

POPERY

AGAINST

COMMON SCHOOL EDUCATION

IN FOUR LETTERS TO BISHOP O'CONNOR AND
GOVERNOR BIGLER.

~~~~~  
BY M. W. JACOBUS, D.D.  
~~~~~

PHILADELPHIA:
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION,
No. 265 CHESTNUT STREET.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following Letters, from the Rev. Melancthon W. Jacobus, D. D., Professor in the Western Theological Seminary, will speak for themselves. They were occasioned, as will be perceived, by the bold assaults of the Roman Catholic (so called) "Bishop of Pittsburgh," on the popular system of common schools, recognized and sustained by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and by the insidious attempt to induce legislative action for the support of the very worst form of sectarianism. The Bishop in Pennsylvania has united in an evidently concerted measure, by which the Roman Catholic Bishops in the United States hope to accomplish one of two favourite objects, viz., to subvert the system of common school education, now so prevalent in the country, or at least to divert a part of the general fund, raised for this purpose, to their own contracted, illiberal, and anti-American

schemes. The views expressed by Dr. Jacobus will meet with a hearty response from every enlightened American; and they are now presented in this form, in hopes that they will meet the eye, and secure the attention of the people in general, and of our legislators in particular.

The best interests of society require that every new development of Popery in the United States should be vigilantly regarded, and promptly exposed. Its whole past history proves that it is inimical to free institutions; and it is rapidly losing all traces of those modifications, by which many unreflecting persons supposed it was adapting itself to the genius of our republican government. As it increases in power, it discloses its true character; and the perpetuity of our institutions will materially depend on our being awake to its true tendencies, and counteracting its obvious intentions. *Obsta principiis* is the just rule of action in reference to a system which, under a religious guise, is radically political, and at once grasping, ambitious, and inimical to the most cherished, social, civil and religious liberties of the human race.—[EDITOR OF THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

P O P E R Y

AGAINST

COMMON SCHOOL EDUCATION.

LETTER I.

PITTSBURGH, Jan. 25, 1853.

To the Rev. Dr. O' Connor, Bishop of Pittsburgh, &c.

YOU have taken occasion, from a passing reference to yourself, in a late article, to deliver to this Commonwealth a protest against our American system of popular education. You will allow me to remind you of a public call upon you, much more gravely and directly affecting yourself, which you have left unanswered since last March, even though you stood committed, through your organ in this city, to give it notice. The public had good reason to calculate that at least you would not seek to interfere with our popular institutions, without first making it incontestably clear that

you are not under an oath of allegiance to the Pope, as a temporal sovereign. Since that time you have sat in secret council of the Romish Bishops at Baltimore, and have made a visit to the Pope himself, to await his sanction, as we suppose, to those undivulged proceedings. Your profound silence in regard to a charge which it so behoved you to deny, if you could, must be taken as a tacit concession of its truth.

The bearing which this fact of a foreign allegiance, has upon the point now at issue, is neither trivial nor obscure. This does, indeed, explain to us your great aversion to that system of public education which you find here established. We open to your two thousand children of this vicinity the *common school*, and you demand an *uncommon* one. You claim always some special legislation in your favour, though you choose to talk of it as only "*equal rights*." If *we* are not satisfied with this public provision, and choose to set up parochial schools, for a more religious education, we are compelled to sustain them without aid from the State. You very well

know that no sectarian school is sustained by the State as such. Why should you claim an exemption for Romanists against the spirit of our free institutions? We complain of all this—that you persist in a Jewish separatism, not allowing your people to send their children where they would mingle with our American children, and receive the training that belongs to our American principles. You prefer them to live in ignorance, and roam about the streets uneducated, rather than that they amalgamate with the rising generation of our own land. And this is all in keeping with that spirit of Jewish exclusiveness, which arrogates to your own church that it is the true and only church of God; and to your Roman Catholic people that you are the chosen seed, and that this land of promise is of right yours. And so you are in effect training your children to look with suspicion and hatred upon our system of education—to become opposers of our laws, rebels against the State, and enemies of our institutions.

If it be asked what training you promise to repay for the State funds which you demand,

it is plainly a Roman Catholic training, which recognizes the Pope, as of divine right, the true and only sovereign and head of the State; which regards Protestant governments as unauthorized, and Protestant laws as invalid; which regards the Bible, whether in the school or in the family, as a pestiferous book, fit only to be burned, and Protestantism as a heresy, fit only to be extirpated with the sword. And you ask to be sustained by the State in such a system of education! Your system puts all the funds into the hand of the Bishop, and demands that he and all his clergy be exempt from civil jurisdiction. If you deny that you make such claims in this country, we adduce the boasted *unity* of your Church, and show that this is what it claims wherever it dares. Before such concessions are made in these United States, it may be demanded that you show the very terms of the oath which every Romish Bishop has sworn to the Pope.

We very well understand the light in which you view the system of popular education, as bearing upon the progress of your own politi-

cal religion in this land. We see daily the effort which Jesuitism is making in Continental Europe to seize the portfolio of public instruction, so as to have all educational establishments under Papal control. And we know very well that this is what you aim at in our land. We cannot give up our free principles to promote sectarian legislation, least of all for such as are in league with a foreign political power, and which avowedly aim at our subjection to a foreign State. We are willing and anxious that Romanists here may understand the true genius of free institutions, and may enjoy equal rights with all our citizens; but never that they be recognized as Romanists by the State, and sustained as such by special grants for their political religion.

It is plain to be understood what you require. Your letter is explicit to this point, that nothing will suffice you but a system of Romish education. You expressly declare that *all our educational institutions* are equally an offence to you; all in the same sense sectarian, as being not *Roman*; all in

the same category, and odious in your eyes. How then can we suit you? By paying you a *bonus* for this denunciation of our free institutions, and by patronizing this foreign Papal policy in our midst? You plead your *conscience!* Would the conscience of any American be respected a moment, if you had the power to control our legislation? Ask in Naples, in Tuscany, in Rome itself. *Conscience!* The plea comes with ill grace from those who trample upon conscience all over the world, where it squares not with their pleasure. What is the conscience of the Medici and Guarducci to the Grand Duke, or to the Pope, or to yourself? But only the conscience of the Grand Duke is sacred, and to be respected in such case—that good son of the Church, and next neighbour and near friend and ally of his Holiness. Will you allow your plea to be used on their behalf, and show at Rome and Florence how base it is to force men to subjection in religious things? Come and plead for the conscience of a man and wife separated, and doomed to the gloomy prisons of Tuscany, under the

very eye of the Pope, for their religious faith.

But it is undeniable that the grand aversion of your Church to our system of popular education is: 1st, That your religion opposes the diffusion of knowledge among the masses. This is capable of most conclusive proof from official documents abroad; but we quote from your organs at home. "The Shepherd of the Valley," in a late article on popular education, holds the following language:—" *This teaching every one to read* is bearing its fruit in our own days, here and elsewhere, and a *very unwholesome fruit* it appears to be." You speak guardedly on this point, as we might expect. You say: "It is not from a fear of *real* information of any kind that we apprehend danger. Gladly would we see *true* knowledge diffused." This we understand—that by "*real* information," and "*true* knowledge," you mean Roman Catholic information, and so insinuate that ours is *false*. If you sought for your youth the knowledge that is here placed within their reach, you would seize the high privilege for them as even the

Jew is doing under the Protestant missionaries at the East.

But, secondly, another secret of your aversion is, that your system opposes *free education*. This is the high hand which Popery is showing among the imbecile and craven governments of the European continent—to claim the right of teaching and the control of all educational institutions. Here, on our borders, as you know, the government of New Grenada lately adopted a Constitution, providing for itself a system of popular education, and Pope Pius IX., in his “allocution,” from the Sacred College, denounces the laws as utterly null and void. Here is the very express language in which he begins the onslaught: “Nor must we pass over in silence that by the new Constitution of that Republic, among other things, the *right also of free education is defended.*” The document is worthy only of the middle ages.

Your system essentially denies us the right to educate our own children, no less than yours; and free education, independent of Rome, is its special abhorrence. This posi-

tion you have not yet thought it prudent to take amongst us ; but New Grenada is near at hand. Witness also in Sardinia. The famous Sicardi laws provide, among other things, for "the right of all classes to the benefit of the schools and universities, without regard to sect or party." And this brings down upon that government and people the hottest fulminations of the Vatican.

