

# ARIZONA CITIZEN

Vol. V.]

TUCSON, PIMA COUNTY, A. T., SATURDAY, MAY 29, 1875.

## THE ARIZONA CITIZEN

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

### SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

One copy, one year, \$5 00  
One copy, six months, 2 00  
Single numbers, 25

### ADVERTISING RATES:

Twelve lines in this type, one sq. inch square, twelve lines, one time, \$3 00  
Each subsequent insertion, 1 50  
Professional cards, per quarter, 8 00

Plain death notices, free. Obituary remarks in prose, \$3 per square; in poetry, \$2 50 per line.

Business advertisements at Reduced Rates. Office Northwest corner Main and Congress streets.

### AUTHORIZED AGENTS FOR THE CITIZEN:

W. N. Kelly, newsdealer at Prescott, has THE CITIZEN for sale, and has authority to receive and receipt for money due us.  
L. P. Fisher, 20 and 21 New Merchants' Exchange, is our authorized Agent in San Francisco.

Schneider, Grierson & Co., Arizona City.  
E. Irvine & Co., Phenix.  
WASSON & BROWN, Proprietors.

### J. C. HANDY, M. D.

TUCSON, ARIZONA.  
CORNER OF CHURCH AND CONVENT.

### R. A. WILBUR, M. D.

TUCSON, ARIZONA.  
OFFICE: COR. STONE AND CONVENT STS.

### THEO. F. WHITE,

CIVIL ENGINEER AND SURVEYOR.  
Deputy Surveyor of Mineral Lands,  
Tucson, Arizona. 50-1f

### GEO. HILL HOWARD,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.  
Arizona & Sonora Land and Mining Agt.  
Office in Zeckendorf's building,  
Pennington street.  
Tucson, Arizona.

### HUGH FARLEY,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.  
TUCSON, ARIZONA.  
Office on Congress Street.

### COLES BASHFORD,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
TUCSON, ARIZONA.  
Will practice in all the Courts of the Territory. 1f

### O. F. McCARTY,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
Practices in all the Courts of the Territory.  
Office: first door east telegraph office,  
Tucson. Dec. 19, 1874. 11-1f

### WILLIAM J. OSBORN,

NOTARY PUBLIC AND CONVEYANCER,  
Special assistance given in obtaining patents for Mining and Preemption claims.  
Office north side Congress street, Tucson, Arizona.

### MCCAFFRY & CLARK,

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW.  
Partners in all business except where the United States is a party.  
[Jas. E. McCaffry United States District Attorney for Arizona].  
Office on Congress street, Tucson. 11-1f

### DR. F. O. BARSTOW,

MECHANICAL AND SURGICAL DENTIST,  
Is prepared to insert all kinds of Artificial Teeth. Also to treat and fill teeth in the best possible manner.  
Office corner of Meyers street, and Maiden Lane. Jan. 23, 1875. 16-3m

### BRIGGS GOODRICH,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
TUCSON, ARIZONA.  
Will practice in all the Territorial Courts and before the local land offices in the Territory.  
Office on corner Congress and Meyers Sts.

J. W. HALL, W. G. CRAFTS,  
Late Capt. U. S. Vol. Late Clerk War Dep't.

### JOHN W. HALL & CO.

Bounty, Pension and General Claim and Collection Agents,

No. 824 9th-st Northwest, Washington, D C  
Prosecute claims of all nature against the General Government. Business in our hands receives prompt attention and returns are made at earliest possible moment. Claims for Stock stolen or killed by Indians and Mexicans are made a specialty. Our facilities for a successful prosecution of all classes of claims are unsurpassed, and we respectfully solicit the patronage of all.

REFERENCES:—Hon. T. O. Osborne, Governor of Kansas; Hon. J. M. Harvey, U. S. Senator of Kansas; Hon. S. C. Pomeroy of Kansas, and many friends in the South West. April 17. 28-4w

### Tucson Assay Office.

I BEG LEAVE TO INFORM MY friends and the public in general that I have opened an

### Assay Office in Tucson,

and am ready for work in any line of my business at following prices:  
Single Assays for Gold and Silver, \$3.50.  
Single Assays for Copper, 5.00.  
Single Assays, Copper, Gold & Silver, 8.50.  
SAMUEL HUGHES, Assayer.  
Tucson, Feb. 6, 1875. 12-1f

