachers and educational institutions would be prohibited from taking into account “children’s spiritual interests” or even “whether they have any or wherein they lie.”¹³ Dwyer’s educational proposal appears directed toward producing self-defining and self-choosing adults who can make their way in the world unencumbered by anyone else’s concept of the good. “Fostering the expansion of liberal education,” Dwyer suggests, “simply gives more children some chance of having a real choice among ways of life and conceptions of the good.”¹⁴ He sees religious parents, especially Catholics and Fundamentalists, as major obstacles to this goal. To avoid traumatizing children and to “avoid having to put parents in jail,” the move away from religiously grounded education toward a universal secularist education system must be “very gradual.”¹⁵ His second book advocates vouchers as a way to buy parents and religious schools, encouraging them to secularize without “violent standoffs” and

¹¹ See Michael A. Scaperlanda, *Producing Trousered Apes in Dwyer’s Totalitarian State*, 7 TEX. REV. L. & POL. 175, 195–96 (2002) (reviewing JAMES G. DWYER, *VOUCHERS WITHIN REASON: A CHILD-CENTERED APPROACH TO EDUCATION REFORM* (2001)).

¹² DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 15.

¹³ *Id.*

For [educators] to take account of children’s supposed spiritual interests would require [them] to assume the truth of particular religious beliefs—that children *have* spiritual interests in the first place, that those interests are of a certain nature, and that living in a certain way best serves those interests—and therefore to endorse a particular religious view, which the Constitution prohibits [the state’s monopolistic educational apparatus] from doing.

Id. at 82.

¹⁴ DWYER, *supra* note 5, at 94–95 (“Liberal education does not rule out any conceptions of the good.”); *id.* at 83 (“[O]ne must accept that the children are persons distinct from their parents, with lives they have a fundamental interest in eventually ordering according to self-chosen ends.”). “[T]he anthropological assumption of a radically autonomous individual may enshrine certain values as foundational to the law at the cost of excluding other significant human values.” Coughlin, *supra* note 4, at 613. In addition to jettisoning notions of the common good, history and tradition, “[a] system of law that is primarily concerned with individual rights may not readily enhance the goal of supporting family life. Indeed, the language of individual rights may result in a legal culture that seems hostile to the family unit.” *Id.* at 626.

¹⁵ DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 180.

without the need of “state officials to padlock doors or to jail parents.”¹⁶

Dwyer finds Catholic schools problematic—indeed harmful—to his educational vision on several fronts. In this space, I will just provide a sampling of the harms Dwyer sees in Catholic child-rearing, including Catholic education. He asserts that:

The existing evidence supports the empirical hypothesis that the methods and content of instruction intrinsic to the religious mission of Catholic and Fundamentalist schools affect the students in several harmful ways. First, these schools infringe children’s basic liberties by imposing excessive restrictions on students’ intellectual and physical freedom and fostering excessive repression of desires and inclinations. Second, they fail to promote, and in fact actively discourage, children’s development of the generalized capacity for independent and informed critical thinking (i.e., “intellectual autonomy”). Third, they foster in students dogmatic, inflexible modes of thought and expression Fourth, these schools have adverse psychological effects for many students, including diminished self-esteem, extreme anxiety, and pronounced and sometimes life-long anger and resentment.”¹⁷

Exacerbating the problem for Catholic schools is Pope John Paul II’s “notoriously conservative . . . moral instructions to the clergy and laity,” teaching that “only men may become priests; abortion, contraception, and nonreproductive sexual relations, including homosexuality, are sinful; and remarriage after divorce is impermissible.”¹⁸ “Catholic schooling, too, is marked by

¹⁶ DWYER, *supra* note 5, at 214.

¹⁷ DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 14–15. G.K. Chesterton once wrote that people in Dwyer’s position are in the worst possible spot to judge Christianity:

[T]he best judge of Christianity is a Christian, the next best judge would be something more like a Confucian. The worst judge of all is the man now most ready with his judgments; the ill-educated Christian turning gradually into the ill-tempered agnostic, entangled in the end of a feud of which he never understood the beginning, blighted with a sort of hereditary boredom with he knows not what, and already weary of hearing what he has never heard. He does not judge Christianity calmly as a Confucian would; he does not judge it as he would judge Confucianism. He cannot by an effort of fancy set the Catholic Church thousands of miles away in strange skies of morning and judge it as impartially as a Chinese pagoda.

G.K. CHESTERTON, *THE EVERLASTING MAN* 11 (1993).

¹⁸ DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 19. “[M]oral exhortations by educators effectively prevent many children from freely expressing themselves physically, exploring their sexuality, or even giving affection to others.” *Id.* at 159. “[T]he authoritarian nature of Catholic schooling and the rigidity of Catholic moral teaching appear to produce

constant reminders of human sinfulness, unworthiness, and insignificance.”¹⁹ And, “[f]emale students . . . suffer the additional threat to their self-image of being taught, explicitly or implicitly, that they are, by virtue of their gender, inferior human beings.”²⁰

To protect children from these harms, Dwyer reconceives the relationship between the state, parents, religious institutions, and children.²¹ His project “pertain[s] very broadly to legal treatment of the parent-child relationship.”²² He says that he “want[s] to challenge not just the state’s toleration of specific practices in religious schools but the entire way of thinking about child rearing in our society.”²³ He rejects parental and familiar rights, suggesting “that the very notion of parental rights is illegitimate.”²⁴ Instead, he argues:

[There should be] a legal framework that . . . confers on parents simply a child-rearing *privilege* limited in its scope to actions and decisions not inconsistent with the children’s temporal interest. A parental privilege would legally *permit* certain adults to act as parents—that is, to form an intimate relationship with a child and to perform child-rearing functions . . . but it would not accord those adults any legal claims of their own against state efforts to restrict their child-rearing practices or decision-making authority.²⁵

adolescents and adults who are dogmatic in their opinions and confrontational rather than conciliatory with persons who disagree with them.” *Id.* at 36. To counteract this repressive approach, Dwyer would put the burden of proof on religious schools “to demonstrate that condemning *all* sexual activity—including activity short of intercourse and intercourse with appropriate precautions . . . is necessary to prevent students from making self-defeating choices. Unless the school can do this, it is violating the students’ right to freedom of the person.” *Id.* at 159.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 38.

²⁰ *Id.* at 39.

²¹ I would describe Dwyer’s state as radically secularist rather than secular. In a secular state, the values of the people, including their religious values and sensibilities, shape the culture and, at times, find expression in the law. In contrast, his secularist state and its laws can only reflect secular reasoning and temporal interests. Pluralism can emerge within his secularist state, but since it excludes religious reasoning, the pluralism is thin reflecting only the various secularist ideologies.

²² DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 62.

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.* at 63.

²⁵ *Id.* at 64. “The approach I propose would likely alter to a substantial degree the limits of parental freedom and authority and the boundaries of permissible state action. In particular . . . it would require substantially greater state control over the content and methods of instruction in religious schools.” *Id.* at 65–66.

Dwyer would grant the state a monopoly over education and child-rearing. The state would then license individuals and schools to engage in parenting and education, and the state would be compelled to restrict the “scope of relevant considerations” to “children’s *temporal* (i.e., secular, worldly) well-being.”²⁶ Under his system, parents, teachers, and educational institutions, as agents of the state, could be prohibited from taking into account “children’s spiritual interests” or even “whether they have any or wherein they lie.”²⁷ As Dwyer says, “Considerations of justice for children based on judgments about their temporal interests, therefore support state control over the content even of religious instruction in religious schools.”²⁸

III. A SELF-EVIDENT TRUTH: THE SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS DIMENSION OF PERSONHOOD

In *Producing Trousered Apes in Dwyer’s Totalitarian State*,²⁹ I criticized Dwyer’s educational vision on a number of fronts and offered an alternative based on my reading of Jacques Maritain,³⁰ Clives Staples Lewis,³¹ and Luigi Giussani.³² In this essay, I continue to develop my understanding of a Catholic education. I start with what I take to be a self-evident truth: children—and adults for that matter—possess an innate spiritual and religious sense. To deny or marginalize this fact, as Dwyer does, is simply to ignore reality.³³

²⁶ *Id.* at 15.

