

VI. Education

C. Elementary Education

327.

Lecture, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 23 and 30, 1876

Lecture before the Young Men's Society of the Church of the Sacred Heart, Columbus, Ohio. (Printed by Reinhard & Fieser, Columbus, 1876; also printed in The Catholic Columbian on September 23 and 30, 1876, no doubt shortly after its delivery)

Catholic Schools

Gentlemen of the Society: Education, in its most comprehensive state, is the "bringing out" of all the powers of soul and body, in their proper order, to the fulfillment of their true end. Years ago, when education began to be provided for by the state, here, in the West, we did not understand it in so broad a sense. To know how to "read, write and cypher," was to be educated. A few gifted souls might attain grammar and geography, as then taught; and the favored few might be rich enough to go to college for higher studies. What we then understood by common schools were houses in each district, where, for certain months of the year, a man or woman was hired to teach all the children of "the district" every branch, from the a, b, c, to the end of the spelling-book; from the multiplication table to the Double Rule of Three in Daboll's Arithmetic; from making straight marks with a quill pen to following copies in a fine hand. We had no idea that the government intended to assume possession of us, body and soul, in all the early years of our lives, and run us through the primary, intermediate, and high school courses, as they take marble through successive departments of the manufactory, until it becomes a polished vase, a full formed image, or a finished tombstone.

Now, however, the idea is put forward that the state owns the people; and the state must mould the individuals into unity by educating them all in the same schools, to perpetuate our free institutions; and anti-Catholic prejudice is appealed to in order to make this new view of education come into favor with the American people. We must furnish such teaching as will favor or offend no one's peculiar notions. Therefore, there must be no particular religion taught in the public schools.

We Catholics have to take ground on this question as follows. To all non-Catholics we say: "You have the right to educate your own children as you please, since you, not we, answer to God for their souls. If schools in which religion is sought to be excluded suit you, use them. But for us, our eternal salvation, and the knowledge of the means of attaining it, are the first and most important consideration; so important, indeed, that we see no use in education,--in fact, no use in living,--if this is neglected. Therefore, schools in which religion is ignored are not for us. We leave you your

liberty; leave us ours. The world is wide enough to give ample room for all of us. Take your space, give us ours. There are enough things to contend about, in matters purely temporal, without borrowing themes of strife from questions that cannot be settled until the Judgment Day. If you are satisfied with your religious convictions, and we with ours, let us live according to those convictions, and await the Last Term of the SUPREME COURT for a decision as to which are right, and which are wrong."

On the abstract question of the kind of education which is so good that it ought to be forced upon all citizens of the Republic, indiscriminately, there is an irreconcilable difference of opinion between Catholics and non-Catholics. It arises from the essentially different views they take of the meaning and purpose of human life. The Catholic view is: Man lives for Eternity, and his supreme good is to know and serve God, and his supreme evil is not to know God, and to sin. He must aim at eternity and the interests of time will take care of themselves.

The non-Catholic view is: Man lives for Time, and must be educated to understand its interests. If there is any Eternity, that will take care of itself. He must be educated that he may know to take care of his body, his health, his property and his liberty.

This difference is as irreconcilable as that between the ideas of going South or going North on the same train, or of climbing up or climbing down on the same ladder at the same time.

It was this, His fundamental teaching of human destiny, that the Founder of Christianity ran athwart all the prejudices of his time. "Take no thought of food or drink or clothing," He said, "Fear not them that can kill the body," "what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his soul?" "He that loseth his life shall find it." "If thou wouldst be perfect sell all thou hast and give to the poor." "Deny thyself, take up they cross and follow Me." He placed blessing in what non-Catholics dread as a curse. "Blessed are the POOR, the MEEK, the SIMPLE MINDED, the UNKNOWN, the DESPISED, the CALUMNIATED the persecuted with prisons, chains and death.

Pagan Rome was the most tolerant of governments towards all religions that would acknowledge the Emperor's divinity. A man was free to be of what religion he pleased so long as he did not mean anything by it. Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and the rest of them have beautiful sentiments about truth, justice, piety, patriotism, and other virtues; and were popular for having them. But the moment a "sect" arose that did more than sentimentalize about God's dominion and the soul's destiny; that quietly proclaimed truth to be supreme and not Caesar, and went joyously to death rather than disobey God, all the fury of Jew and Gentile was aroused to crush it.

This is very like the toleration among us to-day. Our people tolerate the Chinese "Josh," the Mormonism of Utah, which would never have been disturbed had not the valley of Salt Lake become wealthy enough to call the attention of Bible admiring

adventurers--the filth of spiritism and free love, and all shades of sects of every stripe and kind. To them they say, educate your children as we please; or educate them any way you please provided you do not bring them up Catholics. If they are Catholics they will think their religion is a reality; and will never become homogeneous with the rest of their fellow citizens. The state can tolerate no rival in the business of education.

Now, we Catholics cannot comply with this exaction, for many reasons:

1st. Doing out share, as we did, to found and uphold this fabric of free government, we want a share of liberty according to our own taste. American Catholics were not hooted out of the armies of the revolution, whether in the old Pennsylvania and Maryland line, or when the gallant Frenchmen were welcomed to the tent of Washington.

In the dark days of the late war, Irish, German, and American Catholics never heard a nickname or a word of abuse at their place in the front. American liberty is no boon conferred by those outside of the Church on Catholics, as alms thrown to a beggar. It was won by them as well as by others with God's help. Now we want liberty after our own taste. We want no liberty to domineer over others or to annoy and abuse and calumniate them; but simply liberty to follow the dictates of our conscience, in our care of our souls and of our children.

We do not want the liberty of communistic European manufacture, which consists in forcing upon people opinions they reject, and practices they loathe, in making a homogeneous mass of all classes of society, wiping out the family; and, under pretext of raising up the poor, pulling down the rich, and with promise of making all alike prosperous and happy, bringing in envy, strife, murder and despair to the hearts of all. We do not want the liberty of free love, divorce and child murder; but old-fashioned Catholic liberty which CHRIST brought to earth from heaven, which the martyrs won by their blood, which flourished when Catholic conscience, without a drop of blood shed, struck the shackles from every slave in Christendom, when the bishops and barons of England wrung their Charter from King John; which had its home in Germany, though often buffeted, until the great rebellion against the Church paved the way for modern imperialism; in Switzerland, before the time of Calvin and Zwinglius, and still flourishes among the simple people that dwell contented in the mountains of Tyrol. We want our own kind of liberty, Catholic liberty, true American liberty.