## JUDGE DUNNE'S LECTURE.

### A Division of the School Fund Considered—Shall we have a Union of Church and State.

We have received a copy of a lecture delivered by Hon E. F. Dunne in the hall of the house of representatives of the Territory of Arizona, February 20, 1875. We did not refer to the lecture at the time of its delivery for several reasons. Among them, we had known the lecturer a number of years well and favorably; we believed that in this matter he was acting justly, not having been in the country long enough to properly understand the situation of the subject upon which he was lecturing. We believed then and believe now that the many errors that are found in his lecture would not have appeared had he resided here long enough to have been familiar with our educational interests from the commencement to the present time. We were willing however so long as his lecture went no further than the audience who listened to it to let the matter pass unnoticed, knowing as we did that no harm resulted to the public schools in consequence thereof. But the lecture has been published to the world in pamphlet form and we believe in justice to this community and the friends of public schools in the Territory that it is our duty to make such correction and explanations as will give a true history so far as the subject in controversy is concerned in Arizona. The lecturer starts out by saying that the free school side of the question has a great deal of John Bull bluster in it and then almost from the commencement to the end of his lecture plays a full hand at bluff and seems to imagine that he has exhausted the resources of reason and that no arguments can be brought to bear against it. Now the fact is we have failed to discover any new feature in the lecture that has not been presented many times before by those who on his side of the question are trying to divide the public school fund, or rather by those who are engaged in an effort to break up the public school system. Those arguments have upon all occasions been met and refuted and the public school interest has constantly gained strength until there is hardly a public journal in America, outside of the Church, that does not heartily sustain the free public schools.

The lecture in the pamphlet is prefaced as follows:

"The occasion of the delivery of this lecture was that a grand ball was gotten up in Tucson during the session of the legislature in January 1875, to raise funds to start a public school building. As Catholics were not allowed their share of the school money in Arizona, some of them refused to patronize the ball. The result was, the friends of the public schools, as now managed, got very much excited and made many angry comments upon the conduct of those Catholics who declined to join in the ball."

In the first place the Judge, no doubt on account of his short residence among us, fell into an error in the belief that the friends of the public schools became angry towards any one for the reason of not patronizing the ball. What did lead to some feeling was this: The friends of the public schools had contributed at least four fifths of the money to build the Catholic Church and school-house in Tucson; they had been among the best paying patrons of the school taught by the Sisters of St. Joseph; they had sanctioned a liberal donation from the public treasury for the support of said school. Now when they proposed to get up a social party, the proceeds to be appropriated to aid in building a public school house, what was the result? Did the leaders of the opposition to public schools meet us with that liberality that they had always received at our hands? Far from it. They were not content to remain away but did all in their power to prevent others from going, and thereby intended to break up an innocent, social party. We are happy to state that the party was a great success and we know of no one who remained away who was in the habit of going to such places except the lecturer himself. Through the whole lecture the idea seems to be made prominent that the speaker is a martyr to the religious and conscientious opinions he entertains. He doubtless covets a position of that kind, but he will have to seek other climes; he cannot force this community to place him in that position.

The lecture, though wandering and by intimation charging a hundred things never dreamed of by the friends of pub-

lic schools, seems to rely upon the following propositions:

1st. The State has no right to teach religion.

2d. The State has no right to teach irreligion.

3d. That the State has no inherent right to teach at all."

Upon the first two of these three propositions we agree fully with the lecturer, while upon the third we widely differ, and upon this proposition mainly rests the controversy. Our limited space will only allow us to touch upon several of the main points in dispute. As to the third and last of the points above raised we have to say that any government has the inherent right to do all necessary things to protect its own existence; that a Republican form of government is based upon the intelligence and patriotism of the people and as a natural consequence when the people fail to possess the necessary intelligence and patriotism to govern themselves, the government is like a rope of sand and will fall to pieces. But, says the lecturer, we propose by our corporation bill to educate the people. Now the proposed bill provides that any ten or more persons residents in any of the counties of the Territory may at will form themselves into a corporation for educational purposes; and further it provides that when the persons who compose said corporation pay their school taxes, by request their said taxes shall be paid into this corporation for their use and benefit to be used for educational purposes. Now what would be the result of the passage of a law of this kind? At once the various religious creeds would seek for their proportion and it would be divided and subdivided and the public schools would be broken up and the education of the youth would not be conducted upon the basis of love thy neighbor as thy self or to do unto others as you would like to be done by, nor to stand by the government of the United States against all enemies whether foreign or domestic; but that other system would be inaugurated, of hate thy neighbors because they have done you wrong, love thy neighbors if they belong to the same Church, if not strike them down as heretics and enemies to the human race, be true to the government of the United States so long as the interest of your Church is advanced by so doing, but pound it into atoms and stamp it into the earth if it ever comes in conflict with your Church.

