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ABSTRACT

After the relaxation of the Penal Laws in 1793, the Irish University Question became rooted in the dissatisfaction of Roman Catholics and Dissenters with the state's provisions for higher education. It was a question in which problems not only of education, but also religion, politics, and economics were involved; and it was a source of intermittent disturbance in Irish public life and in Anglo-Irish relations throughout the nineteenth century.

In 1845 Sir Robert Peel attempted to solve Ireland's educational difficulties along non-denominational lines. He introduced the Queen's Colleges Bill which called for the establishment of three provincial colleges based on the principle of mixed education, i.e., united secular and individual religious instruction. This monograph is an inquiry into the division of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy and Repeal Association, two basically Roman Catholic groups, over the establishment of the Queen's Colleges, 1845-50, as reflected in some contemporary periodicals. The outcome of this controversy determined Roman Catholic attitude in Ireland in favour of denominational education and resulted in the establishment of the Catholic University in 1854 with John Henry Newman as rector.

The introduction of this paper explains briefly the basic problem in higher education during the first half of the nineteenth
century and gives an outline of the reception of the Queen's Colleges Bill and the Queen's Colleges in Ireland between 1845 and 1850. It discusses the division which developed within the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Repeal Association over the colleges, the make up of the advocates and opponents of the Colleges in each organization, their leaders, and the organs which represented them.

The first chapter entitled "Educational Background" traces the history of the Irish University Question prior to 1845. It shows the role of Trinity College, Dublin, on the university level, and the importance of the National System, in the field of primary education, in prompting Sir Robert Peel to introduce the Queen's Colleges Bill.

The reception of the proposed Queen's Colleges Bill in Parliament and among the members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Repeal Association forms the basis of Chapter II, while Chapter III deals with the attempted amendment and passing of the Bill through Parliament.

The reception of the final Bill in Ireland was mixed. One section of the Roman Catholic hierarchy was willing to give the Colleges a trial while the majority of the Bishops gradually became more insistent in their demands for separate education. The struggle of these two factions from the passing of the Bill in 1845 through 1848 forms the basis of Chapter IV. Chapter V deals with the establishment of the Colleges in 1849, the ultimate victory of one group of the Bishops at the Synod of Thurles in 1850 and the subsequent history of Catholic association with the Colleges. Comments and conclusions form the final chapter. The text of some of the more scattered and less known documents is collected and placed in the appendix.
INTRODUCTION

The Irish University Question was for the first half of the nineteenth century a question primarily of how to satisfy the needs of Roman Catholics and Dissenters for higher education. At the opening of the century three solutions seemed feasible: (1) Trinity College, Dublin, might be completely opened, 1 (2) new colleges might be established within the framework of the University of Dublin, or (3) new acceptable colleges might be established outside this framework. The Anglicans of Ireland opposed a solution of the University Question along either of the first two lines, because they associated the destruction of the University of Dublin, as constituted, with the disestablishment and disendowment of the Established Church of Ireland. The Anglicans were a minority group among an overwhelming hostile majority and it was only reasonable that they should want to protect jealously every vestige and sign of their supremacy.

At the same time one may see from the pages of the Dublin Review that Roman Catholic attitude, both lay and clerical, was generally favourable to the opening of Trinity College, or the establishment of new colleges within the University of Dublin. Mr. Wyse, the Roman Catholic lay voice on educational questions, lauded Trinity College,

---

1 All degrees at Trinity College, Dublin, except for Divinity, were opened to Roman Catholics and Dissenters by the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 and letters patent of 1794 but Scholarships and Fellowships remained closed. See. Ch. I, Section II, 2 f.
Dublin, "as the best college of the British Empire for encouraging literary merit." This enthusiasm was moderated by the fact that scholarships and fellowships were withheld from Roman Catholics, on the grounds that such largesse was considered contrary to the charters of the University, common law, and the acts of parliament. Roman Catholic laymen, with the approval of Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, and the majority of the Roman Catholic Bishops, made efforts during the first forty-five years of the nineteenth century to secure the opening of the University of Dublin. They were unsuccessful however, for the officials of Trinity College, Dublin, and the Church of Ireland felt that the University of Dublin had been established as an Anglican institution, had developed as such, and should remain its particular domain.

By the mid 1840's Roman Catholic laymen abandoned hopes of solving the University Question by opening the University of Dublin, and the majority of the Roman Catholic Bishops, dissatisfied with the development of mixed education on the primary level, turned for leadership from the conciliatory policy of Dr. Murray to the more positive position of Dr. MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam. He was an avowed opponent of mixed education and favoured a solution of the educational problems of Ireland along denominational lines.


3 See Ch. I, Section III, 4, 5, 6, 7.

4 Dr. MacHale's attitude and influence was reflected in the Dublin Review, see: J. O'H agen, "Reform of the Dublin University, The Scholarship Question", D.R., XXIII, No. 45 (September, 1847), 245.
II

In 1845 Sir Robert Peel attempted to solve the University Question by introducing the Queen's Colleges Bill, which called for the establishment in Ireland of three provincial colleges founded on the principle of mixed education. The colleges were to be free of all religious tests and open to all. No public funds were to be provided for theological teaching, but voluntary contributions might be allowed.

The principle of mixed education, combining secular and separated religious instruction, had been introduced in Ireland early in the nineteenth century and the most notable attempt was made in 1831 by Lord Stanley. He established the National System of Schools which aimed at solving the problem of primary education in Ireland. At first the National System and its principle were accepted favourably by the Roman Catholics as the best compromise possible. Gradually, however, as concessions were granted to the Presbyterians, who at the outset had opposed the system, the Roman Catholics began to look with distrust upon the National System. By 1845, Dr. MacHale, who was the foremost opponent of the System, had succeeded in winning a large segment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to his side in opposing the mixed system.

III

The reception of the Queen's Colleges Bill was mixed in both England and Ireland. In Ireland Unionists were generally favourable to mixed education while Nationalists were divided. The Repeal Association to which most Nationalists belonged tended to be divided on political

---

5 For an account of mixed education during the first half of the nineteenth century see Ch. I, Section IV, 7 - 19.
grounds and these policies dictated their attitude on education. One
Section of the Association, known as Young Ireland, favoured the Bill
in their organ, the Nation. The other Section of the Repeal Association,
known as Old Ireland, which attacked the Bill, was led by Daniel O'Connell
and was more than adequately defended by Frederick Lucas in the Tablet.

Old Ireland, as the name indicates, was composed of the older
members of the Association, who were for the most part Roman Catholics.
They were inflexibly devoted to their leader, Daniel O'Connell, and
religiously dedicated to the principle that Repeal must be won by moral
rather than physical force.7

6 The Repeal Association was founded in 1841 by O'Connell in an effort
to unite Catholics and Protestants in opposition to the 1801 Act of Union.
Throughout his political career O'Connell had a strong inclination to
support Repeal of the Union. Even during the first period of his public
career, 1800-1830, when he was devoting himself to the Cause of Emancip-
ation, he showed a tendency to turn to Repeal to solve Ireland's difficul-
ties. Once Catholic Emancipation was a reality, O'Connell devoted
himself more completely to Repeal. In 1830 he founded the Society of
Friends of the Association aimed at "abolishing ancient animosities
and preparing the way for Repeal of the Union". O'Connell's support of
the Reform Bill of 1832 was based on the conviction that it was only in
a reformed parliament that the question of Repeal could be coolly,
properly and dispassionately discussed. O'Connell momentarily suspended
agitation during the early years of Lord Melbourne's administration but
in 1838 he founded the "Procurers Society". He made the significance of
this society clear, "... the Procurers may precede justice to Ireland
from the united parliament and the consequent dispensing with Repeal
agitation and will, shall and must precede Repeal agitation if justice
be refused." When Peel came to power O'Connell founded the Repeal Assoc-
iation.

Robert Dunlop, "Daniel O'Connell (1775-1847)", Dictionary of National
Biography (hereafter cited D.N.B.), XIV (1921), 517-530, passim.

7 Ibid., 822. O'Connell's aversion to revolution dated back to his
college days in France where he witnessed the excesses of the French Rev-
olution and it was strengthened by witnessing Emmet's disastrous uprising
in Ireland in 1802. When he founded the Repeal Association he made it
clear that he definitely opposed the notion of "arraying a barefoot,
turbulent, undisciplined peasantry against the Marshalled troops of the
Empire.
Young Ireland, the youthful group of the Repeal Association, was less rigidly devoted to O'Connell, and objected to his constitutional means and limited aims. This section of the Repeal Association numbered both Protestants and Roman Catholics among its members and leaders: Thomas Davis was the leading Protestant member while Cravan Duffy was the leading Roman Catholic. This segment of the Association came into prominence when Sir Robert Peel introduced the Queen's Colleges Bill.

Young Ireland, led by the co-editors of the Nation, Thomas Davis and Cravan Duffy, favoured the Queen's Colleges Bill and mixed education because they felt it would produce brotherly friendship among all faiths. They looked upon non-denominational education as the panacea of all Ireland's political, religious, and social troubles. They expected mixed education to create an intellectual aristocracy whose ranks would be filled by merit alone. Young Ireland dismissed the idea of the Colleges being dangerous to Roman Catholic faith and morals. They avoided the discussion of the merits and demerits of mixed education as a system, and relied on the more pragmatic argument that Ireland's intellectual needs demanded the acceptance of whatever immediate amelioration could be obtained. "Young Ireland never understood the Roman Catholic case against mixed education". Davis, a sincere Christian, petitioned for the inclusion of religious instruction and felt that a bill with religious instruct-

8 In 1839 Davis joined the Repeal Association and launched himself on an extensive literary career. In 1840 he contributed a number of articles on the State of Europe to the Dublin Morning Register, and in 1841 he became the joint editor with John Dillon of this paper. The publication of the Register was shortlived and in 1841 he joined Cravan Duffy and Dillon in founding the Nation.

George Baker, "Davis, Thomas Osborne (1814-1895)", DNB., V (1921), 621.

ion tasked on would be ideal. This arrangement could only be second
best as far as Roman Catholics were concerned. Finally, Young Ireland
looked upon itself as champions of religious liberty and felt it should
support mixed education against the convictions of its fellow countrymen.

O'Connell, while conscious of the need for giving education a
religious character, was attracted as were the Young Irishers by the
wholly praiseworthy aim of achieving this in some way which would also
unite youths of all denominations in friendly intercourse.

His advocacy of separated institutions and
opposition to mixed education was probably
prompted less by a conviction as to the
intrinsic merits or demerits of either
system than by a suspicion that nominally
undenominational institutions would be
used, in fact, to carry on the traditional
policy of state control and anti-Roman
Catholic bias. 10

Francis Graven Duffy, owner and co-editor of the Nation, admitted
that "O'Connell opposed the establishment of any institution dangerous to
Roman Catholic faith". He had a much deeper knowledge than Young Ireland
of the history of undenominational education in the National Schools, and
hence more reason to be suspicious of its practical working in the new
scheme. His great life work had been the freeing of his fellow Roman
Catholics from their disability, and he was, naturally, more sensitive
than the Protestant Section of Young Ireland to the emergence of a form
of religious toleration which he felt would lead only to religious servit-
ude to the Church of Ireland. While both sections of the Repeal Associ-
ation tried to win public opinion, they agreed to be bound by the decision

10 F. McGrath, Newman's University: Idea and Reality, (Dublin, 1951),
56.

11 Graven Duffy, Young Ireland, (London, 1881), 719.
of the Roman Catholic hierarchy regarding the Bill.

IV

The Roman Catholic hierarchy was also divided over the Queen's Colleges Bill and the principle of mixed education, but not as basically as the Repeal Association. A small but significant section of the hierarchy led by Dr. Murray and the Primate, Dr. Crolly, though not favourable to the Queen's Colleges Bill and principle as the best in theory, were quite anxious to obtain whatever concessions they could, and to give the colleges a fair trial. This group, which included the Bishops of the specific provinces for which colleges were planned, felt it was a question of mixed education, or no education at all. On the other hand, Dr. MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam, and the majority of Bishops definitely opposed the principle of mixed education, as embodied in the proposed colleges as anti-religious and an evil to be avoided. They would only accept the Colleges if clauses guaranteeing strong religious security were attached.

In order to understand the position of the Roman Catholic Bishops on education and their demands for religious security, it is necessary to understand the traditional Roman Catholic philosophy on education. In common with all educators, Roman Catholics maintain that education is training of the whole man, intellectual and moral. In common with all who accept religious belief, they hold education must include training in

12 The official legislation of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject of education is contained in Codex Juris canonici, Titulus XII, De Scholis, Canons 1383. The most recent authoritative pronouncements of the philosophical and theological principles underlying the Roman Catholic demands for education are contained in the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, Divinini Illuis, Magistri (1929) which refers to earlier documents, especially pronouncements of Pius IX and Leo XIII.
those religious beliefs since they form the highest part of man's intellectual heritage and are the basis of morality. Here the Roman Catholics part company with the vast majority of other Christian educationalists, for they hold that religion is so essentially related to other branches of human knowledge that it is impossible to convey that knowledge without reference to religion. The reference is more or less explicit in some branches; but if it is excluded, Roman Catholics maintain that both knowledge and religion are presented in a false light. This false presentation of human knowledge and religion will have a weakening effect on religious belief.

With this understanding of the Roman Catholic philosophy of education, it is much easier to understand the opposition of the Roman Catholic Bishops to mixed education. When people of various religious beliefs are educated together, either religious considerations must be excluded from secular education, or religion must be diluted to the lowest common factors of the beliefs of persons concerned. The Roman Catholic Church holds that either course involves a false presentation of the whole scheme of being. What the Bishops objected to was not the mixing of pupils but the inevitable mixing of what was taught. The term neutral education which is used in the code of canon law, is less liable to misinterpretation and is more expressive.

Added to these theoretical objections to mixed education as a system was the belief that in practice such education could never be truly neutral; for each teacher, consciously or unconsciously, is by his example and the views he expresses, a propagandist of religion or anti-religion of some sort. In light of these facts it is easy to understand why the Roman
Catholic Bishops of Ireland looked with suspicion at this time and throughout the first half of the nineteenth century upon the principle of mixed education - a principle which was at variance with Roman Catholic principles, and which offered obvious opportunity, if abused, for bringing to bear on children of the Roman Catholic religion, both intellectual and moral influences dangerous to religion.

While opposed in principle to mixed education, the Bishops were nevertheless cognizant of the uselessness of attempting to secure government assistance for purely Roman Catholic schools. Theirs was not an enviable position, they were unable to provide private schools and yet they realized that the government was definitely going to establish a general scheme of education. If they held strictly to principle and refused to compromise, then the situation would result in Roman Catholics paying taxes for the education of non-Catholics while the Roman Catholic population remained without University education.

The O'Connell group in the Repeal Association was closely allied with Dr. MacHale and the majority group of the Bishops, not only in its attitude towards higher education but also in its attitude towards tithes, tenant rights, and repeal, as remedies for the Irish Question.
They were supported in the public press by Frederick Lucas in the Tablet, a weekly paper founded in 1840 and published on Friday for Saturday. Lucas, who had always displayed an interest in Ireland, supported O’Connell’s demands for denominational education, repeal of the union, and fomented the agitation of tenant rights. In 1849 Lucas moved the Tablet from London to Dublin to contact more closely Roman Catholic opinion.

The Tablet was composed of two chief sections: a chronicle of the week and editorial articles, the latter often based on the former. The initial three or four pages of the chronicle of each issue offered straight reporting of the more important news items, mostly of political events at home, throughout Europe and not infrequently overseas. The space devoted to these varied according to their gravity or ramification as seen by the editors. Although the Chronicle customarily led off with domestic, especially governmental affairs, other news often took priority. During 1845,

13 Frederick Lucas was till 1839 a member of the Society of Friends. He was educated at the Quaker School at Darlington and received his higher education at University College, London. Throughout his undergraduate days Lucas eagerly expounded the claims of Catholic emancipation and took a keen interest in Irish politics. In 1838 he was converted to Roman Catholic Church, and he subsequently published a pamphlet, "Reasons for Becoming a Catholic" to Friends of the Society which impressed his new co-religionists. He also contributed several articles to the Dublin Review which increased his literary reputation and made the Roman Catholics desirous that he should be permanently engaged in support of their cause. Therefore, some wealthy London Roman Catholics aided him in founding the Tablet, a Roman Catholic weekly the first issue of which appeared on 16th, May, 1840.


xv
when the Queen's Colleges debates were at their height, these developments were displayed on the front page.

Editorials were sometimes inspired by events themselves, or at other times by an opinion expressed by some contemporary publication. From 1845 to 1850 Lucas' editorials were often inspired by articles in the Nation. Strictly speaking, these editorials more often represented an amplified commentary rather than a decisive statement of intrinsic principle. In either case the position of the Tablet was decidedly opposed to mixed education as embodied in the Queen's Colleges.

The Minority group of the Bishops did not support Young Ireland's evaluation of mixed education, nor did they share their growing revolutionary attitude towards Repeal. In the educational question the Bishops sided with Young Ireland, however, in what they considered the lesser of two evils. They were represented in the public press by Thomas Davis and Graven Duffy in the Nation. This paper, which was founded by Duffy in 1842 as the official organ of young Ireland, described itself as a "journal which aspires to represent the people of Ireland, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, and to protect their interests from wrongful aggression". Because of the vigor with which it was written and its singleness of purpose, it immediately became popular and achieved three times the circulation of conservative papers. Its aim as stated in the prospectus (which with the exception of a single sentence was written by Davis) was "to direct the popular mind and the sympathies of educated men of all parties to the great end of Nationality.

---

15 Cited from the Prospectus first published in August, 1842, reprinted in "Six Years of the Nation", Nation, VI, No. 222 (January 1, 1843), 2. See also M. Doheny, The felon's Track, (New York, 1849), 18
16 "Davis, Thomas Osborne", NYIB, V, 622.
Like the Tablet, the Nation was printed on Friday, for Saturday, and it consisted of two parts; the Chronicle of News and the Editorial Section. The policy of the Nation was quite different from the Tablet however, in that Editorials took precedent over the Chronicle of events which appeared in the second section. Editorials were inspired by events in Ireland and England and by articles in other periodicals, particularly the Tablet. The Editorials of the Nation were not usually elaborations of Chronicle reports and they usually stated their own position.

Throughout 1845 when the Queen's Colleges Question was being considered in Parliament, the Nation carried lengthy editorials praising the principle of mixed education but attacking the principle of government appointment of officials and professors. Early in the discussion of the Bill the Nation committed itself to rejection of the proposed colleges if government appointment was made a requisite. After the final Bill was passed with this stipulation in it, the Nation ceased to support the colleges in Editorials but continued to report favourably on the establishment of the colleges in the Chronicle of News.

VI

In May, 1845, Dr. Crolly convoked a meeting of the Irish Bishops to examine the government project which he described as "pregnant with danger to faith and morals." At this meeting the Queen's Colleges Bill as introduced was condemned by all the Bishops assembled but a memorial was attached to the resolution declaring that:

17 "The Synodal Meeting of the Catholic Bishops", Tablet, VI, No. 264 (May 31, 1845), 128.
the prelates were prepared to co-operate with the government if the scheme were amended on a number of crucial points: (1) a fair proportion of the professors and the other officers should be Roman Catholics approved by their Bishops, (2) all office bearers should be appointed by a board of trustees, which should include the Roman Catholic prelates of the province, and be empowered to dismiss any officer convicted of seeking to undermine the faith or morals of students, (3) there should be a Roman Catholic professor of history, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, geology, and anatomy for Roman Catholic students; and (4) Roman Catholic chaplains who would superintend the moral and religious instruction of Roman Catholics should be appointed at a suitable salary. 10

The outcome of this meeting was a compromise. The Bishops were willing to accept the principle of mixed education if certain securities were provided.

VII

At the next meeting of the Repeal Association the memorial of the Bishops was interpreted by both parties as a victory for their cause. Davis and Duffy in the Nation pointed out that the resolution contained no rejection of the principle of mixed education and argued that the very fact of the Bishops presenting the memorial pledged them to the principle. O'Connell, on the other hand, declared that the "principle was embodied in the system and the system was denounced." 20 In reality, the Bishops

---

18. Ibid.

xvii
memorial was neither an acceptance nor a rejection of the principle of mixed education. It was a declaration of a modus vivendi. The discussion over the Bishops' memorial gave rise to the now famous split in the Repeal Association between Young and Old Ireland, which was the first visible sign of a break in the organization.

VIII

The demands of the memorialists were, for the most part, turned down. When the memorial was presented to Lord Haytesbury, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, he assured the bishops that there would be no difficulty in acquiring any of the concessions sought, save a voice in appointments "which the government felt could not work successfully." The Lord Lieutenant's assurances proved valueless however, and Peel refused to budge on any of the memorial demands regarding them as "incompatible with the principle of the bill". Some minor points were conceded which gave assurance that a fair percent of Roman Catholic officials would be appointed, provided for a review in three years of the system of the appointments of professors, and protected the morals and faith of Roman Catholic students through licensed lodging houses and religious halls. These concessions were looked upon by the majority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy as insufficient. They failed to satisfy Young Ireland as the Nation declared that if the appointment of professors remained in the hands of the Government "the Bill must be resisted and defeated in or out of Parliament."
Daniel O'Connell declared in Parliament and in the Tablet that although the "bill had been much altered since the Roman Catholic prelates had expressed their opinion upon it, he was certain these changes had made no change whatever in their view regarding the Bill." 24

He pointed out the two main objections were unchanged; religious instruction and government appointment of officials and professors.

IX

Lucas himself in commenting on the concessions granted stated "they [were] of no value whatever, even as a lure." 25 The concessions did prove attractive, however, as was seen within two months when Dr. Crolly petitioned the government to establish one of the proposed colleges in his diocese. Dr. Crolly was backed in his support of the Colleges by Mr. Wyse and a very significant element of the clergy including Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of three dioceses for which colleges were tentatively planned, Dr. Denvir of Belfast, Dr. Ryan of Limerick and Dr. Murphy of Cork. 26 The result of the action of Dr. Crolly's group was to put the stand of the Roman Catholic hierarchy towards the proposed Colleges in a very uncertain position.

In Ireland, one of O'Connell's Repeal organs, the Pilot, attacked Crolly severely for his move and went so far as to make the unjust claim

---

24 "Colleges in Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 271 (July 5, 1845), 126. See also: "The Godless Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 19, Old (October 2, 1845), 2.

25 "Notes of the Week", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 23, 1845), 401, and Lucas, op. cit., I, 182.

26 "Renewed Protest of the Bishops Against the Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 282 (September 27, 1845), 609.
that he was insane. 27 It is to the credit of the Irish press that this accusation was attacked by all of the leading papers both Unionist and Repeal, including O'Connell's official organ, the Freeman's Journal. It is unfortunate that Frederick Lucas discredited the Tablet with the libel.

In the Nation, Dr. Crotty defended his action. He admitted that he was fearful of the Colleges' Bill when first introduced but he felt that the Bill had been sufficiently amended, and he wanted to try the colleges. 28

The majority of the Bishops, however, continued their opposition to the Bill. On September, 17th, 1845, eighteen of the Bishops including the five who had not signed the first resolution and memorial signed a second resolution declaring against the Colleges. 29

On November 17th, 1845, the Bishops assembled to consider again the position of the Queen's Colleges. Both sections persisted in their arguments and it was decided to refer the question to Rome for consideration.

Lucas' appraisal of the stand of the hierarchy decrees at this period was quite illogical. He argued that since all of the Bishops save five signed the first memorial and since these five signed the second memorial,

---

27 "The Godless Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 19, 6th (October 2, 1845), 7, and "The Archbishop of Armagh, Mr. Barrett, and Old Ireland, Nation, IV, No. 159 (October 25, 1845), 23.

28 "The Minority of the Irish Bishops, Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 28h October 11, 1845), 6th.

29 "Irish Colleges, Meeting in Armagh", Nation, III, No. 114 (August 15, 1845), 732.

30 "Second Memorial", The Times, No. 19, 037 (September 27, 1845), 5.
the bishops were united.

The Times carried a more accurate appraisal of the situation. It denied that the bishops were united but admitted that "the very fact of a majority opposing the colleges would destroy the chance of establishing the colleges as a bona fide experiment."

Between 1845 and 1850 the public forum was taken up with economic and political events of more far reaching significance than the Colleges' Bill; events which had an effect on the position of the proposed colleges; however. In 1845 the now famous Irish potato famine began and it continued throughout 1846. During this period the Tablet, Nation, and The Times were filled with articles pleading the case of the starving nation.

On July 26, 1846, the long awaited split in the Repeal Association occurred. This event was closely tied with the Queen's Colleges Question for it was over the Colleges that the first visible disagreement in the association occurred. Up to this point Young Ireland had honoured its resolution to oppose the colleges if the government appointment was persisted in; but there was strong evidence that it was anxious to support the colleges. It would feel much freer to do so now that the question was removed from the Repeal Association and the general question of repeal.

On June 1st, 1846, Pope Gregory XVI died and he was replaced on June 16 by Pope Pius IX whose liberal tendencies gave the supporters of the Colleges renewed hope. The general picture was further complicated

---

31 "Renewed Protest of the Bishops against the Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 282 (September 27, 1845), 609.

32 Editorial, The Times, No. 194037 (September 21, 1845), 5.

33 See Ch. IV, Section I, 59, 60.
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on February 7, 1848 when Lord Lansdowne introduced a bill in parliament aimed at renewing diplomatic relations with Rome. There is evidence that at the same time negotiations were opened on the Colleges Bill between Lord Clarendon, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and Dr. Murray and the minority Bishops. Dr. Murray received assurance from the Lord Lieutenant of three fundamental changes if the Bishops cooperated with the government: (1) the Archbishop of the province and the Bishop of the diocese in which the colleges were located would be ipso facto Visitors of the Colleges; (2) Roman Catholic students were to have residences reserved exclusively to them and (3) deans ranking as first class professors should be appointed to supervise these houses. The dissenting Bishops, represented by Dr. MacHale and Dr. Slattery, were also active in Rome opposing the proposed amendments on the grounds that (1) the new decree would not have force commensurate with the original acts; (2) the proposals were submitted to the minority bishops instead of the whole hierarchy, and (3) that the Government was trying to force its will on the hierarchy of Ireland through Rome. The negotiations continued throughout the troubled summer of 1848 which saw revolutions in Italy and Ireland. In Italy Lord Minto, the English envoy, supported the revolutionaries, an act which was looked upon unfavourably by the Court of Rome. By fall, negotiations for Lord Lansdowne’s Bill broke down and with them the behind the scene negotiations for the colleges bill.

34 "The Irish Colleges—the new Statutes", Nation, IV, No. 294 (May 20, 1848), 332.

35 "The Memorial to His Holiness Pius IX", Tablet, IX, No. 412 (March 25, 1848), 800 f.
A Papal Rescript condemning the proposed colleges, suggesting the establishment of a Roman Catholic University, and urging sacerdotal concord had been issued in October, 1847. Now in October, 1848, a second Rescript along the same lines was issued.

When the second rescript was issued The Times changed its stand on the position of the Colleges. Up to this point The Times had argued that the Colleges were not needed or wanted in Ireland, that Peel was not sincere in introducing them but merely used them to conciliate the Irish rather than attack the basic demands for separate education. After the second Rescript was issued, however, The Times stated that lack of education was the great evil of Ireland, that Peel's measure was dictated by reason and that the Bishops were unjustified in condemning the system after agreeing in the first Rescript to support it. This position of The Times and particularly its statement that the Bishops had to this time supported the Bill was inconsistent in view of its previous articles.

XI

The government proceeded with the Colleges undeterred by the Papal Rescripts. On December 4, 1848, an announcement was made that the Colleges would be established the following fall and that a University would be established shortly after to grant degrees. The list of faculty was published in August, 1849 and although Roman Catholics were not completely

36 See Appendix III, B, 1.
37 See Appendix III, B, 2.
38 Editorial, The Times, No. 19,037 (September 25, 1848), 5.
39 Editorial, The Times, No. 20,006 (October 26, 1848), 1.
excluded they were not, on the other hand, fairly represented. The appointments at Queen’s College, Belfast, were acceptable to the Presbyterian General Assembly and the school opened its doors with complete lay and clerical support.

