

course we will welcome them. But in its main outlines that treaty seems to me worthy of being made with England, with France, with Italy, with Switzerland, and the rest, one after another, until our cause makes such wide progress that when we meet here, a few years hence, we shall look back on 1897 as ancient history.

The next speaker was MISS LUCIA TRUE AMES of Boston.

---

#### ADDRESS OF MISS LUCIA T. AMES.

*Mr. President, Gentlemen and Ladies,*—This subject of education as related to arbitration naturally divides itself into three divisions: first, the extent of the particular kind of ignorance which we are here to consider; second, the nature of that ignorance; third, the remedies for that ignorance.

Ten years ago I wrote to the superintendent of schools in Chicago and asked him how many children left school before they had studied United States history. He replied that seventy-five per cent did so before hearing any historical stories, and that ninety per cent left school before they had studied history proper. I made the same inquiry of the state librarian of Wisconsin, and he gave an even more startling reply. I think he said that ninety-five per cent of the children of Wisconsin did not study United States history. The inferences from this are so obvious that I will not take time to state them. While we may admit that there has been some progress in ten years, and that some states show larger proportions studying history, yet it is fair to say that at least four-fifths, if not nine-tenths, of the children in this country leave school without having had any adequate training in the one thing which is certainly prerequisite to intelligent voting,—that is, a knowledge of the elements of United States history.

Three years ago, at the World's Fair in Chicago, I went into the educational department of the Illinois Building, where I saw a large placard with some very interesting statistics. They showed that in the state of Illinois 809,000 children were in the public schools; that of these about 7000 were boys in high schools, and about 14,000 were girls in high schools. This meant that in a typical state only three per cent were getting anything more than the grammar school offers, and that over one hundred per cent more girls than boys were getting a higher education,—that is, were studying whatever of history is taught after United States history, namely, English, Roman and Greek history, besides civics, ethics, literature, and those studies which will best fit them to deal with such matters as we are here to consider. I do not know how accurately that represents the condition to-day, but I think it is safe to

say that in most of the states from fifty to one hundred and fifty per cent more girls are getting this higher education than are the boys, who are to be the voters and legislators and are to settle questions of public policy.

Had I suspected that, on this my first visit to Mohonk, I should be called upon to speak, I should have provided myself with statistics which would be accurate up to date.

Since the war a large part (probably nine-tenths) of the education of the people of the United States has been put into the hands of women, ambitious, self-sacrificing women, who are often doing for their pupils the work of the home and the church as well as of the school, but who often are uncultivated women,—women who are paid on an average less than Colonel Waring pays his street-sweepers! That, I am told, is seven hundred and twenty dollars a year; it is much more than is paid to the average school-teacher in the United States for doing the most delicate, difficult and important work that any citizen is doing.

In the matter of text-books on American history I cannot take the optimistic view of the president of Roanoke College; I am inclined to think that our text-books and teaching—perhaps more by omissions than by positive statements—inculcate a feeling of bitterness toward England. A report recently circulated by our Commissioner of Education upon this whole matter shows how conscientiously and fairly English text-books have taught the history of the war of the Revolution. I am quite ashamed to say how recently it was that I learned from Mr. John Fiske the truth that the war of the Revolution was not fought between Americans as a unit and English as a unit, but between the progressive party and the retrogressive party on both sides of the Atlantic. American history is not taught in that way, and it ought so to be taught. We forget the great number of Tories that we had in America, and we forget the friends we had in England. Americans abroad are often politely careful not to mention Bunker Hill or the Fourth of July; but I never met an Englishman in my life who did not think of them exactly as we do. Much of the objection to arbitration is due to sheer ignorance of history, and much to gross ignorance of the present animus of the English people.

I am glad that Colonel Waring called our attention last night to the fact that we neglect certain things in human nature which ought to be considered. The writers of text-books and the teachers sometimes forget that the natural child is a natural bigot. The child reasons, "My father," or "My country, is good to me"; then, "Whatever my father or my country does must be entirely right, and whatever is, or was, opposed to them must be entirely wrong." Liberal-minded parents are sometimes astounded to find what partisanship and bitterness their children reveal when they have neglected to give explicit instruction to counteract the youngsters' false impressions. I remember that at the age of eight I marveled that the Almighty did not annihilate all Roman Catholics, Jews,

Unitarians, and all other obnoxious and dangerous persons who did not hold my father's creed. I was sure that if I had omnipotence I would sweep them off from the face of the earth. (Aside) I should have had no mercy on you, Dr. Hale. I would n't have let you cumber the ground! (Laughter.)