We Catholics cannot accept Godless education.

2d. From the nature of the thing. "'Tis education forms the common mind. Just as the twig is bent the tree is inclined." "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it." Though the mind is no unwritten tablet, nor tablet of any kind, but a spirit, essentially active, yet it goes where it is led. It sees what is spread out before it, trusts to those who assume the office of forming it, values what

they value, despises what they despise.

Now the fundamental doctrine of all Christianity is that we must take care of our soul, whatever happens to our body. If "the world and all the glory of it" is to pay us for sinning we must not sin. If exile, and dungeons, and scaffolds threaten us, unless we say that an idol is God, or a lie the truth, we must not "fear them that can kill the body, but only Him who has power to cast both soul and body into hell." Baptized people are *in* the world, but not *of* it. Their model is a MAN, who voluntarily put aside riches, honors and pleasures, was born in a stable, lived among the poor and despised, and died a felon's death.

To them human knowledge is only one of the means of living in the grace of God by obeying the Ten Commandments. They have nothing to do with the strifes of factions, the turmoil of those pursuits which have their beginning and their end in this fleeting life. They live the life it is true, and fulfill all the duties of it as zealously, as bravely and perseveringly as those who have no expectation of anything substantial, beyond the grave. But their aim is far away from the thoughts of the Gentile. They treat themselves as stewards awaiting the day of settlement, and handle all their employments with a view to the time when accounts will be made up, and receipts exchanged.

Here then is the plain reason why Catholics cannot accept an education from whose teaching their faith is excluded. The business of life, its whole bearing and meaning, is to learn from the Son of God what He would have us believe and practice, and having learned, to believe and practice. What we do outside of this is utterly useless--wasted time, squandered opportunity.

But the godless school would take our children from their seventh to their sixteenth or eighteenth year, and keep them studying matters with which Jesus Christ is ostentatiously pronounced to have nothing to do. This separates fatally in two ways. It distorts science and roots out faith.

God is the source of all truth and of all right knowledge. To know truth and not connect it with Him, is to know the wheels of a watch, scattered and separate, without understanding why they were constructed or what end they are to serve. It is not true knowledge. But the godless system of education allows no other knowledge of truth than this. It forbids the student to consider what he studies in its bearings on religion. He learns words, but he dare not think of the Eternal Word. He is taught the ways of the stars, but may not meditate on their Author, or of the Star of Bethlehem. He is compelled to have no daily contact with his religion, but to hold it aloof for all times of the day, except two minutes or so in the morning and evening, and all times of the week, except Sundays. His knowledge is necessarily fragmentary and disconnected. He knows some facts and some rules, some history and some literature; but he does not know the meaning of anything; because science outside of God is vain--"falsely so

called." And this despising of faith subverts it, in swift degrees. What result can be expected in a contest where six days of the week are spent in alert study of things which imply that religion is of no practical value, and an hour of one day is spent in droning over the words of Catechism, or listening with yawning impatience to a priest urging the supreme importance of what the main drift of your life treats with contempt? Of all the pitiful inconsistencies in human conduct, that of parents pretending to teach enough religion by giving a few fugitive lessons in their Catechism to their children, or rushing them through all of it when they are old enough for First Communion, is among the foremost. The character of a child is not formed after it is fifteen, but before it is ten; and it is not formed from what the parents and teachers say, in their set speeches, and didactic moods, but from what their lives say. Children see through hypocrisy, and become too familiar with it to be surprised at it, long before their parents and teachers dream of. They learn very young that honesty, obedience, industry, humility, purity, truth-telling, are very convenient qualities for parents to have in their children; and they are not slow in suspecting that these virtues are urged upon them for that reason. This, particularly, when they observe that their parents have no fondness for the practice of the virtues they recommend. So, when they see that the all-important business of life is put out of their studies, banished from the school-room, postponed to out of the way times, made subordinate to dress and all other kinds of convenience, they quietly fall into their elders' habits of acting and their unmeaning ways of speaking. They will act as if religious duties were something painful and constrained; like putting on a solemn face at a funeral when they are really glad he is dead; and speak very solemnly about the sin and theft and the duty of restitution, when their little brothers have stolen their pencils or pen-knives. Faith ceases to be reality with them, and becomes mere feeling and sentiment at first, and later an idle superstition of the past. No Catholic parent, therefore, can consent to abandon the education of his children to schools in which religion is ignored.

3. But after all, reasons like them, however conclusive and unanswerable, do not form the precise and peremptory motive of our rejecting non-religious schools. We might see the results of pagan education in French atheism, Italian diabolism, English mammonism, American sentimentalism, without learning the lesson they teach; and, deluding ourselves with the folly that in every generation repeats itself in other matters, think that we could incur their peril without sharing their shipwreck, had not the Church spoken and ended the controversy for loyal Catholics. "Education must be made more Christian," is the saying of Pius IX. To study pagan authors as if they were oracles; to learn science, as if life had no other end than to puzzle over mathematical combinations or empirical experiments, is to make religion the recreation of the learned, and the business of only the vulgar; and so the upper classes of European countries were the first victims of infidelity. The Church tried to stay the movement by raising

her voice loud in earnest condemnation of godless education.

The present Pontiff, the great and saintly Pius IX., has again and again spoken the mind of the LORD JESUS CHRIST in unmistakable words. In 1849 the theory of government control of education was boldly advocated in Upper Italy. Conscience--the voice of the Church--had nothing to do with what was taught to children; let bishops have no voice in any other school but their own episcopal seminaries. They and parents have no say as to the discipline of schools; the choice of studies; the conferring of degrees; the selection and employment of teachers.

This was condemned in the Allocution of the Pope in November, 1850, and again in a Brief September 5, 1851.

The same parties who exaggerated the power of the civil government in the matter of secular education, went on to maintain further the maxim of pagan tyranny, that she has the right to prescribe the course of studies in ecclesiastical seminaries, and dictate what shall be taught in the same. This proposition was condemned in a Brief of the Holy Father, December 15, 1875.