But the head and front of offending in our Public School system is, *the use of the Bible*. Even in the smallest measure, it is too much for your interests. It endangers your religion even with the noisy urchins who never hear the chapter read. The shadow of it is a spectre of evil to your eyes. The same deadly hatred of this sacred book which shows itself in Rome, at this day, hunting even the Old Testament from the poor Jews of the Ghetto ; the same spirit which, in Florence, against the united outcry of the Protestant world, dooms husband and wife apart to gloomy cells, for reading the simple Gospel, "*Il puro evangelio* ;" that foul spirit, which, at the Pope's demand, has lately repealed the tolerant laws

of the first Leopold in Tuscany, and made heresy punishable with death, and which now arrests a man for reading the 15th chapter of the gospel by John, "*I am the true vine,*" &c. The very same spirit is here, shunning and denouncing our most precious, popular education, because it includes any opening of the word of God! You construe this, in Tuscany, into an offence against the State! And how? The Bible is against the Romish church. Whatever is against the Romish church, is against the Romish State; for they are one! And by the same reasoning, you do before the world admit all our allegation, that whatever here is for the Romish church, is for the Romish State, and so is against the American State. Then ask no legislation for Romanism.

Hear "The Freeman's Journal" on the public schools, and you would think he was speaking of the foulest brothels of New York: "What we, Roman Catholics, must do now, is to get our own children out of *this devouring fire*. At any cost, and any sacrifice, we must deliver the children over whom we have control, *from these pits of destruction*, which lie invitingly in their way, under the name of *public*

or *district schools*," &c. Let us rather see this zeal expended in keeping the children out of real dens of iniquity. Scenes of violence have occurred, as we learn, in some of the public schools of Pittsburgh, which foreshadow the results of all this bitterness, if the power were in such hands.

Let me say again, that, though Romanism shows itself all round us, in such persecuting acts against the rights of conscience, though it denies American freedom of worship wherever it rules, yet we throw our arms open to as many Romanists as will come to us; and we cheerfully accord to them the religious liberty which they deny to us. *But this is not enough.* Our free institutions are denounced because they are free. And you demand for Romanists, as a sect, what we grant to no sect in the land—special recognition and legislation. We have no laws *against* Romanism. We make no difference *in favour of ourselves.*

We note your discourse on the sacredness of a man's religion—the rights of conscience—the shame of being forced to act against it, even in receiving favours, and the sense of

justice in our land. Will you join in the petitions which are now pouring in to our national Congress, on the measure now before them, viz: *to secure by treaty, to our citizens, the right of religious worship in Papal lands?* Your name, as the Roman Catholic Bishop of Pittsburgh, would have great weight, I am sure, with the Pope. The moment is opportune. And be assured, my dear sir, I have no motive in this communication other than the interest of truth and freedom, and the honour of our Lord Jesus.

We ask you to join with us in making such an appeal where it belongs—on behalf of the poor, imprisoned, and doomed subjects of Romish governments abroad, and especially of that faithful son of the church, who declares that *he will extirpate heresy from his dominions, though he may gain the name of being the bloodiest tyrant in history.* We know his relations to the Pope.

And again, for the satisfaction of this community, we ask: Have you not sworn a like fidelity to the Pope, and are you not under oath and allegiance to him as a temporal ruler?

LETTER II.

PITTSBURGH, Jan. 27, 1853.

*To His Excellency, William Bigler, Governor of the
State of Pennsylvania :*

SIR—Your worthy zeal for the perfecting of our public school system, as exhibited in your annual message, has drawn forth a notable manifesto from the Roman Catholic Bishop in this city. I make no apology for this counter address. The subject is momentous. It is not too much to say that the proverbial sophistry of the school of Loyola appears in this new device, and entitles it to public examination. And it is not to inform you, be assured, but to reach the community for whom “the letter” is specially framed, that I undertake this running review.

The Letter is, in substance, a *protest*, a *plea*, and a *plan*. The protest is against our noble and universal school system. The plea is for

Roman Catholics alone, who are alone ag-grieved. The plan is, not to remove public burdens, and promote the general weal, but, as is frankly avowed in the concluding para-graph, to redress the grievances referred to in the protest. We look, then, in the protest, for the burdens complained of. Is it, that the Romanists, being the wealthiest and most numerous class, are paying the largest tax, and virtually providing for the education of Protestants in our land? No; for the very opposite is the well known fact. And on this score the heavy burden is upon Protestants to provide the means of education for Roman Catholic children. This, however the boon may be rejected, is the intent of our public school system—to offer to a class not over-wealthy nor over-numerous, except in children, the benefit from tax on Protestants. How is it, then, that what was meant for a favour, and works as a favour in every other case, proves, with these, a grievance? This ques-tion is a grave one, and affects the whole sub-ject, and must throw light on all the sequel. Whence is it, that a system of free principles,

which enfranchises all others, *disfranchises*, as the Bishop declares, *every Roman Catholic*? It is worthy the attention of our legislators, how far this difficulty must keep up a steady and incessant war upon all our free institutions. There is no disguise here. The Roman Catholic religion is here confessed to be that very unique, peculiar, implacable thing, which is not suited for our free institutions. But this admission absolves the State; nay, it *warns* against legislation on such grounds. For the moment you legislate for any one religion, to suit its interests and plans alone, that moment the most sacred principles of our Government are violated. That the plan of the Roman Catholic Bishop proposes this special legislation, under the guise of a most general system, will be shown.

But first observe, our public school system, which is the pride, not of Pennsylvania alone, but of our whole land, is truly an American system. It is framed for the masses. Its kind and wise object is to amalgamate from such various elements, all national interests, and to run into the new mould of our institutions

the children of all others *with our own*. A vital condition of our liberties is, that all must be American—must be trained to the same sense of individual responsibility, and to the same freedom of conscience—as *freemen* fitted for free institutions. This has been held an object worthy the highest care and most liberal expenditure of the State. To this same end all our institutions bear. And the fostering of national, sectional, or sectarian prejudices, is counted hostile to the public interest. But this plan is essentially anti-American. It stands in the way of this very working—opposes any such fusion of all varieties into this mould of our free principles, and aims to wall up and hedge around this Roman Catholic body in our bosom, as an empire of its own. Can we pay a *bonus* for this? Can we legislate on such behalf and for such an end? It comes forward, even in open protest, against the institutions which are our pride and boast. Our motto “of equal rights” is complained of as inequality to them. And where, as in this case, they have the same vote in the choice of the public school officers as any, the griev-

ance is, *that somehow, and how it is not said*, our popular plan does not suit them. And we are gravely called upon to break up our whole system of popular education, and conform it to the demand of the Roman Catholic hierarchy among us.

But let us examine, 1st, the planning; 2d, the plan.

1st. We see in this an ingenious attempt to get indirectly what has been so often applied for directly in vain—sectarian legislation. This it is the just and peculiar policy of our American government to refuse, however covertly brought forward. And here, by a plausible device, worthy of Antonelli, we are called to break in upon this first principle of our religious liberties, “protection for all, provision for none.” The aim is, to open a way for Roman Catholic recognition and discrimination on our statutes—to begin at the beginning, and where a plea of religion and conscience can be made, so as to have Roman Catholic employees, as such, in the pay of the State. It is an easy step from school teachers to other officials, till this very precedent

be pleaded for Roman Catholic judges and justices, on the plea of properly guarantying Roman Catholic oaths! The principle being once conceded, we have it carried in all state and national affairs. And the plan is, in effect, to open the way for a re-union of Church and State, however remotely connected with this beginning. This measure would give them their first finger in the public purse.

2d. The planning aims, as will be seen, to accomplish *indirectly* what cannot be done *directly*—*the control of our public education*. According to the present system, this is made impossible. Hence it must be demolished, as in the change they could not be losers, and in the new arrangements their tactics might work great gains. Jesuit education, with all its complicated apparatus, has been the curse of all other lands, politically and morally, and to open the door to it has been the ruin of governments. The Jesuit reasoning here is plainly in the face of their well known principles, and therefore is only a device. In all Papal countries, the position is, that the State is bound to control public education. Witness

the demands to this effect now making in France, and in all Papal quarters. But what if the State be Protestant? Then indeed they can do better by having the field open for competition. And at once education is *not* a social thing, but an individual matter—*not* for the State, but for the parent! Mark the concerted movement to this end in these United States. To-day, Roman Catholic Bishops are reported as “log-rolling” in the Legislature of Michigan. The war has been raging in Ohio; and after many a battle and defeat, has broken out afresh in New York. And the Bishop of Pittsburgh, in his measure, *works at the same wheel*, taking his cue from the editor of the Freeman’s Journal of January 3d. Something is hoped for from this loose-and-wide-open plan, echoed by the Bishop from his head-quarters.

Let us see—“every one setting up a school” would draw *per capita* from the State fund. At once, from the over-running foreign supply, these Jesuit *solitaires* would swarm among us. There would soon be a dozen schools where there should be one, and all located so

as best to serve the plans of the Roman Catholic Church.

“*The working*” is, that easily our American children are drawn in, and obtain a Roman Catholic education. The plea of economy or convenience of location will avail with many. Indifference will rule with more. And the competition, which in commercial things is equal, becomes here, in ecclesiastical things, vastly unequal, by *their better tactics, more numerous ecclesiastics, and more determined sectarian aims.*

This measure, *which could not be at all reached without State funds*, would thus be fostered by our own Protestant taxation, and by our own government patronage. And whilst there is the faintest remembrance of our freedom from Popish rule, as our choicest birthright, the State will sooner be dissolved in anarchy, than this will be conceded.