²⁷ *Id.*

For the state to take account of children’s supposed spiritual interests would require *it* to assume the truth of particular religious beliefs—that children *have* spiritual interests in the first place, that those interests are of a certain nature, and that living in a certain way best serves those interests—and therefore to endorse a particular religious view, which the Constitution prohibits it from doing.

Id. at 82.

²⁸ *Id.* at 171.

²⁹ Scaperlanda, *supra* note 11.

³⁰ JACQUES MARITAIN, *EDUCATION AT THE CROSSROADS* (1943).

³¹ C.S. LEWIS, *THE ABOLITION OF MAN* (1947).

³² GIUSSANI, *supra* note 6.

³³ “[T]o educate means to help the human soul enter into the totality of the real. A comment on the meaning of rationality may help us to understand this definition: we define rationality, reason, as ‘the capacity to become aware of reality according to the totality of its factors.’” *Id.* at 105.

[Persons across cultures and across history face the same] fundamental questions which pervade human life: *Who am I? Where have I come from and where am I going? Why is there evil? What is there after this life?* . . . They are questions that have their common source in the quest for meaning which has always compelled the human heart. In fact, the answer given to these questions decides the direction which people seek to give to their lives.³⁴

Merely temporal, secular, or materialistic answers cannot satisfy the human heart's desire to know the truth about human existence in the face of such fundamental questions. The answer to the question of whether life has meaning must transcend the temporal because "the first absolutely certain truth of our life, beyond the fact that we exist, is the inevitability of our death."³⁵ At its core, this great inquiry into meaning is religious in nature. "The question of religious awareness, of the religious sense . . . is: 'What is the meaning of everything?'"³⁶ This inquiry "has been an integral aspect of man's behaviour at all times and tends to affect all human activity."³⁷ Therefore, education must go beyond the temporal and address the transcendent.³⁸

³⁴ JOHN PAUL II, ENCYCLICAL LETTER *FIDES ET RATIO* ¶ 1 (1998) [hereinafter *FIDES ET RATIO*]. These questions are universal. As the Pope says:

These are the questions which we find in the sacred writings of Israel, as also in the Veda and the Avesta; we find them in the writings of Confucius and Lao-Tze, and the preaching of Tirthankara and Buddha; they appear in the poetry of Homer and in the tragedies of Euripides and Sophocles, as they do in the philosophical writings of Plato and Aristotle.

Id.

³⁵ *Id.* ¶ 26.

³⁶ LUIGI GIUSSANI, *THE RELIGIOUS SENSE* 4 (John Zucchi trans., 1997).

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ It could be that this religious sense is a dangerous cancer growing within the human being and society and that this cancer must be removed by any means possible. Richard Rorty, for example, would root out the religious sense by having "nonintellectuals . . . see themselves as contingent through and through, without feeling any particular doubts about the contingencies they happened to be. . . . They would no more need to answer the question[] 'Why are you a liberal?' . . . than the average sixteenth-century Christian felt to answer the question 'Why are you a Christian?'" RICHARD RORTY, *CONTINGENCY, IRONY, AND SOLIDARITY* 87(1989). Or, it could be that this religious sense is fairly harmless if left to the private sphere as a crutch for the weak or fancy for the romantic, and only becomes dangerous when allowed to bleed over into the public square. But, these arguments would rest on the assumption that there is no God, or at least no God who wants anything to do with us, and this is an assumption that the "liberal state" cannot make and be true to its identity.

For all his denials, Dwyer implicitly recognizes this religious dimension of the person, and, in fact, his whole project is built upon the transcendent qualities of the human person. He argues that children *ought* to be treated as “persons rather than objects to be treated as property,”³⁹ and he advocates that education *ought* to be oriented toward the child’s freedom.⁴⁰ “[S]ez who?”⁴¹ If the human is merely a temporal being made up solely of material substance, why is it entitled to freedom? And why is it entitled to be treated as “a person” rather than as an “object” or as a species of “property?” Separating and distinguishing “person” from “object” or “property” suggests that personhood has qualities that transcend the human being’s material nature. Leff and Rorty both make convincing arguments that in denying the transcendent nature of the human being one denies the very foundation for treating the individual as a person worthy of dignity and autonomy.⁴² In reading Dwyer, with his insistence on personhood, freedom, and dignity, I cannot help but sense that despite the overtly secularist veneer, his project implicitly recognizes the non-temporal, non-material, and yes, even religious and spiritual qualities of the child. By insisting on treating the child as “person” rather than “property,” even he has

³⁹ DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 67; *see also supra* notes 9–14 and accompanying text.

⁴⁰ *See supra* notes 9–14 and accompanying text (arguing that a child’s rights are violated when they are not afforded an opportunity to pursue a fulfilling career).

⁴¹ *See* Arthur Allen Leff, *Unspeakable Ethics, Unnatural Law*, 1979 DUKE L.J. 1229, 1230 (1979).

⁴² *See id.* at 1232 (“The so-called death of God turns out not to have been just *His* funeral; it also seems to have effected the total elimination of any coherent, or even more-than-momentarily convincing, ethical or legal system dependent upon finally authoritative extrasystemic premises.”); *see also* RORTY, *supra* note 38, at 53, 75 (stating that without objective truth, one “cannot give a criterion for wrongness,” and, therefore, must give up “the idea that liberalism could be justified, and Nazi or Marxist enemies of liberalism refuted” by argument); JOHN PAUL II, ENCYCLICAL LETTER *VERITATIS SPLENDOR* ¶ 99 (1993) [hereinafter *VERITATIS SPLENDOR*], available at http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0222/_INDEX.HTM (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

Totalitarianism arises out of a denial of truth in the objective sense. If there is no transcendent truth, in obedience to which man achieves his full identity, then there is no sure principle for guaranteeing just relations between people. Their self-interest as a class, group or nation would inevitably set them in opposition to one another. If one does not acknowledge transcendent truth, then the force of power takes over . . .

Id.; Michael A. Scaperlanda, *Immigration Justice: A Catholic Christian Perspective*, 1 VILL. J. CATH. SOC. THOUGHT 535, 540–44 (2004).

made the leap from the temporal to the spiritual, from the material to the transcendent.

IV. WHO SHOULD CONTROL EDUCATION?: A CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE

But how to educate the whole person⁴³ in a liberal pluralistic society where people maintain diverse explanatory hypotheses of reality? And, who is going to decide how the child will be educated? Taking the “who” question first, Dwyer proposes that the state and the state alone dictate education policy.⁴⁴ Parents and religious schools may play a part in implementation but only as licensees authorized to carry out the state’s mandate.⁴⁵ In contrast, the Catholic Church envisions a dynamic interplay among the parents, religious institutions, and the state in providing each child with an education.⁴⁶ Each institution—i.e., family, Church, and state—has its own unique and complementary role to play in the formation of the child.⁴⁷

Catholicism maintains that parents are the primary educators of their children and the home is the primary school of community. “Since parents have brought children to life, they are bound by the most serious obligation to educate their offspring and therefore must be recognized as the primary and principal educators.”⁴⁸ As we shall see, love—the radical giving of one self to another—resides at the core of the educational project and parents are normally in the best position to provide an education in and through love.⁴⁹ Parents, however, cannot

⁴³ By “whole person,” I mean the integrated whole of the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual aspects of personhood.