The Queen’s Colleges in Cork and Galway opened in an uncertain atmosphere. Some Roman Catholic students attended and therefore some of the clergy felt obligated to accept positions to protect them. Clerical participation was possible through an interpretation of the two Papal Rescripts as prohibition seemed to be implied rather than stated. However in April, 1850, a third Rescript was issued which (1) prohibited the clergy from holding office, (2) obligated bishops to discourage Roman Catholic students from attending and (3) again urged common policy in the matter. This Rescript was backed by the new Primate of Ireland, Dr. Paul Cullen who was appointed to Rome to replace Dr. Crolly who passed away April 3, 1849. The loss of Dr. Crolly was a great blow to the supporters of mixed education among the hierarchy and one from which it never recovered. Dr. Paul Cullen convened a national Synod of Thurles as the Papal Rescripts suggested and the decision of this group, which was against the Colleges, was sanctioned by the authority of Rome late in 1851.

---

40  See Ch. III, Section IV, 2.

41  See Appendix III, 3, 3.

42  See Appendix III, C
That the effect of the decree of the Synod of Thurles had a definite effect on the Queen’s Colleges of Cork and Galway cannot be denied. Shortly after they were promulgated, The Times tells us the Roman Catholic prelates who had accepted positions as deans of residence resigned and in the following year all clerical association ended. Some Roman Catholic students continued to attend but not in sufficient numbers to make the Colleges successful.

XII

The aim of this monograph is to consider generally the history of the Irish University Question prior to 1850. More specifically, it deals with the reaction of the two sections of the Roman Catholic Bishops and the Repeal Association to the establishment of the Queen’s Colleges in Ireland 1845 to 1850 as expressed in the pages of certain British and Irish periodicals. The nineteenth century papers and periodicals covered the question of the provincial colleges extensively and it is from these that much of the contemporary Roman Catholic reaction must be gained. The role and value of The Tablet and the Nation in studying the position of the opponent and advocate of the Colleges respectively has already been discussed. Three other nineteenth century publications have also been extensively referred to: the Dublin Review, the Edinburgh Review, and The London Times. The Dublin Review, a Roman Catholic quarterly founded in 1836, has proved helpful in ascertaining the reaction of the Roman Catholic Bishops. Being a quarterly it is dissimilar in nature and approach to the Tablet. It contains no comment on the University Question in Ireland from the time the Irish Primate, Dr. Crolly, lost the support of the

43 “Statutes of Thurles, Ireland”, The Times, No. 21,013 (October 31, 1851), 5.
majority of the Bishops in 1815, until his successor Dr. Cullen and the
majority of Bishops agreed in their rejection of the Queen's Colleges
and the principle of mixed education at the Synod of Thurles in 1850.
The Presbyterian Quarterly, the Edinburgh Review, has proved helpful by
providing a somewhat antagonistic interpretation of Roman Catholic
reaction while The London Times has to a certain extent fulfilled the
role of an uncommitted observer.

The first monograph on the Queen's Colleges is scheduled to
appear in 1960. It is entitled Queen's Colleges, Belfast, and will deal
for the most part with Presbyterian reaction to that institution. A
preliminary article on the book, entitled "The Irish University Question
in the Nineteenth Century" appears in the June, 1958, issue of History.

The co-authors of Queen's College, Belfast are T. W. Moody and
J. C. Beckett of the staff of Queen's College, Belfast. I am deeply
indebted to them for referring me to Dr. Moody's article in History and
for permission to make use of the material therein. This article proved
very useful in writing Chapter I of this thesis, "Educational Background".
I am also grateful to them for referring me to Reverend Fergal McGrath's
book Newman's University: Idea and Reality. Chapter II in this work, which
deals with the Queen's Colleges, has proved very useful in providing a
general framework for this thesis.
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The history of the Irish University Question prior to the mid-nineteenth century resolves itself into three intermingling periods: first from 1591 to 1793, a period in which university education at Trinity College, Dublin, was a preserve of the Church of Ireland; secondly 1793 to 1845, an era which was characterized by efforts to open Trinity College, Dublin, to Roman Catholics and Dissenters; and thirdly from 1845 to 1850, when attempts were made to provide university education for Roman Catholics and Dissenters at non-denominational colleges founded on the principle of mixed education.¹

From its foundation in 1591, Trinity College, the only constituent member of the University of Dublin, was closely identified with the Anglican Ascendancy.² Roman Catholics and Dissenters were associated with the College at the outset but in 1637 Roman Catholics and Dissenters were in practice excluded from membership in the College by the obligation

¹ This division of the Irish University Question is the one usually followed and appears to be adequate.

² For an account of the founding of Trinity College, Dublin, as stated in the Dublin University Calendar, 1831, see Appendix I,

---


2 For an account of the founding of Trinity College, Dublin, as stated in the Dublin University Calendar, 1831, see Appendix I,

cf. J.P. Mahaffy, An Epoch in Irish History: Trinity College, Dublin. (London 1903), 60-76.
laid on all students of attending divine service and receiving the Holy
Communion according to the Anglican rite, and by an oath against popery
(Pontifico Seligio) to be taken by the Fellows. At about the same date
there was required an oath, on taking a degree, against transsubstanti-
ation, invocation and adoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Sacrifice
of the Mass. The outcome of this legislation was to make it difficult
for Roman Catholics to attend Trinity College, Dublin, and impossible for
them to attain degrees. Since both Roman Catholics and Dissenters were
also restricted from attending English Universities or going abroad for
a degree, an Irish University question already existed before 1793 in
the demands of Roman Catholics and Presbyterians for university education.

II

In the 1780's, public discussion in the Irish Parliament and in
the press marked out three possible ways (not mutually exclusive) of
dealing with the university problem. First, Trinity College might be
opened by the abolition of religion tests; second, a new college or
colleges might be established within the University of Dublin; and third,
new university institutions independent of existing universities might be
founded. Trinity College officials would accept the first of these
solutions but were vehemently opposed to the association of other

---

3 B. O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concession to Ireland, 1831-81, 2 vols.
(London 1883), II, 335, and E. Curtis, op. cit., 240.

4 An Act of Elizabeth required all graduating from English Universities
to take the Oath of Supremacy and Act of Uniformity. J. B. Mullinger et. al.,
"Universities - Reformation and Past Reformation Reform", Encyclopedia
An Act of William made it illegal to go abroad for an education. E. A.
D'Alton, "Ireland", The Catholic Encyclopedia, (hereinafter cited Catholic
Ency.), VIII (1903), 104.
colleges with the University of Dublin, for they felt it would require a change in the constitutional position of Trinity College itself.

The Catholic Relief Act of 1793 sought to supply the needs of Roman Catholics for higher education by providing that the laws of universities could be altered to permit graduation without the taking of oaths save of allegiance. In 1794, accordingly, a Royal Letter made the necessary changes, and consonantly with the spirit of the law the College authorities admitted Dissenters on the same terms with Roman Catholics to all privileges of study and graduation. But no relaxation was made in the case of the teachers or privileged students who were either Scholars who had to attend Chapel and take the Anglican Communion, or Fellows who must all belong to the Established Church. Therefore a problem still remained.

In the Charter of Incorporation of May 3rd, 1592, Trinity College is twice designated as a Mater Universitatis, a title which, at first sight, would seem to suggest that it was intended to be the first stage in the formation of a university. The same Charter, however, granted immediately to the College, the power of admitting to degrees, a power always considered to be the exclusive privilege of a university. The possibility of associating new colleges with the University of Dublin was alluded to in subsequent charters issued by James I in 1613, Charles I in 1637, and the Act of Settlement in 1660, which confirmed the position of Trinity College, Dublin. The proposed colleges never materialized, however, and by 1793 the exclusive relationship between Trinity College and the University of Dublin was a well established tradition, jealously guarded by the Protestant Ascendancy.


III

Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century Roman Catholic laymen sought to have Trinity College opened more completely. They were supported in the pages of the Dublin Review by the majority of Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, who were at this time under the influence of Dr. Crolly, and of Dr. Murray. They opposed the exclusion of Roman Catholics from scholarships and fellowships, contending that this policy was the work of the Established Church and that it was contrary to the charter of the university, common law and the acts of parliament.

It was the view of the Anglicans that by admitting Roman Catholics to Fellowships and Scholarships they afforded an opportunity for them to gain control of the religious instruction of the Institution, a possibility contrary to the character of Trinity College, Dublin. They pointed out that the position of Fellow required acceptance of Anglican priesthood, while even that of Scholar required presence at the Anglican place of worship.

In 1834, a Bill was introduced into Parliament by Richard Lalor Sheil, a graduate of the University of Dublin and one of O'Connell's ablest lieutenants in the Emancipation campaign, for the admission of

7P. MacMahon, "Trinity College, Dublin", DR., IV, No. VIII (April, 1838), 283 f.

8For an account of the Protestant objections to the opening of Fellowships and Scholarships to Roman Catholics and Dissenters see: Pollack and Blaunt, "op.cit.", DR., I, No.I (May, 1836), 77 ff.

Roman Catholics and other Dissenters to Scholarships and certain Professorships in Trinity College. The proposal was a modest one, for Shell expressly excluded such professorships as had a connection with religious instruction, and also Fellowships which might entitle Roman Catholics to share in the Government of the college. Nevertheless, his bill failed to secure even a first reading and was denounced by T. L. Lefroy, one of the members for Dublin University, as "the first step in the subversion of the Irish University, and through the subversion of that nursery of the Irish Church, to the total extinction of the Protestant religion in Ireland".

The question of the opening of fellowships and scholarships to Roman Catholics was brought to a head in 1845 when a Roman Catholic student named Heron was denied a scholarship because he refused the sacramental test. The question in Heron's case was whether scholarships were presently open to all, as degrees were, or if they constituted a body distinct from the 'studiosi', and should remain the sole possession of the Established Church by continuing the old religious observances and by adding a new one of sacramental test.

---

10 McGrath, op.cit., 6.

11 B. O'Brien, op.cit., II, 335.

12 Denis Gouldfield Heron was a Roman Catholic student at Trinity College, Dublin. He had successfully passed all the exams for a scholarship but when he refused the sacramental test his name was removed from the list of scholars. He appealed his case to the Queen's Court and this gave rise to litigation in 1844-45 which attained great celebrity. For an account of the proceeding see: "The Scholarship Controversy-Trinity College", Nation, IV, No. 167 (December 26, 1845), 155.
Heron's chief attorney, Mr. J. O'Hogan, based his cases on the argument that Scholarships were not explicitly denied to Roman Catholics either in the original charter or in subsequent ones. He contended that Trinity College was designed for the diffusion of general literature among Irishmen of all creeds without distinction, and not for the propagation of the dogma of reformed theologians. Furthermore, he pointed out that not only were Roman Catholics members of the College in its early years, but that Roman Catholic Anglo-Irish gentry had subscribed large sums for its support, and the land on which the original buildings were erected was granted by the Corporation of Dublin whose members were largely Roman Catholic.

The case hinged on the interpretation of the 1793 Emancipation Act and the 1794 Royal Letter. Prior to the letter there was as much difficulty for Roman Catholics becoming students as Scholars. The oath was acceptable and the only difficulty was the common religious exercises. The Sacramental test was established in 1794 by the governing board of the college to exclude Roman Catholics, and O'Hogan claimed this was unconstitutional and adverse from the wishes of the founders.

Dr. Keating, the assessor, decided against Heron. His main argument was that Trinity College was essentially an Anglican institution not only for the promotion of learning, but also for the cultivation of virtue and religion, and that Elizabeth gave as one of the reasons for the foundation of the college that it would dissuade her Irish subjects from travelling to "foreign Universities where they become infected with popery and other

---

13 See Appendix I.
ill qualities". Dr. Keating felt that the Anglican religion was one of
the objectives for which it was established and that the intention of
the founders must still be carried out, except so far as a change had been
made by express word or necessary implication. The decision in the Heron
case ended for the time being the possibility of opening Trinity College,
Dublin, to Roman Catholics and Dissenters.

In 1847, Mr. Heron wrote a book attacking Trinity College, Dublin,
for not opening all emoluments to Roman Catholics. In it he pointed out
that very few Irish Catholics attended the College after 1793. He
accounted for this paucity by the fact that there was only one seventy-
fifth part of emoluments open to Roman Catholics and Dissenters.

IV

The attitude of the Roman Catholic hierarchy towards the opening
of Trinity College changed during the first half of the nineteenth century.
Throughout most of the period the majority of the Bishops led by Dr. Murray
supported the claims of Roman Catholics for the opening of fellowships and
scholarships. By 1845, however, the majority turned for leadership to Dr.
MacHale who opposed the principle and practice of Trinity College. He
looked upon Trinity College, Dublin, as an establishment, anti-Catholic
not only in its constitution but also in its spirit, atmosphere, and
teaching. Roman Catholic students were not bound to attend catechetical

---

11 McGrath, op.cit., 3.

15 The number of Catholics attending Trinity College, Dublin, after
1793 was: 1793-1829, 15 per year; 1829-1844, 32 per year; and in 1844
only 23 registered.

J. O'Hagen, "Reform of the Dublin University-the Scholarship
Question", DR., XXIII, No. XLV (September, 1849), 231.
lectures or examinations but Dr. MacHale objected to their being taught "anti-Catholic history and philosophy". He also rejected the assertion that the association of Roman Catholics and Anglicans at Trinity College would break down bigotry. Dr. MacHale favoured separate education in denominational institutions. While the majority of Bishops did not support him in this demand, they did share his mistrust of any solution of the educational question along mixed lines.

Undoubtedly the attitude of the Roman Catholic Bishops towards mixed education was determined by developments which transpired in the field of primary education. Early in the nineteenth century a mixed system of education had been attempted with the establishment of the Kildare Street Society in 1811. Though Protestant in origin, this Society was planned along different lines than earlier ones which demanded terms of aid which Roman Catholics could not, in conscience, accept.

The Roman Catholic objection to the earlier educational societies centered around their aim, the proselytizing of Roman Catholics. Proselytizing of Roman Catholics was common in the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century particularly by means of mixed education.

The Kildare Street Society was established in order to overcome the shortcomings of the Proselytizing Societies and make primary education

16 Ibid.

17 The idea of popular education supported by the Government did not exist in Ireland at this period and was not introduced till later in the century. At this time the initiative in education was taken by private religious societies and any government aid was made in the form of grants in aid which was distributed by the Societies to schools fulfilling certain requirements. Prior to 1811 no Catholic schools accepted grants because the terms of aid required acceptance of the Protestant religion.

18 McGrath, op.cit., 24.
available to Roman Catholics. Its design was to have Roman Catholics and Protestants educated together in secular subjects, leaving their religious training to ministers of their religion outside of school hours. At first this system was supported by the vast majority of Roman Catholic laity. Daniel O'Connell, who recognized the plight of Roman Catholic children with reference to education, became a member of the governing board in an effort to induce Roman Catholics to make use of the Kildare Street Schools. The only voice among the Roman Catholics raised against the Kildare Street Society at this time was that of John MacHale, a young priest at Maynooth.

MacHale received little support from the Roman Catholics in his rejection of mixed education until the Society associated itself with three proselytising institutions, the London Hibernian Association, the Society for the Discomfitting of Vice and the Baptist Society. After 1820 the Roman Catholic clergy withdrew their support of the system; their example was followed by the Roman Catholic laity who withdrew their children from the schools associated with the Society, and by O'Connell, who resigned his position on the Board. The Society, however, backed by Parliament, Presbyterians, and the Church of Ireland continued to function until the establishment of the National System in 1831.

19 Dr. MacHale, a native Irishman and a fervent nationalist, was educated in a small parish school in Leatherden and received most of his instruction in Gaelic. Ordained to the priesthood in 1811, he remained at Maynooth as theological lecturer. In 1831, despite government opposition based on fear of his nationalism, he was appointed Archbishop of Tuam.

Thomas Hamilton, "MacHale, John (1791-1881)". *DNB*, XII (1921), 550.

20 B. O'Brien, *Fifty Years of Concession to Ireland, 1831-81*. (London 1883), I, 120.

21 For a full account of the Kildare Street Society see *Ibid*, 120 ff.
The National System of education came about as a sequel to the findings of the Royal Commission on Education in Ireland in 1824. This commission in turn, owed its origin to the protests of the Roman Catholic hierarchy who opposed the entrusting of public funds to the proselytizing societies. The findings of the state commission resulted in the dissolution of the societies and their replacement by the National Board of Education.

The Report of the Royal Commission favoured the establishment of a system of mixed education which might lessen bigotry. In 1824-25 the Commission presented its findings to the Roman Catholic Bishops whose reply was unfavourable to the principle of mixed education:

In the Roman Catholic Church the literary and religious instruction of youth are universally combined and no system of education which separates them can be acceptable to the members of her community...That schools whereof the master professes a religion different from that of his pupils, or from which such religious instruction such as the Catholic Church prescribes for youth is excluded, cannot be resorted to by the children of Roman Catholics.23

The Roman Catholic Bishops, however, were willing to accept a compromise with the principle if certain religious securities were allowed. They asked for a Roman Catholic master where the majority of students were Roman Catholics and a Roman Catholic assistant where there

---

22 Of the 11,823 schools in existence at this time 9,352 were independent pay schools. These independent institutions taught 103,774 pupils of the total 560,549 attending schools in Ireland.


23 McGrath, op.cit., 22.
was a minority of Roman Catholics. Education of Roman Catholic teachers was to be in the hands of the Bishops as was approval of books to be used by Roman Catholics. Finally and perhaps most important of all no attempt should be made to transfer ownership of the schools to the Government.

The findings of the Royal Commission were submitted to a Selected Committee of the House of Commons in 1828 which drew up the scheme of National education, designed to meet the demands of the Roman Catholic Bishops in providing aid to all denominations.

The National System was introduced in 1831 by Lord Stanley. The basic concept or principle of this system was "united secular and separate religious instruction". Lord Stanley felt that Ireland wanted denominational education as much as England, but, because public opinion would not allow money to be used to teach Roman Catholic principles, he proposed a system of mixed education in which the state, while supporting only secular education, afforded sufficient opportunity for each denomination to receive adequate instruction. These schools were to be governed by a Board on which Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and Presbyterians were represented. Four days a week were to be devoted to secular education.

---

24 O'Brien, op.cit., 1, 189.


26 The original board founded in 1831 consisted of two Roman Catholics, Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin and Right Hon. J. A. Blake; two Presbyterians, the Rev. James Carlile (of the Synod of Ulster) and Mr. Robert Holmes (of the Synod of Munster); and three Anglicans, the Duke of Leinster, Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin and Dr. Sadlier. This Board was one of the main points of contention in the system and one of the points Dr. MacHale attacked most vehemently. He maintained it was unfairly composed and that its rulings were constantly partial to the majority group. See, Lefevre, Peel and O'Connell. (London 1887), 147, and O'Brien, op.cit., I, 176.
and one or two for separate religious instruction which was in no way to be provided by the state. They were to be so managed that "there should not be a suspicion of proselytizing." 27

Roman Catholic reaction was at first favourable to Lord Stanley's plan. Mr. Wyse, member of Tipperary, who was the leader of Roman Catholic opinion in the 1830's and 1840's on the question of education, defended the scheme in the able speech in Parliament. He supported the principle of the Bill as one which reduce bigotry. 28 O'Connell expressed appreciation of a bill which afforded education for the Roman Catholic children of Ireland but he was non-committal on the principle of the Bill.

From 1831-1837 the overwhelming majority of Roman Catholic Bishops and clergy of Ireland, lead by Dr. Crotty, the Primate, and Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, favoured the principles of mixed education, as operative in the National System, as a vast improvement over all preceding systems and the best which could be obtained. They pointed out that their religious convictions were no longer tampered with; their moral and literary training was no longer neglected. They seemed to have recognized the fact

27 Lefevre, op.cit., 146, and O'Brien op.cit. I, 159 ff.

28 In 1830 Wyse was elected for Tipperary and in the same year he presented to Earl Grey, through Lord Stanley, a detailed plan for national education in Ireland which he had drawn up after consultation with the Roman Catholic Bishops. Though Wyse's Bill received no support in 1830, the following September Lord Stanley introduced an independent bill (National System) which was a verbatim reproduction of Wyse's Bill but for which he received no credit. "Wyse, Sir Thomas (1791-1862)", DNB, XXI (1921), 1139.

that the education problem could only be solved by the adoption of a compromise scheme and they considered that, upon the whole, Lord Stanley's plan, as such, was fair and workable.

Such was the opinion of the vast majority of Roman Catholics, but from this opinion there was one dissenting voice, that of John MacHale, who was made Archbishop of Tuam in 1831. As early as 1812 MacHale had shown himself as an opponent of mixed education. In 1820 he wrote the first of a series of letters signed Hierophilos against the joint educ­ation of Roman Catholics, Anglicans and Presbyterians, and in 1831 he wrote to Earl Grey recommending denominational education along with the abolition of tithes, tenant rights, and repeal, as remedies for the disturbed condition in Ireland. John MacHale maintained that "the Irish people never asked for a system of mixed education; they wanted separate education." Mixed education might be all well and good for a country where the population was mixed, but Ireland was almost exclusively Roman Catholic. He was unwilling to oppose the current of public opinion which O'Connell had countenanced and commended and accordingly he assumed a position of watchful neutrality to await the development of events.

During the same period, 1831-1838, the system was opposed by the Anglicans and Presbyterians. The Church of Ireland was dissatisfied

30 Thompson, Hamilton, "MacHale, John (1791-1881)", DNB., XII (1921), 551.
31 O'Brien, op.cit., I, 175.
32 Jane Whately in The Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately points out that although Archbishop Whately himself favoured the National System as spreading intellectual culture and spiritual knowledge, he was not supported by the Protestant clergy and laity. Jane Whately, The Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, (London, 1886), 139.
with the exclusion of religion from school hours, and also feared the loss of control over education which it had hitherto exercised. The Presbyterians resented the allowance of Roman Catholic instruction in their schools. While the Anglicans in the main held aloof from the system, the Presbyterians endeavoured to alter it in their own interests. They succeeded between 1831-39 in obtaining inclusion in the curriculum of a type of instruction which consisted of reading passages from the Scripture without note or comment, to be moral and religious without being sectarian. They also secured in 1837 permission to give religious education at any time intermingled with secular instruction. Thus while the system became acceptable to them, it became unacceptable to a large portion of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, who feared common religious instruction would pave the way for the inculcation of Protestant doctrines.

In 1838 Dr. MacHale began his assault upon the system. He addressed a series of letters to Lord John Russell in which he attacked the unfair representation of Roman Catholics on the National Board, the large number of Anglicans and Presbyterians in leading positions in the training schools, and the character of the lesson books which were compiled by Dr. Whately.

---

For a complete list of the Concessions granted see O’Brien op.cit. I, 181. The change in position of the Presbyterian clergy regarding National System and the principle of mixed education as amended can be seen in the pages of the Edinburgh Review. In an article in the 1833 issue the system is bitterly attacked as one which interferes with the inestimable possession and use of the Scriptures in school. In an article in 1852, however, it describes the schools as free "from all sectarian discord, while the religious independence of every sect is perfectly secured." The Article goes on to praise the schools for teaching along with knowledge, "the lessons of mutual forbearance, an education in the divine art of dwelling together."

Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, and which were held by Mackale to be anti-Catholic and anti-Irish. During the same year he convened a meeting of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to ascertain the feeling of the episcopacy. The conclusion was disheartening as only ten Bishops supported him, while eighteen sided in with Dr. Murray, who favoured the system.\footnote{Thompson Hamilton, "Mackale, John", \textit{Adv}, XII, 551.} Despite this defeat Mackale made a stand against the schools in his diocese in 1849.

Events of 1840 prompted some of the Bishops to transfer their support to Dr. Mackale's minority group which opposed mixed education. In that year the separate days for religious study, referred to by the Presbyterians in derision as the "fifty-two Popish holidays", were abolished. At the same time the Presbyterians' demands for abrogation of the rule giving Roman Catholic priests the right to administer religious instruction to Roman Catholic children in the mixed schools of Ulster was conceded. The practical result of this abrogation was to convert such of the National Schools of Ulster, as had been promoted by the Synod, into Presbyterian denominational institutions. The Roman Catholics, of course, withdrew en masse from the schools that their priests were forbidden to enter.\footnote{O'Brien, \textit{op.cit.}, I, 189.}

This move by the Presbyterians was followed by one, not equally successful, by John Mackale in February, 1840. The Archbishop of Tuam convened a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates in Dublin for the purpose of discussing the system and considering whether an arrangement
might be arrived at with reference to its future workings, in which the Roman Catholic hierarchy could unanimously concur. It was resolved at this meeting that three bishops favourable to the National System and three bishops unfavourable to it should be appointed to formulate the united Catholic demands. The Bishops so appointed were: Dr. Crolly; Dr. Ryan, Bishop of Limerick; Dr. Kinsella, Bishop of Armagh (favourable to the System); Dr. McHale; Dr. Keating, Bishop of Ferns; and Dr. Higgins Bishop of Armagh (unfavourable to it). The demands formulated by them were briefly these: (1) that the Roman Catholic Bishops and clergy should by the patrons of all the schools which Roman Catholic children attended, those alike which were exclusively or almost exclusively frequented by Roman Catholic children, as well as those in which there was a mixed attendance of Roman Catholic and Protestant children; (2) that the patrons should be invested with supreme power in the appointment and dismissal of teachers; (3) that they should exercise absolute control over the books to be used for the moral and religious instruction of Roman Catholic children; (4) that they should fix and set the time for giving of secular instruction without interference on the part of the Board; (5) that the lectures on religion, morals, and history at the model training schools for teachers be set up under the National System should be given by Roman Catholics; (6) that a model school should be founded in each province; and (7) that one prelate and two Roman Catholic laymen from each province should be appointed to the Board, the first to be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant the latter by all the bishops of the province. These extensive demands were presented to the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Ebrington, by Drs. Crolly, Murray, Keating.

36 Ibid., 179.
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and MacHale. They were refused. Throughout this period Dr. Murray, who was a constituent member of the Board of Education and the strongest supporter of mixed education among the Bishops, used all of his power to counteract the efforts of MacHale. Both Bishops and their followers felt that this division among the hierarchy, accompanied as it was by undifying controversy and publicity, ought to be resolved, if possible. Therefore in 1840 it was unanimously agreed that the whole question in dispute should be referred to Rome. The decision of Rome, anxiously awaited, arrived in January, 1841, and did not oppose the system. The Pope, mainly influenced by the representative of Dr. Murray, no doubt, without expressly declared either for or against the principle of mixed education as applicable to the state of Ireland, decided that "the National schools were entitled to a further trial and in order that they might more effectively obtain it, forbade all public controversy respecting them in the future."37 The decision was practically against Dr. MacHale, but the Pope did agree with him that the Roman Catholic clergy and laity should be trustees of all schools established.

All public controversy ceased till 1845 when the Board in control of the National System tried to pass a ruling vesting the control in itself of all property in the schools established or to be established, and not as before in local managers. This ruling would affect Roman Catholic schools because the local managers were usually priests. The united Roman Catholic clergy protested against the measure and won a partial concession and they were allowed to keep the schools already established under their patronage.

37 Ibid., 189.
By 1845 the National System had changed from a voluntary one to a state controlled one. The system of voluntary local contributions was abandoned and teachers became paid officers of the Board. Religion was excluded from the central training school in Dublin. Books were published by the Board at public expense at such a low price that the nominal freedom to use others seemed incongruous, if not ridiculous. The series of model schools in the country towns were under the commissioners.

By the Synod of Thurles, 1857, the Roman Catholic clergy were forbidden to vest new schools in the Board or to transfer old ones. The Commissioners, on the other hand, refused to relinquish their control of schools within the system. There was no aid, therefore, till 1862 when the rule regarding the site of new schools to be conveyed to the Commissioner was rescinded. Henceforth Roman Catholics and Protestants were able to obtain state aid for new schools while retaining possession of the sites and vesting the schools in trustees of their own choice. In 1860 the National Board was increased from eleven to twenty, and half the members were to be Catholics. The "Stafford Rule" introduced in 1847 was also abrogated in the same year. It had made it arbitrary for Roman Catholic children to leave religion classes for Protestants, and was particularly hateful to the Bishops since they felt moral pressure could be brought to bear on children placed in this position.

In a recent article in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record Reverend M. Brennan points out that Catholic opinion in Ireland is now favourable to the National System and he points out that "in its present form it respects the principle that education is fundamentally a Church and family concern." The schools of themselves are now generally owned or held in trust in the interests of religious denomination, and the trustees of the schools undertake to conduct them within the rules prescribed by the Minister of Education in return for which the state contributes aid by way of teachers salaries, etc. Only 8% of the primary schools in Ireland are "state property". The remaining 92% are non-state institutions usually held in trust for some religious denomination. He goes on to state "Whatever about the theoretical objections to mixed education, practically all of the schools deriving aid through the system of national education are denominational in the sense that each school is frequented by children of the same religious persuasion. They are, in effect denominational schools with a conscience clause". See Reverend M. Brennan, "The National System", IRR. LXIX (January-June 1847), 34-45, passim.
This was the point at which the battle of mixed education had arrived when Sir Robert Peel introduced his Queen's Colleges Bill aimed at introducing into Ireland institutions of higher learning based on the principle of mixed education.

