



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. II.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 1852.

NO. 46.

THE IDEAS OF A CATHOLIC AS TO WHAT SHOULD BE DONE.

Translated from the French of Abbé Martinet, for the True Witness.

(Continued from our last.)

14.—MOTIVES FOR HONORING THE MISSIONARIES AND INTERESTING THE PUBLIC IN THEIR LABORS.—JUST REPROACH ADDRESSED TO US ON THIS SUBJECT.

Catholics, when we claim for our missionaries a share in the national, in the European glory, it is not for the interest of those admirable men that we advance the claim—of what importance to them are eulogiums which they never hear, and which they rejoice in not hearing, because their modesty would consider them undeserved. They would not be what they are,—the perfect images of Him who is meek and humble of heart, if they said not in the midst of success, "Pardon, Lord, our inefficiency, for we are but idle and useless servants."

By irradiating with the halo of glory our missionaries and their labors, it is ourselves that we shall honor, it is our country, our religion that we shall glorify, and, at the same time, snatch millions of our fellow-creatures from the yoke of a fearful barbarism.

There are many who complain of the limited views of governments, and the trifling good which they effect with the immense means at their disposal.—But if governments are little in their acts, is it not because they have to govern men who are enamored of little things? Are not their attempts to depart from the old beaten track perpetually baffled, and nullified by the ignoble squabbles of factions? Instead of insulting and exasperating them by unjust censures, let us help them to undertake great things, by forming, enlightening, and elevating public opinion, which is the true regulator of affairs.

Let us display before the eyes of ardent, generous youth, a career the noblest, the most expansive, and the most sublime which can open to mortal eye. Let us offer a magnificent field to a multitude of ambitious youths, who jostle each other for want of space, and who plot the destruction of what others have done, because they are tormented by a wish to do something. We shall save our country while saving the world.

Let us incessantly repeat to our rich men who, even at the moment when the angel of death extends his arm over them, are still buried in luxury, or employing their treasures only to enlarge them by guilty speculations; let us remind these voluptuous and earthly souls that there is a pleasure which surpasses all others, and a speculation which leads to real wealth: to do good,—to gain men over to God and to civilisation. Let us confound beforehand the infamous efforts of those iron hearts, who grudge the little morsel of bread which we give to our missionaries, the cloth wherewith we cover their limbs and those of our spiritual children. If ever so vile a thought should make itself heard, let our fellow-citizens do themselves the honor of treating it with the disgrace which it deserves or with the silence of contempt.

Men of the nineteenth century, what were we all, on our mothers' knees, forty years ago? Children devoted body and soul to arms. Each of us said, as we heard that a parent had fallen on the field of honor: I, too, when I become a man, shall live and die a soldier. Whence came that military fever which agitated all classes of society? The man, who then imposed silence on all Europe, sat in his tent at the close of a great battle, and dictated some words; those words resounded every where, from the pulpit to the domestic hearth.

And we, also, have bulletins from our grand army; why is it that we read them in the privacy of our closets? We, too, have royal and ducal crowns as the rewards of valor; why do not Christian parents hold them forth to the gaze of their children, telling them from time to time: "Happy children, you may still aspire to those crowns; for ourselves, we can only hope to be the parents of apostles and martyrs. Has history any one thing more beautiful—more noble than that saying of a mother of four score years when she heard of the martyrdom of her only son:—"God be praised! I am now delivered from the fear of seeing him yield to the temptation of suffering."

Christians of Europe, let us prove that we are not so degenerate, that our hearts have ceased to throb for great things. Let us console, let us elevate, by the display of sublime devotion, a world which is perishing beneath the overpowering waves of corruption. To the miserable intrigues of parties who prey upon society—the infamous schemes of egotism and cupidity, which are its disgrace, let us give, as a counterpoise, those deeds of heroism which may cover before God and man the shame of our country and our kind. Each day the press makes us hideous revelations, as though the public scandals were not

grievous enough. Let us, therefore, give all possible publicity to prodigies of virtue, too long unnoticed. Let the press, the pencil, and the chisel, re-produce the lives of our heroes, their combats, their triumphs, their venerable portraits. Let us every where present them to the public, and especially to the young. Let us preserve, to that interesting class which is our country's future, the faith which saves communities, faith in deeds of virtue.