⁴⁴ DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 179.

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 180–81.

⁴⁶ It is beyond the scope of this paper to develop and defend this position. Here I only lay it out for the reader’s information and to contextualize my idea of a Catholic education.

⁴⁷ Inevitably, occasional tensions will arise as the state and the family—and sometimes a religious institution—assert overlapping and conflicting authority. In the United States, the state in the form of the Court has assumed the role of arbiter in many of these boundary disputes. *See, e.g., Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 207, 234 (1972). The question of whether the judiciary ought to assume this role and an exploration of alternatives to judicial resolution are beyond the scope of this essay.

⁴⁸ *GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS*, *supra* note 3, ¶ 3; *see also* UNITED NATIONS, THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS art. 26 (1948).

⁴⁹ The state, in contrast, is particularly ill suited to *love* those within its jurisdiction.

succeed in isolation and are in need of help from the community as a whole in order to fulfill this duty.⁵⁰

Society's task is to assist the parents in their role as educators. Toward this end, the state has an important but limited role to play. It must: a) "protect the right of children to an adequate school education"; b) "check on the ability of teachers and the excellence of their training"; c) "look after the health of the pupils"; d) "in general, promote the entire work of the schools";⁵¹ e) "protect the duties and rights of parents and others who share in education, and to give them aid"; f) "according to principle of subsidiarity, when the endeavors of parents and other societies are lacking, to carry out the work of education in accordance with the wishes of the parents"; and g) when "the common good demands, to build schools and institutions."⁵² *Subsidiarity*⁵³ prohibits Dwyer's solution of a state educational monopoly because a state monopoly "is opposed to the native rights of the human person, to the development and spread of culture, to the peaceful association of citizens and to the pluralism that exists today in ever so many societies."⁵⁴ *Pluralism* and respect for *religious freedom* require the state to "assist families so that the education of their children can be imparted in *all* schools according to the individual moral and religious principles of the families."⁵⁵ *Distributive justice* requires "that public assistance is given in such a way that parents are truly free to choose according to their conscience the schools they want for their children."⁵⁶

Finally, in a free and pluralistic society religious institutions have a role to play in educating adults and assisting parents in the education of their children. As novelist Morris West said:

Once you accept the existence of God—however you define Him, however you explain your relationship to Him—then you

⁵⁰ *GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS*, *supra* note 3, ¶ 3.

⁵¹ *Id.* ¶ 6.

⁵² *Id.* ¶ 3.

⁵³ See generally Robert K. Vischer, *Solidarity, Subsidiarity, and the Consumerist Impetus in American Law*, in *SELF-EVIDENT TRUTHS: CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE ON AMERICAN LAW* (Scaperlanda & Collett, eds.) (forthcoming) ("[S]ubsidiarity represents the conviction that 'needs are best understood and satisfied by people who are closest to them.'" (internal citation omitted).

⁵⁴ *GRAVISSIMUM EDUCATIONIS*, *supra* note 3, ¶ 6.

⁵⁵ *Id.* ¶ 7 (emphasis added).

⁵⁶ *Id.* ¶ 6.

are caught forever with His presence in the center of all things. You are also caught with the fact that man is a creature who walks in two worlds and traces upon the walls of his cave the wonders and the nightmare experiences of his spiritual pilgrimage.⁵⁷

Religions have a role in education precisely because they propose truths about this “presence at the center of all things.” Emanating from this understanding will be an understanding of the human being in relationship to this Presence, which will in turn provide the foundation for education, giving the educational enterprise meaning and direction.

Religious institutions and religious parents would be horribly remiss if they failed to ground their educational systems in the “presence at the center of all things.” And, the liberal state would lose its *raison d'être* if it imposed on the whole of society an educational system grounded in a particular—in Dwyer’s case secularist—vision of the person and the good.⁵⁸ I have briefly sketched a Catholic view of “who” ought to be involved in the educational process and the role to be played by parents, religious institutions, and the state. Now, I turn to the central question of “how” to educate children in a pluralistic society.

V. HOW TO EDUCATE FOR FREEDOM?: DWYER’S ATHEISTIC APPROACH

Dwyer’s solution, which is to ignore or deny the pupil’s religious sense, a solution that he would impose on the whole of society, is not realistic, as I have suggested above, and is not neutral, as he admits. An educational policy that prohibits or discourages the teaching of certain material implicitly or explicitly teaches that the neglected subject is either bad for the student or of no or marginal significance to the life of the student and society. Even if it were possible to disentangle the child’s temporal self from her spiritual self, an educational system that refuses to acknowledge, much less give direction or guidance, in

⁵⁷ MORRIS WEST, *THE CLOWNS OF GOD*, at Author’s Note (1981).

⁵⁸ Professor Garnett reminds us that “[t]he hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Those who decide what children may and should learn thereby shape those children’s character and commitments as well as, by extension, those of the community.” Richard W. Garnett, *Assimilation, Toleration, and the State’s Interest in the Development of Religious Doctrine*, 51 *UCLA L. REV.* 1645, 1696 (2004).

the area of spiritual or religious development has effectively imparted a claim that religious and spiritual matters are relatively unimportant in the grand scheme of things. Far from being merely agnostic as to spiritual matters, Dwyer's proposed educational system goes further and is *de facto* atheistic in its foundational anthropology. David Schindler makes this point succinctly:

[S]imple neutrality toward God, in any moment of the creature's being, action, or thought, implies just so far a finite God: and a finite God is not really a God at all. Any such moment of simple neutrality, in other words, already and in principle implies the absence of God—implies, at least in that (logical-'onto-logical') moment, the death of God.⁵⁹

VI. HOW TO EDUCATE FOR FREEDOM?: A CATHOLIC RESPONSE

There is a Truth about reality and that Truth, if accessible by mortals, has great consequences for education, for the concepts of liberty, justice, equality, beauty, and meaning, and for how the human person ought to spend her life. In a pluralistic society, diverse voices propose varying hypotheses concerning this Truth about reality. Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Mormonism, Buddhism, and Atheism all offer different answer's to Pontius Pilate's question: "*Quid est Veritas?*"⁶⁰ Each child in such a society will be offered an explanatory hypothesis

⁵⁹ David L. Schindler, *Modernity, Postmodernity, and the Problem of Atheism*, 24 COMMUNIO 563, 567 (1997).

Modern atheism often takes on a systematic expression which, in addition to other causes, stretches the desire for human independence to such a point that it poses difficulties against any kind of dependence on God. . . .

. . . .
 . . . [W]hen the proponents of this doctrine gain governmental power they vigorously fight against religion, and promote atheism by using, especially in the education of youth, those means of pressure which public power has at its disposal.

PAUL VI, PASTORAL CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH IN THE MODERN WORLD *GAUDIUM ET SPES* ¶ 20 (1965) [hereinafter *GAUDIUM ET SPES*], available at http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_cons_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005). It is possible that atheists are correct that there is no God. But, that position ultimately requires a faith commitment in some form, faith in an accidental, purposeless, and materialistic appearance and development of the universe, the solar system, the earth, and life on earth. Any community or society that considers itself truly pluralistic would not seek to banish all other explanatory hypotheses of reality from the minds of its young.

⁶⁰ "What is truth?" *John* 18:38 (New American).

of reality—an anthropological foundation—upon which to begin to explore the universe and her own unique place in it.⁶¹ And, in a pluralistic society that recognizes the rights and responsibilities of the parents as primary educators of their children, the initial explanatory hypothesis ought to be offered, hopefully in love, by the parents.⁶² When the explanatory hypothesis is made explicit, as it ought to be in the Catholic family and the Catholic school, and the child reaches the appropriate age, she can freely test the reasonableness and coherence of the hypothesis and freely choose to accept it as Truth or reject it in favor of some other explanation of reality.⁶³ In other words, what is offered to the child may be rejected or in time replaced in the child's free will, but there must be a starting point; religious educators, including parents, are not treating the child as property simply by guiding their first steps.⁶⁴

But what does Catholic education look like and how does it differ from a secularist liberal education like the one Dwyer proposes and from other types of religious education? I assume that Professor Dwyer would agree with me that education involves a journey with the teacher serving as guide and mentor.