Despite the evident growing distrust of the majority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy towards mixed education, the Government continued to attempt to resolve Ireland's educational woes along non-denominational lines. In 1835 Dr. Wyse, considering Lord Stanley's educational policy inadequate, introduced a Bill for National Education in Ireland more complete than the National System of 1831. On the second reading of this Bill he was appointed head of a Parliamentary committee which inquired into the question of Irish education, and recommended a comprehensive scheme of elementary and secondary education crowned by four provincial colleges, providing teaching on a university level, financed by the state and the grand juries, and controlled by a national education board. The committee avoided saying much about the place religion should occupy in their scheme, being content to work on the assumption that the National System principle of mixed secular and separate religious instruction would

Sir Thomas Wyse was perhaps the most educated man of Ireland at this time. At the age of nine he had been sent to the Jesuit school at Stonyhurst in Lancashire. Upon graduation he entered Trinity College, Dublin, making use of the Repeal Act of 1793, and in 1812 he graduated B.A. In 1813 he entered Lincoln's Inn to study law for his own edification. Between 1815 and 1817 he studied in France and Italy while 1817-19, he was in the East studying in Athens, Constantinople, Egypt, Palestine and the Greek Island. He was partially responsible for the inception and establishment of the National System of 1831 and its acceptance by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Throughout his life he was probably the most active campaigner for extension of education in Ireland. "Wyse, Sir Thomas (1791-1862)", DNB, XXI (1921), 1187-1191.
prevail throughout the whole system. Nothing came immediately of the suggestions of this committee but it did undoubtedly play a part in making known in government circles the existence of a demand which was steadily growing more insistent.

On June 9th, 1814, Wyse once more brought the university question before the House of Commons. His immediate purpose was to improve the status of Maynooth College, where the majority of the candidates for the Roman Catholic priesthood were educated, but he took the opportunity to press for a solution of the whole problem of higher education in Ireland.

"Wyse, Sir Thomas", DNB, XXI, 1189
For further details on this Committee see:

Maynooth College was established in 1795 as a seminary for the Roman Catholic clergy because the French Revolution broke up many of the colleges on the Continent, at which the Irish Catholic priesthood was trained. Ireland at that date, still had her own Parliament which, under the leadership of such Protestants as Edmund Burke and Henry Grattan, was favourable to relaxation of the penal laws. It is to these men more than any others of their time that the foundation of Maynooth must be ascribed. Other circumstances were also favourable. On the one hand, the programme of the rebellious United Irishmen, 1798 proclaimed the doctrine of universal toleration and liberty of conscience. On the other hand, the British Government was glad of an opportunity to withdraw young Irish ecclesiastics as far as possible from the revolutionary influences to which they were exposed on the continent. Moreover, soldiers were needed at a time when war was raging or threatening on all sides and it was necessary to conciliate the class from amongst whom the Irish soldiers could be recruited.

An endowment of £80,000 was voted by the Parliament in 1795. This money was granted for a Catholic college for the education of Irish clergy; that was the express intent of the Government but, as the Act was drawn up in general terms, the trustees proceeded to erect a college for laymen in connection with the ecclesiastical establishment. This lay college never developed, however, and Maynooth remained primarily a seminary.

It is interesting to note that on this occasion he adumbrated the three main solutions which with slight variation, had been suggested in the late eighteenth century and continued to be proposed up to the establishment of the National University of Ireland in 1908, namely, the opening of Trinity College or at least the University of Dublin, or the creation of Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Universities or the establishment of a mixed University.42

Peel paid a tribute to Wyse's able exposition of the problem, and intimated that a solution would shortly be forthcoming. He did not, however, feel that the first two solutions suggested by Wyse were workable. The authorities of Trinity College were by this time determined to maintain the Anglican character of the institution and its exclusive relationship with the University of Dublin. On the other hand, Peel felt English public opinion would not tolerate a Roman Catholic University. He determined therefore, to supply the educational wants of the Irish Catholic youths by the establishment of a non-sectarian University, where attendance at religious instruction should not be compulsory, and where professors of all religious persuasions could be appointed. In fact, in introducing the Queen's Colleges Bill Peel tried to solve the problem of Irish university education, as Lord Stanley had in 1831 tried to solve the problem of Irish primary education, by founding a mixed system.

42 About the same time Wyse wrote to Smith O'Brien outlining his complete appraisal of the Irish University Question and advancing what he considered feasible solutions.

See Appendix II, A
CHAPTER II
RECEPTION OF THE QUEEN'S COLLEGES BILL

I

On May 9th, 1845, Sir Robert Peel's Bill for the establishment of the Queen's Colleges was introduced into Parliament by Sir James Graham, Secretary of the State for the Home Department. 1 In introducing the Bill he spoke of the penal laws and their gradual relaxation and declared that "in no degree were they more noxious than where they can still be found interfering in the matter of education". 2 After praising the National System, which was the embodiment of the principle of mixed education on the primary level, he went on to outline the government proposal for higher education on this same principle.

1 When Sir Robert Peel came to power in 1841, Sir James Graham accepted the position of Home Secretary and served in this position throughout Peel's administration. His association with Ireland as Secretary of State for the Home Department was not very amiable. He alienated the Catholics in 1833 by declaring "concession to Ireland had reached its limit" and his unpopularity was added to by the arbitrary manner in which O'Connell's arrest and imprisonment was handled in 1843.

It is interesting to note that the introduction of the Queen's Colleges Bill was not Sir James Graham's first attempt at an educational measure. In 1843 he introduced a Factory Act, in which the educational clause was opposed by the nonconformists. On this occasion he failed to be sufficiently conciliatory and the clause had to be removed. In the same year a Bill for Reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts had to be withdrawn because he failed to consider vested interests. Mandell Creighton, "Graham, Sir James Robert (1792-1861)", DNB, VIII (1821), 328-32. passim.

2 In. Par. "Academic Institutions in Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 261 (May 10, 1845), 266.
The Queen's Colleges Bill, originally called the Academic Institutions of Ireland Bill, called for the establishment of three colleges to be situated in Belfast, Cork, and Galway or Limerick. It was intimated that they would probably be united later by the foundation of a new university. A grant of £100,000 was to be made for the necessary building and each was to receive £6,000 annually for current expenditure. The appointment of officials and professors was to rest with the Crown. Provisions were made to ensure the strictly non-sectarian character of the institution. No religious tests were to be imposed either at entrance or upon admission to degrees; no religious instruction was to be given; no religious topics were to be introduced into the lecture halls, and no religious considerations were to be weighed in the appointment or dismissal of officials. Sir James Graham pointed out that it must not be considered, however, that religious instruction would be altogether disregarded in these institutions, for provisions were made for private endowment of religious instruction and the use of college facilities where it did not interfere with secular education.

On the whole, the bill had a mixed reception in the House of Commons. Gladstone reflected the general attitude when he remarked that it was an imperfect measure, but that the cause of the imperfection was

---

3 Changed in Committee to the Colleges, Ireland, Bill In. Par., "Colleges, Ireland, Bill", The Times, No. 18,964 (July 1, 1845), 4.

4 For accounts of the proceedings in the House of Commons on the Introduction of the Queen's Colleges Bill see In. Par., "Academic Institutions in Ireland", The Times, No. 18,920 (May 10, 1845), 2, and In. Par., "Academic Institutions in Ireland," Tablet, VI, No. 261 (May 10, 1845), 266.
the state of Ireland. The Irish Conservative Members of Parliament were silent, being content to hold a passive brief for Trinity College. Several members felt that the power given to the Government was too great but the debate for the most part turned on the religious aspects of the Bill. The Irish Roman Catholic members present were for the most part favourable to the measure but felt that (1) the Roman Catholic Bishops should be consulted, (2) Roman Catholic clergy should have control over students in residences, and (3) that it should be imperative upon every student to attend some place of religious worship. Some disapproval was also expressed by High Anglican Members of the lack of provision for official religious instruction. The most vigorous criticism, however, came from the Low Church champion, Sir Robert Inglis, who had previously led the opposition to the increase in the Maynooth Grant, and who denounced the new measure as a gigantic scheme of godless education.

5 These recommendations were made by Mr. Ross and Mr. Sheil respectively. Both Daniel O'Connell and John O'Connell who later led the opposition to the Bill in the House of Commons and in the Repeal Association were in Ireland when the Bill was introduced. Im. Par. "Academic Institutions in Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 261 (May 10, 1845), 297.

6 When Maynooth College was established in 1795, the Irish House of Commons voted £8,000 and this became the annual endowment varying slightly. The Act of Union 1801 reaffirmed its charter and provided that its endowment should not be reduced for twenty years. The grant was voted annually in the House of Commons and debate on the grant usually gave rise to considerable acrimony. In 1845 Sir Robert Peel introduced a Bill to increase the grant from £9,500 to £26,000, to make it annual, and to provide £30,000 for capital expenditure. There was much opposition to the Bill but Peel rushed it through Parliament maintaining that the underlying principle of state support of the Catholic clergy was established by long precedent and that the question involved was merely the adequacy of the grant. This sum remained the grant to Maynooth College down to the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland in 1869 when the college received a lump sum of £370,000.

Reaction in the public press to the proposed Colleges Bill was also mixed, as might be expected from the attitude of the House of Commons. The Times declared that the proposed colleges were too thoroughly in accord with the precedent of the last few years to excite surprise or effectual opposition, and pointed out that the Queen's Colleges merely aimed at filling in a vacuum left in the educational legislation for Ireland.  

This Editorial in The Times should not be misconstrued as a declaration on their part in favour of the Queen's Colleges, or of the principle of mixed education. It was merely a typical example of the editorial policy of The Times, intending, in the first instance, to describe a proposed Bill along with the Government's reason for advancing it. The Times reserved comment for later editorials. This was only the first in a series of articles covering the whole story of the Bill's reception in England and Ireland and dealing with the question of separate and mixed education.

These articles show clearly that the attitude of The Times passed through two distinct phases. In the first instance, The Times attacked the bill, claiming that (1) colleges were not needed in Ireland since the section of the population interested in higher education was Anglican and was provided for; and (2) that the bill was merely an expedient of Peel's ministry aimed at conciliating the Irish rather than satisfy any basic need of Ireland.  

The National System provided for middle class lower education and the Queen's Colleges Bill was to provide for the middle class upper education. The question is often brought up of why Sir Robert Peel did not propose a Bill for secondary education as logic would seem to dictate. Perhaps he felt that such a measure would be less acceptable to the Catholics of Ireland who would definitely be opposed to submitting students of secondary education age to secular education without providing implicitly for religious instruction. He probably felt that this objection to lack of religious instruction would not be such a deciding factor with the Catholic hierarchy in the case of students of college age.

basic problem was to be found in landlord-tenant relations. Regarding the principle of mixed education The Times felt that it was acceptable in countries where it was wanted but claimed that Ireland, far from wanting mixed education, was inclined toward separate education and determined "to denounce all education which did not come in the name of religion." 9 The Times supported the principle of separate education and the demands of the Bishops for religious securities at the time of the issuance of the first Papal Rescript in 1847 and it looked upon this Rescript as "a victory for MacHale and the dissenting Bishops". 10

When the second Papal Rescript appeared in 1848, however, The Times contradicted its former stand completely. It declared that the ignorance of Ireland was one of its basic problems, and that the scheme devised by Peel was dictated by reason. The principle of mixed education was praised as one aimed at "excluding the distinction of sects and the obnoxiousness of dogmas," and the Pope was attacked for contradicting his former stand "in favor of a system of mixed education." 11 From this point on The Times seemed favourable to the principle of mixed education as applied to Ireland, and encouraged the government to persist in establishing the system, which it argued the Roman Catholic laity would accept despite Papal objection.

The reception of the proposed College's Bill in the Tablet was not as temperate as was The Times, but it was consistent. Frederick Lucas

10 "The Pope and the Godless Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 19,689 (October 25, 1847), 8.
was the first to discuss the Bill in the public press. He fully realized the importance of Roman Catholic Hierarchy on the question of higher education in Ireland and he also perceived that the Bishops, though united in principle in favour of separate education, were divided on the practical question of acceptance or rejection of the Queen's Colleges. Even before the introduction of the Bill in the House of Commons, he addressed an editorial to the Bishops of Ireland counselling them to meet and unite in their opposition to any weak Educational Bill proposed by Peel and assuring them that they had the power to secure amendments.

II

The day after Sir James Graham introduced the Bill, Lucas called it "a scheme for de-Catholicising the middle classes of Ireland -- a scheme which in every point realized his worst fears." In the first of a long series of articles denouncing the Queen's Colleges, Lucas outlined in the Tablet editorial section the most objectionable features of the Bill. These objections centred around the absence of any provisions for religious education and the lack of any formal moral training or discipline. Augmenting these sources of dissatisfaction was the adoption of the principle of non-residences in the Colleges for both professors and students and the ignoring of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the appointment of professors. His first editorial concluded with a question: "What human being who is not an atheist by profession, can do other than abhor such a scheme?"

---

13 "The Provincials Colleges", Tablet, VI, No. 261 (May 10, 1845), 296.
14 Ibid.
Such severe criticism of a bill as yet unprinted and only pronounced in the broadest terms seemed questionable. It is doubtful whether this particular editorial met with the approval of Daniel O'Connell, or Dr. MacHale, despite the fact that it contained many of the criticisms which these two opponents of the Colleges employed at a later date. In a letter of February 11, 1815, Daniel O'Connell advised Archbishop MacHale against any premature and rash denunciation of the Bill lest the Protestants of Ireland and particularly of the Repeal Association should interpret such a reaction as showing them "inimical to toleration and determined not to be satisfied with any concessions." Dr. MacHale respected this suggestion and made no official comment on the Bill until after the Roman Catholic Hierarchy had considered all of its provisions thoroughly.

III

The reception which the Queen's Colleges Bill received in Ireland was more tempestuous than in the House of Commons. It was first introduced on the public forum at the meeting of the Repeal Association, on Monday, 12th of May, 1815. The discussion which it prompted showed that this organization was sharply divided in its attitude toward education and their appraisal of the Bill. O'Connell, speaking on behalf of those who opposed

---

15 For the text of O'Connell's letter see Appendix II, B, 2.

16 The Repeal Association was formed by O'Connell with the express purpose of uniting Protestants and Catholics in their demands for Repeal of the Union with Great Britain. Graven Duffy severely criticized O'Connell for not keeping the Colleges Bill out of the Association for the "aim of the Association was repeal and the constitution had been drafted for the express purpose of combining men who desired a native Parliament without sacrificing their individual opinions on any other question". Young Ireland contended that it was impossible to unite the North Presbyterians and Federalists to the cause of Repeal if religious and social problems were linked to the political aspects.

Graven Duffy, Young Ireland, (London 1881), 687.
mixed education, adopted Sir Robert Inglis' expression and described
the proposed schools as 'Godless Colleges'. He went on to expound his
own solution for Ireland's University problem; which was a decided dec-
laration for separated education.

While I ask education for Catholics, I
freely and gladly concede it to the
Protestants and Dissenters ... Let the
Protestants of the Establishment have
the full use of Trinity College for the
education of their youth. Let the
Presbyterians have the complete control
over the education of their children in
the Belfast institution; 17 but for the
purpose of Catholic institution let two
more colleges be instituted, one at Cork,
the other at Galway, and let the Deans
of the establishments be Catholic clergymen, whose appointment shall be vested18
in the Catholic bishop of the diocese.

O'Connell concluded by saying that it was not his intention to propose
any motion against the colleges at this time, for there might be some
difference of opinion among the members of the Repeal Association.
Besides he felt it would be premature to give a notice of motion at
present, for the Roman Catholic Bishops had not pronounced any opinion
on the Government plan as yet and his conduct would be guided by theirs.

The moderate attack of O'Connell upon the Colleges was reiterated

17
Belfast Academy was founded in 1810 to solve Presbyterian demands for
a lay and clerical education. It consisted of a high school, theological
school and collegiate department, the latter including an arts faculty and
a medical faculty. No religious tests were imposed and no teaching of
theology was provided but it was allowed on a voluntary basis. When Graham
introduced the Queen's Colleges Bill he hinted that the Belfast College
would be based on the framework of the Belfast Academy.

18
Repeal Association "The Educational Scheme", Tablet, VI, No. 262
(May 17, 1845), 316, see also
Repeal Association "Ireland", The Times, No. 18,923 (May 11, 1845) 6.
in more violent terms by his son, John. Not content with attacking the Queen's Colleges Bill, John O'Connell advanced further by firing a broadside at the Young Ireland party "for the melancholy spectacle they made of themselves" (by not opposing the Bill in the House) and "by presuming to commit their country-men to the abominable scheme for education. What or who were they, that they should presume thus to compromise the Irish people?" This tirade by John O'Connell elicited a reply from Davis, editor of the Nation, who had remained silent to this point. He spoke now, however, on behalf of the faction of the Association which favoured the Bill because they felt that higher education was an urgent necessity for Ireland and that united education would lead to national unity. Davis believed that the people of Ireland were most anxious to receive academic education, regardless of its source, for "it was a good gift, which could not be polluted by the hands through which it passed." On one point he

19 John O'Connell was the third and favorite son of Daniel O'Connell. Like his father he was a lawyer and politician. He was a member of the "household brigade" in the Repeal Association; his father's first lieutenant while he was in England, and the practical head of the Association during his frequent absences. He asserted an almost dynastic claim to his father's uncrowned kingship.

John Andrew Hamilton, "O'Connell, John (1810-1858), DNB, XIV (1921) 834.

20 Repeal Assoc., "Ireland", The Times, No. 18,923 (May 14, 1845), 6.

21 John O'Connell strenuously opposed Young Ireland and incurred its bitter enmity. Like his father he was closely allied with the Roman Catholic priesthood and was trained in O'Connell's school of constitutional agitation. Therefore, he was prone to denounce vehemently irreligious or lawless tendencies in the new party. He lacked the tact of his father, however, and Young Ireland, willing to defer to the age and genius of Daniel O'Connell frequently revolted against such pretentiousness on the part of his youthful and mediocre son. "O'Connell, John", DNB, XIV, 835.

22 Repeal Assoc., "Ireland", The Times, No. 18,923 (May 14, 1845), 6.
joined wholeheartedly in John O'Connell's position: the appointment of
Professors. He was not disposed to surrender the appointment of the
instructors of the youth of Ireland into the hands of an English, that is,
of an anti-Irish Government. He felt, however, that the Bill did not
establish any form of sectarianism in the country. He favoured the prin-
ciple of mixed education pointing out that he was educated at a mixed
school, which fact had increased his understanding and affection for
Roman Catholics. Separate education, he felt, led to disunion and
deepened differences in the youth of Ireland. He questioned whether Roman
Catholics and Protestants, separated in youth, could be united in manhood
to stand together politically for their country.

Speaking of the religious question in the colleges Davis said:

Were the religious discipline and instruction
of the Catholic students entrusted to a
Catholic dean, appointed by the Catholic
Church authorities, and training of
Protestants and Presbyterians left to
deans named by the Protestant and Presby-
terian Church, no sect could complain nor
even a zealot murmur with any show of justice. 24

Agreeing that the religious instruction of Roman Catholics should
be vested in the hands of Roman Catholic authorities, the Editor of the
Nation felt this could be accomplished as well in mixed colleges as in
separate colleges.

Daniel O'Connell concluded the discussion at this point, in order
to avoid further division in the Association, by agreeing with Davis that the

23
Ibid.

24 "The Educational Scheme of Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 263 (May 11, 1845),
316, and "Repeal Association - Ireland", The Times, No. 18,923 (May 11, 1845),
6.
discussion was premature and should be postponed till the Bill was printed. Both groups agreed to exclude discussion of the Bill from further repeal meetings until the Bishops decided the question, but groups were to be free to express their own views.

III

An appeal to both Roman Catholics and Presbyterians to support the principle of mixed education as one which would "strengthen the soul of Ireland with knowledge, and knit the creeds in liberal and trusting friendship," was made by Davis in the Nation. He argued that the principle of mixed education had been accepted in the National System by Catholic Ireland. Certainly adequate provisions for religious discipline must be obtained. The appointment of the professors by the Government was unwanted but perhaps these blemishes could be removed. Davis was very sincere in his support of mixed education. A Protestant himself, he had been educated at a mixed school and it was his conviction that united education would overcome the animosity existing between Roman Catholics and Presbyterians and unite them in their fight for Repeal. Davis readily admitted the Bill had shortcomings in its religious provision, but he felt these could be overcome. Young Ireland looked upon the Queen's Colleges as the panacea of all Ireland's religious, political, and social problems, which they were anxious to secure at almost any cost.

Duffy, in the same issue of the Nation appealed to the Roman Catholic middle class, from which he sprang. He pointed out the "crying need of some system of regular educational training". He argued that since

the "English ministers offered a system of large scope fettered by injurious restrictions and conditions . . . [Catholic Ireland's] plain duty was to strive that the objectionable provisions of the bill should be amended." He went on to point out that non-residence was common in Roman Catholic Colleges on the Continent, the danger of which could be guarded against by a system of licensed lodging houses under the superintendence of deans appointed by the Ordinary. There should also be two chairs of history. It can be seen from this article that Duffy, who was a Roman Catholic himself, understood the Catholic claims for separate education better than Davis. He did not attack separate education as Davis did, in fact, he avoided any comparison between the principles of separate and mixed education. Duffy tried to impress upon Roman Catholics that it was not a question of choosing between separate and mixed educations but rather between mixed education or no education at all.

At this point young Ireland was avowedly favourable to the proposed colleges, feeling they would advance the cause of Repeal. Its only serious objection was to government appointment and they committed themselves to rejection of the Colleges "in or out of Parliament" if this stipulation was not removed. The religious question was secondary with them. O'Connell and Old Ireland took a different stand on the proposed colleges. As far as they were concerned the religious objections to the Bill were primary. They opposed government appointments, as Young Ireland

26 "Academic Institution, A Word to the Catholic Middle Class", Nation, III, No. 136 (May 17, 1845), 521 and Duffy loc.cit.

27 "Academic Institutions", Nation, III, No. 136 (May 17, 1845), 520.
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did but because they felt these appointments would be anti-Roman Catholic as well as anti-Irish. They did not look on mixed education as a positive blessing and would only accept it if strong religious security was attached. Even this was considered second best to separate education.

Lucas, in evaluating the position of Young Ireland as expressed in the Nation, stated that he believed their opposition to government appointments was "hearty and sincere, and evidently intended for use", but maintained that the Nation was "egregiously mistaken in the view it gave its readers of the doctrine of Separate Education." Lucas contended the Roman Catholic opponents of mixed education did not object to the mixing of students per se but rather to the curriculum which such a mixed student body required. They were not for Separation of students, which in a mixed population was neither physically nor morally possible, but rather desired the provision, for Roman Catholic students, of purely Roman Catholic education. The Roman Catholic opponents of the Bill claimed that since all sound education was religious, it must be based on religion and possess religious discipline.

IV

The controversy in the Repeal Association and in the public press was a prelude to the pronouncement of the Roman Catholic bishops. The importance of their attitude toward the proposed colleges cannot be overemphasized. Both partisans and opponents of the Bill in the Repeal Association knew that Roman Catholic lay opinion would almost certainly be

28 "The Nation on Mixed Education", Tablet, VI, No. 263 (May 24, 1845), 322, and also Lucas, op.cit., I, 200.

29 Ibid.
strongly influenced by the decision of the hierarchy. Both parties had committed their members to be bound by its decision.

As a group the Roman Catholic hierarchy made no official announcement of its position towards the Colleges Bill prior to the meeting of the Bishops held on Wednesday, May 21, 1845. Dr. MacHale, although decidedly favourable to separate education had made no public comment on the Bill, probably in deference to O'Connell's suggestion. Dr. Cnelly, Primate, who was one of the staunchest supporters of mixed education in Ireland throughout the earlier part of the century, was the only member of the Roman Catholic Bishops who made any comment, and this a personal one, on the proposed Bill prior to the meeting of the Bishops. His comment did not seem favourable to mixed education. In a letter dated April 27th, 1845, Dr. Cnelly wrote to Sir Robert Peel expressing "opposition to any Bill in which Catholic Bishops would not have over the Catholic youths of his diocese that control that essentially [belonged] to them," or which entrusted the instruction of Roman Catholic students to "some trading socialist who [cared] not for that religious morality, the very soul of instruction". He concluded his preliminary remark on the Bill by

30 See above, 28.

31 As far as the Roman Catholic hierarchy were concerned the distinguishing characteristic between mixed and separate education was not to be found in the student body but rather in the way the administration and staff was constituted to accommodate the student body. A mixed student body, indicating the joining of various religious sects to form, one whole, demanded of necessity a mixed or neutral staff pledged to be non-denominational in their teaching or at least to support only those religious beliefs which were common to all groups represented. A separate student body, indicating the presence of one religious sect or at least, concern for the education of one religious sect, warranted a denominational staff pledged to support the religious convictions of that body.

32 "Letter from the Archbishop of Armagh to Sir Robert Peel", Tablet, VI, No. 260 (May 3, 1845), 278 f.
cautioning Peel not to forget that the people of Ireland were Roman Catholic, and that it was on Roman Catholic principles that education of the youth of Ireland must be based. He asserted that it was by Roman Catholic agents, under the superintendence of the proper Roman Catholic authorities that this education was to be conducted. This much of Dr. Crolly’s letter was compatible with mixed education with strong religious security, but his concluding paragraph seemed to be a declaration for separate education:

Let it not be imagined that it is meant to exclude Protestant youth from the benefits of education. Far from it. As far as they constitute what might be termed a community or a people, they are confined to the north of Ireland, where they have a college; and for the rest, who are scattered over the other provinces of Ireland, more than half a million of money in tithes and church lands ought, in all conscience, to furnish both clergy and laity with adequate funds for education.33

It was Dr. Crolly who in a letter describing the government proposal as "pregnant with danger to faith and morals" convened the meeting of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to consider the colleges.34 Dr. Murray presided at the meeting of the Bishops. The entire hierarchy except for six were present.35 A division among the bishops developed: a minority under the leadership of Dr. Murray and Dr. Crolly, was inclined to waive theoretical objections, accept mixed education and give the plans a trial,

33 Ibid.
34 "Ireland, the Synod", Tablet, VI, No. 262 (May 24, 1845), 326.
35 The six Bishops absent were: Egan, M'Laughlin, MoNicholas, Higgins, Keating and Cohen. "The Meeting of the Bishops", Tablet, VI, No. 263 (May 24, 1845), 328, and "Academical Education, Times, No. 18,933 (May 26, 1845), 5.
while the majority, led by Dr. MacHale, was disposed to hold out for a solution on definitely denominational lines. The outcome of the meeting bore signs of being a compromise. Dr. MacHale moved, Dr. Slattery seconded, and the bishops voted unanimously to reject the bill in its present form. Dr. Crolley then moved, Dr. Ryan seconded, and the majority passed a resolution calling for "a memorial, suggesting and soliciting such amendments in the said Bill as might be calculated to secure the faith and morals of students." This memorial which was later presented to Lord Heytesbury, stated that the Bishops were willing to co-operate with the Government in establishing the colleges, but demanded the following provisions as requisites of any such system:

First, "that a fair proportion of the professors and other office bearers in the new colleges should be members of the Roman Catholic Church, whose moral conduct shall have been properly certified by testimonials of character signed by their respective prelates, and that all office bearers in their colleges should be appointed by a board of trustees, of which the Roman Catholic prelates of the province in which any of these colleges shall be erected shall be members".

Second, "that the Roman Catholic students should not attend the lectures on history, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, geology or anatomy, without exposing their faith or morals to imminent danger, unless a Roman Catholic professor will be appointed for each of these chairs."

Third, "that if any president, vice-president, professor, or office bearer, in any of the new colleges shall be convicted before the board of trustees of attempting to undermine that faith or injure the morals of any student in those institutions, he shall be immediately moved from his office by the same board."