The point of the question lies in this: "Is there such a separation of the temporal and eternal interests of man as to allow the study of one set of interests to be absolutely separated from the study of the other?" Can a person say secular education ought to be entirely removed from the domain and control of conscience in such manner that Catholic parents may, without scruple, allow their children to be brought up in schools in which religion is treated as a thing of naught? This question was answered in the negative, in emphatic terms by our Holy Father in his letter to the Archbishop of Fribourg.

The whole controversy between Bismarck and the Catholic Church has hinged on this question: Has the Church the charge of the souls of men, or does this charge belong to the state?

The fact that the authority of the Church has distinctly and emphatically pronounced against the surrender of Catholic children to godless teaching is beyond controversy.

There is, therefore, but one honest conclusion. All Catholics must either accept the decision, or become non-Catholics. Those who persist in defying authority are no more Catholic than Luther or Calvin, or Henry VIII. or John Knox.

Yet you will meet with many who will not see this plain conclusion. They make evasions; suppose ignorance on the part of the Pope; feign a distinction between *their* rebellion and that of other schismatics; appeal to anti-Catholic and infidel prejudices; calumniate the quality of the teaching in Catholic schools; and go through all phases of meanness and hypocrisy, instead of coming out honestly with the declaration that they no longer desire to be considered children of the Church. In their abject submission to their worldly inclinations they sacrifice all independence, and try to persuade the world

that they do this rather than bow down to the dictation of priests. They "link their bonds, shouting that they are free."

As for us, my friends, who consider our Catholicity no empty name, but the great reality that gives meaning to life, let us not be deceived by the sophistry of infidels, or daunted by the threats of demagogues. Our Faith is worth as much to us as it was to the army of the martyrs who for centuries preached it by their sufferings and death: It is worth as much to those who are to succeed us, as it is to us; therefore let us think it a privilege to brave obloquy and spend life in the effort for its promotion.

Those who instruct many unto justice shall shine as stars for ever and ever.

328.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Oct. 16, 1875 (4)

[Patronizing the Catholic Schools]

It was not a Protestant but a Catholic that we heard, not long since, speak of "patronizing" a Catholic school. We had never seen this word in the books before. In the Catholic Church the teachers do the "patronizing." The priests and religious who devote themselves to the education of the young seek no reward on earth for their labors. All they ask is the means to live in order to work. In every school the charge is barely what will pay current expenses, and in most of them many pupils are received gratuitously on application. The teachers receive only their board and clothing. Actual experience shows that their charity scholars are the ones who speak most about having "patronized" them. We know of teachers who, for the amount of instruction they give daily, would receive, in the world, more than the superintendent of the public schools of any city in the union. Take divine charity out of the Catholic schools, and try to bring them to a money basis, and the schools would disappear entirely.

329.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, September 23, 1876 (2)

Why Catholic Schools Sometimes Fail

Catholic schools are the very life of the rising Church. It is in them that the heart and mind of the child are developed together; in them that the youth are taught how to save their souls as well as how to make a living. It is in them too that the arms are given with which to ward off the future attacks made on their religion; it is in them that they must learn all those practices of piety by which faith is fostered and the salvation of their soul made an habitual care. In the Diocese of Columbus every effort is made to make Catholic schools perfect. Pastors have built comfortable school houses at great sacrifices and supply them with edifying, competent and devoted teachers.

329 - Why Catholic Schools Sometimes Fail

Unfortunately many Catholics leave all the burden and care with the priest and teachers. They never ask themselves whence must come the money to pay for those buildings or to keep the schools in running order. Many parents send their children regularly, but make no inquiries concerning their conduct or progress, whilst few require their children to study at home. There are others who make no scruple of keeping their children home one or two days in each week or several half days in each month. The child by this course fails to keep up with his class, is a source of annoyance to the teacher, is a drawback to his fellows and a burden to himself. These children, and those whose careless parents refuse to purchase *all* the necessary books, learn little or nothing. Their parents realize this at the end of one or two years and with artless simplicity wax wrathful about Catholic schools; declaim against their inefficiency; and lament they did not send their children to the public school. They forget or else fail to understand that they themselves are sadly to blame and that had their children been sent to the public schools irregularly or without the necessary books they would be dismissed. Some parents again imagine their children too apt or too far advanced to be taught in the Catholic school. The diocesan statutes make special of the latter class, saying that if they cannot be taught in the Catholic schools they may with the pastor's consent be sent to schools not decidedly anti-Catholic. Parents often fail to see that the reason why pastors cannot establish a high school is that parents do not give them a chance, by withdrawing the children. Some parents will go so far in spite of the pastor's protest to render themselves unfit for the Sacraments, and to be the cause of much scandal "to those who are of the household of the faith."

Now any intelligent person can see how difficult it is for a Catholic school to prosper where any considerable number [of] parents act in any of the foregoing manners. Parents should realize that the priest is powerless without their help, that without their contribution these institutions must fail to exist. They can easily understand on a little reflection that not a few books nor a broken attendance is necessary. If they love their children they will consult often with their teachers and the priest and cooperate in making them what the Church wants them to be. With the Holy Father and their bishop they will scorn the idea of a public school being fit for Catholic children; and as loyal children of the Church they will uphold Catholic schools. Their children will grow up good Catholics and become loving and dutiful sons and daughters; when they rise in the world there will be no such stigma as apostate attached to their name.

330.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, March 21, 1878

[Daily Mass for School Children]

We are sorry that the Waterloo (N.Y.) *Catholic Times* does not agree with us on the question of school children attending Mass daily. Our conviction that a school in which the children are not directed to assist every morning at the Holy Sacrifice does not deserve the name of a Catholic school is not in the least shaken by such respectable opposition. Of course they are not to be urged to go to Mass when the pastor is away and there is no Mass; but there should be, where there is a school, a Mass for the school children, which they should be directed to attend. The two objections which our respected cotemporary urges, strike us as of little weight. If the pastor finds it "prejudicial to his health to fast until nine o'clock," he has two remedies.--He can sleep late in the morning, quite a popular prescription in this western climate, and he can resign his charge into the hands of some healthy man. He has no use for health if he does not do his duty to the children with it. As to children learning irreverence from familiarity, the argument proves too much. It would prove that the Church makes a mistake in imposing the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays and Holidays. Prayer, of which the Holy Sacrifice is the highest form, is the daily bread of the soul. You do not fear that a child will learn to undervalue it by having breakfast every morning. It is true that we are apt to lose esteem of what we can easily have; but this tendency of human nature is to be met by prayer and grace, and not by any management or policy that we can invent. A child's soul is as free and strong as a man's; and if we want it to bow to truth, and call good what *is* good, we must bow to truth ourselves. We can never make little people understand that to assist at Mass is the chief solace and strength of a good life, by keeping them away from it.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 4, 1878