⁶¹ Without an adequate hypothesis of meaning:

The student will yearn from the depth of her being for some stability, along with meaning and coherence. Her deepest longings elude her when, instead of a hypothesis of meaning drawing from the deep wellsprings of *her* family's culture (be it Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Hindu, or Buddhist), she is exposed to multiple forms of meaning and ways of life and told that her task will be to find the one that suits her best. She is told to engage in critical thinking and analysis, but is given no first principles from which to reason. She is told to live out her desires and preferences, but she is given no criteria for judging between conflicting desires, no yardstick to measure when desire should give way to duty.

Scaperlanda, *supra* note 11, at 208–09.

⁶² Professor Dwyer's solution, which, in the name of preserving the child's "freedom," would mandate that every child receive a secularist education, is illiberal, non-pluralistic, and, as I have suggested elsewhere, totalitarian. *See id.* at 192–94.

⁶³ Based on his books, Professor Dwyer might object that at this point, after years of Catholic education, the student will not be able to freely reject her religious upbringing and education. Additionally, she may suffer deep psychological scarring from her experience. *See DWYER, supra* note 9 at 158–61. Everything that can be said about Catholic education can also be said about Dwyer's non-neutral and atheistic system of education. *See* Stephen G. Gilles, *Hey Christians, Leave Your Kids Alone!*, 16 CONST. COMMENT. 149, 181–82 (1999); Scaperlanda, *supra* note 11, at 187–88 n.77.

⁶⁴ GIUSSANI, *supra* note 6, at 26 ("Because it professes to be the truth, Christian faith is not only not afraid of being tested but it also extracts from every event what is true . . .").

The student in secular and religious schools alike ought to be taught the traditional subjects. In math, for example, the student will journey from numbers, to addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions, algebra, and possibly beyond. In science, the grandeur of the material world will be opened up for student wonder and exploration in systematic ways as she studies biology, chemistry, and physics. And, in science she will find some practical applications for her mathematical skills. The teacher will mediate the complex nature of the person in a community in social studies, history, and language arts classes. The desire for and appreciation of beauty will be cultivated in the fine arts. The student's journey will involve the development of her analytical and critical thinking ability while also tapping into her imagination and creativity.⁶⁵ The educator will aid in the socialization process as the student learns to live in a community, treating others with dignity and respect.⁶⁶ I suspect that Professor Dwyer and I would agree that the school, whether Catholic or secular, should excel in all of these areas. Within the subjects taught, it is not so much what is taught—although this may vary in some courses—but how the student and each of her academic subjects is approached.

The Catholic school sets out to be a school for the human person and of human persons. "The person of each individual human being, in his or her material and spiritual needs, is at

⁶⁵ William Cardinal Baum stated:

In virtue of its mission, then, the school must be concerned with constant and careful attention to cultivating in students the intellectual, creative, and aesthetic faculties of the human person; to develop in them the ability to make correct use of their judgment, will, and affectivity; to promote in them a sense of values; to encourage just attitudes and prudent behaviour; to introduce them to the cultural patrimony handed down from previous generations; to prepare them for professional life, and to encourage the friendly interchange among students of diverse cultures and backgrounds that [leads] to mutual understanding.

LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS, *supra* note 7, ¶ 12.

⁶⁶ Professor Dwyer might take issue with me here and argue that the Catholic Church does not treat women with equal dignity and respect. Here, I would let the record speak for itself, fully understanding that the reader's judgment will be determined largely by his or her underlying anthropological commitments. The Church has long championed the rights and dignity of woman. See, e.g., JOHN PAUL II, APOSTOLIC LETTER, *MULIERIS DIGNITATEM* (1988), available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_15081988_mulieris-dignitatem_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

the heart of Christ's teaching: this is why the promotion of the human person is the goal of the Catholic school.⁶⁷

But, I suspect that Professor Dwyer will also claim and firmly believe that his proposed secularist school is designed for "promotion of the human person."

This brings us full circle to the anthropological question. What is the human person, this creature capable of scaling vast heights and stooping to unbearable lows? And, should the state in a pluralistic society make, as Dwyer suggests, a public commitment to only one anthropology? Liberal secularist education is founded upon one concept of the human person, the person's journey through the educative process, and freedom for the person.⁶⁸ Catholic education is founded on a fundamentally different concept of the human person, the person's journey through the educative process, and freedom for the person. Continuing with the image of education as a journey, I want to suggest that the divergent anthropologies lead to very different understandings of life's journey and the place of education in that journey.⁶⁹

Professor Dwyer and I would agree that one point of education is to develop the skills necessary to earn a living

⁶⁷ *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 9 (quoting Pope John Paul II, Address to the National Meeting of the Catholic School in Italy (1991)).

⁶⁸ For my critique of Professor Dwyer's liberal secularist education proposal, see Scaperlanda, *supra* note 11.

⁶⁹ One of the great challenges of a symposium like this is that without a common foundation, true dialogue is extremely difficult. In discussing the American situation 40 years ago, Jesuit John Courtney Murray observed that:

The whole premise of the public argument, if it is to be civilized and civilizing, is that the consensus is real, that among the people everything is not in doubt, but that there is a core of agreement, accord, concurrence, and acquiescence. We hold certain truths; therefore we could argue about them. . . . There can be no argument except on the premise, and within a context, of agreement.

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, *WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS: CATHOLIC REFLECTIONS ON THE AMERICAN PROPOSITION 10* (1960). In this symposium, reasoned argument is made more difficult because Professor Dwyer and I disagree about first principles. He and I have fundamentally different faith commitments. He seems to believe, on faith, that a child's spiritual life is either non-existent or irrelevant to her development and education, while I believe, on faith, that it is central. He would *impose* his anthropology on the whole educational system, and I would *propose* the Catholic educational system and allow parents to choose that educational system according to the dictates of their conscience. But, in the end, unless one of us has a conversion of faith, we will disagree and must leave it to the reader to determine which system of education is more reasonable.

according to one's desire and ability. And since food, clothing, shelter, and meeting material needs are never enough to satisfy the human being,⁷⁰ he and I would agree that the educational system must provide the tools necessary to seek happiness and fulfillment in life. But what will fill the emptiness that resides in our lives? What will bring us happiness? Here is where we diverge as our differing anthropologies lead us to different conclusions on these fundamental questions.

I understand Professor Dwyer's project—and I want to state it accurately and not create a caricature of it—as a one-way journey into self-creation. In this worldview, we begin life as purely material beings of abundant potential, beings who possess desires that transcend our material nature. There is no knowable hypothesis about life's origins—other than perhaps the materialistic hypotheses contained within the naturalistic parameters of modern science—its meaning, or purpose. Secular liberal education on this account is designed to free us from those things that hold us back from our own definition of self-fulfillment and happiness. The joint opinion in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* states this vision: “At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.”⁷¹ Within this anthropology, education must include the development of skills to free oneself from the religious, moral, familiar, cultural, and historical ties that may constrain the student from the exercise of self-creation.⁷²

⁷⁰ I would argue that this longing for more than just material comfort displays the human person's spiritual and religious nature.

