AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS AT THE SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING.

WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 28–31, 1889.

THE American Historical Association was organized at Saratoga, in 1884, with only forty members, for the promotion of historical studies. In six years this Society has grown, by a process of historical selection, to a membership of six hundred and twenty, with one hundred life members. At the sixth annual meeting, which was held in Washington, D. C., from the 28th to the 31st of December, 1889, there were present eighty-seven members, the largest attendance in the history of the Association.

The headquarters of the Association in Washington were at the Arlington Hotel. Three morning sessions, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday, were held from 10:30 to 1 o'clock at the National Museum, by permission of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and three evening sessions on the same days, from 8 to 10 P.M., in the large lecture hall of the Columbian University, by invitation of President James C. Welling. Sunday and the afternoon hours were free for social purposes. On Monday, from 4 to 7 o'clock, a tea was given to the members of the Association and their friends by Mr. and Mrs. Horatio King, 707 H Street, and on Tuesday afternoon, at the same hours, Mrs. Walworth extended to the Association a like courtesy at her new home, 1300 L Street. By invitation of the board of management our members enjoyed the privileges of the Cosmos Club during the four days' sojourn in Washington. Every evening after adjournment of the formal session of the Association at the Columbian University there was a social re-union at the Cosmos Club. On Monday afternoon and

Tuesday morning, by invitation of the librarian, Dr. Bancroft, parties of historical students and specialists visited the State Department for an examination of the interesting archives there preserved.

The Convention opened Saturday morning, December 28th, in the large lecture hall of the National Museum. The walls were decorated with the Catlin collection of Indian portraits, with pictures of Pueblos and Cliff dwellers, and with the busts of American statesmen. The room was admirably suited to the purposes of the Association. The curators of the Museum had introduced a number of cases for the display of interesting historical relics, books, manuscripts, etc., which attracted much attention on the part of the members as they entered or left the hall. The first paper presented at the morning session was by Prof. George L. Burr, of Cornell University, who has in his immediate charge the excellent historical library of ex-President Andrew D. White. The subject of Mr. Burr's paper was "The Literature of Witchcraft," for the illustration of which ample materials had been found in Mr. White's library. The literature of witchcraft includes perhaps a thousand volumes. The earliest were written in the fifteenth century, and their authors were Dominicans of the Inquisition. They regarded the subject as an old one. Indeed, the Church had always fought against magic. She had taught that the gods of the pagans were devils and that those who worshipped them were sorcerers. The belief in Satan was developed by mediæval monks and the Church fathers, reinforced by Byzantine speculation. Belief in the Devil's activity in this world was elaborated by scholasticism into a system, of which the whole literature of witchcraft is but a broken reflection. To detect and punish the servants of Satan was the work of the Inquisition and the persecutors of witchcraft in England and New England.

The second paper of Saturday morning's session was "A Catechism of the Revolutionary Reaction," by ex-President Andrew D. White. In his preface to this paper Mr. White called attention to the fact that while studies of the French

Revolution in Europe have been developed to an enormous extent there has been no corresponding treatment, indeed no adequate study of the reaction after the various revolutions. Mr. White's paper was a contribution to such a history. His essay was based upon a very rare and curious little book which he obtained at Sorrento three years ago. The book was a wonderfully well-argued and well-written catechism by the Archbishop of Sorrento, who was placed by the King of the Two Sicilies, about 1850, at the head of the Department of Public Instruction at Naples, and also made the tutor of the young prince. It contains the most amazing declarations of war against modern civilization, and indeed against nearly every thing moral, political, or social which the nineteenth century regards as a landmark of progress. It argues with wonderful force that the King is not bound by any oath that he may have sworn to maintain a constitution, and urges with extreme cleverness all the arguments in support of absolute government. Mr. White took up several chapters of this remarkable catechism and gave in detail the argument in each.