The Waterloo *Times* is still of the opinion that "Being directed to go to Mass, daily, is rather a harm than a benefit to school children." What detriment the old Christians of the catacombs must have suffered, when they met at midnight, sang Matins and Lauds, recited Prime, sang High Mass, went to Communion and then went forth to the labors of the day. "The spiritual appetite grows with feeding," says St. Gregory, and he knew, most probably. By the way, we advise our contemporary not to get off any more graceful jokes on the West than he can help. This East and West business is likely to prove serious. Our respected contemporary wants to know what is to become of a pastor after he has resigned his charge on account of not being able to give the school children daily Mass. After resigning, he is no longer a public man. He must make his

331 - Census Takers!

own private arrangements as if for his funeral.

331.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, September 17, 1859 (1)

Census Takers!

The Committee of the School-Board has appointed a person in each ward of the city to take the school census. The object of this, as our readers know, is to draw from the State funds in proportion to the number of pupils. Now as the Catholic parents of the city cannot conscientiously send their children to the common schools, the School-Board will demand from the state the funds for between six and seven thousand children, which the School-Board does not educate!! It is thus that we are swindled all round! Give us this proportion of the state school fund, to which we are by every law of justice, before God and men, entitled, and we will be able to educate the Catholic youth of the city in a style which cannot be surpassed. Let the state show the same liberality to us which has been shown to Protestant schools in Austria, Belgium, France. But far from it. Our country is too free to be just. People are too fond of reading the Bible with a sectarian bias to observe the golden rule of doing to others what they would wish others to do unto them in like circumstances. Not content with taxing us to support schools from which we can derive no benefit, it now proposes to tax the schools and charitable institutions which at a heavy cost we have erected for ourselves!! If this be not tyranny we know not the meaning of the word. And there are thousands of honest Protestants who think as we do on this subject, but they are *afraid* to say so publicly. A blue-book lately published by order of Parliament, shows that there is more respect paid to the rights of conscience in England than in Ohio. From this it appears that thirty-three Catholic schools in England and Scotland have received from the Hon. Privy Council *forty-eight thousand six hundred and sixty pounds sterling*. In this list those schools only are mentioned which have received more than one thousand pounds.

D. Godless Education

332.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, November 11, 1876 (1)

[Schools Unsafe for Catholic Children]

When we follow the warnings of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, in declaring godless schools unsafe for Catholic children, it should be well understood that we mean no shallow denunciation of those schools. From the standpoint of the world they are good enough. If life were simply to succeed in gaining a subsistence, to reach posts of honor, to accumulate property, the public schools are all that could be desired. They are

333 - State Schools--The "American" System

genteel and try to be refined. Human nature is responsible for the rudeness sometimes shown and the immoralities sometimes practiced by the pupils. To be sure, all teaching that would give any solid reason for being virtuous to the young people is carefully avoided. They must be virtuous, of course, because it is a good thing to be virtuous--and it would be a shame for any American to be wanting in any good thing. So the schools, while they ignore religion, do not inculcate immorality. It is to faith that the Church appeals, in entreating and commanding Catholic parents to "suffer little children to come unto" her Founder, by placing them where His teachings are revered and His Person honored; and "to forbid them not" by sending them where He is never named, and His Church and Sacraments are reviled and contemned. There will be a fashion in every circle; a standard to measure right and wrong by, positive and overruling notions of what is becoming and unbecoming. And this fashion will never be with unbelievers what it should be with Catholics. A child, trained among these un-Catholic surroundings, may learn to detect unnatural, disgraceful and shocking sins; but it will never learn to hate sin. A boy who is sent by a reckless and deluded father to the Public schools prepared himself for Communion last Hallow Eve. On All Saints' Day he did not even go to Mass, for fear of losing his standing in his school. The teacher there will set him down as a good pupil; and he, with mortal sin upon his soul, will take the teacher's standard instead of God's. The same rule of action will never do for those who accept this world as a finality and those who believe in a world to come. And therefore the schools that suit the one will not answer for the other.

333.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, January 22, 1853

State Schools--The "American" System.

We have had lying on our table for some time, certain documents and pamphlets relating to the system of education introduced into practice by certain reformers of the eastern states, and ostentatiously styled by the same, "the American System of Free Graded Schools." We did not wish to mention these, nor to say anything in our columns about this last invention of our Yankee neighbors, in order not to give it an undue importance. It is but a whim of our reformers; and before one generation passes--they will have reformed it quite away.

Nevertheless, from the peculiar position of our city and its schools, this system is beginning to have an interest to our citizens. We have a very expensive school system now, and an effort is being made to fasten upon us permanently this mode of education. Our citizens, therefore, ought to know well, the system they are to be taxed to support:

1. In the first place, then, this system, on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, is styled "the American System." Had it been called the Prussian System--or the French

Atheist System the name would have been more appropriate. The essential feature of the Prussian System and of the French System is the assumption that men--body and soul--are the *property* of the state; that in every act of life--no matter how small--the subject is to have an eye to the will of his ruler.

Now, this is the principle assumed by the so-called American System of Education. Education must be done by the State--and private seminaries and colleges must be broken up. The people are to pay their taxes and say nothing; but leave to their rulers the care of their children.

This is no American principle. Our fathers have taught us that the best government is that which governs least, that the individual is not made for the state, but the state for the individual; and that government has a right to trench on personal liberty only so far as the peace of society requires.

The boast of this country is religious toleration. In it every individual has a right to believe what he pleases, and consequently to practice his belief--and in that belief to educate his children. Thus a Methodist must have the liberty of educating his child in a Methodist school--an Episcopalian must be allowed to send his son or daughter to an Episcopalian school--and a Catholic to teach his children according to the doctrines of his Church. But if the state assume the right of dictating the schools to be frequented--the books to be studied--the teachers to be employed, then this freedom of conscience is annihilated. The children become the property of the state.

