

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Invidials," THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LOCK KING, JOHN STEIN, P. J. NEVIN and WM. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Saturday, Feby. 8, 1896.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

When the civil war broke out in the United States thirty years ago, Artemus Ward in a burst of patriotism declared that he was prepared to make immense sacrifices for the sake of his country.

Our neighbors to the south of us seem very much filled with a similar zeal for the relief of the Armenian sufferers from Turkish brutality.

The treaty here referred to is that of Berlin, whereby the Russo-Turkish war was ended, the Porte agreeing to give good government to Armenia and other Christian provinces of its Empire.

Senator Cullom's resolution further provides that "the President of the United States be requested to communicate this resolution to the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy and Russia."

It is, of course, quite correct for the American Government to protect its own citizens. But surely, while the Christians of Armenia are being threatened with extermination, it is scarcely in good taste for the Americans to look on complacently while telling all the other Governments of the world that they should interfere to put an end to the atrocities which are being perpetrated; yet this is what the resolution proposes.

There is responsibility somewhere. Back of this are the disputes of the European alliance seeking their territorial advantages. These countries are responsible. It is a matter of regret and embarrassment that the policy of the United States is such as to prevent the sending of a fleet to Turkish waters to put a stop to the bloody rule, but Europe had assumed the obligation of protection to Armenia.

While we admit that it is a disgrace to the Christian world that an end has not been put to Turkish barbarity, we cannot see that it is less disgraceful to the United States than to the Christian powers of Europe.

It is probable that even one of the Great Powers of the world would be able to deal single-handed with Turkey in the present emergency.

all, that they allow their jealousies of each other to prevail so that not one dare interfere alone lest the others, suspecting a design of self-aggrandizement, should unite to sustain the Turk against the aggressor or should attack the aggressor in another quarter so as to nullify its efforts to better the condition of the Armenians.

It is not alone in the United States Senate that our American neighbors have shown a disposition to urge on the other powers to relieve Armenia, while standing aloof themselves.

There is no appearance of hope for the cessation of the massacre of the Armenians. It will go on till the murders will stop for lack of victims.

This is all, alas! too true. But why not say that the flag of the United States is soiled with the foul stain equally with those of Europe?

Of all the powers, it must, we think, be admitted that England showed most anxiety to intervene actively on behalf of the Armenians, whatever may have been her former shortcomings on occasions similar to the present.

At the critical moment when England was on the point of dealing emphatically with the Sultan, the United States intervened in such a way as rendered it impossible to make the movement proposed.

In Mr. Olney's letters to Lord Salisbury he stated that it would be preposterous for an American State to involve itself in any contest over the fate of Turkey.

The possibility of relieving the Armenians depended upon the European powers showing a united front, and as England especially was the power which most urgently demanded that the massacres should cease, and good government be given to Armenia, the least that any Christian power should have done was to give her a moral support in this demand.

But the United States had secured from Turkey a promise of a few thousand dollars indemnity for the destruction of the property of the American missionaries, and that appears to have sufficed to make the American Government so grateful as to do a favor for the Turks in return.

It seems certain that President Cleveland's threat to wage war upon England on the Venezuelan question has decided the fate of the Armenians; and if the American menace had not sufficed to do this, the act of the Emperor William of Germany in threatening England's suzerainty over the Transvaal at the same critical moment has completed the work.

A recent issue of the New York Times puts this in a clear light. It says: "We may not have meant to have anything to do with the fate of Turkey, but we have, the best European authorities agree, sealed the fate of the Armenians."

It is probable that even one of the Great Powers of the world would be able to deal single-handed with Turkey in the present emergency. Two could certainly do so effectually, but it appears the two are not to be found which can agree to take the necessary steps. Surely blame lies upon them

mous mischief thus wrought is beginning to get into the American mind. The Baptist preachers of this city have resolved that, if we must have a war, we should cut a much better figure fighting to save the Armenians than to kill Englishmen.

Even the passing of Senator Cullom's resolution will not change the condition of affairs now.

EGYPTOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.

A recent discovery made in Egypt has attracted much attention and caused much discussion among learned searchers into the mysteries of Egyptian antiquities. The article unearthed is a stone cylinder on which the names and titles of King Pepi I. are recorded.

The cylinder has been acquired by the British Museum, and placed among the Egyptian antiquities, of which the Museum contains a very extensive collection.