36 "The Synodal Meeting of the Catholic Prelates" Tablet, VI, No. 264 (May 31, 1845), 328, and "Meeting of the Catholic Bishops", Nation, III No. 138 (May 31, 1845), 551.
and fourthly, "as it was not contemplated that the students should be provided with lodging in the new colleges, there should be a Roman Catholic chaplain to superintend the moral and religious instruction of the Roman Catholic students belonging to each of these colleges; that the appointment of each chaplain with a suitable salary, should be made on the recommendation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese in which the College is located, and that the same prelate should have full power and authority to remove such Roman Catholic chaplains from his situation." 37

The interpretation attached to the resolution and memorial demands of the Bishops in the public press reflected the positions which were previously taken. The Nation construed the document as an acceptance of the principle of mixed education; "it will be observed that the principle of mixed education [was] not here directly approved or condemned, but approval [was] an inference, as clear and emphatic as words could express." 38 According to the Nation the Bishops assumed that a mixed system was to be established while Young Ireland declared that the amendments required by them to make it satisfactory did not lead to separate education. Regarding the demands of the Memorial, Young Ireland felt the suggestions were just, except that the demand of separate chairs for geology and anatomy was extravagant.

The significance which Davis and Duffy ascribed to the Bishops' Resolution and Memorial Demands reflects again their strong desire for mixed education. The Nation was justified in stating that the Bishops

37 Ibid., See also Appendix III, A.
did not positively denounce the principle of mixed education, but it was not justified in interpreting this lack of absolute censure as emphatic approbation. Both sections of the Bishops looked upon mixed education as a mixed blessing but they were willing to accept it with certain religious security...

a more candid interpretation of the Bishop's meeting was made by Frederick Lucas in the Tablet. He spoke with satisfaction of the resolution condemning the college as,

the more courtly expression for Sir R. Inglis' emphatic and pregnant description of a gigantic scheme of Godless Education ... 39

but he pointed out that the memorial contained no statement of principle, pointed to no very definite results, and consisted of a series of specific demands, the bearing, purport, and ground work of which had as many interpretations as there were readers of the document.

V

The next meeting of the Repeal Association was held on Monday, May 26th, 1845. Both segments within the Association claimed the bishops as their allies. The dispute which developed over the purport of the Bishops' Memorial and Resolutions gave rise to the now famous split in the Association.

Daniel O'Connell opened the consideration of the Memorial in a speech of two hours duration in which he "attacked the Bill from one end to the other". He claimed that the Bishops' Memorial had put an end to the Bill and rejoiced to believe that all the symptoms of division and dissension in the Association were at an end. It seemed to O'Connell that all were agreed in condemning the ministerial measure.


40 Repeal Assoc., "The Educational Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 264, (May 31, 1845), 349.
These opening remarks, however, led to further discussion in which John O'Connell denied that the prelates favoured mixed education, as the Young Ireland members of the association intimated. He declared that for all intents and purposes, their memorial was "a condemnation of what [had] generally been known as a system of mixed education." Mr. M. J. Barry, a member of the Young Ireland section, agreed in condemning the appointment of officials and professors by the Government and the lack of religious instruction but stated that he was an advocate of mixed education and wished to see Anglicans, Presbyterians and Roman Catholics educated together. In reply to Barry's speech, M. O. Conway, one of O'Connell's backers said Young Ireland supported the Bill because it was indifferent to religion and that he was not prepared to give up old sympathies to the theories of Young Ireland. Davis then rose and addressed his reply to "his Catholic friend, his very Catholic friend..." Mr. Daniel O'Connell took offence at this inference and an open rupture loomed on the horizon.

Davis defended himself and his party in an impassioned speech in which, after pointing out that his "dearest friends were Catholics", he went on to express his "strong approval" of the demands of the Roman Catholic bishops, but claimed they amounted to an acceptance of the principle of mixed education, "mixed in management, instruction and education".  

41 Ibid., 350.
42 "Repeal Assoc", Nation, III, No. 1 38 (June 31, 1845), 548 f, and Repeal Assoc, "The Rupture and Conciliation", Tablet, VI, No. 264, (May 31, 1845), 350.
43 Ibid.
He again denounced the failure of the Bill to provide for the religious supervision of the students, and for the power which it gave the Government in the matter of appointments. O'Connell rose a second time, and declared that he regarded Davis' attitude as tantamount to a declaration of war between the Young Irelanders and those whom he dubbed Old Ireland. Davis overwhelmed by the vehemence of this attack leaped to his feet protesting his loyalty to the Association and O'Connell. O'Connell shook his hand as a sign of forgiveness and the meeting closed with both parties pledging their allegiance to the cause of Repeal.

It was ironic that the outbreak centered around the question of whether the bishops accepted or rejected mixed education for in reality, they had done neither. They had merely outlined the requirements for a modus operandi. The importance of this disagreement in the Repeal Association cannot be overlooked not only as far as the University Question was concerned but also in the political question of Repeal.

Frederick Lucas in commenting in the Tablet on the rift left no doubt as to his sympathies which were "neither with Middle-Aged Ireland nor with Young Ireland, but solely and exclusively with Old Ireland". His support of O'Connell's condemnation of the Queen's Colleges Bill was equally clarified.

Doheny and Duffy claim that Davis's show of emotions on this occasion was prompted by genuine sorrow at incurring the displeasure of Daniel O'Connell with whom he had "laboured so earnestly for the national cause." Duffy, op. cit., 700, and Doheny, op. cit., 120. Professor Gwynn, "O'Connell, Daves and the Colleges Bill", (Dec., 1845), 1051-1065, gives different reasons. He believes it was the result of exhaustion and nervous tension resulting from political agitation against the Bill and also by attacks he had been sustaining from the Irish Catholic Press and particularly from Frederick Lucas in the pages of the Tablet.

"Old Ireland and Young Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 264 (May 31, 1845), 337.
Writing in the Nation in the issue immediately following the outbreak, both Davis and Duffy eulogized the outbreak as "a sign of independent thinking within the Association which would necessarily lead to better understanding and closer association. Writing at a later date, however, they looked upon this meeting as the first visible sign of a split in the association.

---
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Editorial, Nation, III, No. 138 (May 31, 1845), 553.
CHAPTER III
THE BILL GOES THROUGH

I

Daniel O'Connell and Smith O'Brien were selected by the Repeal Association to attempt to secure amendments to the Queen's Colleges Bill in line with the Bishops' Memorial. Hopes were high at first in Ireland, for Peel had shown a conciliatory attitude towards Roman Catholic Ireland in some of his recent legislation. Furthermore, the demands of the representatives of the Bishops were supported in the British Press. The Times pointed out:

There cannot be anything unreasonable in demands which are justified by the experience of our English universities during the many centuries they have existed. We require all professors and other office-holders to be Catholic in our sense of the word. We put every

---

1 Barry O'Brien points out "there can be no doubt that the views of the great Conservative statesman respecting the administration of Irish Affairs underwent an important change during his tenure of office, in 1841-46. While Lord Melbourne was in power he [Peel] was still a supporter of the Ascendancy. But, in 1843 he said that Ireland could no longer be governed on ascending principles. His appointment of the Devon Commission to inquire into Ireland agrarian system and introduction of the Maynooth Grant Bill and the Bequest Bill help to prove this point. The Bequest Bill which was passed in 1841 committed the control of charitable bequests to a body consisting of three judges and ten commissioners. Though it was open to some criticism, it had the merit of removing the legal insecurity of charitable Catholic institutions. It was opposed by Dr. MacHale and many other bishops, and by Frederick Lucas in the Tablet chiefly because it limited the rights of bishops in the control of ecclesiastical property, and placed excessive power in the hands of the Government, who had the appointment of commissioners.

Barry O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concession to Ireland 1831-51, 11, 422.

Similarly McGrath, Newman's University; Idea and Reality, 57.
student in a college, under a tutor, and
a body of lecturers all committed by oath
to the particular tenets of the Church of
England. We compel attendance on one's
church service, and exclude, as far as we
can, every trial or offence to religious
feeling. We at least, with our own
rigorous exclusion, cannot pretend to
doubt the correctness of the misgivings
alleged by Smith O'Brien, Mr. O'Connell
and Mr. Sheil. 2

The Times article went on to question the sincerity of the
Bishops in requesting such strong religious security. . It was the
conviction of The Times that the Bishops would be satisfied if only
deans of residence were appointed, but the editor admitted that the
Irish would go along with their Bishops and that unless the Govern­
ment could come to terms with these de facto authorities the colleges
would begin their arduous existence with a stigma.

O'Connell and O'Brien also stressed the fact that unless the
Bill was amended in line with the Bishops' Memorial it would be useless.
At this time O'Connell felt Peel would go as far as possible in granting
the Bishops' demands and he counseled MacHale "to stand firm and all
would be conceded." 3

II

In parliament the Roman Catholic claims received support from
some Protestants. Lord John Manners and Lord John Russell both supp­
ported the Bishops' demands. Gladstone felt the Bishops' counsel should

2 Editorial, The Times, No. 18,967 (July 4, 1845), 4.
3 W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, 2 vols.
(London 1888), II, 358. See Appendix II, B.3.
4 For a full account of the initial debate in Parliament see, Im.Par.,
"The Academical Institutions of Ireland", The Times, No. 18,938 (May 31,
1845), 4.
be weighed carefully in making the appointments. Sir Thomas Akkland also supported the Bishops' claims for separate chairs for he felt that with respect to the question of separate or mixed education the question did not turn so much upon who were to receive it as upon those who were to give it. The Earl of Carnarvan supported the demand for Roman Catholic chairs for history and moral philosophy and agreed with the Bishops in regard to anatomy and geology as far as to state that teachers of these subjects should be professing Christians.

For the most part, however, the claims for the Queen's Colleges Bill and the arguments for mixed education dominated the debate. The familiar claim that mixed education would prove a unifying force was repeated but the chief government spokesman sounded that note with caution, naturally enough, in view of the position in his own country. Peel depended primarily on the argument that something must be done and that conditions in Ireland made the non-denominational system unavoidable.

"I admit", said Peel, "that I think the system we propose inapplicable to England and Scotland; but, if we are to have academic institutions in Ireland, I see no other mode of securing that advantage but by establishment of some such system as this. I justify it by the peculiar and unfortunate character of the religious differences which there exist."

The Ministers voiced the argument against separate education as strongly as they did those for mixed. Lord Stanley pointed out that denominational institutions would be frequented only by members of the creed which they represented and thus the advantage to be derived from

---

5 In Par., "Irish Collegiate Education", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 28, 1845), 411, and In Par., "Irish College Bill", The Times, No. 18,957 (June 23, 1845), 2.
united education would be lost. Peel, in the third reading in the Commons, stated that the government was determined to retain the appointment of officials in Ireland, where there was so much jealousy of interference, for he surmised that "neither Catholics, Anglicans, nor Presbyterians were likely to renounce all voice in the appointment of officials in denominational institutions, much less of the theological professors." The Marquess of Lansdowne, during the second reading in the House of Lords, proclaimed that the Government had no moral right to impose a religious test upon subjects who wished to attend educational establishments maintained out of public funds, to which all denominations alike contributed.

During the second reading in the House of Commons, Brougham brought up the basic argument that the Roman Catholic priests would oppose the government appointment in denominational institutions "as sapping their influence over their flock." The Times opposed the passing of the Queen's Colleges Bill and the principle of mixed education as a solution for Ireland's difficulties. As far as The Times was concerned, the Irish question was not educational, religious, or political, but agrarian.

Throughout the nineteenth century The Times constantly fought for improvement of the tenant farmer's position. The Queen's Colleges Bill was

---

6. Im. Par., "Irish Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 28, 1845), l11.


8. Im. Par., "Irish Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 28, 1845), l12, and Im. Par., "Irish Colleges Bill", The Times, No. 18,957 (June 23, 1845), 2.
looked upon as "merely an expedient of Sir Robert Peel's Budget, a mere put-off resulting because Peel [dared] not grapple with Irish landlordism, the real difficulty."\(^9\)

It was the position of The Times at this point and throughout the passage of the Bill that the British Government assumed Ireland wanted education and could be conciliated thereby, whereas, in reality, there was no desire or demand for higher education in Ireland. The Times contended that there was no corresponding class in Ireland to make use of the proposed colleges, because the class which aspired to professional education was not Roman Catholic, but Protestant, and was quite satisfied with existing means of education.

The Times was only partially accurate in its evaluation of the entire Irish question and particularly the university question. As far as the Irish question itself went, the advancement of the agrarian solution by The Times was laudable and showed foresight. But to relegate educational, political and social implications to an inferior position was lamentable. In the educational question too, The Times was guilty of warped judgment. It was correct in its appraisal of the Irish attitude concerning the role of religion in education, and in stating that the Anglicans were satisfied with existing means of education. It is difficult, however, to justify The Times implication that there was no desire or need for additional institutions of higher education to satisfy the needs of Roman Catholics and Dissenters. It has already been pointed out that it was a Roman Catholic member of Parliament, Dr. Wyse, who in 1835 and again in 1841 initiated

demands for provincial colleges open to Roman Catholics. Moreover at the time Peel introduced the Queen's Colleges Bill, Presbyterians of Ulster were already formulating plans for a college there. The desire for education was definitely present among Roman Catholics and Dissenters in Ireland even though the need for these colleges could be debated. The Times claimed there was no need since there were no students to make use of additional colleges. The Roman Catholics and Dissenters, on the other hand, maintained that there was a need, but that the demand did not show itself because there was no supply.

III

The first reaction of the Ministry to the request had been expressed by Lord Heytesbury, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, who, upon receiving the Memorial, assured the Bishops that "no serious obstacle was likely to arise on any point but one, namely, the vesting of the appointment in a Board of Trustees." The Government, he thought, would have a decided objection to such an arrangement. The Ministers in Parliament justified the Lord Lieutenant's scepticism on the relinquishing of appointments but did not justify his hopes for concessions. On the second reading of the Bill, May 30th, Graham announced that "the adoption of the most material part in the Memorial appears to his colleagues and himself to be inconsistent with the principle of the Bill."
One by one the demands of the Memorial were denied at the second reading of the Bill. Sir James Graham after dealing with the general financial provisions of the Bill proceeded to answer the questions arising from the Memorial of the Bishops. Regarding the question of the appointment of officials which had been posed on behalf of the Bishops and Young Ireland by Mr. Sheil and Mr. O'Brien he stated that "speaking generally where the state [granted] the endowment, the Crown [had] the appointment".

He flatly refused to consider giving the Bishops a voice in appointing the president and vice-president but conceded that after three years the system of government appointment of professors might be reconsidered. He went on to explain that a University was planned for 1848 and its governing body should have the power to recommend potential professors to the Crown. The right of veto would be reserved to the Crown.

On the question of appointing Roman Catholic chaplains for religious duties to the colleges, Graham was opposed as he felt that such an arrangement was decidedly at variance with the principle of this Bill. Mr. Mohan, a

13 Sir James Graham, on Saturday, June 15, 1845 was asked by Mr. Sheil if he would consent to the appointment of Roman Catholic chaplains, if there was to be any alteration in the appointment of officials by the Crown, and if the Bishops had been consulted on the Memorial? These same questions were again posed by Smith O'Brien on Thursday June 18th, and Graham postponed reply until Monday, June 21st and the debate on the Colleges Question.

14 In Par., "Colleges (Ireland) Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 268 and "Colleges (Ireland) Bill", The Times No. 18,950 (June 17, 1845), 4.

15 Ibid.
member of Old Ireland in parliament, proposed the appointing of theological professors selected by the Roman Catholic bishops and paid from student fees. Graham was adament however. Should attendance be compulsory or voluntary, he queried, if voluntary, then Mr. Mohan's amendment was superfluous; if compulsory, it was at variance with the principle of the bill.

Graham explained that the moral aspect of students' activities was more than adequately provided for in licensed lodging houses and religious halls, the establishment of which was to be facilitated by making loans available from the Board of Public Works. Rules and regulations for residences were under the immediate control of the Visitors, the leading ecclesiastics in each district.

Peel opposed separate chairs in geology and anatomy, expressing surprise at the idea advanced in the Bishops' Memorial demands, that Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and Presbyterians could not be taught abstract science unless by professors of their own faiths. Graham went further in opposing separate chairs for history and moral philosophy declaring that such a concession to Roman Catholics would require similar positions for Presbyterian and Anglican professors.

From what has been said we may see that the demands of the Bishops, which at first sight seemed compatible with Peel's original scheme and with the principle of mixed education, were denied for the most part by the Government in the final Bill. The Bill had been amended but only on minor points. It will be recalled the Bishops asked for a voice in appointing officials and professors, separate professors for certain

---

16 For a description of the final Bill see Ch. V, Section 1, 81. and G. B. Lefevre, Peel & O'Connell. (London, 1887), 247.
subjects, Roman Catholic deans of residence to supervise the faith and morals of Roman Catholic students and a promise of dismissal in the case of professors who interfered with religious convictions. All of these religious securities were combined with mixed education when it was founded on the primary level in the National System. Yet most of these securities were denied the Roman Catholic Bishops now, when the principle of mixed education was to be applied to higher education. The Hierarchy was denied a voice in the appointment of officials. It is true there was a promise that after three years the system of appointing professors would be reviewed, but this was looked upon with suspicion by the Bishops for there was no reason to believe the Government would be any more disposed to relinquish appointments in 1846 than they were in 1845. The Roman Catholics were promised that a fair proportion of the officials and professors would be Roman Catholics but this promise was not fulfilled. Separate chairs were denied in the teaching of both inductive and deductive sciences. That the government might object to providing separate chairs for professors in geology and anatomy was understandable but the objection in the field of history and philosophy required further explanation. The provisions of the final Bill for protection of Roman Catholic students in residence were considered inadequate by the Bishops as were the measures to prevent proselytising. To all intent and purpose, it would appear that Sir Robert Peel had failed to come to terms with the Bishop's demands for compromise with mixed education.

The Times stated that the principle of the amended Bill was not the establishment of provincial colleges but that the

only indispensible part of the measure—
the Ministerial essence of the Bill—the
nucleus of which all the rest is the comma and the tail, is such a separation of
learning from religion as will render
the former [i.e., secular learning]
necessary, the latter [i.e., religious
instruction] optional and precarious. 17

The Bill would not merely be ineffective, would not merely fall
dead in the Irish arena, but as Mr. O'Connell said, it would be "a new
source of discord, branded as an irreligious project." 18

IV

As might be expected Roman Catholic reaction to the Bill as ame-
ded was very unfavourable. Daniel O'Connell wrote to Archbishop MacHale
from London on June 21st, 1845, stating that,

Sir James Graham's amendments [to the
Irish Colleges Bill] will make the Bill
worse simply by increasing and extending
the power and domain of the Government,
or of persons appointed by and also
removable at will by the Government, over
a wider space, and over more important and
more delicate matters, including perhaps
all religious details. 19

At almost the same time (June 27th, 1845) he sent a letter to P.
V. Fitzpatrick, a member of Old Ireland, attacking the final Bill because
it gave unfair advantage to Anglicans and Presbyterians. 20

Frederick Lucas, commenting on the second reading of the Bill,
and on the concessions and amendments proposed by Graham, said they
amounted exactly to nothing, and were of no value whatever, "even as a

17 Editorial, The Times, No. 18,960 (June 21, 1845), 5.
18 Ibid.
19 Fitzpatrick, op.cit. II, 358. In this letter O'Connell urged the
Bishops to persist in their demands. Evidently he still hoped there was
a good chance of amending the Bill. See Appendix II, B, i.
20 Ibid. See also Appendix II, B, 5.
The Government would not allow religious education either by Parliamentary grant or by student fees, and offered only trifling assistance. The Roman Catholic Bishops were denied a voice in the appointment of administrative officials, and offered only a dubious potential vote in appointing professors. No definite commitments were made regarding the number of Roman Catholics to be appointed on the staff and the request for separate chairs was flatly denied. Lucas was not enthusiastic about the provisions for moral conduct. His general feeling towards the situation was summed up in the columns of the Tablet.

Not a single Professor, not a single security against the heterodox instruction; not a single trace of honourable independence; not a single direct provision for religious education; nothing that is not ludicrous in the way of moral discipline—but a loose, lax, corrupt system of political and religious bribery and official despotism, such is the entire system in all its principles and details.\(^\text{22}\)

The indictment by the Nation was far less severe. Young Ireland held high hopes for the Bill at this stage mainly because O'Connell had stated in the House, before the Bill went into committee, that he "once believed a system of mixed education proper" and still thought "a system of mixed education in literature and science would be proper, but not with regard to Religion."\(^\text{23}\) The Nation looked upon this statement as proof

\(^{21}\) "Notes of the Week", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 28, 1845), 401.

\(^{22}\) Ibid.

\(^{23}\) Dr. Par., "Irish Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 28, 1845), 412.
that O'Connell had renewed belief in mixed education, and pleasure that the Bill had reached Committee stage was mixed with the earnest trust that it would come out to the satisfaction of everyone concerned.

Young Ireland had high hopes that (1) separate chairs of history and philosophy would be established; (2) that an endowment of £2,000 would be supplied by the government for religious instruction and (3) that the selection of the staff would be based on competitive exams and that a fair proportion of professors would be Roman Catholic as a result of these exams, and (4) finally, that the system of Irish National Education would be completed by opening Trinity College, Dublin. Added to these hopes was the demand that government appointment of officials and professors be removed. If it were not the Young Ireland group felt, "the Bill must be resisted and defeated, in or out of Parliament."

The Roman Catholic Bishops renewed their objection to the Colleges Bill as amended. Their ordinary meeting was held at Maynooth on June 22nd and at that time seventeen of twenty-five bishops present supported John McHale in his opposition to the Colleges Bill. The minority group led by Dr. Crolley and Dr. Murray wished to open the question of accepting the Colleges Bill on the grounds that the concessions granted warranted it. Dr. MacHale was definitely against the Bill, however, and held for separate institutions. The majority of the Bishops sided with him in his opposition to the meager amendments to the Bill, though it is not certain that they supported his demands for separate institutions. On June 11th and

24 "The Colleges", Nation, III, No. 144 (June 28, 1845), 517, See also E. Lucas, op.cit., I, 200.
21st, 1845 and again after the Maynooth meeting on June 27th, Archbishop MacHale addressed letters to Robert Peel denouncing his "scheme of academic education coupled with his repudiation of the resolution and memorial of the Bishops as an attempt to bribe Catholic youth into an abandonment of their faith." 25

V

Despite this Irish Roman Catholic opposition the Bill passed through committee almost unchanged. 26 At this time O'Connell remarked in the Commons that although the Bill had been much amended from the time that the Roman Catholic prelates had first expressed their opinion upon it, he was convinced these alterations made no change whatever in their views regarding the Bill. He pointed out that the two main objections were still present; government appointment of officials and lack of religious securities. As proof of this he quoted one of John MacHale's letters to Peel condemning the Colleges. 27 This letter was dated June 26, and O'Connell pointed out it was obviously the outcome of the Maynooth

25 "Letter of His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam to Sir Robert Peel Ireland", The Times, No. 18,950 (June 21, 1845), 6, and "Letter of His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam to Sir Robert Peel", Tablet, VI, No. 268 (June 21, 1845), 391. For the full text of these letters see Appendix II, C, 1 and 2.

26 For an account of the progress of the Bill in the committee stage see In Par., "Colleges in Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 270 (July 5, 1845), ii, and In Par., "Academic Education", The Times, No. 18,965 (July 1, 1845), 1. For a comment see Editorial, The Times, No. 18,965 (July 2, 1845), 3.

27 See Appendix II, C, 1 and 2.
meeting of the Bishops.

O'Connell's animadversion proved futile; further attempts to alter the Bill in line with the Bishops' demands failed. The Bill passed through both houses only slightly amended and received Royal Assent on July 31st, 1845.

O'Connell's assertion that Dr. MacHale's letter to Sir Robert Peel dated June 27, 1845, was inspired by the regular June 22, Maynooth Meeting of the Roman Catholic Bishops and that his sentiments were those of the majority. Since this claim was uncontradicted we can assume that O'Connell was correct.
CHAPTER IV
QUEEN'S COLLEGES 1845-46

I

Less than two weeks after the passing of the Queen's Colleges Bill a significant event took place in Ireland. On August 11th, 1845, at a public meeting of all denominations in Armagh, Dr. Crolly, Primate and Archbishop of Armagh, addressed the group and stated that he was satisfied with the Queen's Colleges Bill as amended. He consented to approach the Lord Lieutenant and request that one of the colleges be erected in the city.

Dr. Crolly, it will be remembered, was one of the staunchest supporters of mixed education throughout the early part of the nineteenth century, when it was inaugurated on the primary level in the National System. When the mixed principle was first proposed for higher education, Crolly, in a letter to Peel, seemed to favour separate education, and he was the first to describe the proposed colleges as "pregnant with danger.

1 "The New Colleges, Ireland," Tablet, VI, No. 276 (August 16, 1845), 520.

2 See Ch. I, Section VI, 12 ff. Dr. Crolly was asked in 1825 by the Royal Commission on Education, "In general do you think it desirable or otherwise that Catholics should mix with Protestants in general education where proper guards are taken for the integrity of their religious principles?" He replied, "I think it might be an effective means of suppressing the spirit of party which unfortunately prevails in this country, particularly if proper precautions were taken against any undue influence or preponderating power on one side or the other." B. O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland 1831-51 (London, 1883), 97.
to faith and morals". It was he who convened the meeting which resolved to reject the Bill as originally presented, and who also suggested amendments. At this meeting Crolly exhibited a desire to accept mixed education, but only if religious securities were embodied. The required securities were listed in the original Bishops' Memorial and for the most part they were denied.

Between July 30 when the Colleges Bill was passed and the Armagh meeting, August 11, no official declaration on the amended Queen's Colleges Bill had been made by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. It was generally assumed, however, that the final Bill was not acceptable. The opponents of mixed education renewed their rejection individually during the passage of the Bill through Parliament; when the outline of the final Bill became clear, they unofficially renounced the Bill at the regular meeting of the Hierarchy held on June 22, 1845. The proponents of the Bill made no comment during this period, but their silence was interpreted as tacit rejection. Dr. Crolly's announcement came as a surprise to Roman Catholic Ireland.

Dr. Crolly confessed that, when the Bill for establishing the provincial colleges first made its appearance, he "entertained serious apprehensions respecting the morality of the students", and prompted by that impression had called a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates.

---

3 "Ireland, the Synod", Tablet, VI, No. 263 (May 21, 1845), 326. See Ch. II, Sec. IV, 35.

4 "Irish Colleges Meeting in Armagh", Nation, III, No. 149 (August 16, 1845), 732. See also, "The New Colleges in Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 276 (August 16, 1845), 520.
At this meeting it became apparent that all the Roman Catholic Bishops were ready and willing to cooperate with the Government on fair and reasonable terms. After discussion of the provisions of the Bill and after mature deliberation, the Bishops went to the Lord Lieutenant and represented their objection and the amendments they deemed advisable. Dr. Crolly declared that the Lord Lieutenant received the memorial and forwarded the case of the Hierarchy to the Government which made such amendments as were calculated to afford general satisfaction. Dr. Crolly went on to maintain that the Bill was sufficiently amended providing for "licensed lodging houses" and "Chaplains to supervise morals" and stated that he was determined to "give the colleges a fair trial." 5

Young Ireland made no stand either for or against the Bill as amended. The only mention of it had been in the minutes of the Repeal Association. It will be observed that in this issue announcing the Armagh meeting, no comment was made of Dr. Crolly's action. 6 Young Ireland had already committed itself to rejection "in or out of parliament" if state appointment of officials was not removed. 7 As Davis stated:

It (Peel's administration) has guaranteed £100,000 to build lay Colleges in Ireland, and guaranteed income for the Professors in

5  Ibid.

6  Professor Owynn in his article in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record on "O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill" quotes a letter from Smith O'Brien to Davis which would seem to indicate that, although Young Ireland group was inclined to support the amended Bill, it felt obliged to reject it because Government appointment of officials was embodied. See Appendix II, D.

7  "Academic Institutions", Nation, III, No. 136 (May 17, 1845), 520.
them. The mode of introducing the Bill was offensive, the details were clumsy, some of them dangerous, one of them despotic. We regret that after the acceptance of the Bill by the Catholic Primate and many of his coadjutors and after the unhappy dissension which it created among Repealers, it will now be vain to seek the amendment of the College Act, and we grieve the more, because we are sure but had the opposition been more qualified and therefore more united, it would have compelled the Ministers to abandon the patronage clause. [David could not resist adding however] Yet we can never treat knowledge as an enemy no matter how allied. 8

Dr. Crolly's invitation to have a provincial college established in Galway was severely criticized by the Pilot, one of Daniel O'Connell's Repeal organs in Ireland. 9 The article went so far as even to hint that Dr. Crolly was insane and maintained that was the reason he missed a recent meeting of the hierarchy. It is to the credit of the Irish press that, for the most part, this apparently unjust accusation was denied by the leading Repeal papers, including O'Connell's official organ the Freeman's Journal and also the Newry Examiner and the Telegraph. 10 The Nation called the article a "diabolical libel" and stated that at the time of the article Dr. Crolly was in Dublin engaged in ecclesiastical

8 "The Sessions", Nation, III, No. 156 (August 23, 1845), 7th.