Neither does it obviate this difficulty to say that in this country the state is only the people. For the principle is the same. The individual conscience to be free must not be fettered, even by the will of the majority. No doubt, a majority could be found to say that the Episcopalians are wrong. Must the Episcopalians therefore be proscribed? An immense majority would vote tomorrow, if the question were agitated, that the Swedenborgians are wrong; but is that any reason why they ought not to have liberty of conscience? Tyranny is not less tyranny because it happens to be exercised by certain cliques, in the name of the majority.

2. Besides the name, assumed for claptrap purposes, and the broad taking for granted of a principle which is only in vogue in Russia, Turkey, China, and other despotic countries, the system has nothing peculiar that is not objectionable. The means taken to secure good teaching[,] proper books, healthful rooms--good discipline--are similar to those used in every good system, and are therefore not peculiar to this. One undoubted peculiarity of the system is, however, this: That the children of both sexes are to be subjected to the *same* discipline, both of intellect and morals; they are to sit together in the same room, have the same professors, the same studies, the same examinations, the same tutors. The girls are to learn surveying, civil engineering, and navigation, along with the boys; and the boys are to take lessons on the piano and guitar, and learn fancy needle-work and embroidery along with the girls. The girls are

to learn a manly independence and a masculine boldness from the boys; and the boys are to learn a girlish gentleness and modesty from the girls!

It is a misery of the present age, cast loose, as it is, from every tie that binds us in the past, that we are obliged to fall back on the abstract principles of the natural law, in order to prove the justice and propriety of customs sanctioned by the practice of all ages; and this too, we have to do to set right the errors of men who have that "dangerous thing," a *little* learning, and that still more dangerous thing, a great deal of self-conceit. Now, with the men who propose this system of education, we must begin by establishing, 1st, that the virtue of purity is desirable in both the sexes. 2nd, that virtue being desirable it is proper to have over it some safeguards--such as the guarding the different sexes from indiscriminate companionship--and the keeping them away from all temptation. We cannot appeal to the wisdom of the past; we cannot say that such has always been the practice of all nations not entirely lost to every sense of natural probity--No. So we must fall back on abstract reasoning; and we must prove to men, who if they have sense to understand, are often too proud to listen to reason, that men and women have different spheres, and are to receive a different training; that, even were they to receive the same training, they ought not to herd together. We have to demonstrate to persons, ignorant of the first principles of ethics, like the editor of the Daily Times of this city, that males and females are designed by nature to have peculiar duties for which they ought to have a peculiar education.

"Can it be demonstrated," says the author of one of the pamphlets, to which in the beginning we have alluded, "that there is any difference between the mental constitution of the two sexes which demands a distinct training for each?"

And so, mothers, you must take your daughters from the convent and the academy, and send them to a boy's school unless you can demonstrate a difference of mental constitution between them and the males. It will not do to say, that you have always been taught to believe that your daughters are safer, and better fitted to become modest, retiring, pious women under the care of those conscientious persons of your own religion to whom you have entrusted them. It will not do for you to say that you can take your rest more quietly, when you reflect that your child is surrounded by vigilant guardians, and by virtuous companions, than if she were to be the occupant of a crowded schoolroom along with those of the other sex. You must throw off these prejudices in favor a guarding your child's virtue; and if you want to shield her from temptation, and fit her not for a politician, a stump orator, a Bloomer, but to be a good wife and mother, you must prove that she is not mentally constituted as are boys.

We see that one of our daily papers has the hardihood to stigmatize as the "Roman" method--no stigma to be sure in the eyes of intelligent men, for whom the editor was not writing--every method opposed to this importation from despotic Europe. So that all the colleges of this state are conducted according to the Roman

method, Methodist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, colleges, seminaries, academies, are transformed into Roman institutions. Every place of learning where boys are separated from girls[,] where the teachers are paid by private contributions and subject to private control, where the parent may withdraw his child when he loses confidence in the school, where religion is ostensibly taught, is a "Roman" place of learning. What will our separated brethren say to this? Are they willing to admit that they are not yet free from the trammels of Rome? We shall return to the subject.

334.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, January 29, 1853 (1)

State Education.

We promised last week to return to the subject of state schools at an early opportunity. We propose to do so now by considering the principle assumed by their defenders, viz: That the state has a right to tax the people for the support of schools in which the course of studies, the discipline, the qualifications of teachers, are under the control of the state; and in which all children that are educated at all, must be educated.

We do not hesitate to assert, that this principle is contrary to maxims hitherto considered fundamental of this government; and to the natural law.

1. The power to make laws in matters of religion, or interfering in any way with liberty of conscience is expressly denied to Congress in the Constitution; and this maxim is fundamental to our government.

Now it is essential to liberty of conscience, that parents be allowed to train up their children in that religious belief which they may deem essential to salvation. The parents may be wrong in deeming their religious belief essential to salvation. Be it so. But as long as they think so their belief must be respected.

An Evangelical may be wrong in thinking that his children would be lost were they to imbibe prelatish doctrines; a Protestant may be wrong in deeming it his duty before God to guard his little ones from "the errors of Popery;" a Catholic (*per impossibile*, and for the argument's sake) may be wrong, in thinking that as he values the souls for which, as a parent, he is to render account, he must train his child up in the old faith; yet the Evangelical, the Protestant, and the Catholic must have full liberty each to educate his children as he deems it his religious duty to educate them. For, Congress shall make no law interfering with the liberty of conscience.

Now the principal of state schools morally takes away from the parent this religious right. The avowed intention of its proposers is to crush all private institutions; and thus morally compel all children to attend the state schools. But in the state schools either no religion will be taught, or else the religion of some particular sect. If no religion is taught, then infidelity is taught, for infidelity is only the negation of faith. If

the religion of any particular sect is taught, then the conscience of all the others is violated. So that in either case the fundamental principle of our government is trampled on.

In fact, the framers of this system do not hesitate to avow their object of controlling the sentiment of the masses, and directing them to a particular end. They cloak their design under popular names, and profess only patriotism.

Whatever in public opinion does not agree with their ideas of things, they set down as a "foreign influence" to be eradicated by an "American Education." The opinion that Jesus Christ was God--that He founded a Church which He is both able and faithful to preserve from error--that He left a living authority--the Pope of Rome--to decide all controversies relating to faith and morals--is a "foreign opinion," to be eradicated by an "American Education."