The third paper was by Herbert Elmer Mills, Instructor in History, Cornell University, on "The French Revolution in San Domingo." In 1789, San Domingo was by far the most important of the colonies of France. Commercially it was prosperous, but its population was divided into the Creole planters, the free "people of color," and the slaves, by far the most numerous class. Government was in the hands of the French Minister of Marine, and was administered by a Governor and an Intendant. The people had no political privileges, and this fact had long irritated the Creoles. At the first announcement of the approaching meeting of the States-General in France, the people of San Domingo took measures to secure representation, hoping thereby to win for themselves the control of the island. Delegates were chosen, but a careful study shows that the assemblies which elected them were widely scattered and by no means represented the entire body of the planters. At first the representatives were given a seat but not a

voice among the Third Estate; but before the end of 1789 they had won recognition as entitled to six votes in the National Assembly. Meantime the free people of color in San Domingo had not been idle. Their representatives also appeared at the National Assembly and claimed seats. It has been assumed by historians that these representatives were actually elected in the island and sent to Paris, but the truth is that they were chosen merely by members of this caste who were residents of Paris. No place was granted them in the National Assembly. Of course neither emancipation nor representation of the servile class was thought of either by the whites or free people of color in San Domingo.

The last paper of the morning session was read by Clarence W. Bowen on a newly discovered manuscript called Reminiscences of the American War of Independence, by Ludwig Baron von Closen, Aid to Count de Rochambeau. This manuscript was found in the early part of the year 1889 among the archives of the Von Closen family in their castle in Bavaria. A translation was sent to Mr. Bowen, who read brief extracts. Ludwig Baron von Closen, the author, was born August 14, 1755, and in his early years entered the French military service. On the arrival of the French expedition in Newport, R. I., in 1780, he was made Aid to Count de Rochambeau, commander of the expedition. Previously he had been captain in the regiment Royal Deux Ponts. On returning to France in 1783, Von Closen received from Louis XVI. the Order of Legion of Honor and the Order for Merit, and in 1792 was informed of his election, with the permission of the King of France, to the Order of the Cincinnati. He died in 1830. In his reminiscences he speaks of his visits to John Hancock of Massachusetts, Jonathan Trumbull of Connecticut, and Thomas Jefferson of Virginia. He conducted Washington from the Hudson River to Rochambeau at Newport. He reports the conferences between Washington, Rochambeau, Lafayette, and De Grasse near Yorktown. His visit to Mrs. Washington at Mount Vernon, a ball he gave at Baltimore, and visits to other

sections of the country are described by Von Closen in the most charming manner. His reminiscences are full of historical interest, and are an important addition to the literature of the French in America during the Revolutionary War.

The evening session on Saturday began promptly at eight o'clock at the Columbian University, with the Hon. John Jay, of New York, presiding. In a brief but comprehensive sketch Mr. Jay reviewed the work of the morning session and then introduced President Adams, who delivered an interesting inaugural address upon "The Recent Historical Work of the Universities." He said that the first distinct professorship of history was established at Harvard University in 1839 for Jared Sparks. At Yale, as at other American colleges, history was long taught by means of text-books without much real enthusiasm. A great advance was made when Andrew D. White, fresh from original studies in France and Germany, entered upon an historical professorship in 1857 at the University of Michigan. From that institution President White's influence was transmitted to Cornell University, which developed the first distinct professorship of American history. Senator Hoar, after President Adams' address, called attention to the fact that Jared Sparks' lectures at Harvard University were largely upon American subjects, and were at the same time original contributions to American history. Mr. Adams reviewed the progress of historical science in the various countries of Europe, including Great Britain, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Germany, and France. His conclusion was, that the best advantages for historical study are now to be found in the schools of Paris, and that before the achievements of European universities American scholars find more to encourage humility than pride. Remarks were made upon President Adams' paper by President White. Professor Austin Scott, of Rutgers College, justly called attention to the work of the smaller colleges in America and to the services of the late Professor Allen, of the University of Wisconsin, who was one of the most

critical scholars and ablest teachers of history in this country.

After the inaugural address, Mendes Cohen, Corresponding Secretary of the Maryland Historical Society, gave an interesting account of the discovery of the Calvert papers in England, and of their recent publication in Baltimore. He exhibited to the Association the first volume, which has just appeared from the press. Mr. Cohen's statement of the progress of an important work undertaken by a State historical society perhaps foreshadows similar reports that may be presented at future meetings by delegates from the various historical societies of the United States and of Canada.

