

interest is the significant fact that when we study the written comments of individuals—boys and girls—as opposed to avowals of faith (measured in degrees of certitude!), we find very little difference between churchgoers and non-churchgoers. In fact, the *apparent* superiority of the churchgoer in his/her grasp of religious ideas amounts to little more than a display of verbalisms gleaned from the pulpit.

The most prominent feature of all the answers is a basic confusion between two types of thought: empirical thinking and teleological thinking. As the writer says, this reflects the basic difficulty for all believers in a society which has been transformed by science. It is hardly fair to blame young people for theological illiteracy when theology itself is so much a matter of debate. 'Though they [the pupils] are mostly convinced that there must be some underlying purposive power to which they, sometimes grudgingly, will accord the name "God", they find difficulty in thinking about it because they have no imaginative concepts by which they can picture it to themselves and so think accurately about it' (p. 176).

It is hardly surprising that the attitude of Sixth Formers towards their Religious Instruction is closely related to this mere general difficulty. In matters where the subjective element is so strong and where traditional theological concepts have little or no meaning, there is understandable resistance to indoctrination of any kind; the opposition to having

religion 'forced down one's throat' (to quote a typical comment) is perhaps the most prevalent feeling amongst modern teenagers. What emerges more clearly than anything else in the free comments recorded in this book (and they substantiate what many experienced teachers already know) is the insistence that there should be much more class discussion at every level in Grammar School R.I. Only in this way, it is believed, can there be a genuine dialogue between teacher and pupils—a dialogue in which the pupils are learning not merely to think for themselves but to 'discover' themselves in the difficult process of growing up. Most Sixth Formers, of course, experience some teaching of this kind, and they appear to appreciate the wider opportunities for discussion which they find when they reach the Sixth Form; but they deplore the type of teaching that they received lower down the school, in particular the emphasis on Old Testament History which is both badly taught and (in the pupils' view) irrelevant.

Clearly, a number of vast issues are raised by these conclusions. Some of them are severely practical like the problem of large classes (How does one *discuss* with 30 or 40 children?). Others go to the very root of the religious problems confronting man in the twentieth century and remind us that the question we all face is, How to find adequate language to convey religious experience.

J. F. ELTON

**RELIGIOUS EDUCATION**, ed. by Dom Philip Jebb. *Darton Longman and Todd, London, 1968. 275 pp. 30s.*

Here is a group of ten papers, forming the 8th Downside Symposium, on various aspects of religious education. The editor has made a gallant but unconvincing claim for their unity; in fact they have little—and are therefore very hard to review within any reasonable length. On the whole they seem very remote—almost a cry from a previous generation. The musty flavour comes partly from the cover and St Prisca, partly from echoes of battles of past years, partly from the discussion taking place mainly in the context of convents and Downside with a fleeting acknowledgement of grammar schools packed with intelligent boys—though there is one superb exception, Miss Bray's paper.

Take, for example, Derek Lance's contribution. The type of person who is going to spend 30s. on a book like this doesn't need to be reminded of the horror stories that are still part

of our teaching legacy—he knows about them and it would astonish me if the Downside conference did not. He doesn't need to be told the inadequacies of the catechism—we knew about them when I was a tot, and now they are just part of the furniture. The current problems in the classroom are caused by the absence which made the catechism so lethal and which will make any new syllabus just as lethal—the absence of theologians in schools of the same intellectual level and depth of training as the chemists who have produced the new Nuffield courses and are teaching them—an absence which will continue until Catholic schools have the honesty to advertise the highest head of department allowances for theologians and make it possible to support one's family as well that way as by teaching chemistry. Derek Lance tells us that 'the teaching must be rooted in the pupil's own

experience' but fails to add that it must also be rooted in the teacher's experience and thought. Without that, '11-16' is, like the catechism, an aid to teaching doctrine without knowing any—and in three years time will be the shield and buckler of the rockiest fossils.

Take A. E. C. W. Spencer's paper—'An Evaluation of Roman Catholic Educational policy in England and Wales, 1900-1960'. This is a careful survey suggesting that Catholics who go to Catholic schools do not go to Mass much more than Catholics educated elsewhere, that it all depends on the family. We all know this. The question is not whether Catholic schools produce intelligent Catholics—we all know that for the most part the production is in spite of the school. Indeed, so much is this recognized, that increasing numbers of Catholic parents are choosing non-Catholic schools even when a place in a Catholic school is available. This lack of quality has, I suggest, been largely caused by a general acceptance of Mass going as the criterion, used also by Mr Spencer, for judging quality. I fear that his enormous concentration upon proving what we know already will turn away attention from the urgent question, which is not even how to change from quantity to quality, but what is quality? How does it show itself? Perhaps this lies in taking up that neglected aspect of the Church's duty, bearing witness and judging the world—an introduction of the prophetic spirit. How would one judge this? By numbers involved in protesting against H-bombs, Suez, Vietnam perhaps? Numbers involved in Catholic Housing Aid, Shelter, Oxfam? Numbers training as guerillas for South America maybe? And what about the Heads? Christian schools should be helping children to kick against the world and that can't be done by people who aren't kicking. We need great schools and such are only made by great heads—how do we find those? Not, I suspect, by reappointing all secondary modern Heads to be Heads of reorganized comprehensive schools. Personally I would take a full half of the Heads from outside the teaching profession. I incline to making a list of people with vision, likely to produce a high proportion of social misfits with a sense of humour, and offering them the jobs—the late Peggy Janiurek would have been a good choice, or Herbert McCabe: there would at least be life and thought in those schools. Mr Spencer's evaluation is too limited to be of any real help in this.