9 "The Godless Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 19,044 (October 2, 1845), 7, citing from the Pilot.

10 "Alleged Lunacy of Dr. Crolly, Ireland", The Times, No. 19,047 (October 6, 1845), 6, citing from the Freeman's Journal, Newry Examiner and Telegraph.
business in his usual health and spirits. Unfortunately the lunacy theory received support from the Irish organ in England where Lucas stated it was the only explanation he could devise to account for Dr. Crolly's actions. The Tablet pointed out that it was Dr. Crolly who moved "that Roman Catholic pupils could not attend the lectures in history, logic, metaphysics, geology or anatomy, without exposing their faith or morals to imminent danger unless Roman Catholic professors be appointed to these chairs" and he asked if "he [Crolly] was satisfied on this point".

Lucas also severely criticized Dr. Wyse, who was the most consistent supporter of mixed education among the Irish Roman Catholics throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, and who had first proposed provincial colleges on the mixed principle in 1835. Wyse represented Waterford, Ireland, in the Imperial Parliament, and, although he was not officially a member of the Repeal Association, O'Connell has been successful in forcing him to agree to vote with the Association in Parliament. From 1833 on, Wyse concerned himself principally with Imperial problems, but because of his extreme interest in higher education he did take an active part in consideration of Ireland's university question. Through-

11 "The Most Rev. Dr. Crolly", Nation, III, No. 158 (October 1, 1845), 811. The Nation also contains petitions against the Pilot liable signed by the majority of the leading clergy of Dr. Crolly's diocese. See also, "The Archbishop of Armagh, Mr. Barrett [editor of Pilot] and Old Ireland", Nation, IV, No. 159 (October 21, 1845), 23.

12 "The Minority of the Bishops", Tablet, VI, No. 294 (October 11, 1845), 641.

13 "The New Colleges, Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 276 (August 16, 1845) 530.

1h See Ch. I, Sec. V, 19.
out the passage of the Queen's Colleges Bill, Wyse maintained that the majority of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy wanted mixed education and favoured the amended Bill—even many who claimed to support O'Connell's rejection of it.

The Bishops pretend to go with O'Connell in the education question; but from some of them who are most loud in their support of O'Connell, I am in possession of letters which privately denounce his course on this question and entreat me to continue my exertions to carry out my views. 15

The letters which Wyse refers to were not printed in any of the leading periodicals consulted, and determining which Bishops might have written them presents a dilemma. None of the Bishops who supported Dr. MacHale and O'Connell at the June 22nd meeting of the Hierarchy changed their minds when a subsequent declaration was made on September 20th. Seventeen Archbishops and Bishops supported MacHale on June 22nd, and eighteen Archbishops and Bishops declared against the colleges on the 20th of September. These facts combined with Wyse's failure to repudiate Lucas' accusations would seem to indicate that Mr. Wyse was guilty of mendacity.

The Times tended to Wyse's side. In commenting on the Tablet article "accusing Mr. Wyse of attributing duplicity to the great body of the Irish prelates", The Times accounted for his reticence by asserting that:

the right honourable member for Waterford has very properly not condescended to rebut, inasmuch as it is clear as noon day that the Primate—a cool and cautious northerner—spoke not merely his own sentiments but those

15 "Respectful Notice to the Irish Bishops of Mr. Wyse", Tablet, VI, No. 273 (July 26, 1845), 172.
of several his right rev. brethren who are notoriously favourable to the Ministerial scheme.\textsuperscript{15}

Subsequent events bore out the \textit{Times} assertion that several of Dr. Crolly's confrères were favourable to the proposed colleges, but this does not corroborate Wyse's assertion that the majority of the Hierarchy favoured the colleges, or his statement to the effect that the Bishops were only verbal in their support of Dr. MacHale and O'Connell.

The position of the hierarchy towards the proposed colleges was further complicated when the \textit{Nation}, in commenting on a meeting in Cork, quoted Dr. Bully, a Presbyterian minister, as stating that Dr. Ryan of Limerick and Dr. Egan of Kerry were now in cooperation with those in favour of the colleges, in addition to Dr. Murphy of Cork, "who was, all along, most interested in the subject and anxious for the foundation of provincial colleges."\textsuperscript{17} The September 20th memorandum against the colleges proved the \textit{Pilot} was only two-thirds right. Dr. Ryan and Dr. Murphy refused to sign this condemnation of the colleges but Dr. Egan, who had been absent from the May meeting did sign the protest.\textsuperscript{18}

The general result of Dr. Crolly's support of the proposed colleges, backed as it was by a significant minority element among the Bishops, was to make the position of the hierarchy in Ireland on the Colleges very uncertain. John O'Connell observed in a Repeal Meeting that it was rumoured

\textsuperscript{16} "The New Provincial Colleges, Ireland", \textit{The Times}, No. 19, 013 (August 27, 1845), 5.

\textsuperscript{17} "Provincial Colleges", \textit{Nation}, III, No. 151 (August 30, 1845), 750.

\textsuperscript{18} See below, p. 65.
the "so-called amendments made by the Government in their Education Bill satisfy the prelacy of Ireland", and he asked for "some authoritative expression of combined opinion on the part of the hierarchy."\(^{19}\) He pointed out that the Roman Catholic members of Parliament were labouring against the Bill under the impression that it was unsatisfactory, and evidently that the Archbishop of Tuam was under the same impression.

II

The majority of the Bishops who opposed the Colleges tried, of course, to remove the doubt about the position of the Hierarchy. Led by Archbishop MacHale, they endeavoured both individually and jointly to remove John O'Connell's doubts as to sentiments of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity, respecting the "Godless Colleges,"\(^ {21}\) and to deny the rumours sent abroad that the godless scheme of education found favour "even from those by whom it was condemned as dangerous to faith and morals".\(^ {22}\) On September 20th, 1845, the following letter signed by the majority of the Roman Catholic Bishops appeared in the public press:

---


20 Evidently a reference to John MacHale's letter to Sir Robert Peel dated June 27 and evidently the result of the June 22nd meeting of the Hierarchy at Maynooth. See Appendix II, C, 2.

21 "The Colleges Act, Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 277 (August 23, 1845), 536, citing from the Pilot a letter by Dr. Cantwell, Bishop of Meath, renewing condemnation of Queen's Colleges.

22 "Letter from the Archbishop of Tuam to Sir Robert Peel", Tablet, VI, No. 279 (September 6, 1845), 568. See also, "A Voice from St. Jarlath's", The Times, No. 19,037 (September 21, 1845), 6.
Lest our faithful flocks should be apprehensive of any change having been wrought in our minds relative to the recent legislative measure of Academic Education, we the Archbishops and Bishops, feel it a duty we owe to them and to ourselves to reiterate our solemn conviction of it being dangerous to faith and morals, as declared in the resolution unanimously adopted in May last by the Assembled Bishops of Ireland.

This resolution was signed by eighteen Bishops including five who had missed the May meeting which rejected the Colleges as proposed, and which suggested amendments. The fact that all of the Bishops, either in May or September, declared against the Colleges prompted Lucas to reason quite illogically that the Bishops were united in their opposition to the Queen's Colleges.

23

"Renewed Protest of the Bishops Against the Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 282 (September 27, 1845), 609.

24

The eighteen Bishops signing the second memorial were:
M. Slattery, Archbishop of Cashel.
J. MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam.
Thomas Cohn, Bishop of Clonfert.
Patrick M'Nicholas, Bishop of Achonry.
James Keating, Bishop of Ferns.
Patrick M'Cottigan, Bishop of Raphoe.
Cornelius Egan, Bishop of Ardfein and Arbadoe.
E. French, Bishop of Kilmacduagh and Kilfennorou.
Wm. Higgins, Bishop of Ardagh.
John Cantwell, Bishop of Meath.
Michael Blake, Bishop of Dromore.
Wm. Kinsella, Bishop of Assory.
George J. O. Browne, Bishop of Elphin.
Bartholomew Crotay, Bishops of Cloyne and Ross.
Nicholas Foran, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore.
Thomas Feeny, Bishop of Killala.
Charles M'Nally, Bishop of Clogher.
Lawrence O'Donnell, Bishop of Galway.

Of these, Drs. Keating, Egan, Higgins, M'Nicholas, and Cohen were missing from the first meeting. "Second Memorial" The Times, No. 19,037 (September 24, 1845), 5, and F. McGrath, Newman's University: Idea and Reality. (Dublin, 1951), 6.
Every Bishop has declared, against the Colleges Bill—this bill, be it observed; exactly as it stands: this bill and no other, to be dangerous to faith and morals... We do not have to decide between Dr. MacHale and Dr. Murray for they both agree. The Episcopacy is undivided on the point that these colleges are panders to everlasting damnation. It is obviously impossible not to take the side of the May Protestors.25

The Times lampooned Lucas' statement that the Bishops were unanimous in their opposition to the amended Colleges Bill, pointing out that the May protest was not a positive rejection but a compromise measure, and that in September nine very significant members of the hierarchy refused to sign the protest. The Times conceded, however, that as a bona fide experiment the colleges were certain to fail; certain they were to fail under any circumstances and the resolution of the Roman Catholic prelates was as much declarative as prohibitive.26

It was the contention of The Times that the Roman Catholic prelates never

25 "Renewed Protest of the Bishops against the Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 282 (September 27, 1845), 609; see also K. Lucas, The Life of Frederick Lucas. (London, 1896), I, 203.

26 The nine bishops who did not sign the second resolution were: Dr. Crolly, Archbishop of Armagh Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin Dr. M'Laughlin Dr. Denvire, Bishop of Down and Connor (Belfast) Dr. Browne, Bishop of Elphin Dr. Holy, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, Carlow Dr. Murphy, Bishop of Cork Dr. Kennedy, Bishop of Lílaloe Dr. Ryan, Bishop of Limerick

Dr. M'Laughlin is the only Bishop among the group who did not sign the first resolution and memorial. He was absent from both meetings due to ill-health and therefore is excluded altogether from consideration in the controversy. Editorial, The Times, No. 19,037 (September 21, 1845), 5,

27 Ibid.
felt there was sufficient demand for professional and industrial education to start with and were glad to turn a social impossibility into a religious triumph. This statement is not corroborated by the fact that the Roman Catholic hierarchy established the Catholic University in 1854 with John Henry Newman as rector.

Finally a meeting of the Bishops was called for November 17th, 1845. At this meeting the majority of the prelates resolved "to approach the Holy See with their condemnation of the Academic Scheme, in order to have the decrees satisfied and sustained by the sanction and weight of the Apostolic Authority." John MacHale proposed that the Holy See be informed that the Bishops assembled had rejected the Queen's Colleges Bill and had proposed amendments which were rejected. Dr. Crolly and the minority of the Bishops, on the other hand, favoured sending the original Bill, the memorial and the amended Bill, a method less calculated to defeat acceptance of the Colleges. When this method of approach was rejected, the minority decided to protest to Rome.

Lucas in the Tablet criticized the Hierarchy for referring the question to Rome, and particularly the minority group for attempting to remove the onus of rejection of the Colleges from their shoulders and put it on those of Rome. He declared quite honestly that

what was being referred to Rome was not the abstract question, not the question


"Great Blow against the Godless Colleges", Tablet, VI, No. 290 (November 22, 1845), 745.
of principle, but a practical question, a question of expedient. The point referred to Rome was not whether these colleges were in themselves good, but whether, bad, wretched, and detestable, as were acknowledged to be many of the elements of which they were compounded; the acceptance of them, was less evil than their total rejection.

It seemed inevitable from the outset that the question of acceptance or rejection of the Queen's Colleges would eventually be referred to Rome. This had been the final resort in 1840 when the Hierarchy found it impossible to agree on the question of mixed education on the primary level in the National System. At that time, Dr. Murray and Dr. Crolly had the majority on their side in favour of mixed education and Dr. MacHale led the opposing minority. Rome in 1840 had ruled in favour of mixed education but at a later date, after concessions by the National Board to Anglicans and Presbyterians had alienated many of the supporters of mixed education among the Bishops, Rome had reversed its decision.

Reason would seem to dictate that the decision on the Queen's College Question would necessarily support the majority group but Dr. Crolly's minority was a significant element highly regarded by both the Papal authorities and the British government. Their position would be seriously considered.

III

Almost two years passed before Rome made any announcement to the Irish hierarchy on the proposed colleges. They were eventful years in the

30 "The Bishops and the Godless Colleges", Tablet VI, No. 291 (November 29, 1845), 753. See also: E. Lucas, op.cit., I, 203.

31 See Ch. I, See IV, 17.
history of Ireland. In late 1845 the famine broke out and it pre-
occupied the pages of the public press for the intervening years. The
editors of The Times, O'Connell in the Irish press and at Westminster,
Young Ireland in the pages of the Nation, the Roman Catholic clergy
through the Dublin Review and Tablet, all pleaded the case of the starv-
ing nation. On July 27th, 1846, another important topic came under con-
sideration when the long threatened division between O'Connell and Young
Ireland became a reality. 33 Following on Thomas Francis Meagher's famous
appeal to the sword and his repudiation by John O'Connell, Young Irelanders
seceded in a body from the Repeal Association and founded the Council of
the Confederation. 34 On February 8th, 1847, Daniel O'Connell, a broken

32
See T. P. O'Connor and R. M. McDade, Gladstone-Parnell and the
Great Irish Struggle. (Toronto, 1886), 391. f.

33
Repeal Assoc., The Times, No. 19,301 (July 29, 1846), 6, and Repeal
Assoc., Tablet, VII, No. 327 (August 1, 1846), 498.

34
The Times in commenting on the split wrote in part:
The long foreseen crisis in the politics of Repeal has at length occurred,
undiagnosed and unavoidable rupture . . . The personal influence and
skillful tactics of O'Connell and the devoted obedience and unceasing sup-
port of his friends, and the general leanings of the Repeal Party have
hitherto suppressed the angry discontent or ambitious yearnings of "Young
Ireland". . . Henceforth, there must be two parties, both professing Repeal
as their object, both essentially Irish in their attitudes, their symbols
and their directions; both equally formidable to English opposition but
not equally incapable of an overt English alliance. The one is the party
of Old Ireland, the other of Young Ireland; at the head of one is O'Connell,
at the head of the other Smith O'Brien and the writers of the Nation . . .
Is physical force to be abjured for the future? O'Connell abhors it; Smith
O'Brien's followers uphold it . . . Moral force and moral resistance to the
end of the chapter says O'Connell. Physical force when moral force fails,
exclaims his rivals.
Repeal Assoc., The Times, No. 19,303 (July 31, 1846), 8, and Editorial,
The Times, No. 19,303 (July 31, 1846), 8, passim.
old man, made his last appearance in the House of Commons, and, in an almost inaudible voice, warned that "unless rapid action was taken, a quarter of the population of Ireland would perish by famine and disease."  

Three months later at Genoa, he died. Upon Daniel O'Connell's death, John O'Connell inherited leadership of the Repeal Association. Without Daniel O'Connell's guidance and deprived of the vigour of Young Ireland, the Repeal Association became ineffective and its importance in Irish politics became almost nil.

Significant events were also taking place in Rome. On June 1st, 1846, Gregory XVI died and was succeeded on June 16 by Pope Pius IX. The election of Pius IX filled the heart of liberals with hope. He was known to have liberal sympathies and he was the first pope to be elected without Austrian influence since the establishment of the Austrian-Hapsburg hegemony in the peninsula by the Congress of Vienna 1815. His immediate granting of amnesty to more than a thousand political prisoners and hundreds of exiles, and his subsequent liberalising of the Papal States government was greeted with immense enthusiasm. Pius IX was a strong advocate of separate education but his liberal political outlook gave the British Government and the minority of the Irish Roman Catholic Hierarchy renewed hope for acceptance of the Queen's Colleges, and prompted them to open negotiations. Archbishop MacHale and Dr. Slattery, Archbishop of

35

In. Par., "Destitute Persons (Ireland) Bill", The Times, No. 19,468 (February 9, 1847), 3, and "Poor Relief (Ireland) Bill; Tablet, VIII, No. 354 (February 13, 1847), 107.

36

Cashel, on the other hand, petitioned Rome on behalf of the majority of the Bishops who favoured separate education. In their congratulatory note to the Pope they urged immediate action against the Queen's Colleges. The Pope replied that the case was being considered.

Frederick Lucas declared in August 1847 that the Cardinals to whom the Queen's Colleges question has been confided, reported unanimously against them and that it was expected that their report would receive the formal sanction of His Holiness on the 19th of July, 1847. In view of the significant political and economic events transpiring in Ireland, it is questionable whether Lucas was justified in saying,

The news, not of the week, nor of the month, nor of the year, but (speaking of Ireland) of the century, is the glorious intelligence just come from Rome of the total and absolute condemnation of the godless colleges.\(^37\)

On the same day the Nation declared that no decision had been arrived at, on the question of the Colleges, and assured its readers that "no authoritative person had received any information as to their condemnation by the College of Cardinals."\(^38\)

In reality, official announcement was not made until October 9th, 1847, when the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda pronounced against the Queen's Colleges in a Rescript sent to four Archbishops.\(^39\) This document advised the Archbishops and Bishops against taking part in the establishment of the Colleges but left the question of acceptance open to further

---

37 E. Lucas, op.cit., I, 275.
38 Ibid.
39 See Appendix III, B, 1.
In spite of the seemingly apparent irresolution implied in the concluding section of the Rescript, Lucas looked upon it as a final condemnation of the Queen’s Colleges. In commenting on the Rescript in the Tablet he stated that the Colleges were condemned for both the bishops and clergy. Speaking of the position of Roman Catholic parents he admitted that they "cannot be prevented from sending their children thither, but the whole power of the clergy must be directed against them and therefore the exception to the rule cannot be very numerous."40 In a subsequent issue Lucas stated:

As far as Rome is concerned, the question is settled, the colleges are condemned in the lump and finally; that no hope remains of setting them up on their legs as mixed colleges; and that the godless policy of the Government, under any shape must forego all hope of receiving Catholic countenance or of being blessed with Catholic co-operation."41

The Times also considered the Rescript as decisive. It declared that "contrary to the expectations of the Roman Catholic laity and no inconsiderable portion of the clergy, Pope Pius IX has pronounced against the scheme of collegiate education devised by the late Premier."42 The Rescript was hailed as a signal victory for Archbishop MacHale and the

40 "Condemnation of the Godless Colleges", Tablet, VIII, No. 391 (October 30, 1847), 90.

41 "The Godless Colleges", Tablet, VIII, No. 392 (November 6, 1847), 705.

42 "The Pope and the Godless Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 19,689 (October 25, 1847), 8.
dissenting majority. That the Rescript was final was contradicted in some of the Irish press. The Evening Post declared that the colleges were not condemned but only disapproved, and that the judgment was pronounced only on the original Tory designs and not on the Whig amendments. The Cork Examiner admitted that the condemnation was "distinct and absolute" but declared, however, that nothing was condemned but the Government measure as set forth in the Act of Parliament and that mixed education was in no degree affected by the verdict from Rome. This statement seemed absurd. One might argue that if the Act of Parliament establishing the Queen's Colleges was "distinctly condemned", the Colleges were likewise distinctly condemned. There can be no doubt that this first Papal Rescript supported Dr. MacHale and the majority of the Bishops and was adverse from the Queen's Colleges and the principle of mixed education. That it was a final condemnation is not so certain. Subsequent events seem to bear out the contention that neither group of Bishops looked upon the Rescript as Rome's final declaration.

IV

The attitude of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Papacy towards the proposed Colleges was again called into question in 1848 when acceptance of the Queen's Colleges was linked with the possibility of opening diplomatic relations between London and Rome. The possibility of such a move had been considered in 1847. The Times of October 20, 1847, contained an announcement by Primate Crolly of a meeting of the Irish hierarchy for

43 "The Godless Colleges", Tablet, VIII, No. 392 (November 6, 1847), 706, citing the Evening Post.

44 Ibid., citing from the Cork Examiner.
the purpose of considering negotiations for the appointment of a Cardinal 
Legate to reside in London, and to act as a medium of communication bet­
ween the Court of St. James and the Vatican upon questions concerning the 
Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain and Ireland. On February 7, 
1848, Lord Lansdowne introduced a Bill in Parliament proposing restorat­
on of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. There is evidence that 
at the same time direct but unofficial negotiations were opened with 
Rome on the Colleges Question. Lord Clarendon wrote to Dr. Murray on 
March 19th, 1848, assuring him that,

in the council, professorships, and other 
posts of each college, the Catholic faith 
would be fully and appropriately represent­
ed, for these colleges are institutions 
for the education of the middle classes, 
and the government would fail in its 
object of training up the youth of Ireland 
to be good men and loyal subjects, if their 
religious and moral conduct were not provided 
for.

Dr. Nicholas, titular Archbishop of Hierapolis and Coadjutor to 
the Archbishop of Corfu, acted as intermediary with the Vatican on the 
Queen's Colleges. After consulting Dr. Murray of the minority group and

---

45 "Meeting of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, Ireland", The Times, 
No. 19, 685 (October 20, 1847), 5.

46 Im. Par., "House of Lords", Nation, VI, No. 280 (February 12, 1848), 
99.

47 F. McGrath makes reference to negotiations concerning the Queen's 
Colleges which were looked up with the Bill for Restoration of the diplo­
matic relations between Rome and London. McGrath, op.cit., 65.

48 Ibid., 66.
the Lord Lieutenant, Dr. Nicholas returned to Rome with a document embodying three fundamental changes. Foremost the alteration stipulated that the Archbishop of the province and the Bishop of the diocese in which the college was located were to be *ipso facto* Visitors of the college; along with a certain number of lay Roman Catholics. In addition, Roman Catholic students were to have houses of residence reserved exclusively to them, and deans ranking as first-class professors should be appointed to supervise these houses.

The majority group of the bishops were also active in Rome at this time. Dr. MacHale and Dr. O'Higgins, Archbishop of Armagh went to Rome to present a memorandum signed by seventeen bishops which threw doubt on the intentions of the government. It was the feeling of the majority bishops as stated in the memorandum that not only would the new decree not have force commensurate with the original acts, but that the proposals were submitted by the minority party instead of the whole body of Bishops. Moreover it seemed that the Government was trying to force

---

49 "The Irish Colleges - the New Statutes", *Nation*, VI, No. 294 (May 20, 1845), 332.

50 "To His Holiness Pope Pius IX the Memorial", *Tablet*, IX, No. 112 (March 25, 1845), 200 f.
its will on the Hierarchy of Ireland through Rome.

Both the opponents and proponents of the Queen's Colleges had their agents active during the summer of 1848. Dr. Nicholson representing the minority group used Lord Clarendon's letter as proof of the Government's sincerity. In addition, Dr. Murray dispatched one of his leading clerics to Italy to plead the case of the colleges and the English government. On the other hand, Dr. MacHale popularized the idea that the proposals did not change the principle of the act and charged that the Government had broken faith, in the National System, in attempting to hand
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At a public meeting of Catholics in London, Frederick Lucas in petitioning for rejection of the Diplomatic Bill declared

It is a fact that a majority of the Irish Bishops have already in private pronounced their opinion on the subject (restoration of diplomatic relations) and have proceeded us in addressing a memorial to the Holy See. A memorial signed by at least twenty Irish Bishops has already gone to Rome denouncing the Bill. He went on saying, "We have tried to govern Ireland by coercion and have failed. We have tried concession and have failed. No other means are now open to us except those which we are resolved on using—namely—to govern Ireland through Rome".

In the same issue the memorial of the Bishops adverse to the Bill was quoted and it referred to many substantial statements to the same effect.

"Diplomatic Relations with Rome", Tablet, IX, No. 112 (March 25, 1848), 195 and "To His Holiness Pope Pius II the Memorial", Tablet, IX, No. 112 (March 25, 1848), 200ff.
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"Italy, Foreign Intelligence", Nation, VI, No. 294 (May 20, 1848), 333.
over school leases to secular authorities. 53

Negotiations for the restoration of diplomatic relations and for acceptance of the Queen's Colleges continued throughout the troubled summer of 1848 which saw revolutions in both Ireland and Italy. On July 22nd, the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended in Ireland and Young Ireland plunged into the abortive uprising which collapsed on August 7th with the trivial, yet in some respects momentous, encounter between Smith O'Brien and a handful of constabulary at Ballinger. The subsequent extradition of the Young Ireland leaders joined with the suspension of publication of the Nation removed almost all of the Catholic lay supporters of the Queen's Colleges from the Irish scene. 54

Meanwhile, Italy was also in a turmoil. In the fall of 1848 the liberal prime minister of the Pope, Pellegrino Rossi, was assassinated, the government overthrown and the Pope forced to flee to Gaeta. Upon the departure of Pius IX, Mazzini was able to gain control and he showed definite anti-Catholic leanings. Throughout the coup d'etat Lord Minto,

53 It will be remembered that the question of ownership of property was the main point on which the difficulty between the Government and the Catholic hierarchy turned on the question of mixed education embodied in the National System. In the 1840 Papal Rescript declaring in the favour of the National System Rome made a definite stand against turning ownership of schools and property over to the corporate body of the National Board. When the National Board insisted on the point in 1845 the united Catholic hierarchy opposed the move and had it partially rescinded. See Ch. I, Sec. IV, D.

54 The publication of the Nation was suspended by the British Government in July, 1848 shortly before the Rebellion broke out; its editors were charged with sedition, liable and intent to incite rebellion. The paper began publication again on September 1, 1849 with Graven Duffy back as editor. "Revival of Paper, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,271, (September 3, 1849), 5.
the English envoy favoured the revolutionaries. Undoubtedly his behaviour during the revolution did much to disrupt the attempted restoration of diplomatic relations and with them the behind the scenes negotiations on the Queen's Colleges. By fall, the negotiations for restoration of the diplomatic relations broke down and with them the

In 1846 in Lord Russell's ministry, Lord Minto (whose daughter Russell had married) became Lord Privy Seal, and in the autumn of the following year was dispatched on a diplomatic mission to Italy to ingratiate Tuscany and Sardinia, to assist in carrying out the reforms suggested by Pius IX on his accession to the Papacy and generally to report to the home government on Italian affairs.

Lord Minto visited the Italian Court in 1847 and tried to encourage the Pope to take the "path of Progress" when the Pontiff was hesitating between his desires to initiate liberal methods of government and the pressures of the reactionary policies being advocated by Mazzini. Minto's mission aroused extravagant hopes among the liberals but it was not destined for much success. He did succeed in inducing the King of Naples to grant separate parliaments to the Sicilians but his relations with Papal authorities were a failure. Minto was severely criticized by the Catholic press. The Dublin Review maintained that while Lord Minto was sent to Rome for the purpose of encouraging and aiding the Pope in his programme of reform, he was in reality "a kind of roving commissioner who patronised the lowest mob leaders and whose real purpose was to investigate and encourage insurrection especially in Rome". The Tablet was equally abusive.

Lord Minto's mission had repercussions in 1850. The papal authorities claimed that Lord Minto had given them to understand that the English Government would be favourable to the proceeding out of England into Roman Catholic episcopal sees and on this assumption the "Restoration of the Hierarchy" was attempted in 1850.

Alexander veins "Elliott, Gilbert, second Earl of Minto, (1782-1859), DNB, VI, (1921), 675 f; "Diplomatic Relations with Rome", Tablet, IX, No. 112 (March 25, 1848), 195; Editorial, The Times, No. 19,750 (January 4, 1848), 6; and Barron, "Our Foreign Policy", IV, XLIX, No. XCVII (February 1859), 418.

Diplomatic relations between Great Britain and Rome were established in through Malta by the efforts of Sir Gerald Strickland. See Henry Hornby Strickland, "Strickland, Gerald, Baron, Strickland, of Sizergh Castle (1861-1940)", DNB, 1931-40 (1949), 838-9.
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behind the scene negotiations for revision and acceptance of the Queen's Colleges. Shortly thereafter, on October 11, 1848, the second Rescript was issued by the Pope against the Queen's Colleges. It stated that the revised statutes and the opinions of the Bishops had been examined, but that the Propaganda could not mitigate the decision made in October 1847. The Rescript also made reference to the erection of a Roman Catholic University and exhorted the Bishops to sacerdotal concord.

