

Mr. Robins then states his conviction that the American attitude to Great Britain is marked by a certain adverse predisposition, and continues:—

"This serious underlying antipathy I attribute entirely to the almost universal misunderstanding of facts, begun with false teaching of history in the schools, and sedulously cultivated by the anti-British foreign element.

"The principal misconceptions I would set down as follows:

"A. That the revolt of the colonists was against deliberate and exceptional tyranny; not that they were fully as well situated politically as the English people at home.

"B. It does not seem to be generally known that the colonists were as far from unanimous for rebellion as the people of England were for coercion.

"C. The circumstances of the war of 1812 are not understood. It is commonly believed that the declaration of war came from our side.

"My firm conviction is that there can be no friendship of any permanent value between the two countries while these misconceptions are general; and I take it is vastly more important now to insure the continuance of peace than merely to record the peace which is past. Therefore, my view is that, however appropriate or desirable may be some tangible memorial, nothing of that nature could compare in real benefit to both peoples with some well-formed scheme of mutual education. What form that should take, I am not at present prepared to suggest: but it is what I have thought of for a long time, and especially since the centenary movement was mooted. I am persuaded that the removal of the embittering misconceptions of our neighbours is well worth attempting, and I see no reason to regard it as too formidable a task for the Associations of the United States, England and Canada if they should combine on it."

Professor G. M. Wrong has made the following contribution to the subject:—

"Speaking generally I should deprecate doing anything that was merely monumental or decorative in character. Out of this happy anniversary might possibly come some educative force. Might it not be possible to endow professorships or lectureships that would result in a continuous, sane and enlightened treatment of the whole question of war and peace? I should include in this not merely the defence of peace but also that of war. If, through such an endowment, Oxford had in one year a course of lectures on either war or peace, to be published later in a book, if in the next year Harvard had a similar course and in the next McGill or Toronto, you would have in the next