⁷¹ 505 U.S. 833, 851 (1992). As Professor Randy Lee wrote in commenting on my essay, “To make one-self God is to place oneself in the center. But if there already is a God at the center who has defined the universe, [the mystery passage's statement of liberty] isn't liberty but self-deception.” Comment from Randy Lee, to Michael Scaperlanda (Feb. 4, 2005) (on file with author). And, although Dwyer and this Court seem to share a similar anthropology, a vast difference separates them. The Court fears state compulsion in the forming of persons while Dwyer fears parental and religious institution compulsion. *Compare Casey*, 505 U.S. at 851 (“Beliefs about these matters could not define the attributes of personhood were they formed under compulsion of the State”), *with DWYER*, *supra* note 9, at 1–6 (proposing increased state controls over religious schools).

⁷² Professor Dwyer does, however, recognize the communal nature of the human being and concedes that “it is also important to a person's self-esteem that her life plan not be scorned by the bulk of the larger society to which she belongs.” *See DWYER*, *supra* note 9, at 172.

VII. THE PRODIGAL SON: A FORAY INTO CATHOLIC EDUCATION

In contrast to the liberal secularist one-way journey to self-creation, a Catholic understanding of the human person and what it requires to educate the person involves knowledge of a two-way journey. I will explore this journey through the prism of the parable of the prodigal son.⁷³ Jesus said:

A man had two sons, and the younger son said to his father, "Father, give me the share of your estate that should come to me." So the father divided the property between them. After a few days, the younger son collected all his belongings and set off to a distant country where he squandered his inheritance on a life of dissipation. When he had freely spent everything, a severe famine struck that country, and he found himself in dire need. So he hired himself out to one of the local citizens who sent him to his farm to tend the swine. And he longed to eat his fill of the pods on which the swine fed, but nobody gave him any. Coming to his senses he thought, "How many of my father's hired workers have more than enough food to eat, but here am I, dying from hunger. I shall get up and go to my father and [ask him to] . . . treat me as you would treat one of your hired workers." So he got up and went back to his father. While he was still a long way off, his father caught sight of him, and was filled with compassion. He ran to his son, embraced him and kissed him. His son said to him, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and against you; I no longer deserve to be called your son." But his father ordered his servants, "Quickly bring the finest robe and put it on him; put a ring on his finger and sandals on his feet. Take the fattened calf and slaughter it. Then let us celebrate with a feast, because this son of mine was dead, and has come to life again; he was lost, and has been found."⁷⁴

"Father, give me . . ." suggests a certain type of relationship between father and son, and here I make a connection with the creation accounts in the book of Genesis.⁷⁵ "God created man in his image; in the divine image he created him; male and female he created them."⁷⁶ An understanding of our origins is vital to the Catholic educational project for at least three reasons. First, we are created beings and not some freak accident of a

⁷³ *Luke* 15:11–32 (New American); see generally HENRI NOUWEN, *THE RETURN OF THE PRODIGAL SON* (1992) (providing a wonderful meditation on this parable).

⁷⁴ *Luke* 15:11–24.

⁷⁵ *Genesis* 1:1–2:25.

⁷⁶ *Id.* at 1:27.

purposeless and uncreated nature. Second, we are meant to be in relationship with our Creator. And, third, the human being possesses the *imago dei*, the image of God.⁷⁷ From this fact, and not from some mythical state of nature or hypothetical veil of ignorance, Catholic education will teach and the Catholic Church will insist on the inherent and inviolate dignity of the human person. Whether studying Catholic Social Teaching formally,⁷⁸ investigating other subjects, or learning lessons on the playground, the student in Catholic school should: a) learn to treat others as persons and not as objects or property to be used or manipulated for the student's own purposes; and b) be given a coherent reason for why others should be treated with this equal dignity and respect.⁷⁹ The student should be challenged to accept the humanity of the homeless and destitute, the disease ravaged,⁸⁰ the immigrant,⁸¹ the prisoner on death row,⁸² the elderly,⁸³ the

⁷⁷ See Counterbalance Foundation, *Meta-Library: General Term: Imago Dei* ("image of God"), at <http://www.meta-library.net/theogloss/imago-body.html> (last visited Mar. 18, 2005) (indicating that *imago Dei* means "image of God," referring to mankind).

⁷⁸ See generally PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR JUSTICE AND PEACE, COMPENDIUM OF THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH (2005), available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/justpeace/ (last visited March 4, 2005); Mirror of Justice, *A Blog Dedicated to the Development of Catholic Legal Theory*, at <http://www.mirrorofjustice.com> (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

⁷⁹ For the past several years, I have judged high school debate and acting at some very good state schools around Oklahoma. The hallways and classrooms of these schools are filled with posters promoting respect for one's self and for others, honesty, tolerance, and the celebration of diversity. It has seemed to me that the slogans ring hollow because the educators in these schools cannot provide an adequate and reasonable explanation of why others ought to be treated with respect, why one ought to be honest if gain can be made from being dishonest, why tolerance and celebration of diversity are goods to be advanced, and what criteria should be used to determine behavior that ought not be celebrated or tolerated. Like Dwyer, these schools want to offer a thick conception of the personal rights, claiming that children ought to be treated as "persons rather than objects," but can only offer a very thin conception of the person, since "any basis for attributing personhood is arbitrary." See DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 67. If the school is successful in teaching critical thinking skills, its brighter students will reject as unreasonable the proposal that a thick conception of rights can be built on an arbitrary concept of personhood.

⁸⁰ See, e.g., JOHN PAUL II, POST-SYNODAL APOSTOLIC EXHORTATION *ECCLESIA IN AMERICA* ¶ 18 (1999), available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_22011999_ecclesia-in-america_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

⁸¹ See, e.g., PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR THE PASTORAL CARE OF MIGRANTS AND ITINERANT PEOPLE, *ERGA MIGRANTES CARITAS CHRISTI* (The Love of Christ Towards Migrants) (2004), available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/migrants/documents/rc_pc_migrants_doc_20040514_erga-migrantes-caritas-christi_

person with a homosexual orientation,⁸⁴ and the unborn (as well as the mother who has had an abortion).⁸⁵ At times these lessons will be reinforced by service projects oriented toward exposing students to the most marginalized segments of society while providing aid to those vulnerable populations. When adequately grounded in Christian anthropology, these projects will help the students develop a sense of solidarity with those who are so often ignored or forgotten by the rest of society.

“So the father divided the property between them. After a few days, the younger son collected all his belongings and set off to a distant country.”⁸⁶ We are made to live in relationship with the Father, to labor along side Him under His protection and guidance, but He values our freedom more than our presence within His house.⁸⁷ In the parable, the father not only allows the child to leave but gives him half the estate although the son is entitled to nothing.⁸⁸ Since God values the human person’s freedom, the Catholic school ought to respect the freedom of

en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005); CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES, STRANGERS NO LONGER: TOGETHER ON THE JOURNEY OF HOPE (2003), available at <http://www.usccb.org/mrs/stranger.shtml> (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

⁸² See, e.g., CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ¶¶ 2266–67 (2d ed. 1997).

⁸³ See, e.g., JOHN PAUL II, ENCYCLICAL LETTER *EVANGELIUM VITAE* ¶ 94 (1995) [hereinafter *EVANGELIUM VITAE*], available at http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0141/_INDEX.HTM (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

⁸⁴ See, e.g., CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ¶ 2358 (“They must be accepted with respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided.”).

⁸⁵ See, e.g., *EVANGELIUM VITAE*, *supra* note 83, ¶ 99.

⁸⁶ *Luke* 15:12–13 (New American).

⁸⁷ See MARÍA RUIZ SCAPERLANDA & MICHAEL A. SCAPERLANDA, *THE JOURNEY: A GUIDE FOR THE MODERN PILGRIM* 66–67 (2004).

After God created the human person in the divine image, [H]e provided a home in the Garden of Eden and invited male and female “to cultivate and care for it” (Gn 2:15). As with everything else in the created order, there were boundaries beyond which danger lurked. Like any good parent, God informed Adam and Eve of the boundaries, forbidding them to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. God also told them up front what would be the consequences of disobedience.