Very little mention is made in The Times or Tablet of these negotiations in Rome, regarding the Colleges, which transpired during the summer of 1848. The Second Rescript was published in the leading papers, however, with the usual reaction except that The Times contradicted its interpretation of the First Rescript which it had hailed as a victory for Mac Hales. Further it severely criticized the Pope for his latest condemnation of the Colleges. In an editorial issued shortly after the Second Rescript, The Times stated,

It is now twelve months since the assent of the Holy See was extorted in favour of a system of mixed education which was intended to exclude the distinction of sect and the obnoxiousness of dogma. All is reversed now by a rescript from the Sacred College to back the remonstrances of a few finicky members of the hierarchy which will plunge Ireland back into the murky pool of sectarian dissension and fanatical hatred, from which it seems on the point of being extricated.

57 See Appendix III, B, 2.

58 See above, 71 f. "The Godless Colleges—the Rescript, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,005, (October 27, 1848), 4 f, and "Final Condemnation of the Colleges", Tablet, IX, No. 452 (December 30, 1848), 336. See Appendix IV, B, 2 for Rescript.

Throughout the battle over the passing of the Queen's Colleges Bill, The Times constantly argued that the colleges were not needed in Ireland and that their introduction was an unnatural attempt by Peel to dodge the basic problems of Ireland. Now The Times stated,

the great evil under which Ireland laboured was ignorance—ignorance of the practical arts and duties of social life, ignorance of those homely but necessary rudiments which are the groundworks of national wealth and independence, and—more than this—ignorance of one another... In such a crisis a remedy was devised so simple that one wonders it was not sooner prescribed, so innocent that one wonders why it should ever have been denounced, —education aimed at making better farmers, agriculturalists, economists, citizens—teaching morals of religion apart from the disputed doctrines of either church, and the obligations of citizenship as contrasted with the behests of faction. This was the medicine which reason suggested and expediency admitted, and this was the medicine of which the Holy See expressed its unmixed approbation.60

This was the first of a series of editorials which supported the Queen's Colleges and the principle of mixed education for Ireland.

60 Ibid.
CHAPTER V
QUEEN'S COLLEGES AFTER 1848

I

The Government proceeded with its plans for the Colleges undeterred by the Papal pronouncements. On December 4th, 1848, the Under Secretary announced that three provincial colleges would be established at Cork, Galway and Belfast. A staff of twenty professors plus principal, librarian, registrar, and bursar were to be appointed and applications were to be made at Dublin Castle. As student indications forty-five junior scholarships of £30 per year were offered and senior scholarships of £50 were to be made available later as candidates of sufficient qualifications became available.1

Along with the announcement of the establishment of the Colleges, reference was also made to the Queen's University which would confer degrees at the end of the college course. At first Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham felt that the best way of giving the new colleges a university connection would be to include them within the University of Dublin. Anglican opposition to this plan immediately became evident. By the mid-nineteenth century the exclusive association between Trinity College and University of Dublin was a jealously guarded privilege. Interference with it was associated in the mind of Anglicans with the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. Consequently, Peel and Graham

1 F. McGrath, Newman's University: Idea and Reality. (Dublin 1951), 68.
had contemplated establishing the Queen’s University on the London University model, that is, essentially an examining body with numerous affiliated institutions. They had talked with enthusiasm of Maynooth students competing for academic laurels with Presbyterians from Belfast and with Roman Catholics from Cork and Galway. In 1849-50 though Peel and Graham were not in office, they were fully consulted about the proposed new university by Lord Clarendon, Lord John Russell’s Irish viceroy. Their advice went far to decide Clarendon against giving each of the Queen’s Colleges the power of granting degrees, on the model of the Scottish universities, which was favoured by Russell. Clarendon differed from Peel, however, on admitting students from institutions other than the Queen’s Colleges to the examinations and degrees of the Queen’s University. He felt that:

applied to Ireland, the London system would result in a lowering of standard to the level of the smaller and affiliated bodies; and by facilitating the Catholic hierarchy in their scheme for a Catholic University would increase their power to injure the Queen’s Colleges. So the Queen’s University was designed as a teaching university in the sense that only students educated in one of its three colleges might obtain its degrees. Empowered to prescribe all courses leading to degrees and diplomas and to conduct all examinations for the purpose, it exercised a decisive control over the colleges.

In August 1848 the list of appointments for the Queen’s Colleges had been announced and they had gone far to disprove Lord Clarendon’s

2 Dr. Moody, “Irish University Question in the Nineteenth Century”, History, XLIII, No. 148 (June, 1958), 98.

3 Ibid., 99.
assurances to Dr. Murray that Roman Catholics would be fairly represented. Roman Catholics were not excluded altogether, for a Roman Catholic priest, Dr. Kirwan, was appointed president at the Galway College while Dr. Robert Kane, the eminent Catholic scientist, was appointed president of the Cork College. On the other hand, Roman Catholics were not appointed to a fair percentage of professorships as promised, for only 7 of 60 professors were Roman Catholics. 5

II

Dr. Moody in his article discussing Queen's College, Belfast, tells us that school was destined to start its existence under quite different conditions from those of Galway and Cork. In Ulster, the population from which university students were recruited was almost entirely Protestant, and the most important institution of Protestant Ulster, the Presbyterian Church, found it desirable from the outset to co-operate with the local Queen's College. This group was scarcely less anxious to control higher education in Ulster than the Catholic bishops were in the south and west, but with the significant difference that it was concerned mainly about the education of Presbyterian clergy.

When the Queen's College Bill was first introduced in 1845, the Presbyterian General Assembly was a staunch opponent of mixed education. In 1848 this group, which was the counterpart of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, ruled against allowing its theological students to attend the

4 W. K. Sullivan, University Education in Ireland, (Dublin, 1866), 17.  
5 Ibid.  
6 Dr. Moody, op.cit., History, XLIII (June 1938), 98.
Belfast Academic Institute. It proposed the establishment of a seminary under its own control where candidates for the ministry could receive a complete education in both arts and theology, and which would be open to the laity. It was agreed at this time that an appeal for funds to establish such a seminary should be launched, and that government help should also be sought. In 1846 a valuable bequest from a Mrs. Magee opened the possibility of realizing this ideal. But the establishment of a Queen's College in Belfast cut right across the plan of the assembly. The government had no intention of endowing an arts faculty in a Presbyterian College when it had provided adequately for such a faculty in a Queen's College. It was prepared, however, to endow an exclusively theological college for Presbyterians.

The General Assembly became deeply and bitterly divided over this issue. A majority led by Dr. Cooke was willing to recognize the Belfast Queen's College as suitable for the general education of candidates for the ministry, and to rest content with state endowment of a theological college under the control of the General Assembly, but only if the professors appointed by the Crown were acceptable to the General Assembly.

On June 23, 1845, at the committee stage, Peel read a letter "from a Presbyterian clergyman of high character" stating that "one Roman Catholic or Arian professor in the undergraduate course would decide the General Assembly to withdraw every student". After receiving a very strong assurance on the

---

7 See Ch. II, Sec. II, 29.

8 In.Par., "Irish Colleges Education", The Times, No. 18,958 (June 24, 1845), 2.
question of officers the General Assembly decided to back the Bill.

After the list of professors and deans of residence was published, the General Assembly passed the following resolution:

that, whereas Her Majesty's Government have enabled us to provide for the religious instruction of all our students by the endowment of a theological faculty under our own exclusive jurisdiction; and whereas, one of our ministers in whose capacity and paternal care we have entire confidence, has been appointed Dean of Residence, to whom have been committed the constant inspection and care of the conduct of the students; and whereas the qualifications and character of the persons appointed in the Queen's College, Belfast, for those classes which the students of this church have hitherto been required to attend, are such as to justify this assembly in accepting certificates and degrees from the College. . . . We now permit them to attend the classes of that department in the Queen's College Belfast.9

At this time Dr. Cooke opposed and defeated an amendment of the General Assembly aimed at allowing Presbyterians to attend the other Queen's Colleges. He stated that the reason he would vote for the Queen's College in Belfast, and objected to the amendment, was because the appointment of professors had been made with a view to satisfy the Presbyterian people, whereas in Cork and Galway the appointments were made to please Roman Catholics.10

Under these conditions the Queen's College, Belfast was established.

The Times declared in November, 1849,

Whatever amount of failure may be anticipated from the establishment of the new colleges in

9 "The General Assembly—the Queen's Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,300 (October 6, 1849), 5, and "The Queen's Colleges" Tablet, X, No. 192 (October 6, 1849), 625.

10 Ibid.
Cork and Galway, there appears to be no general likelihood of a similar fate having to be recorded of the Belfast College, for already the grounds seemed to be laid of the future success of the institution in the capital of Ulster.

The Times was correct in its assertion. Presbyterian students freely attended and soon it had as many students as the Colleges in Cork and Galway combined. A Presbyterian theological college was duly established at Belfast in 1853, and grew up in close and friendly relations with Queen's College. Dr. Moody tells us

Mixed, non-sectarian education proved a conspicuous success at Queen's College, Belfast, so far as the Protestant churches were concerned. Presbyterians, Anglicans, Methodists and others worked harmoniously together as students, and the ministers of their respective churches acted as deans of residence. Catholics did not exceed five percent of the student body, but they were well thought of and included some of the ablest students the college ever had. In an atmosphere of mutual respect for religious diversity the non-sectarian principle became an honoured tradition at Belfast. Hostile critics contended that 'non-sectarian' was synonymous with 'Presbyterian' and it was true that sixty-five percent of the College's students were Presbyterians and that all but three of its presidents were Presbyterian clergymen, but there is no evidence of any ecclesiastical interference with the college, or of a special preference for Presbyterians in appointment to chairs. Presbyterians were indeed always a minority among the professors.

---

11. "The Queen's College in Belfast", The Times, No. 20,331 (November 12, 1849), 5.

12 Dr. Moody states that "an intractable minority in the General Assembly insisted on going on with plans for a 'complete college' and enabled to do so by as much of Mrs. Magee's bequest which did not fall into the hands of lawyers, they founded such a college in Ulster, but as far from Belfast as possible. It was thus that Magee College began a rather precarious existence in Londonderry in 1865." T.W. Moody, op.cit., History, XLIII (June 1953), 98.

13 Ibid., 100.
J. M. Starkie, commenting on the success of the Queen's College, Belfast, before the University Commission in 1903, attributed it "to its strong denominational character, which satisfied the then views of the Presbyterian Church."

III

The Papal Rescripts of October, 1847-48, said nothing of the association of the clergy and laity with the Queen's Colleges except by implication. When the Colleges were opened in the fall of 1849 some Roman Catholic students enrolled, and some clergy felt they should accept appointments to protect them. In Galway Dr. Kirwan, a Roman Catholic priest, was appointed president. The list of faculty for Galway College also included the name of Rev. Godfrey Mitchell, whose appointment as Roman Catholic dean of residence was sanctioned by Dr. O'Donnell, Roman Catholic Bishop of Galway. Denis Caulfield Heron, who had led the campaign of the Roman Catholic laity for the opening of Trinity College, Dublin, in the 1840s, was appointed professor of jurisprudence.

In the Cork College Dr. Kane, an eminent Roman Catholic scientist, was appointed president, and the Cork Examiner tells us there was evidence at a dinner given in his honour that "a considerable number of Roman Catholics in whose integrity the community reposed confidence and trust", were also favourable to the Colleges. The paper admitted that no priests

11 F. McGrath, op.cit., 72.
15 "Opening of Two of the Queen's Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,323 (November 2, 1849), 4.
16 "The Mixed Education Question, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,461 (April 12, 1850), 8, citing the Cork Examiner.
attended this dinner but attributed this fact not to their lack of support
but rather to the fact that it was rumoured that shortly, the Pope would
issue a third rescript against the Queen's Colleges. 17 This document,
published on April 18, 1850, prohibited the clergy from holding any office,
obliged bishops to discourage Roman Catholic students from attending, and
again urged a common policy in the matter, and suggested the establishment
of a Roman Catholic University. It carried considerably more weight than
the previous two Rescripts, however, for it was to be wholeheartedly sanction-
on and promulgated by the new Primate of Ireland, Dr. Cullen.

On April 6th, 1849, Dr. Crolly had died and on May 22nd, 1849, a
meeting of the parish priests of the Archdiocese of Armagh met to select
his successor. 18 Three candidates were proposed to Rome but all were passed
over and after a delay of some months Dr. Paul Cullen, Rector of the Irish
College in Rome, was appointed on the 19th of December, 1849. The importance
of Crolly's death and Cullen's appointment to succeed him cannot be over-
estimated, in the question of the Queen's College. The supporters of the
Queen's Colleges and mixed education not only lost their most active leader,
but were now confronted by a decided friend of separate education. The effect
of Crolly's loss was intensified in 1852 when Murray also passed away and
Cullen was moved from the archdiocese of Armagh to Dublin to replace him. 19

Dr. Paul Cullen was a native Irishman who as a young priest had
attended the Urban College of Propagation in Rome as a student and stayed on

17 See Appendix III, B, 3.

18 "Catholic Intelligence", Tablet, X, No. 467 (April 14, 1849), 227.

19 B. O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland 1831-81. (London, 1883),
II, 196.
later to become vice-rector and subsequently rector of the Roman Catholic College there. While Cullen was rector, he witnessed the 1848 revolution in Italy, which saw Mazzini in the fall of 1849 become master of the Papal States and establish a pure democracy to be called the Republic of Rome. The Revolutionaries ordered the students to leave the Urban College within several hours but Cullen saved the seminary through the intervention of the American minister in Rome. Undoubtedly these incidents did much to turn Cullen as well as Pius IX against both the Italian "liberals" and the British government whose envoy to Rome, Lord Minto, had supported them.

Cullen was forty-five years old when appointed to succeed Crotty as Primate, and he had been away from Ireland for twenty-eight years. Throughout this long absence he had shown a keen interest not only in Irish ecclesiastical affairs but also in her political and educational development. He had acted as agent for the majority group of the Bishops, in nearly all transactions with the Apostolic See. Both Gregory XVI and Pius IX respected his judgment and consulted him regularly. It was Cullen who dissuaded the Pope from issuing a strong mandate for discouragement of O'Connell's agitation for Repeal. What was far more important, as far as the Queen's Colleges were concerned, was the fact that Dr. Cullen was a friend of Dr. MacHale's and a decided opponent of mixed education. He had had a hand in drawing up the Rescript against the Queen's Colleges. In all three of the Rescripts the

20 Cooper Thompson, "Cullen, Paul (1803-1878)", DNB, V (1910), 227.

21 A mandate was issued by the Pope discouraging Roman Catholic clergy from participating in politics but it was mild and was never really enforced. See, "Letter from His Holiness - Important Correspondence", Nation, No. 280 (February 12, 1849), 110.

22 F. McGrath, op.cit., 69.
Pope had urged the hierarchy to sacerdotal concord and in response to this recommendation, Dr. Cullen convened and presided over the Synod of Thurles. The importance of this gathering cannot be overestimated. It was the first National Synod held in Ireland since the convention of Kilkenny under the papal nuncio, Rinuccini, in 1642. Its recommendations would be sent to Rome for official approval, and the reply would carry with it the weight of Papal authority. If it were adverse to the Queen's Colleges, it must, of necessity, spell the end of the association of the Roman Catholic clergy with the institutions, and influence the laity to a large extent.

IV

The Times fully appreciated the significance of the Synod of Thurles and it carried almost daily reports from its Irish correspondent, throughout the course of its proceedings, from August 22nd through September 11th, 1850. Four days after the Synod ended The Times quoted the Cork Examiner as reporting, though not officially, since all the proceedings were secret, that:

there have been two decisions against the Queen's Colleges — one against their character and tendency, which was come to by a majority, but not so large a majority as was anticipated by those adverse to them; the other, for Withdrawing ecclesiastics from them which was affirmed by a majority of one. It was also said that the plan of establishing a Catholic met with general acquiescence, or rather with unanimous approval. 23

Further indication that the decision of the Synod was adverse from the Queen's Colleges could be seen in the Tablet of the previous day which had carried the refusal of Archbishop John MacHale and Dr. Slattery to act.

23 "Synod of Thurles, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,591 (September 15, 1850), 5.
as Visitors of the Galway and Cork Colleges respectively. One week later Dr. Cullen declined a similar position at the Belfast College not only because the College was a "purely Protestant institution", but also because the Pope had declared the Colleges "previously and intrinsically dangerous and had forbidden the Roman Catholic prelates from being associated with them." Dr. Cullen's refusal prompted the following well-founded comment from The Times:

> there can be no mistake with regard to the Pope's ideas of the effect of mixed education, and it requires no great stretch of wisdom to prognosticate the crowning results of the labours of the sacred conclave at Thurles.

Despite the adverse decision of the Synod of Thurles, The Times went on to urge the Government to persevere in the establishment of the Queen's Colleges as mixed institutions and assured them that if they did, the Roman Catholic laity would support them. The Edinburgh Review also felt the Roman Catholic laity would support the colleges despite the Synod of Thurles. It declared that every safeguard possible had been incorporated in the Queen's Colleges and questioned how the Roman Catholic hierarchy could condemn Roman Catholic attendance when the same morals and piety were never considered to be in the slightest peril in the University of Dublin where not only was no special security for them ever provided, but where there existed

---

24 "Government Insult upon the Bishops", Tablet, XI, No. 543 (September 11, 1850), 595.

25 "Another Denunciation of Queen's Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,660 (September 21, 1850), 8. See Appendix II, K.

26 Ibid.
every facility for roselytising and every temptation to apostacy. 27

This accusation that the Roman Catholic hierarchy never opposed the attendance of lay Roman Catholics at Trinity College, Dublin, was not founded on facts. From the opening of Trinity College in 1793 right down to the Synod of Maynooth in 1875, which officially expressed the disapproval of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the Bishops constantly discouraged lay Roman Catholics from attending and strove to provide for the religious security of those who did attend. Even early in the nineteenth century, when the majority of Bishops were under the sway of Dr. Murray's conciliatory policy, the Roman Catholic hierarchy demanded the opening of fellowships to provide for "the religious instruction and supervision of Catholics in attendance". 28

After 1845 when the majority of the Bishops turned to Dr. MacHale for leadership, they attacked not only the lack of religious instruction and supervision, but also Protestant atmosphere, spirit and teaching which characterized Trinity College, Dublin. 29 They denied with some qualification

27 "Lord Clarendon's Administration-Agitation Against the Queen's Colleges", BR., XCIII, No. 189 (January 1851), Art. IX, 295.

28 Pollock and Blaunt, "Irish and English Universities", BR. I, No. I (May 1836), 7; see also MacMahon, "Trinity College Dublin", BR. IV, No. VII (April, 1838), 281-307.

29 J. O'Hagen, "Reform of the Dublin University-the Scholarship Question", BR., XXIII, No. XLV (September, 1847), 228-251. The Roman Catholic hierarchy continued its opposition to Trinity College, Dublin throughout the nineteenth century. In 1873 scholarships and fellowships were opened but none the less, in 1875 Trinity College, Dublin was condemned by the Synod of Maynooth. Dubois, Contemporary Ireland, (Dublin 1911), 378.
the idea that the mixing of Roman Catholics and Anglicans would break bigotry and declared a complete reorganization of the University of Dublin was needed.

The *Cork Examiner*, contrary to *The Times* and *Edinburgh Review*, maintained that although a great majority of the Roman Catholic laity favoured the Queen's Colleges and the principle of mixed education they would nevertheless feel compelled to accept the decision of Rome as final.  

V

The long awaited decision of Rome regarding the resolution of the Synod of Thurles was made known in December of 1851 in an official document to the Archbishops of Ireland. This decree supported the previous Rescripts. It first forbade any Bishop or priest to be associated with the Colleges under pain of *ipsa facto* ecclesiastical suspension; secondly, it urged Bishops to dissuade Roman Catholic youths from attending and thirdly, it sanctioned wholeheartedly their efforts to establish a Roman Catholic University in Ireland. The significance of this document was quite evident. Bishops and priests were forbidden to have any part in the colleges either as administrators, professors, or deans of residence. The Roman Catholic laity were not forbidden to take part on the College staffs, or to attend as students, but every effort was to be made by the Roman Catholic Bishops to discourage them from the Colleges. In lieu of association with the Queen's Colleges, the Roman Catholic hierarchy and laity were to devote themselves to the establishment of a Roman Catholic University to provide

---

30 "Queen's Colleges, Ireland", *The Times*, No. 20,637 (November 4, 1850), 5, citing from the *Cork Examiner*.

31 See Appendix IV.
for the higher education of Catholics. The Tablet tended to agree in this analysis. 32

The decision of Rome in support of the Synodal decrees was hailed by the Edinburgh Review as "a new fangled doctrine menacing all establishments in which the principle of united education was embodied." 33 The surprise which the Edinburgh Review expressed at the decision of Rome is difficult to understand, when we recall that Rescripts against the Colleges were published in October, 1847, October 1848, and April 1850, and that even before these dates a majority of the Roman Catholic hierarchy opposed the Queen's Colleges as originally proposed and later amended. The article went on to argue that the Roman Catholic hierarchy had fully adopted and embraced the system, when they treated with the Government for certain modifications of it, and when the Government modified it to meet their demands.

This argument that the Roman Catholic hierarchy accepted the Queen's Colleges and the principle of mixed education, by opening negotiations for amendment of the original Bill, was similar to the Nation's position when the memorial demands of the Bishops first appeared in 1845. As was pointed out in commenting on Young Ireland's assertions to this effect, the memorial was neither an acceptance of the principle of mixed education nor of the Queen's Colleges, but rather a rejection of the Bill as originally proposed, and a statement

32 "Synod of Thurles, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,967 (November 21, 1851), 8; "Synod of Thurles, Ireland", The Times, No. 20,975 (December 3, 1851), 5, and "Synod of Thurles, Ireland", Tablet, XII, No. 607 (November 29, 1851), 760.

33 "Lord Clarendon's Administration - Agitation against the Queen's Colleges", BR., XCIII, No. 189 (January, 1851), 297. Cf "Commentary on the Last Rescripts", Tablet, XII, No. 594, (June 25, 1851), 392 f.
of religious securities required to make it acceptable. The Edinburgh Review argued that the Government had modified the Bill sufficiently to meet the demands of the Bishops; but the September 1845 protest against the Colleges signed by eighteen Bishops, combined with the rejection of the Queen's Colleges by the majority of the Bishops at the November Meeting of the hierarchy in the same year, indicated that the Edinburgh Review was mistaken.

The Edinburgh Review admitted the Government did not meet all the demands of the Bishops because they were inconsistent with the principle of the Bill. But it argued that the Government made ample compensation by providing two securities not asked for: first, that the Visitors of each College should always include the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese and the Archbishop of the diocese, and secondly, control over the residences of students. Control of residence and the right to have Visitors, were meagre concessions in view of the Catholic requests, and these concessions were only granted in 1848 after the majority of the bishops were opposed to the colleges and skeptical of last-minute concessions. The Edinburgh Review concluded by saying the Synod of 1850 was deprived of all authority and all character by the Synod of 1845.

This article reflects the general approval with which the principles of mixed education, as operative in the Queen's Colleges, was looked upon by the Presbyterians. It is interesting to note that this was the first article issued in the Edinburgh Review on the Queen's Colleges, and that it

---

34 "Lord Clarendon's Administration-Agitation against the Queen's Colleges", ER, XCIII, No. 139 January, 1851, 299.
only appeared after the Presbyterian General Assembly approved support
of the Belfast Queen's College. It would seem to indicate that by 1851
the Presbyterians were abandoning their former demands for separate edu-
cation, and resigning themselves to the principle of non-denominational
education.

Perhaps the most significant comment made on Papal support of the
Synod of Thurles was that found in the Dublin Review. This periodical,
throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, had only supported
the Bishops in their educational demands when they presented a united
front. It supported the opening of Trinity College, Dublin, during the
first part of the century, when Dr. Murray and the majority of the Bishops
favoured conciliation; its writers supported Dr. MacHale and the majority
of the bishops in demands to reconstitute the University of Dublin along
Roman Catholic lines in 1845. But throughout the highly contentious
Queen's Colleges controversy, the Dublin Review remained silent.

This lack of comment would seem to indicate that the position of
the proposed colleges as far as the Catholic hierarchy was concerned, was
not completely established. The fact that the Dublin Review, in 1851,
published an article on the "Address of the Irish Bishops on the Catholic
University", in which they fully explain the Roman Catholic attitude towards
higher education, the objections to mixed education, and the aims of the
Roman Catholic University, would seem to establish the fact that after the
Synod of Thurles, the hierarchy of Ireland were united in their opposition
to mixed education, and their demands for denominational education. 35

35

See Appendix IV, Allies, "Address of the Irish Bishops on the
Catholic University", DR., XXXI, No. LXII (December 1851), Art VII, 554.
From the *Dublin Review* it can be seen that the indictment of mixed education and the Queen's Colleges by the Synod of Thurles was not based on opposition to the mixing of Roman Catholic students and non-Roman Catholics, or upon the inclusion of science in the curriculum of the Colleges. It stemmed from the staff which a mixed college required and the exclusion of religion from the high position which the Bishops felt it demanded. The Bishops stressed the fact that they did not deny the intrinsic value of science and its worth, as an instrument in disciplining the mind, but objected to ignoring its relative position to religion. The staff of the Queen's Colleges, the Bishops felt, must of necessity be "neutral in religion, in all else positive" and "by the very law of its existence, preach indifference to all its scholars, in spiritual truth". Because the teaching staff was pledged to neutrality in religion, training of the moral and spiritual being were to be discarded, and instruction to take its place. The majority group of the Bishops did not consider the mixed education offered at Queen's Colleges as an advancement but rather as a surrender to heresy and schism.

Separate Roman Catholic education, on the other hand, as intended for the Catholic University, was to be a recognition of the role of religion in education and a blending of it with every branch of knowledge, according to its intrinsic value. The Bishops stressed the fact that the Catholic religion did not fear the association of religion and science and was confident that any science fully understood would strengthen religion. The general attitude of the Irish Bishops who fashioned the decrees of the

---

*Ibid.*, 564
Synod of Thurles was best expressed in the statement of the aim of the Catholic University:

'Go and make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' Second, the establishment of Catholic studies in their former range, which must include all existing knowledge and science—whatever is the need of the age must not be neglected. Thirdly, the objects to be kept in view are manifold, we need to meet and overcome infidelity on what it fancies to be its own ground; we need to rescue the physical and the intellectual sciences from its sway; we need to set forth once more a higher standard in the world than mere material progress; fourthly, as a condition of success we must name a perfect unity of thought and purpose in the teaching body. Mixed education makes this impossible . . . When all of the members of that body have but one thought and one action, to inspire into the minds of youth, with the love of knowledge, that of virtue and religion, may one not expect with some confidence, happy results? 37

VI

It cannot be denied that Papal sanction of the decrees of the Synod of Thurles had a positively deadening effect upon Roman Catholic association with the Queen's Colleges. The Times reported, even before the decrees were published by the Archbishops, that the Dean of Residence in Galway (Dr. Mitchell) formally resigned his post by letter addressed to the Lord Lieutenant and prophesied that "the clean sweep out would take place early in the next year." 38 As soon as the decrees were published the two remaining prelates Dr. O'Toole, vice-president of the Galway College, and

37 Ibid., 586.
38 "Statutes of Thurles, Ireland", The Times, No. 21, 064 (October 31, 1851), 5.
Dr. O'Connor, Dean of the Cork College, also resigned. The separation of the clergy from the Colleges was a foregone conclusion since the decree strictly forbade association under pain of ipso facto interdict.

The Rescripts of 1847 and 1848 had not excluded Roman Catholic students, except by implication, so a considerable number enrolled at both Cork and Galway when the Colleges opened in 1849.\(^3^9\) Undoubtedly, the lay Roman Catholics were influenced by the fact that their clergy was associated with the colleges. The continued association of the clergy at the Cork College, throughout most of 1850, accounts for a slight increase in the Catholic enrollment at the Cork College in that year, while the withdrawal of Dr. Kirwan and Dr. Mitchell from the Galway College might well explain the appreciable drop in attendance at that school.\(^4^0\) After the official promulgation of the decrees of the Synod of Thurles in 1851, the number of Roman Catholic students dropped off appreciably, and the utter failure of the Queen's College, which the preceding events portended, soon showed itself.

\(^3^9\) In 1849 at the Cork College, 38 Roman Catholics enrolled, upwards of 54%. The Authorities at the Galway College refused to give figures regarding the respective numbers of the various creeds represented as opposed to the principle of the colleges, but there is evidence that Catholics were well represented, however. "The Catholic University", Tablet, XIII, No. 597 (September 20, 1851), 602.