The chief interest which arises out of these Egyptian antiquities lies in the fact that they throw much light upon the references to Egypt which are found in the earliest historical books of the Bible, namely, the Pentateuch or five books of Moses, and especially Genesis and Exodus. The infidels of modern times lay great stress upon the dates usually attributed to Egyptian monuments in their attacks upon the historical accuracy of the Bible.

It is true that Egyptologists give generally a more remote date to the early history of Egypt than is consistent with the dates commonly given to the creation of our first parents, the flood, the immigration of Jacob into Egypt and the departure of his descendants from that country under the leadership of Moses.

From the time of Abraham the dates given in Scripture are very definite, though even in this case there is an uncertainty of two hundred and fifteen years regarding the period between Joseph and Moses; but for the period before Abraham there is a diversity of interpretation of the Biblical text which makes it extremely difficult to fix the exact dates.

On the other hand, there is also a great uncertainty about the correct dates of the Egyptian dynasties of the same period. One Egyptologist sets the date of Menes, the first Egyptian monarch, at 5004 before Christ, another, Bunsen, at 3643 years. But it is to be borne in mind that all agree there is great difficulty in fixing the dates because it is frequently hard to tell whether the monuments on which dependence is placed refer to successive or simultaneous reigns of local kings; and, besides, fabulous periods are often stated as the lengths of the reigns of the Egyptian monarchs, from whose histories the Egyptian system of chronology is derived: thus reigns of 60, 65 years, etc., are common; and the reign of Pepi II. is placed at 100 years. We are unable to decide positively that any reign in particular is over-stated, but by analogy from what has occurred during the last nine centuries, we may fairly infer that the period covered by the monuments of Egypt is greatly over-estimated; or, at

least, amid its uncertainties, we can infer nothing which refutes any statements in the Bible regarding the history of the corresponding period.

Champollion, the original decipherer of Egyptian hieroglyphics, says in his writings on this subject: "I have demonstrated that there is no Egyptian monument really anterior to the year 2200 before our era."

He adds that "The kings of Egypt named in the Bible are found on Egyptian monuments in the same order of succession, and at the precise epochs where the sacred books place them . . . and the Bible gives more accurately than the Greek historians their true names. I would be curious to know what answer to these facts will be made by those who have maliciously asserted that Egyptian studies tend to change our belief in the historical documents furnished by the books of Moses. On the contrary, my discoveries come invincibly to their support."

It is true that many monuments have been discovered and deciphered since Champollion wrote, but it may be safely asserted that there is not one which refutes a single statement of the Bible, whereas there are many which confirm its incidental references to a remarkable degree, whether those references relate to the reigns of the kings of Egypt or to the manners and customs of the people.

THE SO-CALLED NON-SECTARIAN SCHOOLS OF MANITOBA.

We have heard much of the excellence of Mr. Greenway's Public school system, and this has been flouted as a reason for refusing justice to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. The vaunted superiority of the Protestant schools of the Province has been very fully exploded, though that would by no means be a sufficient reason for the intolerant conduct of the Government toward the Catholics. It has been shown that the Catholic schools of Manitoba were as efficient as could be expected under the circumstances of the Province before 1890, and that they suffered nothing on comparison with the Protestant schools, which were violently and by a single stroke made the nucleus of the new school system then established by law.

We are told also that the Public schools of the Province are quite non-sectarian, and that the decision of the Privy Council, which declared them to be not Protestant schools, settles this point.

We must remark in the first place that the sectarianism of the schools or their pure secularism is not the point at issue. If they were as secular as it is pretended they are it would still be an intolerable injustice to deprive the Catholics of their fair share in the provincial school funds, and it would still be a gross violation of the agreement between all sections and creeds under which Manitoba became at first a Province of the Dominion, namely, that the Separate school system then in vogue should be permanent.

But there are many evidences that the school system as established by Mr. Greenway is distinctively Protestant. The Privy Council in deciding that they are not Protestant schools, took into consideration the wording only of the school acts, and not the facts or actual practice which makes them distinctively Protestant schools.

This is well pointed out by Mr. John S. Ewart in his recent pamphlet on this much agitated school question. He points out that the school regulations are distinctly Protestant. One of the regulations in force is:

"To establish the habit of right doing, instruction in moral principles must be accompanied by training in moral practices. The teacher's influence and example, current incidents, stories, memory gems, sentiments in the school lesson, examination of motives that prompt to action, didactic talks, teaching the Ten Commandments, etc., are means to be employed."