Let us not merit the reproach addressed to us, some two years ago, by a journal whose doctrines are not ours, but which, nevertheless, often praises and commends what we ourselves do not praise or applaud as we should.

"We have thrown out some ideas," said the *Democrat Pacific*, in December 1844, "on the barbarous condition of the unhappy islanders of Futuna and Arofi. Father Chanel—a missionary belonging to the Society of Mary, has since grappled with their evil genius, being only assisted by his catechist, brother Nizier.

"Does one of our soldiers fall while warring, not even against Infidels, but against our Christian and civilised brethren, the word passes gloriously from mouth to mouth—'he died on the field of honor!' Does one of our officers fall while leading his men to murder, to pillage, to burn and destroy, whether on the battle-field or in the captured city, his name is forthwith proclaimed illustrious. The entire army celebrates his obsequies, his country hails his memory with respect, the father holds him out as an example for his son, and even the mother fails not to testify her admiration of him who dies sword in hand. And this is no more than justice, for the life of the soldier as well as his death, is one of devotion.

"But you, poor soldiers of peace and love—you who die, not in the fire of the war-fever, and by a single blow, but slowly, calmly, in the torments of hunger, of contumely, and all imaginable anguish—what homage do we see rendered to your memory by that society, falsely called civilised, but barbarous in reality? You make yourselves martyrs to the propagation of the word of Christ, and Christians have not even a sentiment of pity for you. Ye fall, meek victims, while addressing to your executioners themselves, words of charity and love, and the world knows not how to feel or to manifest the admiration, the veneration which are your due. Who cares anything about your labors? Who knows your names? Where is the journal that takes note of your sacred work, or records its progress? And yet the press pretends to be the grand teacher, the grand enlightener of the public mind! Society is devoid of charity, it is cold, frozen; it is so perverse that even those who blazon on their banners the word—*Fraternity*, remain indifferent to the labors of the Missionaries, and enter their protest when the government, yielding to an intuitive sense of justice, give to the peaceful soldiers of Christ the support of its authority and its ships, and hoists the French flag on the shores of remote islands! And the academies—facetiously styled those of the *moral sciences*—have prizes for those who protest against forming distant colonies, and withhold from France the glory of civilising savage men, and saving our brethren in those barbarous and unknown regions! Miserable society, without mercy, without morals, and without faith! O nation of bad, luke-warm Christians!

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

DR. NEWMAN'S SECOND LECTURE.

(From the Tablet.)

On Monday, May 17th, the Very Rev. Dr. Newman, President of the Catholic University of Ireland, delivered his second lecture on University education at the Rotundo, Dublin. The room in which the first lecture was given having been found too small for the crowds which flocked to hear this illustrious theologian, the concert-room was selected for the present occasion, and was completely filled by a brilliant assemblage of almost all the principal Catholic society in Dublin. Among these we may mention his Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland; Right Rev. Dr. McNally, Bishop of Clogher; Right Rev. Dr. Cantwell, Bishop of Meath; Right Rev. Dr. Whelan, Bishop of Bombay; Lord Bellew; the Lord Chief Baron; Mr. O'Hagan, Q.C.; Mr. Deasy, Q.C.; Mr. Pigot, the Very Rev. Dr. Yore, Dr. Cooper, and a great number of the Catholic Clergy from all parts of the country and city. There were also present many Protestant Clergymen, Professors, and Fellows of Trinity College, and members of the learned professions in general.