But the planning is, *thirdly, to increase the forces of Popery among us, and the power and agencies of the hierarchy.* We can see “the working” in other lands. Where the State sustains, in any way, this Jesuit system, they

defy competition—make headway against all resistance, and soon become the organized police of the Pope—the spies in every district—the *gens d'armes* of this church despotism. We have reason to know that it is not the Roman Catholic PEOPLE, but the PRIESTS, who are at work against our school system. They refuse to the parents the privilege of sending their children to any other than their own schools, and to this end they control them by the terrors of excommunication and perdition. This is, therefore, a movement of the hierarchy, and we should first ask, are not these, the functionaries of the Pope, under oath to him as a temporal sovereign?

But yet further, the planning is—to do *indirectly* what has been attempted *directly* in vain—to drive the Bible from our Common Schools. The scheme hints boldly at this. It can be in this only, that their religion is interfered with, except it is negatively opposed by preventing its positive inculcation. The Bible, which all other denominations tolerate, because each claims to find its own religion

there, and which only Romanists and infidels so attack—this is to be driven out by the scheme! Or, rather, the scheme is secretly to head off what cannot openly be proscribed among us. Yet the State is no less to be the patron or supporter of the schools. It is to be drawn into a measure so decidedly infidel—*à la Girard*—while the Bishop is crying out against infidel indifferentism! Let us see the *working*. The Roman Catholic schools we know would set aside even their own Bible, for it is against their system to have it vulgarly read. The other schools would be on the footing of our select and private schools, with no guaranty for the use of the Bible, and under no regulation to that effect. It would be left, except in mere denominational schools, to the taste or policy of the teacher, and at least the State would abandon the great principle! And this is a leading object that is aimed at by all the new schemes of the Papacy for regulating our public education. Here observe the attack is not directly upon the Bible. This has been tried in New York, and has signally failed. And now, under a guise of facilitat-

ing the legislation, simplifying the machinery, economising the offices, &c., a blow is struck at the root of our free institutions, by disowning and discarding the word of God!

Let us note, then, some of the more practical objections to the plan itself, and to its working:—

1st. Its effect would be to *create a warring of religious sects*—to array every district of the community into such divisions—even the children “hailing” as Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Protestant and Roman Catholic, with all the petty strifes growing into maturity, widening into families, stretching into politics, reaching into State finances, and subverting the fair fabric of our society, by sectarian feuds, far worse than sectional dissensions. It is a plan for relieving the Bishop of *heart-burnings*, and increasing them everywhere else.

The schools themselves would thus degenerate into *nurseries for polemics*—as Roman Catholic schools are now, from the Propaganda down, discarding “the sciences as heathenish,” and teaching nothing so much as Ro-

manism. And thus a proper education would be lost.

2d. The effect would be to *destroy the public school entirely, with all its peculiar advantages*. Breaking up the well appointed system into fragments, what have we? A host of petty private schools, kept alive only by this State patronage, without any State system or supervision; nothing left for the State, on the Bishop's plan, but taxing and disbursing, which had as soon be abandoned also. Will the Bishop propose to give up the whole State system, tax-fund and all? There will be no controversy, be sure, *if there is no money to distribute*. But the question will yet remain, whether the State does not owe this boon of general education to the rising masses. Though the pretence is to favour the freest action under the State patronage, the effect is to destroy popular education.

Parents would find Roman Catholic schools always at hand, but not always others of any kind. Now the State secures these to every district. This is at least "the perfecting of the plan" which would be "the perfecting

of oppression" to the Bishop. In many quarters, the difficulty of "getting up" a school, and maintaining it, would discourage education with multitudes, and the poor especially would go often unprovided for and untaught.

The "*competition*" which is urged by the Bishop as so advantageous, would be most disastrous. It would lead to such a splitting up of every district as to make teaching no longer respectable nor profitable. And this the rather, as the competition would be with men who lead a solitary life, can live on nothing, and whose chief aim it would be to step in everywhere, and by such rivalry, underbidding, &c., to break down or crowd out all Protestant schools. With grants from Propagandas in Lyons and Vienna, we have enough of this foreign competition. IF THE BISHOP SEES NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EMPLOYING A TAILOR, A BUTCHER, OR A SCHOOL-TEACHER, WE DO. The "*Monopoly*," which the Bishop speaks of as he would of the most odious commercial establishments, with vested rights, is a *necessary* monopoly, like our city waterworks, employing a large capital, to do for the

multitude what private enterprise could not reach—supplying, by convenient conduits, through every house, and to all the rooms, if you please, and for the poor too, what your private pumps and cisterns could never do. The State resources are requisite to build school-houses, convenient ones—no cellars of Roman Catholic churches—to provide suitable furniture, necessary apparatus, valuable libraries, &c. This can be done on our public school plan, just because there can be consolidation (misnamed monopoly), by which there can be compassed what would be impossible to the hundred petty schools of the Bishop. The new plan, by splitting, scattering, dividing, would be fatal to popular education in any large and liberal sense. It would answer the Roman Catholic aim of teaching *Ave Marias*. But look at the noble district school-houses, upon which the Bishop looks out with such discomfort, and see the well appointed rooms, desks, libraries, maps, philosophical apparatus, and see how utterly all the splendid advantages would be sacrificed, where the six hundred children would be separated and scattered into fifty puny schools.

And does he tell us that his plan would secure greater efficiency? Or that it would be any advantage to parents to be left to find their own teachers? How absurd! The poor have commonly not the time to examine the teacher, if they could, as the State arrangement does. Usually, the labourer can only know that his children go to school. But, alas! he cannot, in most cases, attend either to comparing teachers, or books, if he were competent. This, therefore, knowing the case, the State does for him.

With many, too, who are careless of their children's education, the school-house, with all its perfected plans, needs to be brought to their door, at the smallest cost, and with the least trouble. The Bishop's plan would be void for the multitude, as too expensive, except for Roman Catholics, who could either retain the advantage of a large district school, as they could gather all in one, or could get their teachers for the smallest pay. And were all parents left to get up a school, as must often be done, how many would fail of an education, who now crowd into these nurseries

of knowledge, and who come out well furnished for the walks of life, in general information? In scattered districts, too, how expensive would this become, and how grievously would it bear upon the poor.

Besides, another grievance of such a system for the masses, would be the vast variety of class books in use, for lack of system, among these scattered schools. Now, in our cities, where families are moving so often from one district to another, the children are not compelled, at every new school, to be furnished with a whole set of class-books anew. But under the same system, the pupil enters the same *curriculum*, and only in a different district, goes on with his course of study the same.

This difficulty of the Bishop's plan, again, would not bear upon Roman Catholics. They would have their general system, under the Bishop's control. But Protestants have no such headship for all. And here again, the scheme that boasts such equality would be all unequal to us.

But further. The effect of the Bishop's

plan is to make Protestants pay for Roman Catholic education. We make no objection to be taxed, as now, for Roman Catholic pauperism, which might be urged as a serious grievance if we chose. We cheerfully pay a large proportion of all the tax for the public institutions, educational and charitable, to which Romanists have as free access as ourselves. But we will never consent to be taxed a dollar for a Roman Catholic training. We are willing that sectarian teaching be excluded from the public schools, in order that no conscience may be reasonably offended. In all this, we make an open and united testimony against that oppression of conscience, which so characterizes Roman Catholic lands. We are willing to be taxed for Roman Catholics, but not for Roman Catholicism. And the moment they turn away from our free system, and must be taught Popery, that moment we protest against being taxed a farthing for their establishments. If we wish our children educated in our Catechisms—and we have many parochial schools, of the different denominations—we cheerfully sustain

them, and sustain in our measure, the public school besides, for the masses who care not for church schools, or come not within their reach. So let the Roman Catholics do!

But finally. Why does the Bishop propose a plan which is every way the most seemingly equal but the most really unequal? He would have all receive, *per capita*, for their scholars according to the number taught in the district. Here, again, it would be all in their favour, because they do not bear an equal share with Protestants in the amount of tax. The scrabble, then, would be for scholars, by arts and traps, to which reputable men would not descend, and merely for the public bonus. And they who pay the least, and work no more—where twenty can be taught as well as ten—would often reap the most of the State fund. Why not propose that Roman Catholics receive according to their ratio of taxes paid to the State, deducting the State expenses for pauperism?

This, if the exclusiveness is to be pressed, would keep a separate and strict account with them, to the oppression of none, on their

sectarian behalf. The Bishop's plan, at best, would in effect make them a *privileged class*, having their sectarian and divisive plans sustained, as others do not ask.

