

volume in each set, rather than they should fall complete into the enemies' hands. How the world has suffered here, and we have to suffer with it. War has limited the immortality of art.

And religion is insisting more and more upon peace. After nearly two thousand years of teaching, following the life of the one called "the Prince of Peace," his followers are awaking to the matter in earnest. Religion now has dreams of a parliament of man,—a federation of the world,—and it points to the sense of community of feelings lying below accidental divergence, disclosed more and more in missionary endeavors. Religion affirms that if great organized states like our own American Commonwealth, with differing interests, can dwell together in peace, a greater commonwealth of nations is no lunatic dream, but the very social form of the kingdom of heaven. It says that if our land, and other civilized lands, can preserve order by a small fraction of shrieval force, that the belief in the same possibility for the whole world is no folly of the night. It affirms that we are all children of a common Father, and that each man is necessary to all other men. It says that if God loves the world, we, at our best, love it too, and that if we are saved we are saved *with* our fellows and not without them. National life, I believe, is only a transition stage to a far nobler generalization,—the finally victorious commonweal of the kingdom of God. The transition state may, and doubtless will, leave some marks upon men, and it is well that it should be so, just as family life marks men within the greater family of society; but I believe that the time is speedily coming when passion and suspicion and hereditary-historic terrors affirmed of less known peoples than our own will be ended. Let us all do our best to bring this happy state into being! And may our working motto be, not "God and my right!"—the cry of older turbulent souls—but "God and His peace!"

Ernest Howard Crosby.

BY DR. J. T. SUNDERLAND.

The death roll of 1906 contains the name of no nobler man than Ernest Howard Crosby of New York. I want to lay a flower on his new-made grave. I want to say how ill the world could spare him. I want to say how glad I am, if he had to go, that he was spared to write the life of Samuel M. Jones, "Golden Rule Jones" as he is often called, mayor of Toledo, O., that strange but lovable man, who appeared suddenly in American business and American politics, and actually proposed to do things on the principle of the Golden Rule; and to the amazement of everybody actually did carry on a large business for years, and actually did conduct the government of a large city year after year, on the principle of the Golden Rule, and with success, with a success that everybody, even his fiercest opponents, was obliged to admit.

I say I am glad that Ernest Crosby was spared to write the life of "Golden Rule Jones" of Toledo. Mr. Crosby's death is a loss. His father, as some of you know, was the Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby of New York, one of the most distinguished Presbyterian clergymen of this country. After receiving the highest university honors and studying law, the son entered political life in New York,

where he had a successful, indeed a brilliant, career for a dozen years. Then he was appointed by President Harrison a judge of the international court in Alexandria, Egypt. After serving there for five years, he resigned, came home, and left political life to devote himself to the work of social and moral reform. For some years past he had given his whole time, with singular unselfishness and devotion, to writing, speaking and laboring in every way in his power, for the promotion of peace, temperance, civic purity and the elevation of the public life and public ideals of his city and country. Some have called him a dreamer, and unpractical, because he thought that peace is better than war; that evil can only be overcome by good, and not by more evil; that there should be honesty and honor in public life as well as in private; that international relations should be relations of reciprocity and justice; that the Golden Rule is practicable, in business and everywhere. Yes, he was a dreamer; he dreamed of better things for men, for society, for humanity; but he also did what he could to make his dreams come true, by courageous unflinching and honest work. He was impracticable, in the same way that Jesus was, that Socrates was, that Garrison was, that every one is who believes in God, and man, and love, and human brotherhood, and that life is more than meat.

HARTFORD, CONN.

The Teaching of History in a Civilized Country.

A Brief Rejoinder.

BY WILLIAM A. MOWRY, PH.D.

In the January number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, Dr. Ernst Richard of Columbia University gave an extended review of my article in the previous September number, which was entitled "The Teaching of History." I have to thank Professor Richard for many good words and evident kind consideration of my article, and I am free to say that with much of his paper I fully agree. The general principle pervading the article is correct, and possibly may prevent many readers of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* from getting a wrong notion.

It may not, perhaps, be out of place to say that my article was not written for the organ of the American Peace Society, but was, as stated at the head of the article, "A paper read at the meeting of the American Institute of Instruction, New Haven, July 10, 1906." It was prepared expressly for a company of American school teachers. Its design was twofold: first, to emphasize the importance of the teaching in our own schools of the history of our own country; second, and far more important, to urge upon the teachers and textbook makers a better and saner treatment of the periods of war and peace. This was to enforce the importance of emphasizing the triumphs of peace and minimizing the details of wars.

Dr. Richard takes no exception to this most important portion of the paper, but confines his objections to the first head. Here I think he misinterprets the intention and meaning of my paper, and I fear he has misunderstood my position. Possibly I did not make it sufficiently plain. I thought I had made my meaning clear, which was simply this: not that our American civilization is in advance of that of other nations; not that *we*