However, read Father Hamish Swanston—'Religious Instruction in the Sixth Form'—and you will find a man who is really wrestling with problems—though here he pulls his punches a little. He tears up the syllabus—but why only for sixth forms? His admirable use of literature (as also Sister Catherine Appleby's) can start much younger—(but perhaps he doesn't teach below the sixth form and so visualizes a different kind of animal?). 'The boys seem unable to view assembly as either redeemable or redeeming'—then why continue with the horror? Nevertheless, what he is showing us is what he is doing and that is breaking away from the nice, tidy, quiet, well-mannered, head-counting, mass-attending, syllabus-ridden, organizational, death-dealing structure to which we have been accustomed, and is giving life to expressive relationships. Father Swanston points the road—Dr Royston Lambert analyses why it is the correct one.

Dr Lambert's paper on Religion in the Boarding School should be read by every Catholic Head, together with Miss Bray's and Father Swanston's papers, and used to examine each school's structure. These three could produce an explosion. Dr Lambert shows how too often the school organization captures religion and murders it, though also how compulsion can be mitigated and borne where the pupils see it in the context of norms established by large and successful use of the expressive roles of the staff. (He does not, unfortunately, query whether the compulsion would be better abolished than mitigated.) Now this overbearing of the formal, organization side, this break-through in the expressive areas, is much easier in a boarding school than a day school—time, meals, coffee, long evenings are on one's side. To achieve the same balance in a day school with the restricted expressive fields available requires, it seems to me, a blasting away of that organizational, compulsive side. However, in the first paper of all, a headmistress gives an account of her non-Catholic state school in a Portsmouth dock area. Miss Bray seems to show that even in a day school, heroism and an immense effort on the expressive side can move a mountain—though I feel that, in her very moving account of her school, she is really proving that the life in it stems from her caring and her staff's caring, not, as she humbly thinks, from her compulsory assembly. Miss Bray's paper really is a jolt for Catholics—read it thinking of your local school. If I can do the half for my

creamed intake that she offers to her twilight children, I shall face the judgement with some hope. And she is dealing with the real situation, the sort of grim situation which faces so many of our own teachers in secondary and primary schools despite the nominal Catholicism of the

families. Lay alongside this the academic little essay by Mrs Houghton and you will return to a remoteness shared by the remaining papers—with the exception perhaps of Sebastian Moore who is always fun.

PETER HASTINGS

**ORGANIZATION AND BUREAUCRACY: AN ANALYSIS OF MODERN THEORIES**, by Nicos P. Mouzelis. *Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967. 28s.*

Catholics have undoubtedly become increasingly concerned since Vatican II with the general problem of the relationship of their religious organization to rapidly changing social structures, and the ostensible message of Christianity. This has sensitized many to the following interrelated issues: the consequence of church organization for the individual and the quality of human experience; democracy and authoritarianism; the relationship between the clergy and the laity; and more generally the possibility of the displacement of the purpose of the organized Church. Now is it possible, whatever our particular posture on these issues, to see them as symptomatic of the general organizational and bureaucratic features of the Church? Furthermore, is it possible to have a general theory of organizations which is appropriate, say, for the Church, a factory or a bank?

It is precisely this latter question which Dr Mouzelis is concerned with in his analysis of modern theories of organization. His book gives a systematic evaluation of the various schools and sub-schools of organizational thought in terms of their contribution to an adequate theory. At the same time it suggests the direction which future research and theoretical development might fruitfully take.

What are the criteria of theoretical adequacy which Mouzelis takes cognizance of? He states that he is not concerned with theory in the sense of 'interconnected hypotheses about specific organizational problems' which can be subjected to empirical verification. Rather he is concerned with theory as a heuristic guide, that 'provides conceptual tools which indicate the level of analysis, the variables to be taken into consideration and the way in which these may be accounted for in a systematic manner'.

The implications of all this emerge as the discussion of organizational theories unfolds. We discover that the characteristic broad scope of early analysts, such as Marx and Weber, was replaced by the concern of later research with narrow problems such as productivity and morale. There was a tendency

to analyse the organization and the wider society only in so far as they seemed to impinge on such problems. Anyway, these problems were often examined almost explicitly in a psychologist frame of reference.

For example, Taylor extracted the individual from his social environment, examining him in terms of a mechanistic response to reward and punishment. From this model he attempted to make generalizations at the level of the organization. In doing so Taylor moved from one level of analysis to another, neglecting such crucial variables as values, informal organization, or conflicting interests, which later research was to stress. Indeed, Taylor emphasized an essential similarity of interests between individuals and groups in organizations, and regarded conflict as a pathological element.

In analysing the theories, Mouzelis shows how in the various approaches of Taylorism, the Human Relations School, the work of Simon, etc., there was a general trend towards focussing not on the individual level of analysis, but on the organization.

It is important to stress that the various theories are evaluated in terms of their specific contributions to a general theory of organizations. The major objection against them is their partiality, their failure to locate all the relevant variables.

The story therefore becomes one of theories in convergence, and Mouzelis confronts us with three possibilities. One is a theory of consensus as epitomized in the highly developed organizational theory of Talcott Parsons. This approach emphasizes the integrative aspects, stressing values and the distribution of power in terms of organizational goals. The second, much more embryonic, alternative lies with researchers examining organizations specifically in terms of conflict and power. Such a perspective might be pursued and warrants, says Mouzelis, returning to Marx, thus considering 'the possibility of societal values, not as a kind of divine providence caring for the welfare of all sub-systems, but as the dominant ideology