



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. VII.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1857.

No. 40.

CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER'S FOURTH AND CONCLUDING LECTURE

ON CRIME AND EDUCATION. This discourse brought to a close this interesting and important series.

To say that it surpassed His Eminence's ordinary standard, would be—unless he himself were the person achieving that triumph—a bold figure of speech; but so it seemed to us, and we could not but feel, most forcibly, how brilliant is the lustre shed upon the Church in this country by the surpassing powers of his master-mind.

Great as he is in everything, his greatness is as unreservedly placed at the disposal of all; and there can be few, we imagine, who do not joyfully avail themselves of every opportunity of knowing the speculations, the reflections, and the conclusions of so profound and cultivated an intelligence.

If we dwell, here, upon his marvellous powers it is because we are painfully conscious of the utter impossibility of conveying to our readers any adequate notion of the flow of ideas, beauty of language, and impressiveness of delivery, which the speaker brought to bear upon his subject.

As His Eminence announced at the termination of the last sermon, his text was from Ecclesiastes, and whereas he had before chosen to expatiate upon the fear of the Lord as the beginning of wisdom, he now desired to exhibit how the fear of the Lord was to be the beginning of Love.

If, therefore, said he, this fear of the Lord is at once the beginning of these two sciences—of Divine wisdom and Divine love—we may justly conclude that the two form in fact but one single volume: that the study of wisdom properly so called, according to human acceptance, imparts to us in its widest range the knowledge of the love of God for us, and of that we should bear to Him.

In fact, if we look at science as the world describes it, but with the eye of faith, in all its particulars of color, form, order in which it invites us to study it, what do we find but this element of love which originates, regulates, sustains and gives life to all things.

What are the laws which govern the spheres but those springing from that love which we learn even in secular science to call a harmony; which even in ancient astronomy is compared to a harp whose measured strings produce a successive and unbroken flow of eloquent though silent music. What is more akin to love, than harmony?—harmony of intelligence, harmony of order, harmony of action, all combining to form one mighty and magnificent plan.

We gaze upon the heavenly bodies, launched into space, they seem to be, as it were, swinging loosely in its boundless realms, and yet we know they are maintained in their several orbits, inevitably fulfilling their appointed path, and are in reality swayed to and fro by what we term the powers of attraction and repulsion, as if each brought from more distant spheres, and sought to communicate to each neighbor that approached it, the mighty tale of the Almighty power and incomprehensible love which overrules them all.

The Heavens declare the glory of God, and the orbs of the firmament sing of His love, crying out, one to another, as they roll on in majestic and undisturbed serenity. And who cannot see that this wisdom so serene, and yet so soft, so inflexible, and yet so mild, must be guided by the hand of love, as well as of strength.

But, leaving the starry heavens, and descending to the sphere which we inhabit, do we not find the same spirit of order, and that the earth, our fruitful mother, teems with fecundity on every side, producing with equal perfection the most insignificant blade of grass, the homeliest fruit tree and the proudest cedar of Libanus? Even as an infant depending on its mother for the sustenance she supplies to it, and with which it imbibes the affection and attachment which makes it cling to her, as by a natural instinct; so it is with all beings on the earth; the herdsman tending his cattle, the shepherd leading his flock, experience in a greater or less degree, a mutual recognition. Even in the domestic animals which we feed and caress is love developed towards us, and towards one another, down to the lowest order of creation; and we know what it is in ourselves. What, then, is Love? That close and endearing cement which binds together elements in the lesser circle of the family; parent and child, husband and wife, brother and sister: beyond this, extending to the ties of duty, citizenship, and nationality; shaping all the different masses into states of social concord, and going on to other great unions which form kingdoms and empires.

The principle which gives it birth begins in heaven, descends to earth, and rises again to man, an unseen current of unity flowing through it; but it wants one more link to complete the circle; it must rise again from the intellect and the heart of man, to Him in whom all is centred, and make us feel how entirely the whole of nature

centres in religion and through our own understanding and reason must return and find its principle in God.

Such principles I wish to place before you this evening. I have spoken to you of Crime, and I have spoken of Education. On the latter subject I dwelt more particularly, to show that, however deeply it may be studied, and however widely its operations may be diffused, it is nothing worth without this principle, which constitutes the whole science of God. It must begin in fear; it must convey the knowledge and assurance of the power, might, and grandeur stamped upon His works, but it must lead to the love of God by a contemplation of His beneficence to man in creation. On this, all we do for training the habit of the youthful mind must be first and principally based.