The Association re-assembled Monday morning, December 30th, at half-past ten, in the National Museum, President Adams in the chair. The first paper was on "The Origin and Early History of our National Scientific Institutions," by Dr. G. Brown Goode, Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. Dr. Goode reviewed the entire history of scientific and philosophical societies in this country, and gave special attention to the development of literary and scientific institutions in the city of Washington. He called attention to the fact that, as early as 1775, when Washington was in his camp at Cambridge, Major Blodgett said to him that a national university ought to be erected in which the youth of the whole country might receive instruction. Washington replied: "Young man, you are a prophet, inspired to speak what I am confident will one day be realized." Dr. Goode pointed out the various tendencies toward the development of a larger scientific and intellectual life in the Federal City. He traced the history of its various institutions of learning, including the Columbian University, the American Academy of Sciences, and the Smithsonian Institution, with which the American Historical Association was allied by Act of Congress approved January 4, 1889.

The next paper was on "The Development of International Law as to Newly Discovered Territory," by Dr. Walter B.

Scaife, Reader on Historical Geography in the Johns Hopkins University. His paper opened with a brief sketch of the policy of the Roman See as the arbiter of Europe, from the eleventh to the fifteenth century. Dr. Scaife showed that the Bulls of Alexander VI., dividing the non-Christian world between Spain and Portugal, were not manifestations of an unheard-of presumption, but were the natural outgrowth of precedent conditions. But this authority was now rejected, and was replaced by the rule of force. Meantime, international law had started on its career to try to persuade men to be governed by reason rather than by force; and ever striving toward the ideal, but keeping the practical in mind, it advanced in the course of two centuries and a half to the formulation of rules of action, high in their aim and still practicable in their application. During this time the practice of nations was undergoing also modifications. Spain, finding the Pope's authority rejected by other Powers, set up the right of possession by discovery; but in this England was at least her equal, inasmuch as her representative had seen the mainland of the Western continent before any Spaniard. England advanced also this theory as long as it answered her purpose, then turned to another, viz., that actual occupation is necessary to effect a complete title. Finally, during the present decade, a union has been made of practice and theory in the formation of the Congo State; and rules have been formulated and adopted by the Great Powers for the future regulation of national action in the matter. The whole subject goes to show the value of forming correct scientific theories as to the affairs of men, even when apparently there is the least hope of their ever being realized; that they do have effect on the practices of mankind, and that a time will come when they will be recognized as the true standard of action.

An important contribution to *post-bellum* historical literature was a paper on "The Impeachment and Trial of President Johnson," by Dr. Wm. A. Dunning, of Columbia University, New York. The points which he considered were three: first, the causes contributing to the impeachment

proceedings; second, the issues involved in the impeachment by the House; and third, the issue involved in the trial by the Senate. The causes which seem to have been peculiarly efficient were the personality of Johnson and his theory of reconstruction. There were three different attempts at impeachment in the House. It was the President's removal of Stanton in apparent defiance of the tenure-of-office act that precipitated the final impeachment. Before the Senate the most important question really answered was, whether the Senate could be viewed as a court proper or not. The radicals said no. The Senate's action, however, favored the contrary opinion. With this divided sentiment, conviction on any of the numerous charges was practically impossible. Article XI., involving the President's resistance to reconstruction, was most likely to prove successful, but failure to obtain a two-thirds vote on this matter was the knell of all impeachment proceedings. Dr. Dunning concluded that the framers of our Constitution built strongly in co-ordinating the various departments of our government. No circumstances more favorable to removing a President from office are likely to arise in the future, and the result of the Johnson impeachment was a confirmation of the principle asserted by the fathers of the Republic.