On this subject, Mr. Ewart, in a debate with the Rev. Mr. Pedley, held in Mr. Pedley's church, Winnipeg, on 29th April, 1895, said: "Am I wrong in saying that the programme sounds like one for a Sunday school? Are the Catholics unreasonable in saying that in the hands of Protestant teachers, the flavor of the memory gems, didactic talks, etc., would be Protestant? It could not possibly be otherwise. I defy any Presbyterian, for instance, who believes his catechism, to conscientiously teach the Ten Commandments without coming into direct conflict with Roman Catholic doctrine."

Mr. Ewart instances the division of the first commandment into two by Protestants. The purpose of this is to make a special commandment against the Catholic use of images, and Mr. Ewart asks:

"When he is teaching the Protestants' second commandment, is he to

state that it is a special commandment aimed at Roman Catholic images and relics? Or is he to explain 'Thou shalt not make unto Thee any graven image' as the Catholics explain that language? . . . Let Protestants tell me that they are willing to have their children taught the Ten Commandments by Roman Catholics, and I shall then, but not till then, acknowledge that the present schools are unsectarian."

Mr. Ewart points out that in other respects there is a divergence between the Catholic and Protestant interpretations of the Ten Commandments, which would be necessarily dwelt upon in the "didactic talks" of the teachers. Mr. Pedley's only answer to this was that "if some Catholic children were taught the Commandments by Protestant teachers there would be some Protestants taught by Catholic teachers." This certainly does not cure, but rather aggravates, the evil, and it effectually explodes the notion that the Manitoba Schools are non-sectarian.

It has been likewise admitted by Mr. Joseph Martin that the religious exercises prescribed by law in the schools are "most unjust to Roman Catholics." He added: "If the State is to recognize religion in its school legislation, such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority of Protestants, is, to my mind, rank tyranny."

It is perfectly clear to every intelligent person who considers the character of Mr. Greenway's school laws that they are intended for the establishment of a strictly Protestant school system, and the following incident, which occurred only a few days ago, fully proves that the trustees are carrying out the law in accordance with this view of the case.

A properly certificated Catholic teacher made application for employment in one of the Winnipeg schools, and received a reply from the secretary of the Provincial School Board saying: "In answer to yours of the 7th inst., I would say that I laid your application before the trustees, but they would not accept your application on account of your religion. I am sorry, as I think we may fare worse."

The lady has published the correspondence, and she makes the statement that

"The Secretary-Treasurer told me their objection was based solely on the score of religion, and admitted that my offer was, otherwise, the best they had had. What difference the religion of the teachers in the National schools makes, I fail to see, as they are bound down to use certain text-books, teach only certain subjects, and abide by numerous other restrictions."

THE POSITION OF TURKEY.

The situation in Turkey seems to be but little changed from what it was at any time during the last fifteen months, or if there is any change it is toward giving the Sultan greater liberty than ever in pursuing his policy of exterminating his Christian subjects.

Not long ago when the great powers of Europe agreed to make a naval demonstration in concert, it seemed as if the Turk's rule was about to be brought to an end, but the wily Sultan knew how to make use of the mutual jealousies of the powers, and he was able so to play off one against the other that he has not been interfered with.

At the present moment reports from the Empire are of a most conflicting character. On the one hand, we are informed, on what is said to be reliable authority, that Great Britain, France and Russia have reached an agreement to the effect that Anatolia, the province in which the Armenian massacres have been chiefly perpetrated, shall be apportioned to Russia, which undertakes to pacify the country. Russia will also have, it is said, Constantinople, while Syria and Palestine will be occupied by France.

It is further provided, according to this account, that England's right to sovereignty over Egypt will be recognized, and also over the western shores of the Turkish Empire where it borders on the Persian Gulf. The rest of the empire, it is said, will be apportioned among the other European powers.

These reports have not much appearance of truth, though they have been made with much display of detail, and it does not seem that the Sultan has any thought that such arrangements are likely to be effected, for the massacres of Armenians are being carried out as remorselessly as ever. It is estimated that since September, 1894, there have been between thirty and forty thousand Armenians slaughtered in cold blood. The last massacre reported is of two thousand Christians, the number of sufferers being fewer than those

reported on previous occasions, for the reason that there are fewer now to be killed. The number of persons who are suffering from loss of property and of any means of sustenance is estimated at several hundreds of thousands, including men, women and children.