Respecting their freedom, God allowed Adam and Eve to reject [H]is invitation But even after their disobedience, it is clear that God watched over them, providing them with “leather garments [by] which He clothed them” and settling them in a new land (Gn 3:21).

Id. (alteration in original).

⁸⁸ The son is entitled to nothing for two reasons. First, an inheritance is received after the death of the parent. *Numbers* 27:8–11 (indicating that inheritance does not pass until death). Second, in the Hebrew culture, only the oldest son inherited. *Deuteronomy* 21:15–17 (discussing the rights of the firstborn son).

conscience of each of its pupils. Some students will not be Catholic, and they should not be forced to confess a creed they do not believe. They should also not be left to feel inferior for not professing the faith.⁸⁹ Some Catholic students may come to reject the faith given to them by their parents. When this happens, the educator is duty bound to respect the student's conscience, hopefully handling the situation the way the father did in Morris West's *The Clowns of God*:

"The fact is, Father, I'm no longer a believer."

"In God, or specifically in the Roman Catholic Church?"

"In neither."

"I'm sorry to hear it, son." Mendelius was studiously calm.

"I've always felt the world must be a bleak place without some hope of a hereafter. But I'm glad you told me. . . ."

. . . .

"Are you angry with me?"

"Dear God, no!" Mendelius heaved himself out of his chair and clamped his hands on the young man's shoulders. "Listen! All my life I've taught and written that a man can walk only the path he sees at this own feet. If you cannot honestly assent to a faith then you must not. . . ."

. . . But remember one thing, son. Keep your mind open, so that the light can always come in. Keep your heart open so that love will never be shut out."⁹⁰

When the teacher and the school respect the conscience of those who reject the Catholic faith and Catholic teaching, other students will learn this lesson by example.

The child's freedom does not translate, however, into a loss of the Catholic school's freedom to teach what it believes to be true

⁸⁹ "It cannot be imposed, but is offered . . . as good news, and as such can be refused." GABRIEL-MARIE CARDINAL GARRONE, THE SACRED CONGREGATION FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL* ¶ 59 (1977) [hereinafter *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL*], available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ccatheduc_doc_19770319_catholic-school_en.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

At times there are students in Catholic schools who do not profess the Catholic faith, or perhaps are without any religious faith at all. Faith does not admit of violence; it is a free response of the human person to God as He reveals Himself. Therefore, while Catholic educators will teach doctrine in conformity with their own religious convictions and in accord with the identity of the school, they must at the same time have the greatest respect for those students who are not Catholics.

LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS, *supra* note 7, ¶ 42.

⁹⁰ WEST, *supra* note 57, at 52.

and to impose rules regarding conduct designed for the good of the student and for the common good of those within the school. After graduation, the student can reject the Church and its teachings, and take what was given by parents and teachers—an education—to make her own way in the world, free of what she believed were unwarranted restrictions on her freedom within the Church and family. This is the story of the prodigal son's journey away from the father's house. The son evidently believed that his father's house was too confining and that freedom could be achieved by leaving the estate.

The prodigal son's journey away from the father's estate is also the story of the whole of humanity. Returning again to the Book of Genesis, we see that Adam and Eve found living on God's estate too restrictive. He had placed them in the Garden of Eden "to cultivate and care for it."⁹¹ They had all they needed, were given dominion over the earth, were in relationship with their Creator, and even had naming rights over all the animals. God imposed only one rule, which he said was for their own good: "You are free to eat from any of the trees of the garden except the tree of knowledge of good and bad. From that tree you shall not eat; the moment you eat from it you are surely doomed to die."⁹² In eating the forbidden fruit, Adam and Eve chose to take their inheritance and become their own gods.⁹³ Like the prodigal son, they were free, or so they thought. The prodigal "squandered his inheritance on a life of dissipation"⁹⁴ or, as I like to put it, on wine, women, and song. His freedom from his father, like Adam and Eve's freedom from God, turned out to be an illusion. What he thought would bring freedom and happiness ended in servitude and despair. Freedom divorced from truth is slavery.⁹⁵

The student needs to understand sin and evil. Hunger, emptiness, despair, brokenness, the sense that we can be our own gods, and the illusion that freedom requires an untethering from that which grounds us, gnaw at humanity just as much as they did when Cain killed his brother Abel.⁹⁶ The twentieth century was certainly no stranger to these phenomena. We need only

⁹¹ *Genesis* 2:15.

⁹² *Genesis* 2:16–17.

⁹³ *See Genesis* 3:1–7.

⁹⁴ *Luke* 15:13.

⁹⁵ *VERITATIS SPLENDOR*, *supra* 42, ¶ 99.

⁹⁶ *See Genesis* 4:8.

remember Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, and Cambodian and Rwandan genocide to get the point on a massive scale. And the start of the new millennium with terrorism raging worldwide suggests that human beings left to their own devices will not break this cycle. As societies, and as individuals, we experience brokenness, incompleteness, and a sense of alienation. Television air time is full of ads for getting fit, losing weight, looking younger, looking sexy, increasing sexual performance, fighting depression, and a host of other debilitating mental conditions. New Year's resolutions are made and quickly broken and forgotten. Students know that evil exists; they often experience it intimately in their own lives in dysfunctional or broken homes, at school, or in their neighborhoods. And they know and experience that their will is often too weak to do the thing they know they ought to do—e.g., truth telling.

A secularist liberal education aimed at creating self-defining human beings, each with her own particular vision of the good, cannot provide a coherent explanation of why some visions of the good are objectively wrong or evil.⁹⁷ Even if it could overcome that hurdle, it still has two more to scale: why is there evil and by what criteria do we distinguish good projects from evil projects? A Catholic understanding of the creation and the fall provides the student with an internally coherent account of prodigal humanity's journey away from God and into undeniable brokenness, restlessness, and longing.

"Coming to his senses . . . he got up and went back to his father."⁹⁸ Catholic education also proposes a way back to health, to wholeness, to happiness, and to true freedom. Although the parable does not delve into how the son returned to his senses or how he got back home, human experience fills in the blanks, telling us that we need the help of others to successfully make the journey. Real life prodigal Rita Grant, a former cheerleader and homecoming queen, provides a chillingly poignant example. Leaving her five children in Florida, she opted for "[t]he so-called free life" in San Francisco.⁹⁹ Homelessness, heroin addiction, and

⁹⁷ If one were to say that it is morally wrong to kill a six month old infant, another person might say that the infant is a nuisance because of the changed economic or health circumstances of the mother and killing it, after all, is only terminating a potential life. Cf. PETER SINGER, *PRACTICAL ETHICS* 81–83 (1979).

⁹⁸ *Luke* 15:17, 15:20.

⁹⁹ Kevin Fagan, *Shame of the City: Reclaiming Her Life*, S.F. CHRON., Jan. 9, 2005, at A1.

AIDS each unmasked her illusion, revealing her life for the stinking mess it had become. She was convinced that “nobody else really g[ave] a damn about [her.] But Grant was wrong. Her family and her friend . . . still cared.”¹⁰⁰ Learning about Rita from an earlier story in the Chronicle, Rita’s daughter and an old high school friend engaged in a “rescue mission” designed to get Rita off the streets, away from this deadly false understanding of freedom and back on the road to a life of authentic freedom worthy of a human being.¹⁰¹ She is now clean, living in her sister’s house, planning to go to school, and saving money to buy a set of teeth to replace the ones she lost living the “free” life.¹⁰²

Catholic education teaches that God conducted a “rescue mission” 2,000 years ago in the person of His Son Jesus Christ. The pivotal moment in Rita’s life was the moment when love rescued her and gently restored her to her humanity. And so it is with us. The Catholic educator will teach her students that the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Christ are the key for unlocking all of history. Inscribed above the entrance to the main building at my secular alma mater are the words from John’s Gospel: “[Y]ou will know the truth, and the truth will set you free.”¹⁰³ Just like Adam and Eve, Rita learned the hard way that freedom divorced from the truth about ourselves, our origins, purposes, and destination, leads to despair and even death. For all of humanity, as it was for Rita and the prodigal son, the truth is that we are free when we choose to allow ourselves to be loved fully and completely by another. True freedom, the Catholic educator will teach, resides in allowing ourselves to be loved by our Creator who provides us the way home in the person of Jesus.