The subject of the next paper was "The Trial and Execution of John Brown," by Gen. Marcus J. Wright, of the War Records Office, Washington, D. C. The paper was substantially an answer to Dr. H. von Holst's charges that John Brown did not receive a fair trial. General Wright reviewed the whole matter from notes and evidences taken at the time, and clearly established his thesis that every thing was done which the law required. The concluding paper of the morning session was "A Defence of Congressional Government," by Dr. Freeman Snow, of Harvard University. Dr. Snow said that Americans are now engaged in drawing comparisons between the English and the American Constitutions, and, like Mr. Bagehot, they find nearly all the advantages on the side of the English. The

multitude, it is said, needs leadership. Hence, if we would save our society from disintegration, we must adopt the English system of responsible leadership. The error of this view, Mr. Snow contended, lies in looking too intently at the mere machinery of government, and not at society as a whole. The effect of obeying leaders is to take away from the masses the habit of thinking for themselves. If our government is at any time less efficient or less orderly, it is the safest in the long run, for it develops the capacity for self-government among the people. Dependence upon leaders, as in the English system, has the opposite effect. Too much is expected of popular government. We should not expect perfection from an imperfect people. If we want more efficient legislation, we must send men to Washington for just that purpose. The present condition of our politics is largely a legacy left us by the slavery struggle and the Civil War. It is an abnormal condition of things and will pass away. It is even now on the wane.

The evening session of Monday was at the Columbian University, Judge Chamberlain presiding. The papers were devoted to New England and the West. This feature of grouping contributions by large subjects, such as European History, National History, the North, the West, the South, and Historical Science, was generally recognized as a great improvement in the arrangement of historical material. The first paper of the evening was on "The Economic and Social History of New England, 1620–1789," by Wm. B. Weeden, of Providence. New England communities were founded on freehold land tenure; on a *meeting*, the local and social expression of religious life and family culture; and on a representative, democratic gathering corresponding to the old folk-mote of the Germanic race. Economically New England settlers profited by trade with the Indians through wampum. These beads were both jewelry and currency. As currency they were redeemable in beaver. When immigration was checked in 1640, the colonists built ships and bartered their own products among themselves. Vessels were loaded with fish, and sailed for the West Indies or Eu-

rope. Returning they brought iron, cordage, and all the goods needed by the new settlements. In this commerce the Puritans prayed, labored, and traded. Stephen Winthrop wrote to his father, after having sold his wine: "Blessed be God, well sold!" Commerce and the fisheries were nourished by home products. The New England whale fishery began in boats from the shore, and finally extended into every sea. The slave-trade and the making of rum were important factors in the industrial life of the eighteenth century. Even the founder of Faneuil Hall helped forward this form of commercial intercourse. Economic history is the basis of political life. No grand theory of government caused our American colonies to form a republic. The economic resistance of strong citizens to stamp acts and other economic grievances won us our magnificent rights of freedom, as truly as the charters of mediæval cities were obtained by purchase.

Mr. William Henry Smith, President of the Associated Press, New York, then read a valuable paper on "The Correspondence of the Pelham Family and the Loss of Oswego to the British." Mr. Smith said that the President of the Association one year ago forcibly presented the importance of governmental aid in the collection of historical records, and commended the example of Canada to the attention of our legislators. If that admirable address by Dr. Poole penetrated to the interior of the Capitol, it would seem to have been confined to the subterranean vaults, or buried beneath innumerable applications for office. The patriotic work of the Dominion of Canada should claim the attention of our great republic. Mr. Smith said he was disposed to favor an extension of the Canadian Government over the United States long enough to inspire our legislators with sufficient patriotism to secure the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts relating to America. He then proceeded to illustrate the value of the papers of the Pelham family which are now accessible, and relate largely to American affairs. The entire collection comprises 522 volumes, 305 of which contain the official correspondence

preserved by Thomas Pelham. It is arranged chronologically, from 1697–1768, and is especially rich in diplomatic papers relating to this country. Mr. Smith's paper will be published in full in the proceedings of the Association, and will doubtless be highly suggestive to students of American history.