Another report is to the effect that Russia has made a secret treaty with Turkey whereby the former power will occupy Anatolia, and will guarantee Turkey against attack from any quarter, especially England. In this report there appears at the present moment some truth, though it is difficult to believe that Turkey would throw itself into the arms of Russia, which has been so long desirous of making encroachments on Turkish territory.

It remains to be seen whether or not these reports are true. Meanwhile the position of affairs has brought forth from Mr. Gladstone another expression of his opinion on the situation. He says in a letter just published, that the "murderous wickedness of the Sultan is unendurable, but he has gained an absolute victory over the powers to their unparalleled disgrace and defeat." He adds:

"I cannot wholly abandon the hope that out of this darkness light will arise, but the matter rests with the Almighty, to whom surely all should address fervent prayers in behalf of His suffering creatures."

BROTHER NOAH'S HANDBOOK OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

We have received from the publishers a new handbook of English Literature designed for use especially in Catholic educational institutions, but which might be very profitably used in all our institutions for higher education. The book is entitled "English Literature: a Manual for Academies, High Schools and Colleges, by the Brothers of the Christian Schools."

The author is Brother Noah, professor of English literature in Manhattan college, New York city, a brother of Judge Curran, late Solicitor General of Canada.

Brother Noah's book has many features which make it superior to works of the same kind which have been hitherto in use, as it traces in a more full and masterly manner the influences which religion and learning in their combination with each other had upon English literature from the beginning.

The book has an introduction by Mr. George Parsons Lathrop which states clearly its excellence, and the testimony of Mr. Lathrop is a sufficient guarantee that we do not lavish undeserved praise upon it when we say that it is the best work of the kind we have seen, treating the subject with more reverence for religion, as well as more intelligently than any other designed for High School use, and consequently more likely to produce good fruits in leading pupils to detect and appreciate the real beauties of English literature.

Mr. Lathrop's introduction is so descriptive of the purpose of Brother Noah's work that there is very little more for us to say than to follow or repeat his comments on it. He quotes Brother Noah's words that "even as heathens, the English were of a religious turn of mind," and this fact suffices to show that a correct appreciation of English literature must "throw light upon the influence of religious conviction and true faith through ten or twelve centuries." Brother Noah has done this with great success, and Mr. Lathrop also points out that though the best treatises on literature hitherto written for school use have brought to bear on the theme the most exact scholarship, none have succeeded so well as Brother Noah in making the reader feel that the past is part of our inheritance which may be utilized in our own century and our own neighborhood.

Mr. Lathrop also remarks that an attractive trait of the volume is that, instead of wearying the student with arbitrary divisions into periods, overloaded with dates that dazzle and confuse, a natural and easy sequence is adopted whereby the salient points are emphasized at once and an indelible impression is made on the mind of the student.

It is not to be supposed, however, that Brother Noah's book is destitute of dates, for chronology is one of the most vital organs of history, and the history of literature would be very vague and uninteresting if dates were not judiciously given, and in this respect the book is not at all defective. The dates of the various authors and events described are very carefully given; but it is not the giving of proper dates which Mr. Lathrop con-

demna, but the which serve o make the stude purpose of a tended for use

The tone of the debt of Eng licity is show Lathrop point always made to non-Catholic w appreciation of These featu Brother Noah's Catholic instit see it general text-book on literature.

It is issued Barclay street,

EDITORS.

An amusing was recently well known England, in spiritualistic began to pl hymn which their gatheri terious voice v ing the words were also he of their origi Questions w given by raps great enthusia the spiritualis voice declare be irrefragab their creed. Th dampened wh raps were giv of an electrici produced by a transmitter, a in the piano The effect wa awe-inspirin hibited by th in their juggl transmitter w of the piano enabling a with the pla the telephoni

In this age ous freaks, which may n and we can't at the appea which sets it tianity and locality. He the usual co without a cr Boston under Mrs. or Miss had no the than that several so-c such as The the like, and upon the am The lady is fashionable, position she more than Her fancy w even her fol the pulpit, a modifying it pelled, muc a plainer an use in the c no doubt th be one just Colonel Ingr good Chur "People's C which he r admiration.

The testi the Catholi that we ar sacred Bod numerous doubt that Church is Catholic Ch nevertheless readers to has been di St. Priscilla arian gate ichthus, m ancient Ch Lord, and quently en our Lord Blessed Eu of Translu this use la of the wor the Greec Theo Vi Christ, the newly - di the priest act of disti ion, and fish in the