The children of the poor faithful Irish who, first fleeing from the most loathsome oppression of those whom our educationists delight to call allies, and next struggling by hard, honest labor to gain a material living, have but scanty, if any means to provide for the education of their offspring, are to be picked up, and have "eradicated" from them the few "foreign notions" of faith and devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and obedience to the Church which their mother has had time to instill into their tender minds.

Who gave these men the right to call Catholicity a "foreign influence?" Is the doctrine that man should do his duty towards himself, towards his neighbor, and towards his God, a foreign influence? Is virtue, the restoration of ill-gotten goods--of fame--a foreign influence in our country? Are not Catholics citizens of the country? Were not many of us born in the country, and those who were not, have they not been adopted citizens--nay, and stood by the country in its dark hour, when the Hartford ancestors of Horace Mann, and the other fathers of this system were burning blue lights--as signals to our enemies, the English?--"Foreign influence"--forsooth!

2d. The system of state schools is contrary to the natural law. In it the state assumes the right to control public sentiment. The state decides what studies are to be pursued, and in those studies what treatises are to be read: that is, the state decides what is true (for what is study but the pursuit of truth?) in every science. The state determines what is true in geography, in astronomy, in philosophy, in ethics, and consequently in theology. Now it is contrary to the natural law to attribute to the state any power that it cannot have. But this system gives the state right to act as though it were infallible; and infallibility belongs to none besides the Church. Therefore this system of education is contrary to the natural law. Protestants are exceedingly shocked at our daring to believe in Jesus Christ, when He said He would guide His Church into all truth, and keep her from all error. How then can they bear the idea of the state's assuming itself to be infallible?

What right has the state to control public sentiment, and direct the education of young souls created for eternity, unless it is sure that it directs them right? If it is sure that it is right, then it is infallible; if it is not sure, then its pretensions are arrogant and to be reprobated.

We are accused--we Catholics--in this country, of which we are citizens, of meddling in politics. The enemies of our religion seek to establish over us a religious despotism, under the name of political law. They avow their intention of employing the public money, of which we pay our part--to subvert our literary institutions, to crush our colleges, our convent schools--our free schools, our private select schools--to root out our religion as a "foreign influence;" and because we raise a feeble remonstrance against this wholesale sending of our children to hell--we are held up to odium as "meddling in politics." We have too much confidence in the public sense of justice, however, to believe that these clamors of interested cliques will ever injure us very far beyond the purlieus of bigotry, in which they originate.

335.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, February 5, 1876

[Education by the Government]

We are in favor of educating the masses. The Catholic Church has always favored it. Non-Catholics and hickory Catholics of the Middle Ages used to consider it a disgrace to know how to read and write. The Church never yielded to the fashion of public thought. The monasteries were the abodes of learning, when it was banished from worldly society. All the great educational institutions of Europe were founded and endowed by Catholic zeal and charity.

When the Church had succeeded in making learning popular, the enemy seized upon it, and, with the same effrontery that in old times gave the name of "clerk" and "shaveling" to all who knew their letters, claimed to be its exclusive patrons.

Taking advantage of the Church's invincible opposition to false education, and to the pride of science that scorns Revelation, the anti-Catholic party succeeded in making people believe that the Church was the foe to enlightenment, and for several generations we have been set down in geographies, histories, novels and plays --nay, in treatises on graven sciences--as hostile to learning. It is a part of the tactics that come out of the gates of Hell.

But, while the Church is in favor of universal enlightenment, she is not in favor of the ownership of the individual by the state. This doctrine is equally hideous, whether adopted to benefit or torment the people. If the government owns the child, to educate it, then the right of property of ruler, in the subject, is established; and the majority, pretending to lord it over men's souls, is just as hateful as the single tyrant.

336 - Supposed Opposition to Equality in Education

Therefore, the poor should be aided to acquire education, but not the rich; and the state is bound to defer to the consciences of parents in the religious character of the education given.

336.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 15, 1875 (1)

[Supposed Opposition to Equality in Education]

One parcel of the dishonest gabble of anti-Catholic newspapers is that Catholics, in asking for some consideration for the religious education of their children in the disposal of a fund to which they contribute their share, are opposed to equality!

The truth is, equality is all they ask for. It was equality that they obtained by the Prison bill, and a howl of rage against the measure was raised all over the country by men who have the effrontery to proclaim themselves advocates of equal rights to all, without distinction of creed or color. Catholics believe that they cannot fulfill their obligations to their children by a mere secular education. They have reasons for their belief which they are ready enough to furnish any candid inquirer. But apart from these reasons, the mere fact of this being their belief entitles them to consideration for it, according to the principles of liberty of conscience, which are the basis of our system of government.

They do not ask to dictate what other people's children shall be taught; but they want a say as to what their own children are to be taught.

And no man can honestly characterize this claim as opposed to equality. Let other people educate their children as they please, and let Catholics have the same privilege. If that is not equality we would be please to know what is equality.

By degrees the people who have souls to save will find out that the whole system of opposition to the Catholic Church that has led generations of honest men astray from light and true liberty has been, and is, a system of misrepresentation and fraud.

337.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 15, 1875 (3)

[Religion in Secular Schools]

And now there comes along a "Daniel to judgment" who thinks it easy to confine instruction in public schools to purely scientific matters, and leave religious instruction to religious teachers. We have seen the Daniel's judgment before. Other Daniels have been along and kindly enlightened Catholics with the same view, "other whiles." It is refreshing to see how easily men who have no religion of their own can provide for other peoples'. Like Dame Quickly comforting the dying Sir John--bidding him "not

think of God--that there was no need of that yet"--they measure out each child's dose of religious instruction with infinite ease, and label it, "To be taken during recess." To them religious instruction means learning hymns, or verses from the Bible, or getting by heart the fooleries of the Westminster catechism, or the platitudes of the XXXIX Articles.

If they were satisfied with saying, "This is all the religious instruction we want," we would have no fault to find with them. But they insist that this religious instruction is not only enough for them, but enough for us also; and when we respectfully decline to be satisfied with their measurement, they dismiss us with indignation, as too bigoted to thank them for being so liberal.