The next paper was on "The Early History of the Ballot in Connecticut," by Professor Simeon E. Baldwin, of the Law Department of Yale University. The paper was read in an impressive manner, and held attention. The professor said that election by ballot first appears in American history as a constitutional provision, in the Constitution of Connecticut of 1639. It was coupled with a system of prior official nominations, as regards the "magistrates," or those who came to form the upper house of the Legislature. Twenty were annually nominated, of whom twelve only could be elected. The list was arranged by the Legislature, on the basis of a previous popular vote, and the present incumbents were always put first, in the order of their official seniority. Only as these died, or refused a renomination, was there practically any chance for the election of any of the last eight. The first name on the official ticket was always voted on first, and so on; no one being allowed to vote for more than twelve. This gave great stability to legislation, and was what kept Connecticut so long subject to a Church establishment. When the power of the Federalists had declined everywhere else, it was as strong as ever in the upper house. The representatives elected semi-annually shared the feeling of the day; but the councillors, or "assistants," stood for that of ten or twenty years before. From 1783 to 1801, only one was dropped without his consent; and it took a struggle of seventeen years longer to give a majority to the "Tolerationists" and Jeffersonians. Congressmen were elected in a similar manner, and with similar results, down to 1818. The Legislature published the nominations (twice as many as there were places to fill), and arranged them so that the first half—those already in office—were almost invariably

re-elected. The Colonial charter of 1662 made no mention of the ballot, or of an official ticket, but both had become so firmly imbedded in use, that they were read into it, between the lines, and stood as fundamental institutions of the commonwealth for nearly two hundred years.

At the close of the evening session, Theodore Roosevelt, of the U. S. Civil-Service Commission, gave an *ex-tempore* address upon "Certain Phases of the Westward Movement during the Revolutionary War." He deplored the ignorance of Western history shown by Eastern historians. He likened the ignorance to that of the English regarding American history in general. Those who find American or Western history uninteresting and unpicturesque have only themselves to blame; for the fault lies in the critics, and not in the subject-matter, which is as heroic and inspiring as any great chapter in the history of the world. Mr. Roosevelt said the great West was won in the midst of war and revolution. He gave a graphic picture of the westward movement of the pioneers and the conquest of the Western country from the French and Indians. The motives of the first settlers were adventure, better lands, and the improvement of material conditions in life. Daniel Boone and his followers were joined by various parties of hunters. The region of Kentucky, that old hunting-ground of Northern and Southern Indians, was successfully occupied, but only after Lord Dunmore's war. There was but one route to the West, and that lay through the Cumberland Gap, which the frontiersman had to protect. The conquest of the Illinois country was achieved by the expedition of George Rogers Clark and the Virginians. Few Revolutionary heroes deserve more credit than this bold and aggressive military leader, who conquered the West for the American Republic. Mr. Roosevelt described how government was organized in that Western country upon the basis of English institutions, with which the settlers were familiar. The reproduction of the old English military system and of representation based on military districts, with palisaded villages as the primary seats of self-government, is

most curious and instructive. The county-type of organization was naturally copied by settlers who had come from Virginia and the South. The foundation of this great Federal Republic was laid by backwoodsmen, who conquered and held the land west of the Alleghanies, and thus prepared the way for the continental dominion of the English race in America. The westward movement of the early pioneers can be best understood in the light of the westward march of immigration in our own time.

A lively discussion followed Mr. Roosevelt's spirited presentation of his subject, and exceptions were taken to his statement that there were no permanent settlements beyond the Alleghanies until after the Revolution. Dr. Toner, of the Congressional Library, made a plea for the early settlers of the Ohio Valley, and Dr. Stillé, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Poole, of Chicago, entered the lists in behalf of numerous local settlements beyond the mountains. Mr. Roosevelt defended his thesis as a general proposition, and Mr. Edward G. Mason, President of the Chicago Historical Society, sustained him.

Tuesday morning the Convention met once more in the National Museum, with a large and enthusiastic audience, to listen to a series of papers upon Southern history. In place of Edward Eggleston's paper on "Bacon's Rebellion," which he was prevented from giving, General Henry B. Carrington, who had just returned from Montana, spoke of "The Concentration of the Flathead Indians upon the Jocko Reservation," as betokening a better future for a tribe which, since the expedition of Lewis and Clark in 1805, has been uniformly friendly with the whites. Chief Carlos and every member of the tribe had consented to the removal. Their lands in the Bitter Root Valley are to be sold for the benefit of the Indians to the highest bidder. General Carrington maintained that the history of this tribe shows that Christianity must precede civilization and is essential to Indian development.