Catholic education begins then, not in ideology, but in relationship.¹⁰⁴ It centers around a love story—the greatest love story ever told. God, who is Love, created the human person in

¹⁰⁰ *Id.* at A15.

¹⁰¹ *See id.* As the article describes, Rita had to be a willing participant in the rescue. Rescue attempts for other members of the homeless population failed because the homeless person was unwilling to cooperate with the gift they were being offered. *Id.*

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ *John* 8:32.

¹⁰⁴ *See generally* LUIGI GIUSSANI, WHY THE CHURCH (2000); LUIGI GIUSSANI, AT THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTIAN CLAIM (1998) [hereinafter GIUSSANI, AT THE ORIGIN]; GIUSSANI, *supra* note 36; GIUSSANI, *supra* note 6.

His own image. As a faithful lover, He desired our goodness and happiness, which rests in communion with Him together with other human beings. But, as a faithful lover, He respected the freedom of the human spirit. Like the prodigal son, humankind abused its freedom, rejecting the Father, and setting ourselves up as the authors of our own lives and destinies. Loving us, knowing that this alienation from Him would lead to our despair, but always respecting our freedom, this divine Lover has pursued the human race from the beginning, seeking our happiness.¹⁰⁵ In the ultimate act of love, God became one of us to lead us back to Himself through the cross. Modern day mystic and songwriter, Danielle Rose, put it this way:

I want my love to be beautiful.
I want to be who you've made me to be,
A love given up for all.
Only the cross reveals true love.
The cross reveals true beauty.¹⁰⁶

Christ and His Gospel, therefore, are central to an authentic education since Christ's life, death, and resurrection are the apex of history, providing meaning to everything. Like Rita's sister, the Father wants to "celebrate . . . because [this son of mine] was dead and has come to life again; he was lost and has been found."¹⁰⁷ Jesus, the rescuer, is "the way and the truth and the life,"¹⁰⁸ providing the foundation for Catholic education.

In exploring her dreams, hopes, and desires, the Catholic school student will learn that Christ reveals her to herself. "The truth is that only in the mystery of the Incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light. . . . Christ . . . by the revelation of the mystery of the Father and His love, fully reveals man to man himself and makes His supreme calling clear."¹⁰⁹ Through His incarnation Christ unites us to Himself, restoring in us "the divine likeness which had been disfigured from the first sin Through Christ and in Christ, the riddles of sorrow and death grow meaningful. Apart from His Gospel, they overwhelm

¹⁰⁵ SCAPERLANDA & SCAPERLANDA, *supra* note 87, at 67 ("God invites us, gives us total freedom to respond, watches over us whether we respond well or poorly, and continually calls us back when we make wrong choices").

¹⁰⁶ DANIELLE ROSE, *True Love*, on MYSTERIES CD (2003).

¹⁰⁷ *Luke* 15:32.

¹⁰⁸ *John* 14:6.

¹⁰⁹ *GAUDIUM ET SPES*, *supra* note 59, ¶ 22.

us.”¹¹⁰ And by adhering to and imitating the person of Christ, the human person “becomes capable of discharging the new law of love.”¹¹¹

Our origin, being, and eternal destination are in God who in His being is an ongoing relationship of Father, Son, and Spirit. We are made to accept God’s love freely and to choose freely to know and love Him in return.¹¹² Mirroring the Trinity, the human person is communal by nature¹¹³ and is called by the second great commandment to be in relationship with other human persons by loving our neighbor as we love ourselves.¹¹⁴ In this life, God has made us stewards of the earth, calling us to cultivate its resources as we cultivate the human community.¹¹⁵ With God and with each other, we are, therefore, in some sense in relationship with all creation.¹¹⁶

Catholic education begins, then, with a proposal about the human person and her relationships with the Creator, other people, and nature. It attempts to sustain and develop the child’s awe and wonder at God and His creation. It teaches that through the sacramental life lived within the Church, the human person can grow in holiness and journey toward our eternal destination of seeing our lover face to face. The relational and incarnational nature of our earthly pilgrimage require that the teacher offer himself or herself completely to the students.¹¹⁷ In this way the teacher becomes the living embodiment of the Christian proposal.¹¹⁸ The teacher has the dual obligation of

¹¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹¹ *Id.*

All this holds true not only for Christians, but for all men of good will in whose hearts grace works in an unseen way. For, since Christ died for all men, and since the ultimate vocation of man is in fact one, and divine, we ought to believe that the Holy Spirit in a manner known only to God offers to every man the possibility of being associated with this paschal mystery.

Id.

¹¹² See CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ¶ 1 (2d ed. 1997).

¹¹³ See *id.* ¶¶ 1877–78.

¹¹⁴ *Matthew* 22:39 (New American).

¹¹⁵ *Genesis* 2:15.

¹¹⁶ See, e.g., *Psalms* 108 (“My heart is steadfast, God; my heart is steadfast. I will sing and chant praise. Awake, my soul; awake, lyre and harp! I will wake the dawn.”); *Daniel* 3:57–88.

¹¹⁷ Cf. GIUSSANI, *supra* note 6, at 111 (“To educate is to communicate one’s self, to communicate one’s way of approaching reality, for a person is a living mode of relating to reality.”).

¹¹⁸ As stated by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education:

seeing the face of Christ in each of her students and of being Christ, modeling Christ's sacrificial love—for each of her students.¹¹⁹ “[T]he educator can never forget that students need a companion and guide during their period of growth; they need help from others in order to overcome doubts and disorientation.”¹²⁰ By openly participating in the sacramental life of the Church; by living a life of love and by loving life; by a commitment to one's students that goes beyond the mere technical transmission of knowledge; by displaying justice and mercy in one's relations with other teachers, parents, administrators; by acts of forgiveness and reconciliation; and, where appropriate, by showing one's own brokenness and total need for God's saving grace, the teacher silently but profoundly proposes a way of life to one's students.

The goal of education from a Catholic perspective is the “integral formation of each student.”¹²¹ Integral formation requires the full development and integration of all the human faculties: spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional.¹²² Christ “came so that [we] might have life and have it more abundantly,¹²³ but we cannot have life abundantly if we are dis-

The nobility of the task to which teachers are called demands that, in imitation of Christ, the only Teacher, they reveal the Christian message not only by word but also by every gesture of their behaviour. This is what makes the difference between a school whose education is permeated by the Christian spirit and one in which religion is only regarded as an academic subject like any other.

THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL, *supra* note 89, ¶ 43.

¹¹⁹ “Students should see in their teachers [a] Christian attitude and behaviour . . . Without this witness . . . they may begin to regard Christian behaviour as an impossible ideal.” *LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 32.

[Catholic education] proposes Christ, Incarnate Son of God and perfect Man, as both model and means; to imitate Him, is, for all men and women, the inexhaustible source of personal and communal perfection. Thus, Catholic educators can be certain that they make human beings more human. Moreover, the special task of those educators who are lay persons is to offer to their students a concrete example of the fact that people deeply immersed in the world, living fully the same secular life as the vast majority of the human family, possess this same exalted dignity.