But one thing is plain, that unless the State is willing to succumb to the plans of Rome, as lately received and delivered, they can never give up the Bible from any system of Public Education. And we doubt not, that to require the present regulation for the use of God's word in the schools, as a condition of receiving the public fund, would most effectually spoil the Plan for the Bishop. At once all the beauty of its working, as simplifying the machinery, relieving the State, giving efficiency to the work by a healthful competition, and so every way promoting the public good, would vanish into thin air!

Governor, I would respectfully urge, that before any concession is made by the State to the plans of Roman Catholic Bishops, a commission be instituted to make earnest inquiry into their relations to the State, and to take evidence of their being functionaries of a foreign political power.

LETTER III.

PITTSBURGH, Feb. 1, 1853.

*To His Excellency, William Bigler, Governor of the
State of Pennsylvania :*

THE Roman Catholic Bishop, in this city, sets out in his "Letter No. 2," with a most gross and groundless reflection on the men who have been taught in our common schools. With an air of deep emotion, he exclaims, "Oh! it is not in them the men are formed, who are the bone and sinew of the Commonwealth." The insinuation is slanderous to the very men who are our pride—the men who, from the humblest walks of society, are furnished with the substantial information which else were out of their reach, and who rise every day, all around us, to stations of trust and honour. They are in our legislatures, in our pulpits, and in our national Congress. The poor boys of our public schools are they who

are constantly appearing on the stage, as our Fillmores, our Clays, and our Websters.

As to the man whom the Bishop knows of, "who every morning carried a calf on his shoulders, with the hope that he could carry it when it became an ox," we strongly suspect his nationality, as not American. We vouch, at least, that he was not taught in our public schools.

The organ of Archbishop Hughes, in the same crusade, has lately gone further, and alleged that at the head of the criminal lists stand the names of those who have been pupils in these institutions. But when the editor is challenged by a city paper (the New York Times) to make good such a false accusation, he is silent.

Romish prelates very well know that any measure which would break down our grand system of popular education, would undermine the foundations of our republic, in which as the common school Superintendent well remarks, "this training and disciplining of the community is in lieu of the soldiery and police regulations of despotic governments."

The Bishop's complaint is of *tax*, of *majorities*, and of *religion*.

But 1st. Is there any grievance in regard to *tax*? The statistics of education, crime, and pauperism will show whether we are more a burden upon them, or they upon us. The difficulty of the Bishop's case is seen when we find him obliged to argue from the *cheapness* of the public school system in favour of its overthrow. If, as we learn, he has commanded all Roman Catholic parents to withdraw their children from the public schools, he should rather have been satisfied that the *public expense is so little*. We are glad of his plea in favour of a more liberal expenditure. We believe that more should be paid to teachers than at present. Meanwhile, we should like to see a report of the salaries paid to the Roman Catholic teachers in his church schools.

But he has not told the people, that, under this very system, which he denounces as "an odious monopoly," the children are taught at an average cost of *forty-two cents per month* for each scholar. Will the cheapness be an

objection with the poor among us? Will the Bishop show us any good objection to economical arrangements for the *tax-paying* community? In New York, at this moment, the organ of Archbishop Hughes is arguing against the public schools, *that they are too expensive!* But nothing will suit these prelates. Pipe, and they will not dance; mourn, and they will not lament. The real difficulty is behind all this.

But let us examine the Bishop at figures. Any of the boys of our public schools would show him, without slate or blackboard, that \$300, instead of being "*more than four times as much*" as \$18.75 multiplied by *five*, is but a little more than three times as much; and if he can make out by his arithmetic, that \$200 is more than four times as much as \$11.75 multiplied by *five*, we will listen to his improvement on our public school system. No! the very economy of our system, which is its strong defence, which teaches multitudes so well and at such small cost, and which ought to satisfy a friend of the people and of the *poor*, is here argued for its overthrow.

We repeat, the Bishop should rather have been satisfied with the present low cost of public education, as he has withdrawn his children from the schools, and has no further interest in their improvement. As he has shown that it costs now not even one-fourth of what it fairly should, to educate the public school pupils, here is a large margin left him for defraying the extra cost of his church schools. So that, after all, with an economical church arrangement, such as we know he has at hand, his people are paying only a fair price for education, on his own showing; and the oppression of paying *a fourth* to the general benefit, would be slight at most. But here, again, we all know, that in the amount of tax, they fall far below their full proportion; so that even this small item for the public benefit would, in their case, be greatly reduced.

But let the Bishop be heard in all that is said about larger salaries for better teachers. And yet, can it be shown that the secular education obtained in the Roman Catholic church schools of our city, is equal to that of

the public schools? This is impossible, without an expenditure which is more impossible in the case. The Bishop's flock are not utterly unaware of this fact, if we have been rightly informed. Some of those enlightened Roman Catholics who are to be found here and everywhere, rebel against the Bull from Grant's Hill, commanding them to withdraw their children from the district schools. We know of one who submitted for six months; and after making the experiment, and finding that his children were getting nothing but Roman Catholic learning, and were falling far behind other children in education, sent them again to the public school, determined to resist, rather than make such a sacrifice; and no wonder. The advantages in some of these city schools are such as to rival those of the best academies in our land. We know of some of our most intelligent families who send their children there for their education, in preference to any other.

But how immensely must the cost of tuition to the masses of our children be increased by the Bishop's plan, of breaking up the very

arrangement which secures economy, and without which, the great majority would fail of any adequate education! It is a well known principle in educational institutions, that the cost of teaching is not materially enhanced by doubling the numbers in attendance. So that all the scattering of the scholars into different schools would be so far an increase of cost to the parents. And *for the very same kind and quality of teaching as at present, the expense would be immensely increased.* This, at least, would be the working for the Protestant majorities, while the Bishop would avoid this result, by having the Roman Catholic children in large local schools, under his own control, and taught by ecclesiastics, at lowest rates. By this means, and with such an advantage, many of the Protestant poor would be driven into their schools, as the only mode of obtaining an education. They would thus defy all competition, and would proselyte under the State sanction and support.

The whole plan of Rome, with its working, is spread out before us in its transatlantic operations. A late German paper, the *Folks*

Blatt, of Halle, in a notice of these movements, says, "In France, since the free opening of education to them, the whole kingdom swarms with 'brothers and sisters,' for school teachers—like a hunting ground when the chase begins. The State schools decline, the church schools overflow. And in Belgium, the Liberals, by this very throwing open of education, have come to such straits, that by their official majority, after sharp opposition from the Romanists, they have restored the State compulsion." And this was on account of the social degradation and lawlessness which attended on the Jesuit teaching.

But while the Bishop pleads against the *cheapness* of the public school system, and while he gives us his authority, as we have shown, for a more liberal expenditure, he would have us *mark well*, that he would not have this in the *shape of a tax*. *By no means!* He would have us distinguish between the pleasure of paying it privately, and paying it at the public call. It is so much more agreeable to people, as he would have us believe, to expend the same amount in

any other way than for taxation. He may have this aversion to support the State. It is in perfect consistency with all that we have sought to show of the *animus* of this matter. But we trust that out of his own pale, this aversion does not exist. Nay, we know that thousands of intelligent Roman Catholics, who are as good citizens as any, are public spirited men, and have not adopted this rare distinction of the Bishop. We hope they never may!

And all this plea would be good against the whole system of public taxation for the public benefit, and for the support of all our public institutions. And it will come to this! Already the organ of Archbishop Hughes declares the public school system to be "unconstitutional, and of the very essence and operation of *despotism*." This cry against the school tax could be used as well by those who have no children to send, or those who care not enough for education to have them enjoy the benefits. Our American system says, "Pay for your neighbours then. This bulwark of our republican liberties must be main-

tained. It is better than standing armies, or a Pope's police, or criminal institutions." And a true-hearted American who looks with such an eye upon our free principles as all worthy to be maintained by the widest diffusion of knowledge, could not object, and would not.

The only instance, perhaps, of a people ever *applying to be taxed*, was for this very object of common school education. Thousands of the largest property-holders and tax-payers in New York, feeling the dreadful evil and burden to society, and the danger to our free institutions, of having no adequate school system, *petitioned the Legislature to be taxed*, so as to provide for it. And when we consider that nineteen out of every twenty in the land are taught in these public schools, we see the monstrous mischief of invading this universal system. It is a glorious scheme, which will rear many a barrier against Romish aggression. Its *magnitude* appears in the fact, that in this State it embraces *half a million of children*, and employs more than *eleven thousand teachers*. Its increasing *popularity* is

shown by the addition of *a hundred thousand scholars in the last three years!*

But everywhere it is plain that this ecclesiastic's objection is an ecclesiastical one. And yet, secondly, there is no just grievance in regard to *religion*.

The laws of Pennsylvania submit the whole matter of regulating the local schools to the popular vote in each district. This is a plan adopted and approved by the people; and every way in keeping with our free institutions. The people are satisfied with the working and the results. Improvements there should be, but not in the Bishop's direction, of attaching his church schools to the State system.