In these remarks we desire to draw a distinction between creeds and religion. No one has a higher regard than we have for the followers of the example and precepts of our Savior, but we say and can prove beyond successful contradiction that the history of all creeds when they have gained the power over the people has been written in blood. Thousands upon thousands have been brought to torture and death for no other reason than that they entertained religious opinions contrary to the ruling church.

Speakers as in the present instance may deny the correctness of the history as written by Macaulay, Motley and Froude, and one creed may claim and prove that the other was the most cruel, but none can deny that each in turn when vested with the power were as ferocious as wild beasts and as cruel as human ingenuity could make them. And yet it is proposed to go back to the commencement, break down our present school system and found one upon sectarian principles, educate our youth entirely in one creed or the other and raise up religious fanatics to go into public life with the firm determination to place the Church in which they were raised above all others, to educate them to believe it to be their religious duty to sustain the creed of their Church at the expense of country, government or all else on earth. If any creed when vested with unlimited power had ever shown that degree of charity and love for the human family and that devotion to civil government that would warrant confidence, then we might with safety place the public schools in such hands. But look at the condition of countries where the education of the youth has been placed in the charge of creeds. The result shows poverty, ignorance, distress of the masses. Does the profession of faith guarantee a compliance with the golden rule, do ye unto others as you would have them do unto you? Far from it. See the condition of the sepulchre of Christ today. Those professing to be his meek and lowly followers could not agree among

themselves who should carry the key. One bloody war ensued mainly growing out of this important subject, and finally a compromise has been effected by which a Mahomedan is intrusted with the key and sits there all day long to keep peace between the various Christians; see who go there to worship at the shrine and it is said as one sect passes in and another passes out, jeers, grimaces and other unfriendly demonstrations are often made by one to the other. Still it is proposed to turn over to these various creeds the education of our youth, grow up and enter upon this kind of strife. It is evident with such material our Republic would soon be merged under the influence of one Church or the other when the same bloody strifes would be enacted as in days gone by. So long as churches confine their duties to religious instruction, we believe they all do good, and to that extent we approve and support them, but when they commence the strife for political power as the lecturer intimates they intend to do with the "silent ballot," then they are deserving proportion to the hand they take in politics, to the same criticism as any other political organization.

Our government is founded on the basis of complete separation of Church and State. This is one of the fundamental principles upon which the whole structure rests and we may say no other principle is dear to the American people as this. It is as evident as the sun at noonday that we wish to perpetuate this glorious heritage and keep this country free from religious intolerance we must send to the councils of the nation men of liberality who have been educated with tolerance and forbearance towards those of every religious faith. Any one who does not believe that Church and State would be united as soon as any one church obtained complete and absolute control has no history to a very poor purpose.

Now we say that it is essential to the peace, security and perpetuity of the government of the United States to keep up our present system of education and that the government has the inalienable right to do all necessary things to preserve good order and its own existence. We have made as you admit every reasonable concession, and all we can make, except to levy taxes and pay them over to the benefit of educating children in particular creeds.

We will now refer to some of the details of the lecture. The lecturer says that "most of you will probably tell me that you agree with all I say about the necessity of religious instruction, but that the only difference between us upon the point is as to where it shall be given; that in your opinion this religious instruction can be given sufficiently well at home, and once a week in special schools organized for that purpose commonly called Sunday schools, and that the effect of this home and Sunday teaching will not be seriously interfered with by sending the child six days out of seven to schools, (the lecturer evidently knows that public schools are only taught five days during the week,) where religious teaching is ignored. Is not that a very perfunctory manner of disposing of so important a subject? Has not the moral tone of our community, under the operation of this theory, already fallen below the standard at which a nation is safe even in the hands of its own people? Do we not need more morality in the community, more people who believe in God?" and again the lecturer says: "Can we maintain our social organization without a high standard of morality, and do you think we shall get it from a system of Godless education?"

We believe the world is constantly growing better; men are more honest and more kind to their fellow men; our contact with humanity has convinced us that honesty and fair dealing is quite as sure to be found outside as inside of creeds; we have been cheated a dozen times by men professing to belong to churches to one by the other class; of public men who have been found corrupt according to our observation a majority have belonged to Churches. Boss Tweed was kept in office years after it was known that he and his corrupt gang were robbing the city out of millions of money, and had not the State locked him up so that he can no longer serve in office he would still hold any office in the gift of his constituency. A majority of the voters who placed Boss Tweed in office and kept him there belonged to the same