You will, I am sure, my dear brethren, give me credit for not intending to suppose that the mere abstract principle of the duty of loving God is the most prevalent in the system of education I would recommend; that the youthful mind should be constantly turned to this as a dry and abstract idea; but what I want to show is that there are several great difficulties in the present system of education which can only be remedied by instilling the principle of love; and it will form the only basis of true, sound, and, I will add, practical education. It is, then, the consequences of this high and noble sentiment, this holiest and purest feeling, that I have principally to deal with and trace to its source; and the principle most important to infuse into education, one which can scarce be too strongly inculcated, but on which we seem to be gradually turning our backs, is contentment. This forms a beginning whence to start, an object which we must endeavor to keep constantly before us. You will remember, from the first I have said, all education is to be considered prospective. True education consists in putting the child, the youth, in that state in which he is afterwards to be; in accustoming him to trace, under the guidance of a skilful eye and an experienced hand, though with faltering and infantine steps, in the same path in which he is to continue to walk during the rest of his life.

Contentment signifies being at peace with all that externally surrounds us—being satisfied with all in the midst of which we move.

Discontentment signifies being in jar and dissonance with the situation, events, and circumstances in which we happen actually to be.

A discontented person is one who does not live happily in his present state; who is always impatient and restless, unquiet and unsettled, always fixing his mind upon some standard in his imagination by which he measures everything, constantly fancying he would be better elsewhere, and that he would attain this desired goal at some future time. The present is to him unsatisfactory, since he is always looking for a change which will, perhaps, never come—always longing after something that is not.

It is clear that a feeling like this is one of irritation. He is become the centre of his own thoughts, and cares not for the pleasure or pain of others, but only for himself.

My brethren, I would ask you if any system of education based on the principle that would produce this—for there can be no question but that acting from motives of self-interest must result in discontent—I would ask you, I say, if such a system can be sound. If not, then, the question is, is there no reason to believe we are educating on a principle which leads to this evil?

I do not ask you, now, whether or not we are over-educating our children; I do not enter now into the consideration of scientific or moral instruction, or how far it may be necessary to initiate children in the mysteries of logic, profound grammar, and many other sciences and points of study which I need not enumerate: this is not the question. But I do ask you, does the basis of the education you are supplying consist in giving children that training and instruction necessary for the state in which they are? or, if not, are you not preparing them for a higher position than they hold? Is not the popular idea that education should raise them from the state in which they are to a higher? will raise the child, intended for a workman, to a foreman, from a foreman to a manager, from a manager to a partner, from a partner to a rich master and commander of men?

Do we not find that the education which raises the poor above their natural state is not such as really to qualify them for a position above that, but only to make them feel a capacity for something different, to the subversion of all things?

Thus, the child must draw, the child must sing, he must be able to travel, theoretically, over the globe, and know the longitude and latitude of every little island in the ocean—he must know the name and position of every star; but still he is a mere pauper, with no immediate prospect from his present circumstances of any amelioration in his position, which shall rescue him from toiling and labouring by the sweat of his brow to

gain his daily bread. I ask you what constitutes the organization of society? It is as rigidly circumscribed by fixed laws as any other part of the system instituted by God, and governed by his providence.

There never was any social community sanctioned by the world in which there was not distinction of ranks. One unfortunately lower than the rest, and then each rising above the other until we reach that higher than all. I speak not of the moral, but of the social scale. This gradation follows a law as certain as that which regulates the system of hydrostatics, and flows on from generation to generation, from age to age.—Changes may take place, but distinctions of classes will always exist. That which is light, and buoyant, and sparkling, and full of life and spirit, and on the surface to-day will be that which sinks gradually, perhaps slowly at first, but it sinks and sinks till it comes to stagnate in the very dregs. We may stir it up with all our might and mingle it into one indistinguishable mass;—but the law of gravitation will prevail in the moral state, and in a short while we shall see it as bright, and smooth, and joyous on its surface, and as dead, and turbid, and stagnant in the bed in which it flows as at first.

There have been attempts to overturn this order. Revolutions, like mountain torrents, have not only agitated their waters, but have broken from their banks, charging themselves with all that is impure in the country, surrounding for a time everything with the agitation of boiling whirlpools, dangerous eddies, sweeping waterfalls and foaming cataracts dashing themselves over rocks; but, look forward, this has never lasted a single generation. Notwithstanding the boast that all are now equal, that the distinctions of high and low have disappeared, we shall find that time will bring back all things to the same level which existed for ages before.

The bold, the enterprising, the persevering, perhaps the wicked, will rise; while the dull, the unenergetic, the tame, will fall and disappear, and society will continue to present the same form it has always held. The various elements which compose it will continue to contend there; learned and ignorant, wise and fools, active and idle, will divide and diversify it as before; and no amount of change you can make in the position of the mass of the people will eventually to any extent destroy this inequality of conditions. If it should, the consequence must be confusion. It is difficult to say whether any effort we could make would diminish the number of the most poor or the most laborious; of those, in short, who have to bear the burden in this world.