"The Constitutional Aspects of Kentucky's Struggle for Autonomy, 1784–92," by Ethelbert D. Warfield, President

of Miami University, Oxford, O., was the next theme of discussion. As early as 1776 Kentucky began to feel the necessity of self-government. In that year George Rogers Clark made the first demand for the separation of that region from Virginia. The mother colony allowed the institution of the county of Kentucky, which concession for the time allayed agitation. It broke out again in 1780, and soon became chronic. From the year 1784 to 1792, when Kentucky was admitted to the Union, no less than ten regular conventions were held and several irregular assemblies besides, in the interest of self-government for Kentucky. The history of the time is one of constant turmoil. Threats of violent separation, both from Virginia and the Union, were frequent; and yet not one action of an unconstitutional character stains the records of these various conventions. The conservative element was largely Scotch-Irish Presbyterian, and it held the balance of power, which was always exerted on the side of law and order. When the Constitution of the United States came before the Virginia Convention, the District of Kentucky voted, eleven to three, against adoption. And yet when their own convention finally drew up a constitution, it leaned strongly toward the Federal instrument. Kentucky shares with Vermont the honor of first insisting on manhood suffrage. The period known as that of the Separatist Movements is one of singular self-restraint when viewed on the constitutional side.

The next paper was by President Lyon G. Tyler, of Williamsburg, Va., who presented some historical facts from the records of William and Mary College, the oldest institution of higher education at the South. Mr. Tyler called attention to the fact that this venerable institution had lately been brought to life by an act of the Virginia General Assembly, which appropriates ten thousand a year to the support of the college. He traced the historic influence of the college upon the university idea in Virginia, and dwelt particularly upon the early elective system in vogue at Williamsburg. He thought that this system was developed

by Jefferson at the University of Virginia, and was not an importation from foreign universities. The first law school in America was established at William and Mary. The professorship of George Wythe was the second law professorship in the English-speaking world. Mr. Tyler also maintained that the college exercised all the powers of a civil-service commission in appointing the county surveyors after examination. He described the early discipline of the college, and illustrated by extracts from the old treasury books the intimate relations between the college and the colony. As early as 1779, William and Mary College was doing its work by an advanced system of lectures on law, medicine, and natural science.

One of the most important papers presented at the Convention was on "Materials for the Study of the Government of the Confederate States," by John Osborne Sumner, a graduate of Harvard University. The author said that historical attention had been directed almost exclusively toward the military operations of the Confederacy, but its constitutional and internal history were also of great interest. Much material for a study of the Confederate Government was destroyed during the war, and much that has been preserved is not yet accessible. We have, however, a full series of the statutes, about one hundred and fifty executive messages, often accompanied by documents, and various reports of secretaries and bureaus. There are also in print numerous congressional documents, ordinances, statutes, and governors' messages of the several States, together with the journals of their legislatures and conventions. The journals of the Confederate Congress are said to be still in existence, but their present place of deposit is not known. The Richmond newspapers contained full reports of public proceedings, but much business was transacted in secret, and is little known. The historical material actually existing is widely scattered among the public and private libraries of the country, and there is as yet no systematic bibliography of what has been published. The most important manuscript collection was that purchased

by the United States Government and now preserved in the Treasury Department. It comprises a large portion of the correspondence of the Confederate Government with its agents abroad and at the North. Other Confederate documents are in the custody of the State Department, and there are several small collections in private hands. The publications of the War Records Office include Confederate documents; but the series thus far has been devoted to military history. The newspapers of the South in war time are a mine of history which has been but little exploited. Various magazines were published at the South, and two or three illustrated papers appeared at Richmond during the war, among them a *Southern Punch*. A noteworthy enterprise of the Confederate Government was the publication in London of *The Index*, a weekly review established for the cultivation of friendly relations between Europe and the South. Mr. Sumner suggested the organization of inquiry with regard to the existence of materials for Confederate history.