\(^4^0\) In 1850 at the Cork College 42 Roman Catholic students, upwards of 59% of the whole entrance, enrolled. In the same year the overall attendance at the Galway College which must have been predominantly Catholic fell off 62%. "The Catholic University", Tablet, XIII, No. 597 (September 20, 1851), 602. The president's reports of Dr. Kane, Cork Queen's College, and Dr. Barwick, Galway Queen's College were very optimistic in 1851, both for the general success of the Colleges and the role Catholic students would play in that success. The facts would seem to indicate Dr. Kane's sentiments had more basis for foundation.

"The Report of the Queen's College", The Times, No. 21, 013 (September 9, 1851), 8; "The Queen's Colleges", The Times, No. 21, 017 (September 13, 1851), 4. See also "Lord Clarendon's Administration-Agitation against the Queen's Colleges", ER., XCIII, No. 189 (January, 1863), 302.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The Roman Catholic lay professors remained associated with the colleges after the publication of the decrees of the Synod of Thurles, and some Roman Catholic students continued to attend, but not sufficient numbers to make the College of Cork and Galway successful.

During the first eleven years of their existence the colleges barely managed to subsist. The Belfast College, "sanctioned as it was by the Presbyterian ministers, was well attended." But the struggling nature of the scheme as a whole may be gathered from the figure given in The Times of October 15, 1860, and also from the returns made on the motion of Mr. Monsell, to the House of Commons, in 1857. From these articles it appears that the total expenditure on the three Colleges had been about £333,000. The number of matriculation students during the eleven years was 1,423, whilst in the same period about 1,451 scholarships had been offered for competition. Of the 1,423 students, only 356 had taken a degree. The faculty of engineering in the three colleges had produced two qualified engineers in eleven years, and even in the comparatively well-attended faculty of medicine, two-thirds of the students failed to last the course. Only 45 students had graduated in engineering, law, and agriculture combined. In the 1860 article an attempt was made to throw a more favourable light on these figures by pointing to a certain number of unmatriculated students who attended the lectures. But the standard of these may be judged

---


2. "The Queen's University". The Times, No. 21,301 (October 15, 1860), 6, and McGrath, *op. cit.*, 81.
by the lack of the achievement of the rest.

That the condemnation of the Colleges by the Holy See and the Bishops was the main cause of this failure, is beyond dispute, the Rescripts and the Acts of the Synod of Thurles did not, indeed, absolutely prohibit Roman Catholics from frequenting them; but the terms of both documents were such that no conscientious Roman Catholic could believe himself exempted, except for grave reasons. Dr. Moody tells us that "the prelates' hostility had a permanent stinting effect against the Queen's Colleges of Galway and Cork which never realized the purpose of their founders though they were far from being a total loss."  

---

The Queen's College Belfast continued to flourish throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century while the Queen's Colleges Cork and Galway developed very little. In 1901 Queen's College Belfast had 354 students; Cork 171; Galway 97. Out of the total 622 students there were only 159 Catholics. 

Dubois, Contemporary Ireland. (Dublin 1911), 380.

T. W. Moody, op. cit., History, XLIII, (June 1958), 98

When the Irish University Question was finally resolved in 1908, after many abortive attempts throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, the Queen's Colleges formed the basis of the National Irish University. The Queen's College, Belfast, formed the nucleus of the Presbyterian University, while the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway, along with University College which was an outgrowth of the Catholic University of Ireland, formed the foundation of the University which was to satisfy the denominational demands of the Roman Catholics. See James Johnston Auchomaty, Irish Education: A Historical Survey. (Dublin, 1937), and Fathers of the Society of Jesus, A Page of Irish History: Story of University College, Dublin. (Dublin, 1930).
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I

Sir Robert Peel's attempt to solve the Irish University Question by introducing the Queen's Colleges Bill met with divided opinion in Ireland. One section of the Repeal Association represented by the Nation looked upon the principle of the bill, mixed education, as a positive blessing, and was anxious to see it instigated at almost any cost. The other section, led by O'Connell and represented by the Tablet, favoured separate education, and looked upon mixed education as only second best. They were willing to accept the latter with certain securities, however. Both groups bound themselves to the position of the clergy.

At first the attitude on the reception of the Bill in the Repeal Association was dictated by the works of the Young Ireland authors, and the Nation. The main tenets of these writings had been that (1) O'Connell favoured mixed education and constantly supported it throughout his life, (2) Peel introduced the Bill to appease Ireland and split the Repeal Association, (3) O'Connell's opposition to the Bill was inspired by the twofold aim at dethroning Peel and of driving Young Ireland out of the Repeal Association, and (4) that young Ireland was as much opposed to the bad points of the Queen's Colleges Bill as O'Connell was.

\[1\] Gravan Dufy, Young Ireland, (New York, 1881), 63 ff, and Michael Doherty, The Felon's Track, (New York, 1849), 35 f. For a similar but more recent account of the attitude of the Repeal Association towards the Queen's Colleges, see R. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1816, (London 1952), 213-20.
As a proof of the first of these tenets, Young Ireland pointed out that O'Connell, during his public life, had repeatedly advocated the education of young men in mixed schools and colleges. In 1812, he became a member of the Kildare Street Society, which was the first faltering step towards mixed education. In 1831, O'Connell supported the National System. O'Connell proclaimed, they held, in a meeting of the Committee, his emphatic approval of the Queen's Colleges Bill. It was not until the Repeal Association Meeting that he expressed doubts on the practicability of a mixed system. They quoted excerpts from O'Connell's speech in the House on June 22, 1845, on the motion for going into committee on the Bill, as further proof. At this time O'Connell, after eulogising the Maynooth grant, said, in part,

I admit that at one time I thought a system of mixed education proper, and I still think that a system of mixed education in literature and science would be proper, but not with regard to religious instruction.  

These assertions by Young Ireland regarding O'Connell's support of mixed education are true, but they do not prove that he favoured mixed education and had been a constant supporter of it. Quite the contrary, they merely bring out the fact that O'Connell was willing to accept the principle of mixed education under certain terms. O'Connell's letter to Primate Curtis in 1830, and his declarations throughout the Colleges controversy, both in the Repeal Association and at Westminster, show him clearly in favour of separate education. O'Connell's attitude closely

---

2 Im.Pars., "Irish Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 269 (June 28, 1845), 412. See also "The Colleges", Nation, III, No. 111 (June 28, 1845), 617; E. Lucas, The Life of Frederick Lucas, (London, 1886), I, 206, and M. Dohony, op.cit., 39.

3 See Appendix II, B, 1.
reflects that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Both favoured separate education as the best in theory. Yet, like the Bishops, he was willing and did consistently support mixed education, if sufficient religious security was combined. When security was insufficient, however, both groups withdrew their support and demanded separated education.

O'Connell's support of the Kildare Street Society, his tacit acceptance of the National System as a compromise, his letter of February 19, 1845, to John MacHale, encouraging acceptance of the Queen's Colleges if professorial nominations were in the hands of the hierarchy, and his efforts to have the Queen's Colleges Bill amended in line with the Bishops' Memorial, prove his willingness to accept mixed education. On the other hand, his resignation from the Kildare Street Society in 1820, when it became associated with proselytizing institutions, and his continued opposition to the Queen's Colleges, when the principal demands of the Bishops' Memorial were refused, show his sincerity in demanding religious security. O'Connell's speech, at committee stage, should not be interpreted as a declaration of mixed education, but a proof of his willingness to accept mixed education with religious security. Young Ireland failed to mention that, in this very speech, O'Connell asked Parliament to,

take one step further and consider whether this Bill may not be made to accord with the feelings of the Catholic ecclesiastics of Ireland, ... I am desirous of seeking education promoted in Ireland, but even education may be misapplied power.

4 See Appendix II, B, 3.

5 "The Home Secretary's Defence of his Academical Institutions", The Times, No. 18,939 (June 2, 1845), 4.
Young Ireland's allegation that Peel introduced the Queen's Colleges Bill to appease Ireland for O'Connell's imprisonment, and to split the Repeal Association, seems unfounded. It is true that Peel at this time was convinced of the need of concessions to Ireland, but this attitude was not the result of O'Connell's imprisonment, but rather of Peel's long association with the Irish question. During the first half of the nineteenth century, Peel's Irish policy underwent an evolutionary process which saw it pass from coercion to conciliation. Initially, the purpose of his policy was to support the Protestant Ascendancy, and to suppress the political claims of Roman Catholics. This attitude is clearly evidenced by Sir Robert Peel's administration of Ireland during his term as Chief Secretary, 1812-1818, when he displayed a definitely anti-conciliatory attitude in carrying out the three duties of his post: controlling patronage, maintaining order, and maintaining in Parliament the cause of the Protestant Ascendancy. He justified his stand, throughout this period, by asking, "May I not question the policy of admitting those who have views hostile to the religious establishment of the state, to the capacity of legislating for the interest of those establishments?" Despite Peel's opposition to Roman Catholic claims for political power, he was an advocate of more education even at this date. "Assuredly he was the last man who would throw any obstacle in the way of extension of education to the Irish people".

Between 1818 and the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act in

6 George Peel, "Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850)", DNB, XV (1921), 658.

1829, Sir Robert Peel's political convictions underwent a slow, gradual, but nevertheless definite change, which had an evident effect upon his attitude towards Ireland. In 1823, although still as strongly opposed as his fellow Tories to such measures as Catholic emancipation or reform of the House of Commons, and although he still fully recognized the exigencies of his party warfare, he began to perceive that it was the duty of a politician to study the conditions of all classes of the people, and to bring parliamentary policy to some extent into harmony with the wishes and need of the constituencies, even at the risk of ignoring many preconceived opinions. In 1825, in Canning's administration, Sir Robert Peel opposed the three fundamental pieces of legislation concerning Ireland: the emancipation, the elective franchise, and payment of the clergy. But in 1828, when O'Connell defeated the popular Fitzgerald for Clare, he decided concessions were in order. As Prime Minister in 1829, he introduced and carried through the Catholic Emancipation Act, as well as a bill regulating franchise in Ireland and another suppressing the Catholic Association. The fact that as early as 1830

8 Ibid., 656.

9 By the Catholic Emancipation Act Roman Catholics were placed on a level with other denominations except that they were excluded from some high civil and military offices and priests were prohibited from wearing vestments outside the church, bishops from assuming titles of their sees, and regulars from obtaining charitable bequests. Forty shilling freeholders, were disenfranchised by the Franchise Bill. The Catholic Association had been reconstituted by O'Connell with a new modus operandi after Peel's first dissolution but now its work was finished so it passed out of existence. E. A. D'Alton, "Ireland since the Union", Catholic Ency., VIII (1910), 108.
Peel showed a willingness to make concessions to Ireland, combined with the fact that he supported the Whig National System in 1831, that the provincial colleges were considered as early as 1835, and that Wyse's letter to Smith O'Brien in 1841 showed plans for the colleges were already formulated, disproving Young Ireland's assertions that Peel introduced the Bill to appease Ireland for O'Connell's imprisonment on May 30, 1841.

The assertion that Peel introduced the Bill to split the Association is not logical. Peel might have known that liberal Young Ireland would support the Bill and the principle of mixed education, but he had no way of determining what O'Connell's stand on the Bill would be, in view of his support of mixed education on some previous occasions.

The third tenet of the Young Ireland writers was that O'Connell opposed Peel from the time of his imprisonment on May 30, 1841, and that he saw in this Bill, introduced as a conciliatory measure, the means of not only embarrassing him, but also the Young Ireland group who were infringing on his power.

O'Connell's opposition to Peel dated back much further than 1841. He opposed Peel as early as 1812 when the latter served as Irish secretary and a lasting enmity grew up between the two which continued throughout

---

10 Viscount Harding et al., op. cit., 46.

11 See Appendix II, A, 1.

12 Similarly see: "State of the Nation", ER., LXXXVII, No. 175 (January, 1848), 140 f.
both their lives. However, this personal animosity did not affect their attitude towards legislation. It is true that from his imprisonment on, O'Connell favoured the Whigs, from whom he thought he could rest concessions but there was insignificant proof to show that his opposition to the Queen's Colleges Bill was prompted by opposition to Peel, rather than based on convictions.

The idea that O'Connell opposed the Bill in an effort to oust Young Ireland from the Repeal Association is untenable, for a number of reasons: the differences between O'Connell and Young Ireland were just beginning to emerge in the summer of 1845; the physical force party had not yet emerged among the Young Irelanders; O'Connell's correspondence shows that, far from plotting the expulsion of Young Ireland, he was anxious for conciliation. O'Connell might have felt that a telling majority in the Association would be an effective blow to the opposition; but the correspondence of Davis and Duffy shows that, although they suggested exclusion of debate on the Colleges Bill from the Association, to avoid dissention, they in reality were seeking a tactical victory for the Bill.

13 Throughout Peel's term of office in Ireland O'Connell pursued him with rancour. O'Connell spoke of Peel in terms of contempt as an inexperienced youth and pointed to his accomplishments as a proof of the indifference of the Irish policy of his opponents, Peel retorted by calling O'Connell a noisy agitator and an itinerate demagogue. He even went so far as to claim O'Connell's agitation of the Catholic question was dishonest. In the course of 1815 these hostilities led Peel to challenge O'Connell to a duel. The proposed duel in Ireland was thwarted by Mrs. O'Connell and arrangements for a continental meeting failed when O'Connell was arrested in London on his way to accept the challenge. In 1825 after the second reading of the Catholic Emancipation Act, O'Connell apologized and accepted responsibility for the argument. Robert Dunlop, "O'Connell, Daniel (1776-1847)", DNB, XIV (1921), 820, and Lefevre, Peel and O'Connell. (London 1887), 37.

14 See Appendix II, B, 2.

15 Professor Denis Gwynn "Davis and the Colleges Bill"—"Davis and Catholic Bigotry", BER, LXX, No. 148 (July, 1947), 571 and Ibid., op.cit. (August, 1947), 672, 680 f.
Finally, Davis was possessed with the idea that an anti-Protestant element was at work in the Association. This idea came from statements in the ultra-Catholic journals, and from statements of O'Connell's satellites. Smith O'Brien accused Davis of being hyper-sensitive and maintained that he, Davis, gave O'Connell just cause for complaint before the scene in Conciliation Hall. 16

Young Ireland's statement that its opposition to the weaknesses of the Queen's Colleges Bill was as sincere as O'Connell's, seems ridiculous. Reason alone would dictate that the degree of opposition or sincerity could not be equal, when Young Ireland looked upon mixed education as a positive blessing, whereas O'Connell favoured separate education as best in theory. It is true that Young Ireland nominally supported the Bishops' demands in the Nation. But as Lucas pointed out in the Tablet, their only serious objection to the Queen's Colleges Bill was the government appointment of officials. 17 Young Ireland's rejection of the final Bill was prompted by the fact that government appointments were embodied, not by any lack of religious security. As far as Davis was concerned, the religious short-comings of the Bill were secondary. O'Connell shared Young Ireland's opposition to government appointments, which he felt would be anti-Catholic, but added to this a sincere demand for religious security.

This account of the Queen's Colleges Bill in the Repeal Association has only recently been attacked by a series of articles by Professor Denis Gwyn in the Irish Ecclesiastical Record and by Father McGrath in his

16 Idem, op.cit. (July, 1947), 668 ff.

17 See Ch. II, Sec. III, 34 f.
book Newman's University: Idea and Reality. It is pointed out in the latter that Young Ireland's claims regarding O'Connell's attitude on mixed education and his motives in opposing the bill were not justified in fact.

Professor Gwynn has had the advantage of referring to the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Smith O'Brien in the National Library, Dublin, which throws a completely new light on the subject. These articles rightly stress the need of accepting the statement of Davis, Duffy and Michael Doheny, Young Ireland authors, with caution. I am grateful to Professor Gwynn for referring me to his article and for permission to refer to the correspondence contained therein.

II

The Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, like the Repeal Association, were also divided on the question of the Queen's Colleges and the principle of mixed education. Their importance in the controversy cannot be stressed too greatly. Both sections of the Repeal Association had bound themselves to be governed by the decision of the Roman Catholic Bishops and, furthermore, the attitude of the Roman Catholic laity would almost certainly be determined by the Bishops' position.

The more liberal section of the Bishops, a significant minority led by Dr. Murray and Dr. Crolly, though not particularly favourable to mixed

18

education as the best type of education were anxious to give it a try, with whatever securities could be obtained. This group associated itself with Young Ireland and with the Nation on the educational questions, but did not support their political demands. The other section, a majority led by Dr. MacHale and represented by the Tablet, were vehement in their support of separated education, but were willing to give the colleges a try, if a compromise with strong religious security could be devised. This majority group was closely associated with O'Connell and Old Ireland, not only on the question of education but also on political and economic issues. 19

The first rejection of the Queen's Colleges Bill by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in May 1845, was a compromise measure which recognized the principle of mixed education, but set up requirements under which it could be acceptable. 20 These proposed amendments were not granted by the Government, despite the fact that they were all in keeping with Peel's original scheme. Neither was Lord Clarendon's promise honoured, that the Roman Catholic religion would be fully and appropriately represented. It was only then that Dr. MacHale was able to win the majority of Bishops to the support of separate education. The result was that the de facto predominance of Roman Catholic influence was lacking and no religious safeguards were present.

19 For an appraisal of the position of the Roman Catholic hierarchy on the Queen's Colleges Bill which maintained that the majority of the Bishops favoured mixed education, cf., J. E. Cairnes, "University Education in Ireland," in Political Essays. (London, 1866), 261 ff.

20 See Appendix III, A.
Between 1845 and the Synod of Thurles in 1850, the position of the hierarchy was uncertain, despite the Papal Rescripts of 1848, 49, and 50, but it was quite evident that demands for separate education were growing in strength.

Political, economic, and religious events in England, Rome, and Ireland played an important role in the five years proceeding the Synod of Thurles. In Ireland the split in the Repeal Association, and subsequent removal of Young Ireland after the abortive uprising of 1848, eliminated one section which supported mixed education. The death of Davis in October 1845, and of Dr. Crolly in 1849, removed the two leading supporters of mixed education. Dr. Crolly's death was even more significant when he was replaced by Dr. Paul Cullen, who was a strong advocate of separate education.

In England, the breakdown of negotiations to restore diplomatic relations with Rome - a breakdown occasioned by official English support of the revolution in Italy in 1848 - destroyed any hopes there were of making the colleges acceptable to the Irish Bishops and to Rome. The hostile anti-Catholic feeling aroused by the controversy over the re-establishment of the hierarchy, together with accusations of Papal aggression, also worked against compromise between the British government and the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland.

III

In summarising the position of the Tablet, Nation and The Times on the Queen's Colleges, we can say in general that the Tablet was the

21 See Appendix III, B, 1, 2, 3.
most consistent in its policy towards the colleges, while the Nation and The Times vacillated in their stand.

The day after the Bill was introduced, Lucas attacked it as a system "for de-Catholicising the middle classes of Ireland". He attacked the two main principles of the bill — government appointment of officials and professors, and the lack of religious instruction. In a series of articles extending over many months, Lucas went into the question of education, its principles, objectives, methods, and function. His vehement objections to mixed education seem a little exaggerated today, but on his behalf it must be said that he was sincerely convinced that mixed education was an evil and separate education a blessing.

Lucas maintained that the supporters of mixed education did not understand the claims of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, who supported separate education. What he claimed was that the Roman Catholics of Ireland looked up to the Church as the God-appointed Guardian of Education, that they would condemn any system of education which the Church looked upon with distrust, and finally that the Roman Catholics of Ireland had a right to places of education in keeping with their own ideas. For all other classes of the community he claimed the same.

The editors of the Nation, on the other hand, sincerely believed in the value of mixed education as a positive blessing which would advance their main aim, — Repeal. The lack of religious security in the Bill

22 "The Provincial Colleges", Tablet, VI, No. 261 (May 10, 1845), 296.

23 "Introduction of the Provincial Colleges Bill", Tablet, VI, No. 261 (May 10, 1845), 296; see also E. Lucas, op. cit., I, 315.
was attacked, but the objection was secondary. Their main objection to
the Bill was the fact that the appointment of officials was left in the
hands of the government, who were not necessarily anti-Catholic, but
rather anti-Bepeal. On the two main points of the Bill, the Nation was
as decidedly against government appointments as it was for mixed educa-
tion. It pledged itself to opposition to the colleges if this weak-
ness were not removed. The Nation was consistent in this stand. After
the final bill was printed, with government appointment as an integral
part, the Nation ceased its official support of the Colleges.

The relation between the Tablet and the Nation was very strained
during this period. The Nation was constantly appealing to O'Connell to
use his influence to protect them from the attacks of the Tablet and the
Dublin Review. On the other hand, the fact that the Tablet had suffer-
ed at the hands of the Nation is indicated in one of Lucas' articles which
maintains the Nation's aim was:

to drive the Tablet out of Ireland, to make the
Nation an organ of Catholic interests so compl-
etely and thoroughly informed that no Saxon
journalist shall dare intrude into your concerns
and earn obloquy by defending what you systematic-
ally neglect.25

The attitude of the Times towards the colleges passed through two
distinct phases. In the first instance The Times attacked the bill, claim-
ing that the colleges were not needed in Ireland since the section of the

24 Professor Denis Gwyn "Davis and Catholic Bigotry", IER., LXIX
(August 1947), 667-676, passim.

25 "Old Ireland and Young Ireland", Tablet, VI, No. 264 (May 31, 1845),
338.
population interested in higher education was non-Catholic and provided for, and also that the Bill was merely an expedient of Peel's ministry, aimed at conciliating the Irish rather than satisfying any basic need of Ireland. The Times maintained throughout the period that Ireland's basic problem was to be found in landlord-tenant relations. Regarding the principle of mixed education, The Times felt that it was acceptable in countries where it was wanted but they claimed that Ireland, far from wanting mixed education, was inclined toward separate education, and determined "to denounce all education which did not come in the name of religion." The Times supported the principle of separate education and the demands of the Bishops for religious security, throughout the first Papal Rescript, 1867, which it looked upon as "a victory for MacHale and the dissenting Bishops." When the second Papal Rescript appeared in 1868, however, The Times contradicted its former stand completely. It declared that the ignorance of Ireland was one of its basic problems, and that the scheme devised by Peel was dictated by reason. The principle of mixed education was praised as one aimed at "excluding the distinction of sects and the obnoxiousness of dogmas," and the Pope was attacked for contradicting his former stand "in favour of a system of mixed education". From this


29 Ibid.
point on, The Times seemed favourable to the principle of mixed education as applied to Ireland, and encouraged the government to persist in establishing the system, which it argued the Roman Catholic laity would accept despite Papal objection.

The stand of The Times against the sudden reversal of Rome, and in favour of mixed education and the colleges, was supported in 1851 by the Edinburgh Review. In an article commenting on the Synod of Thurles the Review refers to its opposition to mixed education as a "new fangled doctrine menacing all establishments in which the principle of united education was embodied." The article argued that the Roman Catholic hierarchy had accepted the principle of mixed education in the National System, and also in 1845, "when they treated with the Government for certain modifications of it (the principle) and when the Government modified it to meet their demands." The Article concludes by declaring that the Synod of Thurles was deprived of all authority and character by the Synod of 1845, and by maintaining that the Roman Catholic laity would attend the colleges and thereby defend the past conduct of their Bishops against their present doctrines and pretensions.

It is significant that throughout the highly controversial discussion of the principle of mixed education and the proposed colleges, the Edinburgh Review contains no comment on the question, either for or against the Colleges. The fact that the Review came out in 1851 declaring for the

30 "Lord Clarendon's Administration-Agitation against the Queen's Colleges", ER, XCI, No. 189 (January 1851), 297.

31 Ibid., 298.
principle and in favour of the colleges, clearly shows that the Presbyterians were now favourable to both, and had abandoned their demands for separate education.

Both The Times and the Edinburgh Review can be criticized for attacking the Bishops for turning against mixed education and the colleges, at the Synod of Thurles. It might be argued successfully that it was not till the Synod of Thurles that the Roman Catholic hierarchy declared definitely against mixed education. But it most certainly cannot be argued that they were favourable to the principle before this date. At best it can be said that their position was uncertain, though even through the pages of The Times one would get the impression that the Bishops supporting a modus vivendi with the principle would not be successful.

The Dublin Review, like the Edinburgh Review, made no comment on the principle of mixed education or the controversial Queen's Colleges, till after the Synod of Thurles. This paucity of comment by the Dublin Review, which can be looked upon as the official organ of the hierarchy of Ireland, would seem to verify the positive stand that after the Synod of Thurles the Bishops were united in their opposition to the principle of mixed education and the Queen's Colleges, and decided in their demand for separate education. 32

IV

In conclusion of our study of the Colleges Bill we can say that Peel was sincere in introducing the Queen's Colleges Bill. He was prompted not only by the aim of conciliating Ireland, but also by his earnest belief

in the need for more education. He did not favour the principle of mixed education himself, but felt that the conditions in Ireland demanded it, and that it was the best that public opinion in England would allow. There does not seem to be sufficient evidence to bear out the contention that Peel introduced the Bill in an aim to split the Repeal Association, for Peel had no way of knowing whether O'Connell would decide for or against the principle, since his position had varied in the past.

Events in Italy and Ireland led to the proximate cause of the failure of the Colleges, which was Papal approval of the decrees of the Synod of Thurles. But there were many remote causes foremost of which was Peel's failure to realize the opposition he faced.

The Synod of Thurles says,

> The system may have been devised in a spirit of generous and impartial policy; but the statesmen who framed it were not acquainted with the inflexible nature of our doctrines, and with the jealousy with which we are obliged to avoid everything opposed to the parity and integrity of our faith.

Another remote cause pointed to by The Times, and commented on by Newman, was the lack of students with secondary education prepared for university education. Peel was advised by Wyse to extend the National

---

33 F. McGrath, op.cit., 82 f.

34 As late as 1871 Lord Cairns described Irish intermediate education as "bad in quality and deficient in quantity". In that year the first efforts were made to improve the deficiency. One million sterling drawn from the disestablishment of the Irish Church was set aside for secondary education. In 1878 a Board of Intermediate Education was founded to allot grants on the basis of results at local exams. Dubois, Contemporary Ireland. (Dublin 1911), 375.
System to secondary education, but was deterred by Roman Catholic opposition to undenominational education in the experimental Model Schools. Peel felt adult undenominational education would be acceptable.

From The Times we can see that another reason for failure of the Colleges was the illogicality of pressing on Ireland a Bill which Peel feared to sponsor in his own country. Newman in the Corn Exchange in the summer of 1851, said that the point which the Roman Catholic Church maintained, against the British Government, as regards the Queen's Colleges, was precisely that which Protestantism maintained and successfully maintained, against the same Government in England -- viz, "that secular instruction should not be separated from religion."35

The mixed education offered at Peel's Queen's Colleges was opposed as part of the anti-Christian campaign on the continent, called liberalism. The change from the old denominational education to specialists was not considered as advance towards equal treatment of all creeds, but rather as an anti-theological and even anti-religious movement. The Church, then, in turn, had to be on the defensive. Two ideas of education were competing -- the denominational or ecclesiastical, which threatened to be obscurantist; and the undenominational or scientific, which threatened to be irreligious. The proposed Queen's Colleges were inevitably associated in the minds of most persons with the latter. 36

35 "The Queen's Colleges", Tablet, XIII, No. 612 (January 2, 1852), 8 and McGrath, op.cit., 79.

APPENDIX I

University of Dublin Calendar, 1834:

"At the dissolution of the monasteries in Ireland under Henry VIII, the mayor and the citizens of Dublin were granted the site, ambit or precinct of the dissolved Augustinian Monastery of All Saints, lying within the suburbs of the city. Archbishop Lafts judging this a convenient situation for the intended college, applied to the mayor and citizens, and in two elaborate speeches, in which he laid before them the Queen's Intention of founding a university in Ireland, and the great advantage of such a society of the city, he prevailed on them to grant the said Monastery of All Hallows, with the adjoining land, for the purpose. The Archbishop having thus far succeeded, employed Henry Ussher, then archdeacon of Dublin, and afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, to petition the Queen for her royal charter, and for the mortmain license for the land granted by the city. The Queen received the petition favourably; and, by a warrant dated 29th of December 1591, ordered a license of mortmain to pass the seal for the grant of the said abbey (which is stated to be of the yearly value of £ 20), and for the foundation of a college, incorporated with the power to accept such lands and contributions for its maintenance, as any of her subjects should charitably be moved to bestow to the value of £ 300 a year. On the 3d of March following, being the thirty-fourth year of Her Majesty's reign, letters patent passed in due form pursuant to the said warrant now in circulation among the students."