Where there are rich classes they will require servants—persons to do menial duties, to toil almost as the beasts of the field; a due proportion, therefore, of the population must be reserved for these occupations, as advantageous, after all, to themselves as they are to those who require them. If, therefore, we teach the poor to direct their thoughts to rising above their appointed work, it can only be (and if we are honest we ought to tell them so) at the expenses of the class which God has placed in the position from which they must drive them. This is a law we cannot controvert and cannot overturn.

Now, this being the case, my brethren, let me ask—Is it a right principle of education to prepare those we bring up for a state they have no chance of attaining? Is it not founding on a basis which ought rather to be deprecated? Is it not inoculating them in youth with dissatisfaction at the position they are occupying, and must hereafter be content to occupy? It is true a great number do rise, and of these many have even attained the highest position. This has always been so, and in our own time especially, more than ever. But what is the result? You will go into the city; you will find men in a large way of business who began life in a poor school, and by laudable industry, activity, and economy have attained to the highest pitch of fortune. Again, the manufacturer, the owners of landed property, have fought their way bravely and laboriously from the ranks of the poor. Honor be to them; they deserve all praise; as long as they have been faithful, honest, incorruptible, there is hardly a higher or more honorable position in this world.

But is this one man, who sees himself master of a large factory, continuing and even increasing his prosperity, to be an example which all are to expect to follow? He has in his employ 500 or perhaps 1000 hands; who are they? His school-fellows, perhaps, or the children of his fellow paupers. Out of the 500 in that school, he alone has advanced in worldly prosperity. Is it fair to direct the education of 500 children that one, or it might be two, or even ten children, may attain an elevated position? Surely it is as false to educate on this principle as to teach things contrary to the established laws of nature.

What, then, I contend for is, that education must take the ordinary rule of life as its basis; that is, it must anticipate that children will remain in the condition in which they are placed, unless God should please otherwise. They must

be instructed in that kind of knowledge which is good and useful for their condition; but it is perfect folly to reckon upon a state which will never be attained by above one out of a thousand.

I know what some will say: "Do you, then, wish to repress the honest ambition of the poor, and condemn them to remain poor and abject all their lives?"

Brethren, I do not like these combinations of terms; I am very suspicious of such expressions, and when I hear people talk of the "honest ambition" of the poor, I cannot but think it is akin to the "honorable pride" and the "genteel vices" of the rich; I say, get rid of the substantives; let us be content with the adjectives. What has honor to do with pride? Let him be honorable in pecuniary transactions, honorable in his dealings with other men, and in his intercourse with the whole world, and his honor will not be lowered by not being combined with pride; let him be tender towards all, compassionate, affable, gentle—for this, after all, is the true meaning of the word. When I see a man thus eminent, I look upon him as more truly noble than he can ever be by the most remote possibility of any connexion with vice. So will the poor, and and their "honest ambition." Let them be honest without the ambition, let them show respect to their superiors, kindness to their companions, condescension to their inferiors when they rise; let them be honest in their dealings with the world, and with God, aye honest with God; giving to Him His due as to man, and they will rise infinitely higher than by honesty, fledged with the wings of ambition.

Honesty is a virtue, ambition a vice. What can they have in common? Repress ambition, but promote honesty to the fullest extent the term will admit.

I will ask, how is contentment, as a fundamental principle of education, to be communicated? The answer is plain, it is a purely Christian feeling.

In the heathen world there existed no class corresponding to the honest, hard working, poor of our own times.

There was no gradation between the slave whose only motive to labour was the lash, and the nobles who possessed all, and well knew how to employ the indigent class and kept it under either by the sword, as in Rome, or in subjection by the passing of mere edicts, and even in the old Testament it is clear there was a check purposely to prevent classes from passing from one into the other. They were maintained in tribes, families, by allotments of inheritance. If they gained any advantage over one another by superior skill or otherwise, and so became rich, yet when the year of Jubilee came, the property was redistributed and restored to its original owner, and thus equality was kept up. There could be no priest or servant of a priest except of the family of Aaron or the tribe of Levi. The tribes settled over Jordan, were of necessity a pastoral race, and it was their duty to keep watch against the invasion of marauders. Those on the sea coast enjoyed the commerce of Tyre; those in Judea were to be the warriors, the learned men, the chiefs of the nation; thus it was impossible for any one to change his position or aspire to one greatly higher; but while in the new law, scope is given to assiduity, unlimited development is allowed to industry, while men may change their position, provided they are guided by honorable and noble feelings; part of the principle is that we be satisfied with what may befall us even in this world.