The denouncement of our plan of "*majorities*," of "*the tyranny of local majorities*," &c., we very well understand. It reveals a deep enmity towards our popular government, which even now would like to over-ride all majorities and popular votes, by ecclesiastical domination. Were it not for these *odious majorities*, the Bishop of Pittsburgh declares that he would be quite satisfied with the provision

in the laws of this State, for allowing public moneys to schools which are connected with religious societies. Give up the only guaranty left to the State, abolish the popular feature, and the local inspection, and he will be satisfied! We see, then, that all that prevents this loose and hazardous allowance of 1849 from answering his purpose is, that the schools must conform to the public school system, and be subject to inspection by the directors of the district, as elected by the people. This should rather alarm the Commonwealth, and call for a revision of this article. It is a wedge, to be driven, it seems, through and through.

I will only say, that such a provision existed, prior to 1841, in New York. But the advantage taken, and the abuse growing out of it, led to an utter repeal of the measure. The fund was declared as properly applying to education for civil purposes alone, as distinct from anything sectarian, and with a view to the security and permanency of our republican institutions. And the experience of our own State, if we read aright the omens, may yet lead to the same results, and that by the *wisdom*

of our legislators, not by their "pusillanimity," as charged upon them by the Bishop.

Why, we ask, does not so lenient and yielding an arrangement of this State give sufficient redress, without "further modification?" Why will it not suit, while the State demands any inspection, even of local directors, or any responsibility to a board, representing the State, and elected by the people? This, if our citizens will now consider it, must expose the drift of these Romish claims; and the extent to which they will press their exclusive demands against the spirit of our republican institutions.

It is boldly avowed that *their religion* is offended. This we can understand only when we consider that it is a *political religion*. Nothing religious is here imposed by the State. The Bible is used where the popular majority calls for it. And even this accommodating plan does not satisfy, because that "tyrannical majority" has the control, and not an ecclesiastical power.

What then can we do? Will not our legislators see how futile are all attempts to con-

form our American system to this foreign one? Will they not say to all such pleas for special legislation—We cannot help you? If your religion is such that it cannot conform to our free institutions, there is no redress. We shall not legislate against you. We cannot legislate for you. Your system is fitted for ecclesiastical rule. Ours is not. If your conscience is offended by submitting to majorities, we cannot help it. Conscience is indeed sacred. But we cannot respect even conscience so much as to regard it where it is false, or to give up the free principles bought with our fathers' blood, for any such asserted grievance. It may be a grievance that the Pope does not rule here, with swarms of friars, monks, priests, nuns, and mitred prelates. But we cannot accommodate you at so dear a rate. It may be a grievance that the Bible insinuates itself into all our public institutions, not by statute, but by the free choice of the people. But you must submit. If it be a grievance that we educate the masses, independently of the Roman Catholic Church, and that many do, perhaps, imbibe a spirit in

our free land, and among our free children, that makes *poor Romanists*,—we cannot help it. We wish all to be American. And we believe that universal education, and a free Bible, are the highest security, under God, of our republican principles. We do not wonder that, in this very view, you so concertedly and steadfastly oppose them. But we cannot help you. IT IS YOU THAT ARE INTOLERANT, NOT WE. We bid you welcome to our land as it is. And where the desert has blossomed under these auspices, we wish it not again to become a barren and desolate waste.

We say, in conclusion, that in a religious point of view, we hold our system of State education to be greatly defective. But, as provided by the State, and with a civil object, we do not expect it to conform to our church views. Nor do we know that it could be made more strictly religious in its provisions, without becoming thereby more objectionable to the Bishop himself, as well as to many others. We take it, therefore, as the civil training which the State owes to the masses

for its own security. We believe that if God were more devoutly recognized in the schools, and the Bible more used in them, the State would be more secure.

How can a State like ours, which demands as a qualification for an oath or an office, that a man believe in certain great Bible truths, do less for its rising generations than to see that they are taught such truths in the public schools? Shall we yield every religious privilege to a foreign interest? We cannot.

Yet the church has also a duty which it owes to our children. And because my church is not the same as the Bishop's, I would not demand that its teaching be adopted in schools which are for the universal public. I would plead for church schools in addition to those of the State, but not as part of the State system. The Presbyterian Church takes this position and acts upon it, as do other churches of our common Protestantism. We pay cheerfully for our common schools, and for our church schools besides. Why cannot the Bishop do likewise? For training the multitudes whom our church schools could not

reach, we cheerfully bear our share of the public burden—if the cost of instruction can be called a *burden* when it saves from so much degradation and crime, which involve so much heavier expense.

A grave question for Protestants now arises. As it is the Bishop's policy to withdraw his people altogether from any connection with the public schools, why should we not claim for them that elementary religious instruction which is agreed to by our common Protestantism, and which has been withheld, mainly to suit the demands of the Romish Prelates among us?

Let Protestants also be awake, lest for lack of vigilance, these ever new encroachments invade our most sacred rights and destroy our liberties before we are aware. Will not our State Legislators be advised, *by the presence and threats of Romish Bishops in the Legislature of Michigan*, and see to it, that no *inch* be conceded, where they will take an *ell*? Let us also demand our Protestant rights, while we may. Restrictions could be imposed on such a political religion without any breach

of toleration. Let us, at least, see to it, that the *half a million* of children in our public schools in Pennsylvania, be taught the great truths of Scripture, and the principles of republican liberty. If the Bishops are to threaten our legislators with the Catholic vote, let us call for the Protestant vote, and it shall speak with a voice of thunder through the land.

Governor, I have aimed to speak plainly and earnestly, not severely. I have pleaded for my Country, not for my Church. But as I love my Bible, which is prohibited by the Pope as containing "damnable heresies," and for which new martyrs are now dying in prison by his side—and as I believe before God, that the Papacy are making signal efforts to subvert our liberties, by breaking in pieces our great system of popular education, so as to gather what they may of the fragments—I have not found it in me to be silent. Especially should we not, by holding our peace against such prelatical assaults, make it as though we lived in Rome, and dared not to speak, even for God and Liberty.

LETTER IV.

PITTSBURGH, March 2, 1853.

To the Editors of the Daily Dispatch :

I DO not feel at liberty to address myself again to Dr. O'Connor at this present, when I have so repeatedly called for his reply to a question which most vitally concerns our argument. Why is he so silent about this one point, diverting public attention by others that are irrelevant? I ask him if he is not among us as a sworn official of that political power which rules at Rome, and he avoids the answer! I ask him to show us the Bishop's oath, that thus our free citizens may judge what hand is here, working in this specious effort to break down our system of public education, and he keeps dark! Plain as it must be to all, how prompt would be his disclaimer, if it could, with any good Protestant conscience, be made, I shall be borne out by a

just public, in holding the point as conceded, and in arguing accordingly.

Why not frankly tell us that he is under oath to the Pope, and, as in duty bound, must do battle, after his measure, against our republican institutions and our popular liberties? Why not confess that his fresh zeal is from his recent interview with his Sovereign at Rome, and from the new Papal decree on this subject? Why not acknowledge, what is so plain to be seen, that the uprising and aggression of the Romish hierarchy, at this moment, in a war upon our system of popular education, is in obedience to the bill passed in the Pope's Congress at Baltimore—sent on to their Sovereign through Bishop O'Connor, for the Pope's approval, and returned by the same hand, with the Pope's signature and decree?

But waiving this, for the moment, he denies that his plan involves any "special legislation" for Romanists. Let us see. He asks us now, at this late day, to adopt his method, to the subversion of our own. He demands that we break down our well established sys-

tem, at vast pecuniary loss, and at immense disadvantage, every way as we conceive, to all others, to society, and to the State; and for whom? For Roman Catholics. For what? For the protection of the Roman Catholic religion, which he says is "not safe" in our schools. If this be not a call for special legislation, I know not the meaning of terms.

Observe: It is not as though we were now first seeking for plans. We have adopted our system. It does not satisfy all. But I know of none who have arrayed themselves openly against it, and called for its demolition, save Romanists and Infidels! Nine-tenths of the whole community, we may safely say, are content under the present system. It is the benignant provision of the State for her children, that they grow not up in ignorance, idleness and vice, and that they prove not unfit for republican freedom. If this strikes a deadly blow at the root of any foreign policy, which manifestly is sustained only by popular ignorance, and which can live only by the death of the public mind, we cannot help the complainant. Our American policy is not

bound to conform itself to the Romish religion, and the Papal State. But when our vast and well-established system involves large properties; when it furnishes, by its grand economy, the only civil education in the reach of the poor at large; when it could not be broken down, as we believe, without scattering multitudes of this half a million children to the streets; when by the growing ignorance and vice, society would be a grievous sufferer, and the foundations of the State would be undermined, and when the nine-tenths are content, yet we are to yield the majority's interest without a whimper, to the Papal demand. And this is not *special legislation*!