To Catholics, religion is the key to the mystery of life, explaining why we live and how to fulfill our destiny. It tells us the reach of our intellect, the value of our instincts and affections, where to follow and where to resist them; what we study for, what we recreate for. It should be in all we do, or think, or say, exalting to an eternal aim even the commonest and most secular of our actions. The Son of God did not become man to teach us a few hymns and meaningless formulas which serve only to make the school-child's life a little more burdensome, but not at all to direct it. He came to save us by being instructor of our intellect and director of our will.

It is true that reading, writing and arithmetic are not religious instruction, but the teacher of them will have some theory of why they are taught, and this theory will be his religion. There will be religion or irreligion or indifferentism in the matter of the reading and writing, whether the system wills it or not. There is "sectarianism" in geographies, astronomies, arithmetics, books of rhetoric and logic; even in grammars--and, of course, in histories.

The injustice of Liberalism is that it will not let people agree to differ in belief, but wants to force them to agree in unbelief; and its hypocrisy is glaring in that it concedes to us the right to be Catholics only on condition of our allowing that the Catholic religion is of no benefit to young or old.

338.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, January 24, 1878 (3)

[Religion in Education]

One view that specially deludes many fair-minded people on the education question is that all differences of religious creeds are mere quips, matters of family prejudice, national pride, or personal preference. With this idea for a basis, they easily conclude that children may be educated in one place and taught religion in another. "The State will educate the children, and the parents can teach them what religion they see fit." That this may be the case among anti-Catholic sects, we do not deny. They agree only in one thing, viz.: the rejection of authority, without which rational faith is

339 - Religious Instruction of the Deaf

impossible. As they have not the ground of faith, it matters little what they agree on or what they divide on, after this. But to the Catholic, faith means everything that regenerates, purifies and saves humanity. It is not a few scattered ceremonies, a peculiar custom here and there, or now and then a doctrine that seems strange, but it is all that makes up the life of the baptized person, until he is brought face to face with God at the Judgment. Therefore, it cannot be laid aside during the week, or at school hours, or recreations, and taken up for a few minutes each day. It might almost as well not be brought in at all. Religion is not to be learned by getting lessons, but by living it. To be taught to live for God, and commanded to live for the world, will make us either hypocrites or infidels. The *Frammasoni* understand these matters better than their dupes. To train a child not to believe is enough for them at present. Devil worship will come afterwards.

339.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, August 29, 1878 (1)

[Religious Instruction of the Deaf]

Some mealy-mouthed lecturer before the deaf and dumb convention, the other day, is reported to have read an essay on giving religious instruction to the deaf mutes without introducing sectarianism. The old way of concealing all truth, and dwelling on sentimentalities, is nearly worn out by this time. From its very nature Protestantism is denial, and therefore is, in all its forms, sectarianism. In the meantime the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Mary have founded a school for deaf mutes at Louisville, Ohio, in the Diocese of Cleveland, and the ravages of administration of the Ohio Deaf and Dumb Asylum, on the souls of Catholic children, may yet be counteracted.

340.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 25, 1875 (2)

[Public Schools Not Good Enough for Protestants]

Every day we hear asserted that Protestants consider the public schools good enough for their children--Catholics alone are dissatisfied.

At the same time it is argued that a division of the funds in favor of the Catholics would break up the whole public school system, because every sect would then want its own school.

This is an example of how anti-Catholic prejudice contradicts itself at every step.

If Protestants esteem the public schools good enough for their children, there would be no danger of the system being broken up by giving Catholics a division of the funds. If there is danger, then it follows that Protestants do not consider the public

341 - Protestant Inconsistencies Regarding the Bible in School

schools good enough for their children. Our opponents must take either horn of the dilemma--either there exists no such danger, or the public schools are not really approved of by the people.

341.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 5, 1875 (4)

[Protestant Inconsistencies Regarding the Bible in School]

The New England Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at its recent session in Springfield, adopted among other resolutions on the Bible, the following:

Resolved, That the reading of the Bible in our public schools, when enforced by legal sanction, is an obligation inconsistent with our republican form of government, the principles of our Protestant religion, and the teachings of the Bible itself.

That's what our Methodist friends up in Massachusetts [say.]

But note the contrast and the time-honored inconsistency of the Protestant sects by reading the following resolutions adopted at the Presbyterian General Assembly up in Cleveland the other day:

"*Resolved*, that the continuous, persistent, and repeated efforts of the Papists throughout the country, under the tutelage, direction and advice of the Papal hierarchy, to obtain control of the school funds in the several States of the Union, or to have a portion of said school funds diverted from the legal and legitimate uses to which said funds are pledged, in order to devote the money to the support of the Papistical schools, demand from all Protestant Christians of every denomination, and every citizen of the United States opposed to a union of Church and State, resolute, determined and combined effort and unceasing watchfulness to prevent the success of insidious attempts now being made in all sections of the country by the adherents of the papacy, to secure control of the school money. And it is hereby recommended by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church that all attempts to subvert our school lands or divert any portion of our school fund in any of the States of the Union to, or for the use of, any Church or sect, shall be resisted and prevented by the use of legal and honorable means.

"*Resolved*, That the outcry of the Papal hierarchy against what they call our 'Godless schools,' can with far more justice and greater propriety be applied to their own schools. In the *Common Schools of our country the pure word of God is read without comment, while in the Papist-schools the Bible is excluded and dogmas and traditions of men are substituted for the commandments of God.*"

We see that though Protestant sects agree in their own condemnation of the so called "Papistical" schools, and uphold the Bible as the "sole rule of Faith," will they

disagree as to the method of applying that rule and circumstances under which it shall be applied.

342.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Nov. 20, 1875

[Ignorance and Immorality]

It is certain that a government of the people cannot be sustained by people who are ignorant or immoral. But as for ignorance, it would be preferable to knowledge of evil and the ways of doing evil. If instructors who invent and propagate falsehood are to be the only ones to reach the masses, then worse than ignorance will reign. Americans are well informed on many topics--in fact on all topics that it is fashionable to be posted on--but there are some very important points that they know nothing of whatever. They know, for example, that Archbishop of New York is a Cardinal, that he has a cross, a crimson cassock, has been to Rome and Dublin, but they do not know what a Cardinal is. They know that the Pope's name is Pius IX., what he wears, and what he eats, but they do not know what the Pope is.