St. Paul lays down the principle of contentment as one of Christian importance, which has existed nowhere else, and is easy to trace to its source. Our Blessed Redeemer, when He preached the Gospel, did what no other sage had ever done before Him: He praised poverty, gave it hopes never entertained before, and elevated it to a position, not only higher than wealth but higher than wisdom—He made the condition of the poor no longer despicable, but, on the contrary, honourable. He even sanctified it and made it a source of happiness. The poor man may be content, the sick may be happy; he may smile in the midst of his sorrow and affliction, for he knows he is more beloved of God, and feeling (which leads us to the principle) that whatever may be his state it is bestowed on him and made his place by One infinitely wise and good; he knows that had such been His purpose He might have made him a king or a great one of the earth—that there was no blunder, no accident, but that his position was the choice of unfathomable love. God rules all things, and poor and suffering as he may be, God has decreed all that befalls him; and though permitted to emancipate himself and ascend above his position, for God has not forbidden this, yet he can remain where he is with perfect content.

He is taught that thus he is more like God, more like His Blessed Mother, to whom Herself poverty was allotted.

It has besides been instilled, again and again, into his mind that life is short, that it is not the

life he is truly to live, that a few brief years will make him all straight. God has his own laws, and however incomprehensible to us they are perfectly consistent and harmonious. While one possesses a magnificent palace, another dwells in a hut—one inhabits a luxurious apartment, another is lodged in the ward of a poorhouse—one is fed at a sumptuous table, another is pining with hunger: the difference is only between the two bodies—between the soul of the richest nobleman and that of the last of paupers there is no difference in the eye of God.

Yet even these bodies are organised with equal care and precision; relatively to external things they are different; but in the sight of God between the body and the soul of the one and of the other there is no distinction, and when laid in the grave there is something more besides the two festering bodies—there are two immortal souls to stand before the throne of God—two souls not to be judged by the purple and fine linen of the one and the rags of the other, but by the use the rich man has made of his wealth, and the patience with which the poor man has sustained the lot of poverty which God has made his.

All this is instilled in our schools, where children are taught to love as well as fear—that worldly prosperity and adversity are sent in perfectly equal kindness—and that in both is to be traced ought but goodness and mercy in exuberant co-operation—ought but the eye, and hand, and purpose of a loving God; and if the child whose lot may be poverty; or the young man pursued by disappointment, or the strong man crushed by the world, yet raises his thoughts to God, he is happy here, and he will be happy hereafter in the kingdom of His love.

We should train them in the love of God as dispenser of all, without flattering their too early opening pride with the idea that they can be something better here: think you they will toil less diligently when you have taught them that awaits them an eternal reward for their submission and patience? We have taught them the motive: pure love will produce the result.

Another consequence of the love of God is what I will call respect. It is closely allied to what I have already described, that it cannot fail to strike us all, that from some cause or other a principal which was once strong has now become weak—I mean respect to others, and especially the respect of the lower for the higher classes of society. It has been noticed, not only in England but in many foreign countries, and perhaps more particularly as regards the natural reverence due from children to their father and mother, which is sensibly diminished. At an earlier age we may observe an impatience of control, a feeling of independence, an assertion of rights which neither nature nor society have given: an intolerance of reproach, a wrestling against the yoke, a rebelling against authority, a desire to be in possession of all the rights of men.

The disrespect to parents is manifested in the manner in which they are spoken of, in the way in which children are popularly represented, in the scenes we are often obliged to witness, in our annals of crime, exhibiting so many youthful delinquents; the father and mother not unfrequently compelled to bring them to justice themselves, and weeping that they have no influence to check the vices of their children. And how, indeed, should they, when so little deference is accorded by the young to the opinions of persons who, from their age and experience, might be expected to command attention? Instead of this, what do we hear? Blunt contradictions, positive assertions, a knowledge of science assumed, opinions laid down on every subject—on politics, on religion—yes, unfortunately, on religion.

And how do they speak of it? With sarcasms, with doubts; indeed, they boast rather of not believing too much. And these qualities declare themselves too often at an age when it was formerly supposed that docility was the very flower of youth—that gentle and amiable submission to parental teaching was its highest ornament—when instruction was gradually and unresistingly sucked in under the mild influence of home—not overwhelmed by the heavy shower which inundates the soil, but watered by the dew of a whole day falling in soft and gentle drops.

We cannot deny that want of reverence is the vice of the age, and that this evil is rising higher and higher.

There is too little deference paid to those God has appointed to teach. It is the feeling of the divine character of social teaching that raises it above all that the knowledge and wisdom of human science can give; and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in him who holds that high and responsible office gives to him a sacred authority. The indwelling of grace imparts a direct guidance in what belongs to the priestly office, which calls for veneration and deep love.

Now, brethren, I must permit myself to make one remark: it cannot be doubted that our sys-