But further: The confessed aim of the complainants is to better teach the Roman Catholic religion, which cannot now be taught in our public schools. And for this it is asked—*not that their amount of tax may be set to their account*, deducting or not their charge upon the State—but that they may receive their numerical share of the *general fund*, which is contributed mainly by Protestants, and that so they may enjoy our Protestant

funds for the support of the Roman Catholic religion among us! *And this is not special legislation!!* The veil is too thin for any disguise. To think by fair pretences to conceal this, is to take for granted quite too much stupidity among us.

He tells us that this scheme—concocted by the Pope's cabinet, in the secret sessions at Baltimore—is the more equitable, and eligible, and excellent way, and so it is insisted on. But the great majority think otherwise. Shall not we be allowed our choice? Here comes in the “tyrannical majority” of which Dr. O'Connor speaks. The difficulty is, that this majority happens to be on the wrong side for his interest. But it must be on one side or other, unless we yield our government to a monarchy—to the Pope, shall we say? Do we put the minority in dungeons, and doom them to death? Aptly enough are we asked, what would be the case if Roman Catholics were in the majority? Full well do we know. And this official of Rome does not blush to point us to the Madaiai, as a specimen of *Protestant minorities*, where Popery has the sway!

Talk of Red Republicanism! This is Red Religionism, which, as surely as it shows the hand among us, will rouse a giant spirit of freedom, which will sweep Popery back to its home. If indeed they had the majority this moment, who doubts that our mouths would be stopped—not by stout and solid arguments, but by stouter bullets, and prison walls?

But strangely enough, we are told that “the question is not of this or that one’s claim, nor of its amount.” We had thought that this was the *very question*. But when the bishop is pressed by the meagre amount of their claim, as measured by their tax, he takes this new position. We had thought it was a call for “*justice*,” and this is everywhere repeated where it suits. But he is forced to acknowledge that it is a question of “*grant*,” and then presumes to demand in what channel the benefaction shall run. Be it so. The simple question then is, more palpably than ever, shall we give our free contributions—or, rather, shall we allow ourselves to be taxed by the State to support the Roman Catholic

schemes in the midst of us? He is perfectly willing that we should be taxed to support their distinctive and sectarian establishments. But he hurls it upon us as a shame that *they* should be taxed, except for their own distinctive benefit.

Let us look at this. The gross injustice of the school tax that burdens the Bishop's mind, what is it? Are we to concede that no one can righteously be taxed except where he receives the direct advantage? Because some hermit never uses the road, shall he pay no road tax? We are all taxed for many public enterprises which do not directly interest us, and for some, indeed, which we would rather oppose.

Because one has no friend in the almshouse or penitentiary, should he claim to be rid of that burden? (Will the Bishop support all the Roman Catholics in these institutions?) Because one has no property to watch at night, should he pay nothing for the night watch? Because one cares not for city lamps, and chooses to carry his old lantern, shall he be exempt from that public expenditure? And

because a man has no children to send to school, must he therefore be released from the school tax? Or, because he does not care for their education, and prefers that they live and die in ignorance, a public tax, a public disgrace, and a public curse, should he be excused from his quota? Certainly, on the same grounds which are here pleaded by the Bishop, that they do not, cannot, or will not enjoy the benefit. And such would be the demand upon us on all hands, if the principle were recognized. Our Roman Catholic citizens are more willing to bear their part in the public burdens than their priests are willing to fall in with our government policy. The secret is in their political relations to Rome.

The Bishop and his people have the very same benefit from the public school system that I have, and that the many among us have who send their children elsewhere. He has a benefit in the peace and good order of society—in the security of property—and in the preservation of those republican institutions, which we hope to hand down unimpaired

to our posterity. These are vast benefits, unless, indeed, it be the object of this Romish movement to revolutionize the State, and to destroy the very free institutions of which every American should boast.

Not to be taxed for public education! This reveals to us, indeed, in what light the Romish hierarchy regard popular knowledge, and how the public ignorance is that atmosphere alone in which their system can breathe and develop its strength. Our theory of society and of government is totally different from theirs—opposite to it, and inconsistent with it, as is light with darkness. We hold our social and political condition to be too valuable to part with, at such a solicitation. We shall resist to the last any plan, however disguised by fair religious names, which would make us, however indirectly, contribute to the inculcation of such principles as are subversive of all our liberties. Besides, we know that, like the horse-leech or the grave, their cry is, Give! Give!—and that they can never be satisfied with concessions, until the neck of this Republic be put under the iron heel of the Pope.

The public education here is a great public necessity. For obvious reasons, too, as we have shown, it is a specialty which baffles all the ordinary laws of supply and demand—it languishes on the feeble aid of individual effort, and fails of reaching the scattered masses when it is left to mere private enterprise. Hence the State builds school houses, as it builds its other public edifices, for the public good, and all must bear a share of the burden—better, too, than for almshouses and penitentiaries. Our republican principles, which rest so much on the public intelligence, make this public education a vital necessity. The Romish priesthood know full well that this is a mighty barrier against their designs. And Rome is moving all its forces to subvert it. And Dr. O'Connor has returned from Rome with the Pope's endorsement of these loyal officials, and of these very measures here! But our free people, and not the red religionists of the Vatican, shall be the judges of what concerns the public weal.

Let us look, another moment, at this plea of *conscience*! Far be it from us to be intole-

rant towards any religion which is properly and only a religion. But what if it be a wily political system, under the guise of religion? What if it be Bishop O'Connor's conscience to cut off my head for opinion's sake? Shall I yield to this on the plea of religion?

Let me call attention to the fact that this is not a simple case of conscience. It is complicated with Jesuitical plots, and with perils to our liberties. The very same stratagem is now used in Europe, to crush all free principles. He may call it intolerance, that we would resist foreign machinations in our beloved land, while the records of history are so plain, and the cry of new victims wakes universal sympathy, and makes the very Turk blush for a religion like this. Do we not read? Do we not sometimes see for ourselves? I have seen the gratings of the Inquisition, in the rear of the Pope's lordly Vatican, and under the eaves of his cathedral at Rome; and all for religion, forsooth. And what are we to think, when, in the face of all documents, and all facts—in the face of fresh victims every hour, whose groans come over to us from

the Pope's dominions, and even in direct contradiction of his own organs here—this Bishop tells us that he “knows nothing in his religion that would teach him to hate any one.”

“We teach, to be sure,” he adds, “that God has made a revelation; that the Church is the organ by which he communicates it, and that all, under pain of sin, are bound to hear her voice.” Mark the words, “BOUND UNDER PAIN OF SIN” to hear the Romish Church's voice! We understand! Here is the dogma, which contains in it the death-warrant of the millions who have fallen victims to Papal power. The holy butchery is not for hatred, forsooth, but for *love*! This is the meaning of “brotherly love,” which the Bishop accepts, in careful distinction from anything universal. And he comes to us talking gently as a cooing dove.

Let us quote from the standard school-book of the Romanists, entitled “A Synopsis of Moral Theology, as prepared for Romish Seminaries and Students of Theology.”

“*Question.* Are heretics rightly punished with death? *Answer.* St. Thomas answers

(2. 2. quest. xi. art. 3, in corp.), Yes. Because forgers of money, and other disturbers of the State, are justly punished with death; therefore, also heretics, who are forgers of the faith," &c. This is the moral and religious instruction considered so important to the dear children, by the Bishops!

Hear the *Shepherd of the Valley*, speaking honestly out, with no Jesuitical concealment or mystification:

“Heresy and unbelief are crimes, that’s the whole of the matter; and where the Catholic religion is an essential part of the public laws of the land, they are punished as other crimes.”

I accept his admission, therefore, as quite to the point. “If any one’s religion,” he says, “teaches this hatred and strife, I think it may be safely asserted, that whatever other portion of it he may fail to communicate to his children, he will without doubt communicate this successfully.”

The Bishop thinks that “Arithmetic and Geometry” may be taught without the aid of Romish priests. He has probably heard of

Cardinal Wiseman's discovery, lately broached at an English *soiree*—that the history of Galileo's persecution by the Romish Church, is all a mistake!

But, alas for the Bishop, *how little can be taught* in these American public schools! The difference between sins mortal and sins venial—cannot be taught. The superiority of the Romish clergy to all civil law—cannot be taught. The virtue of perjury when done in the service of the Romish Church—cannot be taught. The emptiness of the oath of allegiance to a Protestant State—cannot be taught. The religious duty of persecuting Protestants to the death—cannot be taught. And such precious school books as “Dens's Moral Theology,” and authors of such precious morality as Liguori—cannot pass the inspection of these “tyrannical majorities.” Alas! alas!

What makes it so unrighteous—(so “unconstitutional and despotic,” as the *Freeman's Journal* has it)—to have public education done here by the State? Just because the State here happened to be Protestant—that is all. Do we not know that in Papal

States, just now, it is only the State education, as by law established, that will answer these very gentlemen of the Romish hierarchy? So they make fish of one and flesh of the other.