A little girl one day rushed home from Sunday School with the eager inquiry, "Mother, was Jesus a Jew? Teacher says he was a Jew." "Why, yes," said the mother; "certainly he was a Jew." "But how can that be?" queried the perplexed child, "for he was the Son of God, and God is *Presbyterian!*" (Laughter.)

In teaching history no less than in teaching religion the wise teacher must remember that the more sensitive and loyal the child, the more she needs guard against permitting him to harbor prejudices and narrow views.

In regard to the matter of expunging all stories of war from our children's books, as some one desired, it seems to me we need not draw a hard-and-fast rule. I should be very sorry to omit those parts of the Old Testament and of Homer which deal with war. I do not believe it ever hurt a healthy boy to read about Hector and Achilles or David and Goliath. I should certainly recommend some of the hot-headed youth imbued with the "jingo" spirit, who have not the faintest idea what war means, to read that marvelous book by Zola, "*La Débâcle.*" I believe that no one can rise from reading that sickening account of the horror of the Franco-Prussian War without seeing war forever freed from all false glamour. We need not fear to let children read of war, provided they are taught that it is the most savage and most foolish method ever discovered for settling disputes.

A few years ago I should have thought it insulting and unjust to say that in my own circle of society I could find people who unconsciously are at heart anarchists and traitors. But I have been astounded to find in professional and business circles kind-hearted and intelligent men and women who know the rule for the dative case and can discuss the merits of Monet and Brahms, who are yet ignorant — I will not say of arbitration — but of the first principles of civilization. They talk with complacency and approval of atrocious defiance of law in the case of lynchings. They have read history, but to no purpose. They know not by what slow toil and bloody sweat we have put around us the safeguards of the law. They would serenely consent to a policy which would plunge us back into barbarism. They have even pleaded to me the cheapness of the method and the trouble that it saved the courts! I am not speaking of Alabama or Texas, but of my beloved Bay State, when I say there are many there who need to be taught that, when a mob removes from jail and hangs a convicted criminal, it is committing both murder and treason. If such deeds can be approved or condoned by good Massachusetts citizens, what wonder that they are committed elsewhere! We need again to teach the first principles which Hosea Biglow tried to teach us so long ago:

“ The plough, the axe, the mill,  
 All kin's o' labor an' all kin's o' skill,  
 Would be a rabbit in a wile-cat's claw,  
 Ef 't war n't for thet slow critter, 'stablished law;  
 Onsettle *thet*, an' all the world goes whiz.”

Part of the work for arbitration which we, as women, have to do is to begin by teaching in our own circles the fundamental principles of law and order and justice. (Applause.)

There has been, there still is, a superstition that we have a government of the people, by the people and for the people. I hope that some day it will be true; but I think our teachers ought to teach us that it is not so now. In more than one state we have a government over the people, by the politicians, for the few. And in the nation at large, so long as it is possible for a President to be elected by a minority, as has been true nine times in our history; so long as it is possible for a handful of people in Mott Street and Hester Street to turn the thirty-six electoral votes of New York all one way or all the opposite way; so long as it is possible for Massachusetts to be represented by thirteen men, who should stand six to seven, but have stood twelve to one,— so long we do not get an adequate representation of the will of the people. I hope you do not think I am speaking of an irrelevant matter in introducing this subject of proportional representation; so much has been said here about the will of the people and adequate representation that it seems to me pertinent.

I was glad that two of the speakers yesterday touched on the economic aspects of the arbitration question. That is a matter to which all women and teachers need to give their special consideration. It is a vital matter; it is one about which we are grossly ignorant, and such ignorance is dangerous. I heard the other day that one of our eminent speakers had been doing a little figuring in regard to the indirect expense of the dedication of the Grant Monument, which itself cost four hundred thousand dollars. He showed that, without counting in the loss of labor during the holiday, between six and seven million dollars was spent by the people in going and coming and paying incidental expenses. I take that as an illustration of what I want to say, which is, that our indirect losses are often greater than direct ones, and are rarely estimated; in times of peace nine hundred million dollars annually is spent by Europe for the support of armies and navies. I should like some clever gentleman to do a little figuring on the unconscious expenditure in the matter of war. And I should be very glad if his facts could be put in some graphic form where people could read and consider them,—for instance, in the street cars, sandwiched in between advertisements of “Columbia Bicycles” and “Ayer's Sarsaparilla,” where he who rides may read. I believe more people would be reached in that way than by an edition of fifty thousand copies of the proceedings of this Conference, and that to the business man these facts would be more persuasive than all our arguments. The

folly of war, when other means of settlement of difficulties are possible, would be proved to be even more incredible than its wickedness.