The chair was taken by the Hon. Charles Langdale, who introduced the proceedings with an appropriate speech. He said he had to apologise, as a stranger, for taking the chair, but should have regretted very much if, by a refusal to do so, he could have

been imagined to show any indifference to the subject which had brought them together. Looking at what had happened in other parts of Europe from the peculiar kind of education which was practised there, and the evils that followed from it, it was evidently a matter of very great importance that a different and a better system of education should be established in this country. This was not a mere Irish question, nor an English question—it was, in fact, a great Catholic question (applause.) He had heard in the course of that morning that a document had arrived from the Holy See urging the application of all the Bishops, Priests, and Catholic people of this country to proceeding as quickly as possible with the establishment of a Catholic University (applause.) The hon. gentleman concluded by thanking the meeting for the honor done in calling on him to preside.

The Very Rev. Dr. Newman then proceeded to deliver his lecture, the subject of which was "Theology as a branch of knowledge." An entire report of this admirable discourse we are not able to furnish, as it would be infringing on the privileges of the publisher, Mr. Duffy, who is bringing these lectures out, and, we may add, very elegantly printed, and at a most reasonable cost. A few extracts, however, which we are at liberty to furnish, will give our readers an idea of the original and masterly manner in which the learned President treated this branch of his subject. He introduced it as follows:—

"THEOLOGY A BRANCH OF KNOWLEDGE."

"Great as are the secular benefits ascribed by the philosopher of the day to the present remarkable reception, in so many countries, of the theory of private judgment, it is not without its political drawbacks, which the statesman, at least, whatever be his predilections for Protestantism, cannot in candor refuse to admit. If it has stimulated the activity of the intellect in those nations which have surrendered themselves to its influence, on the other hand it has provided no sufficient safeguards against that activity acting on itself. This inconvenience, indeed, matters comparatively little to the man of letters, who often has no end in view beyond mental activity itself, of whatever description, and has before now even laid it down as the rule of his philosophy, that the good of man consists not in the possession of truth, but in an interminable search after it. But it is otherwise with those who are engaged in the business of life, who have work and responsibility, who have measures to carry through and objects to accomplish; who only see what is before them, recognise what is tangible, and reverence what succeeds. The statesman especially, who has to win, to attach, to reconcile, to secure, to govern, looks for one thing more than anything else—how he may do his work with least trouble, how he may best persuade the wheels of the political machine to go smoothly, silently, and steadily; and with this prime desideratum, nothing interferes so seriously as that indefinite multiplication of wills and opinions which it is the boast of Protestantism to have introduced. Amid the overwhelming difficulties of his position, the most Protestant of statesmen will be sorely tempted, in disparagement of his cherished principles, to make a passionate wish that the people he has to govern could have—I will not say with the imperial tyrant, one neck, but, what is equally impossible, one private judgment.

"This embarrassment makes itself especially felt, when he addresses himself to the great question of national education. He is called on to provide for the education of the people at large; and that the more urgently, because the religious sentiments, which private judgment presupposes and fosters, demand it. The classes and bodies in whom political power is lodged clamor for national education; he prepares himself to give them satisfaction; but education, of course, implies principles and views, and when he proceeds to lay down any whatever, the very same parties who pressed him forward, from their zeal for education in the abstract, fall out with each other and with him about every conceivable plan which is proposed to them in a substantive shape. All demand of him what each in turn forbids; his proceedings are brought to what is familiarly called 'a lock,' he can neither advance nor recede; and he loses time and toil in attempting an impossible problem. It would not be wonderful if, in these trying difficulties, he were to envy the comparative facility of the problem of education in purely Catholic countries, where certain fundamental principles are felt to be as sure as external facts, and where, in consequence, it is almost as easy to construct a national system of teaching as to raise the schoolhouses in which it is to be administered.