We confess freely—that *because this is* the Roman Catholic religion, and this the priestly conscience, for which this official of Rome demands such special privileges, we invoke against it the united resistance of American freemen. We know this step—this favourite step for controlling society and government, to seize upon the public instruction, and to break down all other plans. We resist at the threshold, just because, to use his own illustration, his calf is on our shoulders, and full well we know that we shall not be able to carry it when it becomes an ox!

For the mistake in the Bishop's figures, I refer to his letter to Gov. Bigler, No. 2. We did the sum, as we declared, from the only figures there furnished—and on those alone we understood his assertion to be made. With the figures now brought in we have nothing to do. It was a question of salaries. The

statement made by him is this: "Male teachers receive on an average only \$18,75 per month, and females \$11,46 per month—the average time of teaching being five months in the year. If \$300 were named as an average adequate compensation for the former, and \$200 for the latter, it would be a moderate estimate; yet even at these rates, the cost of instruction would be more than four times as great as it is at present." Any one may do the simple sum for himself. \$18,75 (a month) multiplied by five (months) gives us \$93,75 for the year, and we are to see if \$300 is more than four times this amount, which is \$375. Or multiplying the present salaries by the number of teachers respectively—\$93,75 by 7,860, and \$57,30 by 3,853, and we shall have an aggregate of \$957,651, to show whether the total of the Bishop's proposed salaries, \$3,128,600, is more than four times as much—or, more than \$3,830,607. We love to deal with figures, for *they can't lie*.

All that Dr. O'Connor has chosen to drag into the argument in reference to *sects*, is sufficiently answered by his own words. He

complains of the sectarianism which creeps now into the schools. Yet he would cure this by making them more sectarian, and altogether sectarian! We have said that his plan is anti-American, divisive, ruinous to the popular education, and foreign to all our interests; and without answering this, he occupies a column in false issues about the effect of common schools on brotherly love, &c. Let it be marked, that it is he that is intolerant, not we. Who is sectarian and schismatic in this very matter of public education? Who would split in pieces every fair fabric among us, rather than have Romanist children mingle with our American institutions? The Roman Catholic sect is that which carries its sectarianism so far as to dissect all whom it calls heretics—making a glorious unity by burning all who dissent.

The great problem which he flatly propounds is this. "As sects must exist, the question is now how to deal with them?" That question would be answered very summarily at Rome; but here it is a question which may puzzle all the hierarchy. That is

his trouble, not *ours*. Our common Protestantism is not so narrow, but that we can all stand upon it—with room enough for him. And that the Protestant Church is a visible church—that it is somewhere and somebody—has been found out, we think. And that this is a Protestant land, must be apparent now, despite the laboured lectures of Bishops and Archbishops to disprove it.

But, in his heated imagination of the evils belonging to our public school system, how bad does he find it? As “bad as though the State should build a common church at the expense of all, in which all should be required to worship under the guidance of the State.” And as this is the very method of Rome, in all Papal lands, he cannot bitterly complain. “Such a union,” he adds, “would be the union of the grave. The peace it would bring, would be the peace of death.” We accept this as the very analysis of Popery, and the farthest possible from our seeking. From such a union and such a peace may our fathers’ God deliver us!

Doubtless, if there were nothing but Po-

pery, there would be no sect. Just as if there were nothing but midnight, there would be no colours, and if there were nothing but death and the grave, there would be none of the various forms of life. We hold that this would be the most deplorable of all things. Conflict of opinion is salutary. It is the proper condition of truth and progress on earth. It is not inconsistent with a high principle and a personal good will, which would disdain to thrust heretics, so called, into dungeons. They who cry for unity, and madly pursue it, by putting to death all who are outside—they are the enemies of truth. We would have the Bishop know that an angel is often stirring our Bethesda, and keeping it stirred, instead of stagnant; that always, from any of the porches, any one may step in and be healed of whatever disease he has—while the demon, of whom the Bishop speaks, is busy instigating the murder of so called heretics, and grinning with a fiendish smile over this red banner of Papal Unity!

Truth is worth contending for—worth differing about, in an honest effort to get nearer

to the great source and substance. And hence, as I believe—outside of an apostate and dead church, where the truth is first buried—there will be difference of opinion. Yet here is the very room for union, for who does not see that *union* implies *parts*? and there can be no union where there are no parts. Shame, that any one who claims to be an ambassador of Christ, carries sectarianism so far as to swear by solemn oath to the Pope, to persecute heretics to the utmost of his power.

The plea is now for *religion* in schools, as the proper basis of education. This is indeed the very principle which we would accept and adopt. But we are met at the threshold by these very Bishops of Rome. As we have seen, this is really the *dread* of Romanists and infidels! So that they have been found joining in protests against introducing even the Bible, without note or comment, into the schools. Who does not see that that must be a false religion, which denies the Bible as the basis of religion? This could indeed be what Dr. O'Connor calls *making men religious without religion*. Could we admit heathenism

—idolatry—however consecrated by religious names and claims?

All know that in the pending difficulty with New Grenada, the Archbishop's protest against the new system of education is, against "the use of the text of the gospel, in teaching morality in the schools;" and this, too, the Roman Catholic gospel! I would sooner trust a schoolmaster with a Bible, than a Romish priest without one! And so would the people of Pennsylvania!

We do earnestly call for more religion in the schools. Our common Christianity calls for it; and the Romish hierarchy are they who oppose it to the death. But as they are now withdrawing their children, we may come forward without this impediment, and ask that the great masses, who accept this public boon, shall be granted their common heritage—a religious education.

Dr. O'Connor takes all for granted, and begs the whole question, when he assumes that his plan, or any new plan, will please a greater number than the present; or else his is the tyranny, when, without care for the

majority, he demands his own plan. He, indeed, and his interest, would be better satisfied and better served. But what of the nine-tenths of our population? That would be the tyranny that would trample on the rights of the people, to meet the views of a *single sect*; that would sacrifice the well-being of the rising generation, to suit the Pope's officials in our land.

I ask attention to this feature of the Papal movement, that the whole aim is destructive. It is not for the children, it is for the Pope. It is not to reform, but to destroy. The Bishop knows that if he can "persuade us to walk without our crutches," as his figure is, and "get us to throw our crutches in the fire, then when once they are burned we cannot recover them, though we find ourselves unable to walk."

We very well know how much easier it is to break down than to build up, and how little wit it requires to find fault with the best system, but how much it takes to devise a better. We have seen paper plans before to-day—plausible theories—that look remarkably well

on paper, like the city lots of speculators. But it is hard to get their imaginary value. We shall not be so ready to change our well-tried educational policy, for the visionary schemes of these religious politicians. The design is plain. How ready is the Bishop to accept any plan rather than that which we have. But no, we reply, "A bird in the hand," &c. "In vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird."

This would only confuse our counsels. A hundred other plans of public education, to suit various interests, could be brought forward, and would be. And we should lose the grand object altogether by abandoning a well-working American system for a specious, sectarian and foreign one.

And this we honestly believe to be the great ultimate intent of the complainant. The destructive ploughshare is to be driven through all our American republican institutions. And just as ever before, and just as now, in Europe, the aggression of the Jesuit hierarchy begins with a grasp at education, to conform it to their views, and where nothing more can be done, to break down all other systems.

What the people of Pennsylvania are to expect from this Papal league, if ever its strength shall warrant it, appears from the daring and defiant movements in some other States, where this Church, *whose voice we are bound to hear under pain of sin*, has taken the political stand, to wield the civil power. But are we to sit quietly, amidst all these developments, until the power has gone from our hands? Let us rather jealously fortify our institutions against this aggressive and destructive policy. The warfare will never be given up. Let us now demand—what is plainly called for—that measure of religious teaching in the schools which our common Christianity allows. Let our republican principles be inculcated as daily lessons. Let us mark the craven politicians who would truckle to Popery, and sell their inheritance for “the Catholic vote.”

Will any in this community doubt the warrant for such imputations as I have made, as to the political bearings of this movement, and the political designs which underlie it? Besides all that is openly avowed and carried on,

at the polls in Michigan, by bishops and priests at caucuses, and in lobbies, the movement is simultaneous in Maryland, New Jersey, Alabama, and New York, and agitated in other States, "with what meaning we shall see."

I quote from the Freeman's Journal of New York, since the Council at Baltimore: "*This subject [of the public schools] contains in it the whole question of the progress and triumphs of the Catholic church in the next generation in this country. Catholics! let us all act together! Let us all read and listen to the same sentiments, that we may know how to act together!*"—Sat. Nov. 20, 1852.

Again, "There can be no sound political progress—no permanence in the State, where for any length of time, children shall be trained in schools without (the Roman Catholic) religion."

Again, "This country has no other hope, politically or morally, except in the vast and controlling extension of the Catholic religion."