Emerson said, "The Americans have many virtues, but they have not faith and hope." Of course we have faith in ourselves and in the almighty dollar; but that was not what Emerson meant. He meant faith in the invisible. To create this faith is the work which we privileged women chiefly are to do in helping on this cause of peace; we are to teach faith and to teach hope, and we must give reason for the hope and faith that are in us. Emerson has also said, "The measure or gauge of intellectual attainment is the power to perceive identity." *We* gauge men by their diplomas and degrees and fame; Emerson, by their power to perceive identity. That is a very profound insight. It was the perception of the identity of the forces of nature which made the theist out of the polytheist. It is the perception of identity which has given us nearly all the science we have to-day, including the doctrines of evolution and the correlation of forces. It is that perception which made Garrison and Phillips see under the skin of the black man a soul identical with their own,—a child of God. It is that perception of the identity of human interests and human rights which is moving us all here to-day. We are not, first of all, Americans; we are, first of all, human beings; we are, first of all, God's children, and we have identical interests with all God's children all over the face of the earth. That is what we need to feel and what we need to teach. We must teach patriotism in a new way; the raising of the flag on the schoolhouse is well enough, but it does not go far to develop true patriotism. We are not to teach that patriotism is a matter of pride in our country or of boasting about our country, but that it is purely a matter of service for our country,—service which must begin with our own ward and help the nation by bettering that little part of the nation for which we are responsible,—civic service, with its hard, unpaid drudgery, such as people like Mr. Capen are doing every day of their lives.

What finer example of the spirit which Emerson loved can be found for my closing words than in the lines of Lowell's "Present Crisis," that noblest lyric of the century:

"For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,  
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;  
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's vast frame  
Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame;—  
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim."

(Applause.)

MR. EDMUNDS: The Chair would like to mention, in respect of the observations of Miss Ames upon the importance of home instruction and the faith in the father and mother, which is the first ideal of the boy, a very brief anecdote of his own experience. Some

years ago, going into the northern woods of Michigan, bent on war with deer and bear, I was in advance of the rest of the party, on foot, when I came to a crossroad in the woods where was a little log house. I found a bright little boy, nine or ten years old, standing at the corner of the fence, and I asked him which road I should take to reach a certain milling camp which was our point of destination. With perfect good nature, but with a continual stream of oaths interlarding his words, he told me. He was a bright, blue-eyed little boy, and spoke good English, and with the utmost politeness. I began to remonstrate with him in as kindly a way as I could. I said, "My little boy, you seem to have been to school; you speak good language, only you swear terribly. Why do you do that? It is not gentlemanly and it is wicked." He looked up to me with perfect self-possession, and said, "'Square, my father swears, and I guess he knows!" And I was put down at once.

That is the foundation of the whole,—the training of the child at home.

We are now to have the pleasure of listening to HON. THOMAS J. MORRIS of Baltimore.

---

#### ADDRESS OF JUDGE THOMAS J. MORRIS.

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,*—After what has just been so ably said with regard to the educational forces which help on to international arbitration, I feel that I can add nothing, and it seems to me that I may speak of how much has already been done in the way of educating and preparing men's minds to accept the decision of an established international court as the arbiter of disputes between nations.

It is but a few centuries since private controversies with regard to property might be settled in England by the wager of battle, and but a short time since in England and America many private wrongs were settled by the duel. But we now live in a time when even the most pugnacious in England and America bring their controversies into court; not only men who have disputes over property and commercial contracts, but those unlucky ones who have suffered in their domestic happiness, artists who have been accused of stealing ideas or copying models, even clubmen who are accused of cheating at cards, now bring their grievances into court. And it is strange how contented the litigants are with the often inadequate and disappointing results.

None know better than those who have to do with administering the law through the courts how inadequate are the results which are arrived at with so much labor, time and expense, but the strivings and experience of the wise and able men who have preceded us have been able to perfect nothing better, and it is amazing after all