University Calendar, 1834, p. 35.

Official history of founding of Trinity College, Dublin, as found in the Dublin University Calendar, 1834; and cited in M. P. Mahon, "Trinity College", DR. IV, No. VIII (April, 1838), 285.
APPENDIX II

Letter of Mr. Wyse to Smith O'Brien February 11, 1845:

After Wyse stated his demands to raise Maynooth studies to the level of a University he stated suggestions and outlined ideas for lay education.

"Now strong as I am for the integrity of Catholic ecclesiastical education, I am not less for Irish secular education generally. In this view the second part of my plan is connected:

1) open Trinity College or at least the University of Dublin, 2) if this be impractical found Catholic and Presbyterian Universities, 3) if neither be accomplished, or both, found a united University, on the plan of the University of London, the seat in Dublin, with power to aggregate colleges in the Provinces. It will be difficult to open Trinity College, Dublin, or even the University if the Catholic clergy protest against mixed education. No one here (in Parliament) will listen to an exclusively Catholic University, much less funds for it."

"Peel's favourite is a joint University and the Catholic clergy seem to favour it. I propose that Colleges the most exclusive may be aggregated, as well as the most open. The governing body shall be fairly proportioned, every precaution as to appointments of Fellows, Chairs, Professorships, etc."

"The real difficulty is not the joint University but joint colleges. You are right in thinking the Catholic clergy want such colleges solely in their hands, when residence is insisted on this may be just. When the students are extern the case alters. All that can be done is to secure Catholic and Protestant chairs for Religion, Moral Philosophy, and History, to have a Catholic and Protestant dean, and maintain by strong powers strict internal and external discipline."

"Asked if the objection lies deeper and 'it be to Catholics and Protestants at all mixing,' I regret equally with you the opinion existing on the subject. I think them difficult but not impossible to conquer if not in whole, in part."
Letter of O'Connell to Primate Curtis, November 26, 1830:

"My Lord, I have had reason to think, given me by some who possess influence with the new administration [the Tories were almost constantly in power the first thirty years of the nineteenth century but in 1830 the Whigs gained power] that there is a desire amongst a portion of the new members to divide the Kildare Place grant equitably between the Catholics and Protestants. I have also reason to believe that this object would be advanced if the Catholic clergy, and especially the dignitaries of the Catholic clergy were without delay to petition on this subject, that is, that on any future education grants of money, care should be taken to apportion an adequate part to the education of Catholic children."


Letter of O'Connell to Dr. MacHale, February 14, 1845:

"My Reverend Lord,

I am exceedingly alarmed at the coming prospect. I am truly afraid that the ministerial plans are about to throw more power into the hands of the supporters of the Bequest Bill. A fatal liberalism is but too prevalent, and these pseudo-liberals are extremely anxious to have an opportunity of assailing the party of the sincere and practical Catholics as being supporters of narrow and bigoted doctrine. I should not take the liberty of troubling your Grace with a letter if I were not deeply alarmed lest the friends of truly Catholic education should be out manoeuvred by their enemies. What those enemies most desire is that a premature move should be made on our part. They say and I fear the public would and ought to go with them - that to attack Peel's plan before that plan was announced and developed would be to show a disposition indiscrimate to education and a determination not to be satisfied with any concessions. I advise not making any attack upon the academical institutions until we know what these institutions are to be. I need not inform your Grace that my opinion is
decidedly favourable to the education of Catholics being committed to Catholic Authority."

Prof. Dennis Gwynn, O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill", IER.,
LXIX (July-December, 1947), 572.

II, B, 3

Letter of O'Connell to Dr. MacHale, February 19, 1845:

"It is possible, though not very probable, the appointment of professors to instruct the Catholic youth may be given to the Catholic prelates, and in that case though the principle of exclusive Catholic education may not apply, yet I should think there would be no objection to Protestants attending the classes if all the professors were nominated by the canonical authorities of the Catholic church."


II, B, 4

Letter of O'Connell to Dr. MacHale, June 21, 1845:

"Why do I write? Because I wish to disburthen myself of two facts. The first, that Sir James Graham's amendments (to the Irish Colleges Bill) will make the Bill worse, simply by increasing and extending the power and domain of the Government, or of persons appointed by and also removable at will by that Government, over a wider space, and over more important and more delicate matters, including perhaps all religious details. The second fact, is, that if the prelates take and continue in a high, firm and unanimous tone, the Ministry will yield . . ."

"My object is that your Grace should know to a certainty that the game is in our hands if the prelates stand firm, as I most respectfully believe they will, to all the Church sanctions relative to Catholic education."

II, B, 5

Letter of O'Connell to Mr. Fitzpatrick, app. June 21, 1845:

"Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick,

I send as a parcel by this conveyance 25 copies of the Irish Colleges Bill as altered. For, I think as amended by Sir James Graham, it gives all dominion over every branch and detail of the colleges to the Ministry for the time being. It is true it permits subject to the visitation of Government, the erection of separate Halls, by subscription or donation, for separate religious instruction. See what an advantage this gives to the Protestants who are rich, over the Catholics who are poor! You will, of course, have Protestant Halls rapidly, and with difficulty will there be found money to erect even one Catholic Hall...

"Sir James Graham has intimated that the visitorial power, that is to say, the absolute dominion over Colleges, Halls, and all, is to be vested in three visitors, one a Catholic Archbishop or Bishop; secondly, a Protestant Archbishop or Bishop; and thirdly, a confidential Office Bearer, probably the moderator of the Presbyterian Church. This avowed scheme will always give two Protestant voices, among the visitors to one Catholic voice. If our venerable prelates omit this opportunity of insisting on fair play for the Catholics, or a due control over Catholic education, it is impossible but the consequences should be, to say the least, highly injurious to Catholicity."


II, C, 1

Letter from John of Tuam to Sir Robert Peel, June 14, 1845:

"With no regard, then, to those necessary fences with which the Bishops of Ireland are resolved to secure the faith and morals of the flocks confided to their care, you are determined to force through the Legislature your godless scheme of education... You tell the Catholics of Ireland to confide for the security of their faith in the impartiality of Her Majesty's Ministers! ! ! Disguise it as you may, your scheme of
academic instruction, coupled with your repudiation of the resolutions and memorial of the Bishops, is only a fresh attempt, to bribe Catholic youth into an abandonment of their religion."

"Letter of His Grace the Archbishop of Tuam to Sir Robert Peel", Tablet, VI, No. 268 (June 21, 1845), 391.

II, C, 2

Letter of John MacHale to Sir Robert Peel, June 27, 1845:

"Dear Sir, It is difficult to reconcile your professions of respect for the Roman Catholic hierarchy with the pertinacity with which you are pushing on your Godless Scheme of academic education in defiance of their solemn resolution. To every reflecting, and impartial mind it must seem evident that you are utterly indifferent to the opinions of that body or that you hope gradually to win over a passive and unresisting acquiescence in a scheme of infidel and demoralising nature of which they have unanimously recorded their emphatic condemnation.

"Whether you are swayed in your purpose to persevere by the first assumption, you alone are the most competent judge. But, if you entertain the hope of enforcing your pagan plan in despite of the resolutions of the Catholic Bishops, if some were for repeating the experiment, allow me respectfully to predict that you will experience a sad and humiliating disappointment. I am enabled authentically to tell you that not only have the prelates steadfastly clung to their recent resolution, but that they were unwilling to petition Parliament on the subject, lest they should again experience the repetition of the contemptuous indifference with which their appeal to the Executive had been treated.

"If with such a formidable opposition, backed, sustained, nay, encouraged outwardly by the zeal of enlightened clergy, and the piety of a devoted people, who never will endure the infidel project, you fancy that you can sap the foundations of the Catholic faith in the youth of Ireland by the establishment of a system so universally execrated, I must remind you that you have read history, and especially Irish history, in vain. In this brief letter I shall not dwell on the variety of convincing arguments that should persuade the most interpid and
stubborn statesman to cast away for ever all
thoughts of endeavouring to vitiate, by the
deletious application of infidel and inexorable
empires the hearts as well as the understandings
of a people, who, amidst the infidelity which now
threatens to overrun some of the nations of Europe,
stand in the same proud and enviable isolation from
its corruption as did their ancestors formerly,
when unreached by the calamities that convulsed
the entire continent.

"It is impossible for a Catholic prelate to touch
upon the sacred subject of academical education,
especially in college where the hollowed influence
of religion has been uniformly felt mingling with
all its exercises, and enlivening, holloring and
exalting those sciences which properly cultivated,
are but as its so many handmaids, bearing testimony
to its evidence, and doing homage to its dominion,
without being pained at the anticipation of a
possible divorce between sciences which the Author
of Truth has so intimately connected. It is not
for the clergy alone that religion has been ushered
into the world, no, it is for mankind; and never
does it appear with a more winning or attractive
grace then when the most excursive and eloquent
intellects, as well as the most simple and confined,
are seen, may felt, by a young and susceptible
auditory to be captives in that heavenly influence in
whose service alone is the most perfect freedom. Let
then the Catholic laity, as well as the Protestants
and Presbyterians, have their respective colleges, and
the sciences taught by their respective professors,
under the sanction of their respective pastors. You
will find this more servicable to religion, and far
more propitious to the public weal, then any attempt
to draw out to almost an infinite series that long
and dismal succession of charter school projects,
now of persecution and again of fraud, by which the
inhabitants of Ireland have been so long and so
cruelly worried, and of which the uniform failure
affords evidence that they never can succeed."

"I have the honour to be,
Your very obedient servant,
John, Archbishop of Tuam"

II, D

Letter of Smith O'Brien to Thomas Davis, June, 1845:

"It is quite true that the tone taken by John O'Connell has done infinite mischief, and upon this point I have not concealed my opinion from him. But I am not disposed, on that account to despond. The care which ought to be taken by the friends of mixed education with regard to the matter should not be less firm because we do not agree with the sentiments which he has put forward. We have declared that we would repudiate the Colleges Scheme unless it gave securities to religious men of all parties, that religion should not be excluded wholly from these institutions and unless public liberty should be protected from the corrupt influence of such extensive Government patronage. Whilst therefore no practical difference now arises between us and the separate educationalists, we are, in my opinion, bound to sustain them in their opposition on those grounds on which we have ourselves (whether wisely or not is not now, the question) proclaimed our opposition to the measure."

Prof. Dennis Gwynn, "O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill", JER. LIX, (January-June, 1918), 30.

II, E

Letter of Dr. Paul Cullen to Lord Clarendon, September, 1850:

"Sir, I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd inst in which you state you were directed by the Lord Lieutenant to inform me that the Queen has been pleased, by warrant under her sign manual to appoint me to be visitor of the Queen's College, Belfast. In reply, I will not trouble you with a long statement of the reasons that compel me to decline accepting the office in question. I will merely observe that I consider the principle on which the Queen's Colleges are founded most dangerous, and that the experiment of the countries cannot leave any insensible to the unhappy results that may be apprehended from similar systems. I must add that on looking over the superiors of the Belfast College I perceive that they are all, perhaps with one or two exception, members of the established church or Presbyterian body; so that the college may be considered a purely Protestant Institution."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
It does not appear to me desirable to induce any heterogeneous element into such a body. But there is a further reason which renders it imperative on me to follow the course I have adopted.

"The Pope, in his quality of supreme Pastor of the Church whose duty it is to lead the faithful to good pastures, and to drive them away from the poisonous ones, was consulted by all the Bishops of Ireland on the question, whether the education proposed to be given in the Queen's Colleges could be considered safe, and whether the Catholic youth of Ireland could frequent them, without endangering their religious morals, and the answer the Bishops received was, that these establishments were grievously and intrinsically dangerous and that no Catholic prelate was at liberty to take a part in carrying them into operation. The experience, the wisdom, the authority of the Holy See, leaves no alternative but to follow instructions.

"You will, therefore, allow me most respectfully to decline accepting the office which has been offered me, whilst I have the honour to be, with profoundest respect,

Your obedient servant

Paul Cullen

"Another denunciation of Queen's Colleges", Tablet, No. 20,660 (September 21, 1850), 8.
APPENDIX III

A

Memorial and Resolution of the Roman Catholic Bishops, May 21, 1845, on the Colleges Bill introduced May 10, 1845.

"At a meeting of the Prelates of Ireland, convened in the Presbytery House, Marlborough Street, 23rd May, 1845, His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray in the chair, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted. Moved by the Most Rev. Dr. Slattery; seconded by the Most Rev. Dr. MacHale; Resolved: "That having maturely considered the bill now pending before Parliament for the extension of academic education in Ireland, and giving credit to Her Majesty's Government for their kind and generous intentions manifested in the endowment of the College of Maynooth, we find ourselves compelled by a sense of duty to declare, that, anxious as we are to extend the advantages of education, we cannot give our approbation to the proposed system, as we deem it dangerous to the faith and morals of the Catholic pupils."

"Moved by the Most. Rev. Dr. Colly; seconded by the Right Rev. Dr. Ryan; Resolved; that therefore a respectful memorial, suggesting and soliciting such amendments in the said bill, as may be calculated to secure the faith and morals of the Students, be presented to his Excellence, the Lord Lieutenant, praying His Excellence to forward same to Her Majesty's Government, and support its prayer with the weight of his influence."

"To His Excellency Lord Haytesbury, Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland,

"The Memorial of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland humbly shewth - that Memorialists are disposed to co-operate on fair and reasonable terms, with Her Majesty's Government and the Legislature in establishing a system for the further extension of academical education in Ireland."
"That the circumstances of the present population of Ireland afford plain evidence that a large majority of the students belonging to the middle class will be Roman Catholic; and Memorialists as their spiritual pastors, consider it their indispensable duty to secure to the utmost of their power the most effectual means of protecting the faith and morals of the students in the new colleges, which are to be erected for their better education.

"That a fair proportion of the professors, and other office-bearers in the new Colleges, should be members of the Roman Catholic Church, whose moral conduct shall have been properly certified by testimonials of character, signed by their respective prelates. And that all the office-bearers in these Colleges shall be appointed by a board of trustees, of which the Roman Catholic prelates of the province in which any of those colleges should be erected, shall be members."

"That Roman Catholic pupils could not attend the lectures in history, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, geology, or anatomy, without exposing their faith and morals to imminent danger, unless a Roman Catholic professor will be appointed for each of these chairs.

"That if any president, vice president, professor, or office-bearer in any of the new colleges, shall be convicted before the Board of Trustees, of attempting to undermine the faith or injure the morals of any student in those institutions - he shall be immediately removed from his office by the same board.

"That as it is not contemplated that the students shall be provided with lodging in the new colleges, there shall be a Roman Catholic chaplain to superintend the moral and religious instruction of the Roman Catholic students belonging to each of those colleges; that the appointment of each chaplain, with a suitable salary, shall be made on the recommendation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese in which the college is situated, and that the same prelate shall have full power and authority to remove such Roman Catholic Chaplain from his situation."

Signed on behalf of the meeting,
D. Murray, Chairman

"Meeting of the Catholic Bishops", Nation III, No. 138 (May 31
First Papal Rescript, October, 1847, from Pope Pius IX to the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland.

"We wish first of all to declare that it was never the belief of the Sacred Congregation that the bishops who seemed to favour the establishment of the Colleges proposed to do what they believed to be not entirely right; for their integrity has been proved by long experience and it is clear that their decision was prompted solely by the hope of effecting greater good and prompting the cause of religion in Ireland. Nevertheless, Sacred Congregation, having considered the matter maturely and in all its bearings, does not dare to hope for such results from the foundation of the Colleges; on the contrary, it fears that grave danger to the Catholic Faith may hence arise; in short, it believes that such institutions would be harmful to religion.

"It therefore admonishes the Archbishop and Bishops of Ireland to take no part in them. Indeed, it would have wished that those of the Bishops who approached the Government with a view of obtaining some modification of the law concerning those Colleges... should first have sought the opinion of the Holy See, and it has no doubt that these same bishops... will retract everything they may have done contrary to this wish. Nevertheless, if any of your body have anything of great moment to represent, they may freely approach the Sacred Congregation, that the whole issue may be fairly weighed."

"The Pope and the Infidel Colleges, Ireland", The Times, No. 19,690 (October 26, 1847), 5.

Second Papal Rescript, October, 1848, from Pope Pius IX to the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland.

"Most illustrious and Rev. Lord, Some extracts from the statutes which are compiled for the new colleges in Ireland, as well as the suffrage
given by the bishop regarding them, have afforded the Sacred Congregation of again thoroughly treating of the aforesaid colleges, chiefly under that respect, and of weighting diligently and maturely whatever it should deem its duty to answer regarding the spiritual interests of the Catholic people of Ireland. For though the aforesaid statutes are in such form, that it is difficult to judge what may be their authority considering the constitution of the English realm; still all things maturely weighed, the Sacred Congregation could not be induced, on account of the previous and intrinsic dangers of the same colleges, to mitigate the decision passed on them and with the authority of Most Holy Lord, promulgated to the four metropolitans on the 9th of October, last year.

"But since it is manifest with what zeal the clergy and the entire people labour for those things which have for object to promote the good of the church, the most eminent father judged that the erection of a Catholic University should not be despaired of; nay, they have again and again recommended a project of this sort, in order that all may lead their best endeavours towards its execution, and that thus sufficient provisions be made for giving the Catholics more ample instruction without their religion suffering danger from that source.

"This decision of the Sacred Congregation, our most holy Lord having, with all maturity and prudence, strictly examined, he resolved to sanction and ratify it with all the weight of his authority, and signified his wish that it should be sent to the four Archbishops respectively, by them to be communicated to their suffragans.

"But whilst I preform this duty, I ought also to signify that it is the peculiar desire of the Sacred Congregation, nay, also of our most holy Lord, that sacerdotal concord be preserved, and that you have at heart to cultivate this unity of spirit which the Sacred Gospels attest to have been very recommended by Christ our Lord
to his Apostles, and since I am addressing prelates who are well versed in this history of the Church and the excellent admonitions of the Holy Father, I deem it indeed superfluous to quote them, or to mention what benefits the union of bishops conferred on the Church, and what evils, on the other hand, have flowed from their disunions; and whereas you are all unanimously wishing anxiously for this union, it will not be amiss to remind you to choose and carefully to apply the most reasonable means towards securing it. These are pre-eminent in the sacred canons and in the other rules of ecclesiastical discipline, which if you will faithfully follow in your ministry, and if in your doubts you will apply to the Holy See, in order that through it you may know what is to be done, the aforesaid union will become more and more firm and lasting. Amongst other things the Sacred Congregation deemed it right to remind you, with the sanction of our Most Holy Lord, that sacerdotal meetings, shall henceforward be held in due order, and according to the paths chalked out by the canons and liturgical books; other-wise difference of opinion will daily increase, and from meetings of this kind, which may rather wear a secular than a religious appearance, no good will result toward regulating ecclesiastical discipline, to which alone they should be subservient; and therefore it will be most useful to transmit the acts of the synods to the Apostolic See, as also to write at certain times concerning the state of your church, as has been ordained, in order that you may receive from hence reasonable answers.

"But those things are significant to you, not that any doubts arise regarding your submission to the Apostolic See, since it has been proved to the whole world how fervent and constant it is, and a fresh testimony has been borne to it by your letters, written on the aforesaid subject of the colleges; but that by those manifestations it may again be actually proved. And when reference on the more weighty concern is accurately made to that church, from whence sacerdotal union is derived, the same unity will by this means the more easily abide among yourselves."

"In the meantime, I pray God long to preserve your Grace in Health,"

Your Grace's most obedient, etc.
J. Ph. Fransoni, Prefect
Alexander Barnaba, Secretary
To his Grace the Most Illustrious and Rev. 
John MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam.

"The Godless Colleges—the Rescript, Ireland", The Times No. 20,005 
(October 27, 1843), 4 f.

III, B, 3

Third Papal Rescript, April, 1850, from Pope Pius IX to the Roman 
Catholic Archbishops of Ireland:

"(1) No bishop of Ireland can assume to himself 
any part in carrying on or administering the 
Queen's Colleges.
(2) All priests and other clerics are prohibited 
from taking any part or retaining any office 
which relates to the administration of these 
Colleges; and forbidden that any be made Professor 
or Dean of Residence.
(3) In order at length to provide for the sound 
education of Catholic youth, and to follow up the 
reiterated recommendations given to us by the 
Apostolic See, we consider it our duty to strive, 
with all our might, to cause by our common counsels 
to be erected as soon as possible a Catholic Univer­ 
sity of Ireland.
(4) You know that a trueless war is being waged 
between light and darkness, truth and error, vice 
and virtue...we encourage (the Bishops) to unite in 
word and work. Let them exhort Ecclesiastics 
especially to be earnest in prayer, fervent in 
spirit, and edifying in holiness of life, that, 
united amongst themselves by the strict tie of 
charity, they cloth themselves with Divine Armour 
and march to combat, as it were, with a single 
heart and a single soul, joining in common all 
their forces, and under the conduct of their 
Bishops, raising night and day the Priestly voice, 
preaching with ardour to the Christian people the 
Law of God and the Ordinances of the Church. Let 
them urge ecclesiastics to expose to their people 
the fallacies, and deceit of wicked men, and to 
show all evils flow from sin."

"The Return of the Pope" Tablet, XI No. 524 (April 27, 1850) 270
(1) As in the Roman Pontiff we recognise and venerate the Vicar of Christ on Earth and the successor of St. Peter to whom is committed by Heaven the office of instructing the faithful in the best doctrine, and of removing them from pestilent and poisonous pastures; we, with a willing mind and fitting obedience, do assent to the admonitions and Rescripts which relate to the question concerning the Queen's Colleges, lately erected amongst us, and which Rescripts, furnish with the authority of the Vicar of Christ himself, have been communicated to us by Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda.

(2) Adhering not only to the letter, but to the spirit of these Rescripts we declare that no Bishop of Ireland can assume to himself any part in carrying on or administering the aforesaid colleges.

(3) We prohibit all Priests and other Clerics from taking any part or retaining any office which relates to the administration of these colleges; and forbid that any Professors or Deans of Residence be made or remain in them.

(4) But if any Priest or Cleric shall have arrived at such a pitch of Ferment, thus despising the authority of the Apostolic See, or the Statutes of this National Council, to dare to act otherwise, let him incur suspension ipse facto.

(5) Moreover, concerning the aforesaid colleges, because of the grave and intrinsic danger to which, by the judgment of the Holy See, and the Faith and Morals of studious Catholic youth are exposed in them, we declare that they are such that by all means they are to be avoided and rejected by faithful Catholics, who ought to prefer their Faith to all temporal advantages and emoluments.

(6) But that the faithful people committed to our care, of whose Faith and eternal salvation a strict account is to be rendered by us to Almighty God, may suffer no detriment by our silence, we shall in a Pastoral Letter, to be published in the name of the Synod, indicate the grave and intrinsic danger mentioned by the Holy See, to which Catholic youth are exposed in these Colleges, and we shall admonish and exhort all the Faithful with weighty and charitable words that they wholly abstain from
frequenting these colleges, lest their Faith contact some strain, or they be infected with some pestiferous doctrine.

(7) Let the Bishops of the places where the Colleges are situated diligently take heed that these Statutes be kept by all Priests and that fitting veneration be shown by them to the mandates of the Apostolic See, and obedience and veneration to the Statute of this Council.

(8) In order at length to provide for the sound education of Catholic youth, and to follow up the reiterated recommendations given to us by the Apostolic See, we consider it our duty to strive, with all our might, to cause by our common counsels to be erected as soon as possible a Catholic University of Ireland.

"The Queen's Colleges", Tablet, XIII, No. 612 (January 2, 1852), 6.
APPENDIX IV

Dublin Review of December, 1851, commenting on the Catholic University:

"Education is felt by men of all religions and political parties to be the great question of the day, which is to determine not merely the well-being, but the very existence of society in the next generation. And among all these parties, too, there is felt a great zeal, an earnest desire to improve and extend education. And yet equal to the importance of the question it felt to be its difficulty. Why is it that with the best will in the world, no scheme of education can be contrived by one sect of Protestants which will satisfy even another sect of the same Protestants? ... Human dignity cannot devise a plan which shall satisfy at once churchmen and dissenters; and the notable scheme of the state, giving a merely secular education, and banishing religion into the background is but "a desperate attempt to find a way out of the woods, by sacrificing the intractable element altogether."

In summary of the discussion of Roman Catholic opposition to the education system offered by the Government the Review pointed out in the same article:

"It is well to keep in mind that the Catholics did not oppose the inclusion of science in education but rather the exclusion of religion which they considered the heart of any education system. It is not that the physical science cannot be made an effective instrument in disciplining the mind; it is not that they are not full of value in themselves, replete with sources of interest for the intellect, as well as contributions to the material wealth. It is not therefore, in teaching these, and in applying them carefully to the industrial arts, that this new system is objectionable. The order, and beauty, and the harmony of the universe as God's work, are richly exhibited in them, and worthy of man's study; their use is obvious and their cultivation most desirable. The sin lies in ignoring their relation to a higher knowledge; in excluding the cultivation of the spirit which should inform them from being the basis of education. This system had infidelity for its first
principle, because, while giving the public an authorized instruction, in languages, sciences, arts and literature, it leaves religion and morality to be dealt with privately, an open question, on which men may innocently differ. A teaching body, therefore so constructed has no soul. In religion it is neutral, in all else positive. By the law of its being it preaches indifference to all its scholars in spiritual truth. Its professors as individual men, have their private belief, and are Jews, Protestants, Infidels, or Catholics, as the case may be but as Professors, they simply ignore spiritual truth. In treating their specific subject, whether language, history, abstract or experimental science, they are to exclude the divine and moral elements; instead of reducing all arts to theology which is the Christian scheme of education, they are to banish theology from all arts. No particle of matter, nothing within the bounds of time and space is unworthy of their inquiry save the point contested by modern thinkers, God and His dealings with man... 

"As all training of the moral and spiritual being is here discarded for the simple reason that the teaching body is at issue about what that training should be, it results that instruction takes the place of education. However elaborate and complete this may be, it still leaves the greatest work of all undone. Again, the fine influence of religion, as well as its direct teaching are cut off.

"Mixed education is accordingly a surrender to heresy, schism, and self-will, of the whole nature of man which is above and beyond this knowledge; and abnegation of the highest end of our being... 

"Catholic education, on the other hand, for which we hail the institution of a Catholic University is the realization before all, and above all, of that highest end. But this secure, it proceeds to group around it the various sciences, accomplishments, and arts of social life. First of all, indeed, it deals with that which is immortal, universal and most precious in man; that free will after which he is made to the image and likeness of God; but while preserving throughout a due superiority to the enlightenment, strengthening and direction of this, it fosters every branch of knowledge according to its intrinsic value and merit. And Catholicism has, in its firm possession of truth, and by its faith in the unity of the divine will an operation, an assurance that no science either now exists, or can possibly arise, which rightly and fully understood, shall be at variance with that knowledge which it imparts to guide the moral nature.
It starts them from the principle of faith, well knowing that it clears and strengthens all powers of the intellect, and above all that it imparts to the will an indomitable energy and a calm courage, which are the best part of genius itself, and are necessary not only to win success in every path of our mortal life, but a place in the higher creation of God hereafter. Truth is the center of its circle, but the circumference embraces all human arts and sciences...  

"The aims of a Catholic University will be: first, Go and make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. Second, the establishment of Catholic studies in their former range, which must include all existing knowledge and science—whatever is the need of the age must not be neglected. Thirdly, the objects to be kept in view are manifold; we need to meet and overcome infidelity on what it fancies to be its own ground; we need to rescue the physical and the intellectual sciences from its sway; we need to set forth once more a higher standard in the world than mere material progress; fourthly, as a condition of success we must name a perfect unity of thought and purpose in the teaching body. Mixed education makes this impossible... When all the members of that body have but one thought and one action, to inspire into the minds of youths, with the love of knowledge, that of virtue and religion, may one not expect with some confidence, happy results?...

"And it is because we see one man singularly qualified for so great a task, because we see in one, and perhaps in one alone, the conjunction of a name which has attained to European celebrity, a genius embracing the most opposite qualities, a widely extended learning, and a will most admirably tempered, that we hail with the utmost joy and satisfaction the appointment of Dr. Newman to be the Rector of the Catholic University. It is a pledge for ultimately effecting all that we could desire, such perhaps, as none other could give. The principle work of the Church during the latter half of the nineteenth century is the restoration of Catholic schools and the indispensable basis is the Catholic faith itself, maintained and inculcated as the primary law of existence."

Allies, "Address of the Irish Bishops on the Catholic University", D.R., XXXI, No. 62 (December, 1851) 554-6 passim.
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