And again, Jan. 1st, 1853, where this movement is given out as the decreed plan for the year: "Eighteen hundred and fifty-two has helped greatly to spread right principles on this subject. What will 1853 do to give effect in law and in acts to the principle that is to germinate the future glory of our country? The Catholic sentiment in a unit. Let us act. Let us speak. Let us make others hear."

In the light of these quotations, we know how to understand the following:

"Every Catholic church, every Catholic school, every convent, every Catholic asylum is a foundation stone of this precious building of our country's greatness."

Then hear the *Shepherd of the Valley*—
"If the Catholics ever gain the ascendancy here, as they certainly will, religious freedom in this country is at an end."

And again, the same paper, referring to the *Catholic Herald*, of Philadelphia, speaks of this Jesuitical denial of Romish intolerance as "that cowardly system of misrepresentation and concealment, which led English Catholics

to attempt to throw dust in the eyes of cotemporary heretics, by disavowing the practices of their brethren in better days, and other lands.”

What saith the Bishop to this, from his own protégé? And again: “The Catholic who says that the Church is not intolerant, belies the sacred Spouse of Christ. The Christian who professes to be tolerant himself, is dishonest, ill-instructed, or both!”

These citations will be sufficient to expose the political character of this assault upon our public school system. I have spoken, not as a Presbyterian, but as an American. I love my country. I blush to speak thus, as I must, of any system which claims to be Christianity. But a sojourn of eight months in the Romish States of Europe, and a month's residence at Rome, in busy examination of this politico-religious machinery—and some intercourse with their propagandists there, and in Egypt and Palestine, and *en route* for India—has opened my eyes to the deep craft, and fearful intrigue that spreads its net-work around the globe, and marches now in a fresh crusade against all civil and religious liberty!

This Bishop concludes that "it will *take time* to make the people understand" his views of justice. And I earnestly pray, by all the good sense and sound patriotism of the people, even of our Roman Catholic citizens; by the memory of our fathers' blood-shedding; by the every-day report of Papal leagues with despotism, perfidy, torture, and the violation of every sacred right, that the day when this Bishop shall convert the people of Pennsylvania to his code of justice, may be far distant!

M. W. JACOBUS.

P O S T S C R I P T .

In proof of the absurdity and unreasonableness of the complaints of Roman Catholics against the Common School System, we quote the following extract from the Pittsburgh Gazette of April, 1853.—[*Ed. Pres. Board of Publication.*]

THE Roman Catholic war against Common Schools is raging with great violence in Cincinnati, and the municipal election will be made to turn on that great question. Both parties are gathering their forces, and we look for a severe contest. We have no fears of the result, however. The free schools will triumph. The American people are not yet prepared to sacrifice this inestimable advantage to the children of the Republic—this invaluable safeguard of liberty, religion, and

intelligence—to the demands of the papal priesthood; and we trust they never will be. We are prepared for a life-long warfare in defence of the free schools, if need be, and to die at last in the harness. This ground we never will yield—never, never, never!

The *Cincinnati Gazette* is doing good work in defence of the schools, as will appear by the following article:

OPPRESSION OF CATHOLICS.—The Roman Catholics who have arrayed themselves against our Common Schools, are trying very hard to get the reputation of martyrs. They continually complain of oppression and persecution, but never succeed in showing any true ground of complaint. The Archbishop says, “Because we have asked for *our share* of the School Fund, we have been charged with a conspiracy to put down the Common Schools.” The Archbishop should be more accurate. He does not, it is true, deny the “conspiracy,” but when he states a fact, he should be certain it is a fact. Now, so far as we know,

the Catholics have never asked for their "share" of the School Fund. If they are entitled to any "share," that share must be the portion contributed by them. But this they have not asked for; the Archbishop, and the seven hundred and seventy-three others who signed the petition, headed by Archbishop Purcell, did not ask for this; but they did ask "the right to select teachers, to whom they could, with security, confide their children, and that those teachers receive from the fund provided for educational purposes, a *pro rata* compensation for the number of scholars they instruct." Now the question is, whether this "*pro rata* compensation" is the Catholic "share" of the Common School Fund. We think it is not, and we think we can show it is not.

As we have not the means of making a calculation for our city, which would show the working of the Roman Catholic Sectarian School scheme, we propose to take the facts elicited in an investigation of its working on another town, which will have a "*pro rata*," if not an absolute, application to Cincinnati.

The Roman Catholics of Auburn, in the State of New York, petitioned the Legislature to distribute the School Fund, in the same way, alleging that they had "suffered grievous oppression and persecution for many years." The Board of Education remonstrated against the granting of their petition, and stated some facts which admirably show what would be the working of the Catholic scheme. By their remonstrance it appears that the whole amount of taxes assessed on the people of that town in 1852, was eleven thousand two hundred and thirty-nine dollars and seventy-seven cents; and of this sum the Roman Catholics—who alone oppose the Common-School system—pay only two hundred and twenty dollars and thirty-five cents! During the same year, nearly four thousand dollars were expended by the Overseers of the Poor, and he states that more than two thousand six hundred and seventy dollars were distributed among the signers of the petition for relief "from the grievous oppression and persecution," which had ground them down so many years! The whole amount paid by

the town of Auburn in 1852, for the support of Common Schools, was two thousand seven hundred and twenty-nine dollars and seventy-three cents, and of this sum the Catholics contributed fifty-three dollars and fifty cents! Thus it appears that for every dollar the Catholics have paid into the Treasury of Auburn, they have received twelve dollars and eleven cents from the Overseer of the Poor; and for every dollar they contributed to the Common School Fund, they have received six dollars and a half in return! These facts are of general application, and will be substantially true of our whole country, though there may be a few cities and localities where the results would not be so disproportioned.

How much more reason has almost every Protestant denomination in the country to complain of the "despotism" of our Common School system! Yet, it is left to the effrontery of Jesuit priests to complain of a system by which Protestants are heavily taxed to give an education to the children of Catholics. They not only insist that this tax shall

continue to be levied, but that it shall be used to support schools, controlled exclusively by them, wherein men whose highest allegiance, political and religious, is to the Pope of Rome, are to teach such doctrines as will strengthen the Church to which they belong, regardless of their influence upon the institutions of this country. Nothing can well be more unreasonable than the complaints of injustice and oppression so freely made by the Catholics; and unless they come out frankly and say that their object is to separate Catholic children from Protestants as much as possible, to fill their young minds with bitter and unfounded prejudices, and thereby to retain that control of their action, apart from religion, which is dangerous to our liberties;—in a word, unless they acknowledge that they find their school scheme necessary to prevent their people from asserting their manhood and freedom from priestly dictation, we must regard them as dangerous men, attempting, by false appeals to the sympathies of Protestants, and false appeals to the passions

of Catholics, to break down our Common School system, and to keep their own people in ignorance, or teach them nothing which will not make them hate their Protestant neighbours.

T H E E N D .

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS WORK.

In laying before the public a second edition of this little work, the author begs leave to acknowledge his obligations to the distinguished clergymen of St. Louis and Cincinnati, by whom his attempt has been so favorably received. The approbation of such men is far more gratifying to his feelings than any pecuniary compensation could possibly prove, although, in this particular also, he is their debtor. To these divines, and to all other gentlemen of St. Louis and Cincinnati, by whom he has been aided in bringing this little book through the press, he dedicates this performance, in the hope that it may aid, in some measure, in bringing the subject on which it treats before an intelligent and reflecting public.

He further begs leave to express his obligations to these gentlemen, by laying some brief extracts, and other entire testimonials, before the public.

The Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., of Cincinnati, is pleased to say :

“ I have read the pamphlet entitled “ Past and Future.” The sentiments are good. They are clearly and strongly stated. The style is vigorous and attractive. The circulation of the pamphlet I think will do good.”

Rev. Willis Lord, D. D., says :

“ The views of Dr. Rice, above expressed, agree with my own as to the work in question, and the probable utility of its circulation.”

The venerable Bishop Morris says :

“ I heartily recommend the work for general circulation. The author appears to understand his subject well, and treats it in a graphic and spirited manner,

yet so as to avoid giving needless offence. All consistent American patriots and christians would do well to scatter this work broad-cast through these United States."

The Rev. H. P. Goodrich, D. D., of St. Louis, says:

"I have read your 'Past and Future' with much care and great pleasure; and I have heard it spoken of in such terms, that it gives me pleasure to commend it for its general ability.

"*The style, the temper, the logic,* are each worthy of praise."

Several other celebrated clergymen, among the foremost of which he would mention, the Rev. John F. Wright, the Rev. Samuel W. Fisher, the Rev. Dr. Aydelott, the late Rev. Dr. Potts, the Rev. Mr. Gassaway, the Rev. Mr. Robinson, the Rev. Mr. Blake, and the Rev. R. Gray, have substantially concurred with the above.