They know nothing of the real doctrines of the Catholic Church. In this regard their ignorance is so utterly helpless that they can be imposed upon by any fool's invention. It is their own fault, however. They make no demand for Catholic reading. No Catholic books are in the stores they support. In conversation with Catholics they are not ashamed to exhibit an ignorance which they would hold in contempt in other people and on other topics.

Now the sort of intelligence that comes with reading, writing, arithmetic and geography will not make people virtuous. If you want to make a man deny himself anything his passions ask for, you must show him some motive for the sacrifice. But there *is* no motive in mere secular science. It is shallow and silly to go on perpetuating the cant about the omnipotence of education in preserving morality. All this was true in Catholic times, when education meant instruction in the things that concern salvation, but it is not true now, when education means knowledge of things that simply gratify curiosity and create power, but offer no motive for doing good. Education is good and desirable because it renders one capable of finding out his destiny and the means of fulfilling it. But should this end not be reached, education will be a wanted gift.

343.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, March 6, 1875 (4)

[The Effects of the Public Schools]

In a former Pastoral we forbade children who had not attended a Catholic school, where such an one was accessible, for two years previously, to be admitted to Holy Communion. We direct that this rule be observed. Only they who have eyes to see, and ears to hear, and hearts to feel, can tell how blank of the most elementary religious knowledge are Catholic children who go to the District schools, and how soon they forget to make the Sign of the Cross, or to say Our Father, Hail Mary, and the Creed. -- *Late Pastoral of the Most Rev. Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati.*

A Cleveland paper, quoting the above remarks, says, "It is easy to see from this that Archbishop Purcell hates public schools as the devil hates holy water."

It did not need this to tell us that Archbishop Purcell, and every other pastor of souls, hates to see Catholic children wasting their youth in studies that ignore Jesus Christ, and the immortal destiny of the soul; and in company, where it is the fashion, to treat their religion as an imposture, and its adherents as knaves or dupes.

A survey of the results forced upon every one who is in the sacred ministry would be enough, without the emphatic warnings of the Vicar of Christ, to create this feeling. The number of apostates, of immoral young men, of trifling and useless young women, of mixed marriages, and unbaptized children, is too fearfully great not to compel any one who has an interest in the honor of Our Lord, and the salvation of souls, to feel heart-sick at the spectacle of innocent children being condemned to places where they will be taught to believe themselves enlightened when they learn to forget God.

344.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 18, 1878 (1)

[Prejudice Against Truth and Common Sense]

The aggravation of ornamental studies in public schools is not only in making the laborers pay expenses for the *noblesse*, but also in the fact that those ornamental branches are so superficially taught, and the *noblesse* so practically left in ignorance. "*Qualis Rex talis grex*"--"like master like man," is a true proverb. If we Americans are going to change the manners of our fathers, and educate the young not for a simple homely life of labor and duty, but for living by adventure and wit, it would be wiser for us to educate a real aristocracy that would have brain and heart and accomplishments, which would command a following. You accomplished people must have somebody to

live on, you know. If life is reduced to "making a living," the stronger will make the living, and the weaker will starve, or live in slavery. The change from republican government to whatever government may turn up is going on very rapidly all the time, in our country. And the senseless prejudice against Catholic truth and common sense is the force that is moving it.

345.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 18, 1878 (3)

[Choice in Education]

The gentlemen who conduct the Sunday *Capital* are opposed to any "tampering with our glorious common school system" by which parents might be given a say as to what ornamental studies their children are to buy books for. Now that is truly democratic, and progressive, and liberal, is it not? Of course you Irish and Germans, who carry hods, and use hoes, and drive milk-wagons, and hew wood, and draw water, generally, ought to educate genteel people, for the grandeur of the country. What are they here for, if not for that? Then if they want particular branches, such as religion, taught to their children, let them get up schools of their own, besides.

346.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, January 24, 1878 (4)

[Troublesome High School Students]

On the evening of Friday, 18th inst., the seminarian who has charge of the sacristy at the Cathedral, hearing an unusual noise in the vestibule, went there in time to witness a remarkable scene for a Christian and civilized country. Three half-grown boys were forcing a fourth one about their own age into the large holy water vase, made of free stone, half buried in the inner wall, and repeating the formula of Holy Baptism: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." At the appearance of the temporary sacristan the three took to flight, leaving the fourth, with his head and upper clothing dripping, who gave some little explanation of the matter. The authorities at the Cathedral have hitherto kept it open all day for the accommodation of strangers and of those Catholics who like to drop in as they pass to say a little prayer. They argued that few ruffians or thieves would have any taste for strolling on East Broad street, in daylight, and therefore the church would be safe from desecration. The youths engaged in the scene above described were from the High School. Their names are at this office, with a single exception.

Similar offensive conduct in the Cathedral on the part of young ladies from the High School has more than once annoyed worshippers before the altar. The rude

347 - Columbus School Rowdies

gestures, grimaces and derisive genuflections of these young ladies have given frequent pain to people who desire only to say their prayers in peace. Catholics cannot forget that they aid in paying for these young persons' education; and think it hard that, with all their outlays, they cannot get, even in the advanced grades, a return of civility and good manners. If these young gentlemen and young ladies are so highly educated to believe in such nonsense, they ought to be too highly civilized to mock those who do.

347.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Oct. 16, 1875 (6)

[Columbus School Rowdies]

On Monday night some youthful rowdies took the gates off the hinges in the Broad St. front of the Sacred Heart Convent, at the corner of Seventh street. The gate of 283 Broad street, formerly the Bishop's, now the property of James Naughton Esq., was also wrenched from its place and carried away. The children of the Sullivant School and High School have the habit of stopping about the Sacred Heart Academy and annoying the pupils as they issue from the place in the afternoon.

Now we beg the attention of the prominent people who are engaged in defending our glorious common schools to these considerations.

1st. That Catholics are minding their own business and supporting their own schools. 2d. That if the spirit of rowdyism and destruction of property is encouraged by public teachers, those will suffer most in the end who have the most property.

3d. That it is a poor way of demonstrating the excellence of state schools to have the pupils insult and annoy females, whether children or teachers. This might be a plan to remind those Catholic parents who barter the Sacraments for a place in the state schools for their children, that the company to which those children are exposed is not only non-Catholic but Christ-hating. But the trumpet must sound to wake them up.