Id. ¶ 18.

¹²⁰ *Id.* ¶ 33; *see also* GIUSSANI, *supra* note 6, at 105–06.

¹²¹ *LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 28.

¹²² *Id.* ¶ 17 (“Integral formation . . . includes the development of all the human faculties of the students, together with preparation for professional life, formation of ethical and social awareness, becoming aware of the transcendental, and religious education.”).

¹²³ *John* 10:10 (New American).

integrated beings. We know from experience, for example, that conflicting human emotions and passions are often at war with one another within a person. Without an adequate understanding of our origin, purpose, and destination, our intellect will lack adequate criteria for choosing between conflicting passions, leaving us slaves to the strongest passions, emotions, and/or physical sensations.¹²⁴ The wisdom of the Catholic Church suggests that integral formation takes place best when the student realizes that life is a precious gift given by Another, responds to that gift with gratitude toward that Other, and takes advantage of the resources available to develop all her faculties to, in turn, become a gift for others.¹²⁵ The more she comes to see life as a precious gift from a loving God, the more she will desire continued formation in the cardinal virtues of justice, wisdom, courage, and moderation; and the theological virtues of faith, hope, and love.¹²⁶ Through her response to God's grace, she will gradually loosen the bonds of slavery that bind her as a prodigal daughter. She will gradually reject the limits of the physical laws of scarcity choosing to live a life of abundance by spending herself for others. In the Catholic school, each academic subject will have its own methods and rules, which must be respected,¹²⁷ but the Catholic educator will show how "all subjects collaborate, each with its own specific content, to the formation of mature personalities."¹²⁸ As the children mature, they will be able "to open themselves more and more to reality, and to form in themselves a clear idea of the meaning of life."¹²⁹

Our ultimate end is to live eternally in the presence of God. A Catholic education ought to prepare a student to take the

¹²⁴ See LEWIS, *supra* note 31, at 23–24.

¹²⁵ See *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL*, *supra* note 89, ¶ 31.

[The Catholic school] must develop persons who are responsible and inner-directed, capable of choosing freely in conformity with their conscience.

This is simply another way of saying that the school is an institution where young people gradually learn to open themselves up to life as it is, and to create in themselves a definite attitude to life as it should be.

Id.; see also Jesús A. Izaguirre, *The Urgency of an Integral Formation* (May 1, 2002) (unpublished dissertation, University of Notre Dame) at http://www.nd.edu/~izaguirr/webpage_files/formation.html (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

¹²⁶ See generally PETER KREEFT, *BACK TO VIRTUE* (1992).

¹²⁷ See *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL*, *supra* note 89, ¶ 39.

¹²⁸ *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 14.

¹²⁹ *LAY CATHOLICS IN SCHOOLS*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 17.

journey toward our ultimate destination seriously. God has also given us this temporal life, placed us in community, and asked us to “cultivate and care for” the earth.¹³⁰ Toward this end, a Catholic education ought to propose to the student a radical engagement with reality. Whether the student’s temporal destiny is to labor as a lawyer, geneticist, filmmaker, musician, engineer, janitor, or chef, a Catholic education can help the student elevate this work from a mere paycheck, status symbol, or ego trip to a vocation in service to humanity. She will have been taught that all humans no matter how annoying, bad, or inconvenient, are created in God’s image and therefore are of inestimable value and should be approached and treated not as objects for one’s own gratification but as sons and daughters of God. She will have been taught that love requires a radical giving of oneself that is only truly possible through grace and that this love requires a preferential option (a standing in solidarity with) the weakest and most marginalized among us. As she leaves the Catholic school, she will be prepared to participate in building a truly human culture—what Pope John Paul II has called a “culture of life”¹³¹—whether she wins a Nobel Prize or lives a quiet life solely engaged in the “quotidian mysteries.”¹³²

VIII. THE PUBLIC NATURE OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION

As we have seen, Catholic education is directed at “the formation of the whole” person based on “a specific concept of the world, of man, and of history.”¹³³ Catholic schools are often perceived in the United States as “private” schools as opposed to “public” schools. This inaccurate characterization derives in part from the mechanisms for funding education in our society, with state-funded schools being designated as public and non-state funded schools being labeled private. The Catholic school,

¹³⁰ *Genesis* 2:15 (New American).

¹³¹ See *EVANGELIUM VITAE*, *supra* note 83, ¶¶ 82, 97–98.

¹³² See KATHLEEN NORRIS, *THE QUOTIDIAN MYSTERIES* (1998).

¹³³ *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL*, *supra* note 89, ¶ 8. In the 2002-2003 school year, there were 8,000 Catholic primary and secondary schools in the United States educating 2.5 million students, including 26% minorities and 13.4% non-Catholic students. These “Catholic schools represent 29.8% of all private schools and enroll 48.6% of all private school students.” See UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS: 2002-2003*, available at <http://www.usccb.org/education/fedasst/statistics.htm> (last visited Mar. 18, 2005).

however, is public in the truest sense of the word in at least five ways.¹³⁴ First, Catholic education is not a matter of “private initiative” but arises from the Church’s self-understanding as a public entity in service to the world community.¹³⁵ Second, in “her refusal to accept unquestioningly educational projects which are merely partial,” the Catholic school provides “an example and stimulus for other educational institutions.”¹³⁶ This essay, for example, has contrasted the partial—i.e., temporal, secular—education proposed by Dwyer with the Catholic desire to develop the whole person through integral formation. Third, in providing education, the Catholic Church shares with parents, the state, and other educational institutions the universally recognized communal obligation to educate the young.¹³⁷ Fourth, “although clearly and decidedly configured in the perspective of the Catholic faith, [Catholic education] is not reserved to Catholics only, but is open to all those who appreciate and share its qualified educational project.”¹³⁸ And, fifth, its “presence guarantees cultural and educational pluralism and, above all, the freedom and right of families” to educate their children according to the dictates of their consciences.¹³⁹

Authentic freedom is the true goal of a Catholic education because “[e]ducation to freedom is a humanizing action.”¹⁴⁰ Adam and Eve, the prodigal son, Rita, and countless students living in broken or dysfunctional families have intimately experienced the devastation wrought by the false freedom offered by those who advocate a life of self-creation divorced from the truth of the human person. The Catholic Christian proposal is a reasonable one,¹⁴¹ corresponding with the deepest desires of the human heart for truth, beauty, and goodness.¹⁴² Of course, those

¹³⁴ Defending each of these propositions is beyond the scope of this essay.

¹³⁵ See *THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM*, *supra* note 7, ¶ 16.

¹³⁶ *Id.*

¹³⁷ See *id.*

¹³⁸ *Id.*

¹³⁹ *Id.*

¹⁴⁰ *CONSECRATED PERSONS*, *supra* note 1, ¶ 52 (“It is a matter of educating each student to free him/herself from the conditionings that prevent him/her from fully living as a person, to form him/herself into a strong and responsible personality, capable of making free and consistent choices.”).

¹⁴¹ See generally *FIDES ET RATIO*, *supra* note 34; GIUSSANI, AT THE ORIGIN, *supra* note 104, at 24–34.

¹⁴² GIUSSANI, *supra* note 36, at 113–19.

2005]

A CATHOLIC VIEW OF EDUCATION

97

who are still trying to flee the freedom found in the Father's house will see confinement, tyranny, and enslavement where I see freedom. In a pluralistic society, these individuals can freely choose to educate their children toward an alternate conception of freedom. In freedom, the Father lets them go, but He does not abandon them, leaving them as an inheritance the gift of life and an ingrained sense of the transcendent dignity of the human person, which led Professor Dwyer to conclude that children ought to be treated as "persons rather than objects."¹⁴³

¹⁴³ DWYER, *supra* note 9, at 67.