The Hon. Wm. Wirt Henry, of Richmond, said that the library of the Southern Historical Society in his city was the chief Southern repository of collections relating to the Civil War and the Confederate States. Dr. J. R. Brackett expressed the hope that Mr. Sumner would print, in connection with his paper, a full bibliography of the materials which he had discovered. Prof. Wm. P. Trent, of the University of the South, then read some interesting "Notes on the Outlook for Historical Studies in the Southern States." He called attention to the collection of materials for Southern history now being made in New York City. He sketched the condition of the various State Historical Societies in the South, and regretted the great lack of public enthusiasm for historical work. He described the existing historical collection at Richmond and other places, and gave some account of the leading publications and monographs now in preparation. Mr. Trent urged that Southern history should be more earnestly studied by scholars in all parts of the country, and recommended a report of historical progress from

the State societies to the American Historical Association. Dr. Justin Winsor, Librarian of Harvard University, paid a merited tribute to the historical work of Mr. Hannis Taylor, of Mobile, Alabama, who, isolated from libraries and historical associations, had produced a valuable constitutional history of England. Dr. H. B. Adams emphasized Mr. Trent's idea of the importance of an annual report of the work done by State Historical Societies to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution through the medium of the American Historical Association.

The morning session was concluded by a brief and an interesting paper on "The Relations of History to Ethnology," by Prof. O. T. Mason, of the National Museum. He showed that the student of human culture is constantly a debtor to the historian. To illustrate this idea, he spoke of the myth of the armadillo. The existence of musical instruments bearing the same name among negroes on two continents, can be explained historically. The student of ethnology spends quite as much time in libraries as in the field. He urged the Association to use its influence for the increase of the collections in the National Museum. He called attention to the motive which governs the operations of the ethnological department as entirely in harmony with the utterance of President Adams, that all things are now studied by the historic method. Professor Mason then explained the contents of the Museum cases, which had been wheeled into the audience room, to illustrate the nature of studies in the history of culture now in progress in Washington.

During the morning session, the venerable historian, George Bancroft, now in his ninetieth year, entered the hall, and, amid the applause of members of the Association, was escorted to the platform, where, for a few moments, he occupied the President's chair, after he had briefly addressed the Society over which he presided three years ago. The closing session of this, the most successful meeting of the American Historical Society, was devoted to historical science in general. A special report on the bib-

liography of members was made by Paul Leicester Ford, the bibliographer of Franklin. A report was read by the Secretary on "The Present Condition of Historical Studies in Canada," by George Stewart, Jr., D.C.L., LL.D., President of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec. Mr. James Schouler, of Boston, the distinguished author of the "History of the United States," read a philosophical paper upon "The Spirit of Research." He said research is a fitting word to apply to historical studies, for it implies that one is not content to skim over the surface of past events, but prefers to turn the soil for himself. Space will not permit even an abstract of Mr. Schouler's inspiring address, nor of Mr. Winsor's no less suggestive account of "The Perils of Historical Study." The writer of the great "Narrative and Critical History of America" warned the Association that history must be continually rewritten, either from new developments or from new sources, which keep historical study fresh and perennial. Each generation must renew the discussion of historical events. Opinions change; and the history of opinion about facts is no small part of the history of those facts. Mr. Winsor's paper was discussed at some length by Judge Chamberlain, of Boston. The last paper of the session was by Worthington C. Ford, editor of the new edition of "Washington's Writings." Mr. Ford spoke of "The Government as a Guardian of American History." He condemned the past policy of the nation in allowing valuable historical papers to pass into private keeping rather than into our national archives. He criticised past and present methods of treating our State papers, and made a strong plea for a better system of government control in these matters.

Resolutions of thanks were passed by the Association for courtesies received from the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, the Curators of the National Museum, the President of the Columbian University, the Governors of the Cosmos Club, the Librarian of the State Department, Mr. and Mrs. Horatio King, and Mrs. Walworth of Washington. A Committee on the time and place of the next meeting reported through Dr. Poole in favor of Washington