"Under these circumstances he naturally looks about him for methods of eliminating from the problem its intractable conditions, which are wholly or principally religious. He sees then that all would go easy, could he but contrive to educate apart from religion, not compromising indeed his own religious

persuasion, whatever it happens to be, but excluding one and all professions of Faith from the rational system. And thus he is led, by extreme expedience and political necessity, to sanction the separation of secular instruction from religious, and to favor the establishment of what are called 'mixed schools.' Such a procedure, I say, on the part of a statesman, is but a natural effort under the circumstances of his day, to appropriate to himself a privilege, without the Church's aid, which the Church alone can bestow; and he becomes what is called a Liberal, as the very nearest approach he can make, in a Protestant country, to being a Catholic. Since his schools cannot have *one* Faith, he determines, as the best choice left to him, that they shall have *none*."

Dr. Newman then went on to show that this principle of excluding all religious teaching destroyed the very idea of a university. What is a university? A place where universal knowledge is taught. Well, then, if theology be excluded from the list of subjects taught in a university, one or two conclusions is inevitable—either that the advocates of such an institution do not believe that theology is a branch of knowledge at all—that is, that they do not believe that anything is known for certain about the Supreme Being, or else that a most important branch of knowledge is omitted in the teaching of that university. It might be urged that for a common object there must always be a compromise. Dr. Newman admitted this, but made a distinction. A compromise must always be on minor points. People cannot sacrifice a vital point. Now, if there was a vital point about a university—if there was anything it could not sacrifice—it was surely knowledge. Other things might be given up, but not knowledge. He developed this argument in the following words:—

"When, then, a number of persons come forward, not as politicians, not as diplomatists, lawyers, traders, or speculators, but with the one object, of advancing universal knowledge, much we may allow them to sacrifice; ambition, reputation, leisure, comfort, gold; one thing they may not sacrifice—knowledge itself. Knowledge being their object, they need not, of course, insist on their own private views about ancient or modern history, or national prosperity, or the balance of power; they need not of course, shrink from the co-operation of those who hold the opposite views, but stipulate they must that knowledge itself is not compromised; and those views, of whatever kind, which they do allow to be dropped, it is plain they consider to be opinions, and nothing more, however dear, however important to themselves personally; opinions ingenious, admirable, pleasurable, beneficial, expedient, but not worthy the name of knowledge or science. Thus no one would insist on the Malthusian theory being a *sine qua non* in a seat of learning, who did not think it simply ignorance not to be Malthusian; and no one would consent to drop the Newtonian theory, who thought it to be proved true, in the same sense as the existence of the sun and moon is true. If then, in an institution which professes all knowledge, nothing is professed, nothing is taught about the Supreme Being, it is fair to infer that every individual of all those who advocate that institution, supposing him consistent, distinctly holds that nothing is known for certain about the Supreme Being; nothing such as to have any claim to be regarded as an accession to the stocks of general knowledge existing in the world. If, on the other hand, it turns out that something considerable is known about the Supreme Being, whether from reason or revelation, then the institution in question professes every science, and leaves out the foremost of them. In a word, strong as may appear the assertion, I do not see how I can avoid making it, and bear with me, gentlemen, while I do so—viz., such an institution cannot be what it professes, if there be a God. I do not wish to declaim; but by the very force of the terms, it is very plain that God and such a university cannot co-exist."

He went on to show the greatness of the idea of "God," both as a branch of knowledge in itself, and in its relations to knowledge in general:—

"The word 'God,' is a theology in itself, indivisibly one, inexhaustibly various, from the vastness and the simplicity of its meaning. Admit a God, and you introduce among the subjects of your knowledge a fact encompassing, closing in upon, absorbing every other fact conceivable. How can we investigate any part of any order of knowledge, and stop short of that which enters into every order? All true principles run over with it, all phenomena run into it; it is truly the first and the last. In word indeed, and in idea, it is easy enough to divide knowledge into human and divine, secular and religious, and to lay down that we will address ourselves to the one without interfering with the other; but it is impossible, in fact. Granting that Divine truth differs in kind from human, so do human truths differ in kind one from another. If the knowledge of the Creator is in a

* We are to remember that the Abbi Martinet had only Catholic governments in view.—*Trans.*