

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

By HERBERT B. ADAMS, Secretary.

---

The American Historical Association held its ninth annual meeting July 11-13, 1893, in the city of Chicago, with morning and evening sessions at the Art Institute. This meeting was held in conjunction with the World's Historical Congress. The Chicago committee representing this congress, or the historical section of the department of literature, are members of the American Historical Association and cooperated efficiently with its officers and its committee on programme. Dr. William F. Poole, of the Newberry Library, was the chairman of the Chicago committee, and to his personal efforts is largely due the success of the Chicago meeting. A brief report of the exercises was prepared by him and was published in *The Independent* July 20, 1893.

On Monday evening, July 10, members of the Historical Association and others visiting Chicago for the purpose of attending the various congresses, were given a social reception at the Art Institute. On the following morning the historical congress was called to order by Dr. Poole, who nominated Dr. James B. Angell as temporary president and Dr. Herbert B. Adams as temporary secretary. Hon. William Wirt Henry afterwards moved that the two be made the officers of the congress during its session in Chicago.

The programme for the ninth annual meeting of the American Historical Association was practically identical with that of the World's Historical Congress, and comprised 33 papers, 23 of which were read. Others were contributed to the proceedings and were read by title.

President Angell in his inaugural address spoke of "The inadequate recognition of diplomatists by historians." Mrs.

Ellen Hardin Walworth, of Saratoga, read a paper at the first morning session on "The value of national archives to a nation's life and progress." This paper gave rise to a discussion upon the desirability of a department of national archives in Washington, and remarks were made by Dr. W. F. Poole, President Charles Kendall Adams, and others. Dr. Poole, in his report of the Chicago meeting published in *The Independent*, says:

The historical papers in the State Department are not accessible to the historical student except as a special favor, and they are not arranged, classified, and calendared. The State Department has no space for historical archives and no archivist who understands their management or has time to give to the needs of historical investigators. Indeed, these are not the functions of the State Department. At Ottawa, however, Canada has a department of archives; it is an excellent one, and under the charge of a most competent archivist. American historians, when they need to consult the original documents relating to our own history, often go to Ottawa to see papers which should be in Washington.

A resolution was offered to the effect that a committee be appointed to memorialize Congress to establish a department of archives. It was moved by President Charles Kendall Adams that this committee should consist of nine persons, with President Angell as chairman, and that his associates be named by him. This motion was carried, and the committee subsequently appointed was as follows:

President James B. Angell, Hon. William Wirt Henry, Dr. J. L. M. Curry, Hon. Geo. F. Hoar, Dr. Justin Winsor, President C. K. Adams, Dr. James Schouler, Dr. W. F. Poole, Mrs. Walworth.

A paper on "American historical nomenclature," by Hon. Ainsworth E. Spofford, Librarian of Congress, was read at the Tuesday morning session by the secretary. This paper was an earnest plea for the retention of native American names for American places. Mr. Spofford gave an interesting statistical summary of the influence of Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and other foreign names upon American local nomenclature.

At the Tuesday evening session Dr. James Schouler, of Boston, read a paper upon the "Methods of historical investigation." After alluding to the liberal fortune expended by Mr. Hubert H. Bancroft in his recent history of the Pacific States, and to the corps of literary assistants employed by him in exhuming the contents of his large library of 20,000 volumes, Dr. Schouler considered the value of such organized

methods of historical research as compared with the efforts of an individual scholar, who conducts systematically his own studies into the period which he means to describe, and who uses an amanuensis only for strictly clerical work. His own personal experience favored the latter method, as capable, under suitable self-training, of very extensive and satisfactory results. The trained assistance which one employs with only a mercenary interest in the study can accomplish little after all as compared with one mind inspired for its task and concentrating its powers upon what it seeks.

Prof. Charles J. Little, of Northwestern University, discussed the "Historical method of writing the history of Christian doctrine." Prof. Ephraim Emerton, of Harvard University, contributed a paper on the "Historical doctorate in America," advocating higher standards of graduate work and academic requirement. William Henry Smith, of the Associated Press, spoke of the "First fugitive slave case in Ohio," and Dr. Frederic Bancroft, of Washington, presented an essay on "Mr. Seward's position toward the South at the outbreak of the civil war."

Wednesday morning James Phinney Baxter, of Portland, Me., reviewed the "Present status of pre-Columbian discovery," and Prof. Edward G. Bourne, of Adelbert College, emphasized the work of Prince Henry, the navigator, in persistently and systematically promoting the exploration of the west coast of Africa for over forty years (1416-60.) This work was of immense importance in preparing the way for Columbus, Diaz, Da Gama, and Magellan. The sailors of Prince Henry showed that the region about the equator was inhabitable and inhabited, and that the traditional terrors of the ocean had little reality. An examination of the contemporary accounts of Prince Henry's work, especially a series of documents recently published by the Portuguese Government, and the papal bull of Nicholas V, (1454) shows that it was carried on for four purposes—to explore unknown parts of the world, to spread Christianity, to reach the Indies by sailing around Africa, and to promote commerce. Much of his success was owing to his unfaltering persistency in spite of temporary failure, and to the enthusiastic devotion which he inspired in his followers. If Columbus had never lived, it seems inevitable that America would have been discovered by Portuguese seamen following out the work begun by Prince Henry.

Prof. Bernard Moses, of the University of California, discussed "The economic conditions of Spain in the sixteenth century," and Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, of Vassar College, showed the historic importance of the Union of Utrecht. At the Tuesday evening session Dr. George Kriehn read a short paper on "English popular uprisings of the Middle Ages." Prof. George P. Fisher, of Yale University, contributed a suggestive essay on "The social compact and Mr. Jefferson's adoption of it." Prof. Jesse Macy, of Iowa College, presented a careful study of "The relation of history to politics." Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary of the Wisconsin Historical Society, read a paper on "Early lead mining in Illinois and Wisconsin," and Prof. F. J. Turner, of the University of Wisconsin, explained the "Significance of the frontier in American history." Up to our own day, he said, American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the great west. This ever-retreating frontier of unoccupied land is the key to our development. The settlement of the problems that arose at one frontier served as guides for the next frontier—for example, in matters relating to land policy and the Indians. There are various kinds of frontiers which passed westward in successive waves—for example, the Indian's frontier, the trader's frontier, the miner's or rancher's frontier, and the farmer's frontier. The methods of advance and the characteristics of each were traced, showing how the Indian was pushed back and how each frontier affected its successor. It was found that the successive frontiers revealed the progress of society. At the same time the United States could show the hunting stage, the pastoral stage, the agricultural stage, and the manufacturing stage, as the traveler crossed the continent from west to east.

At the Thursday morning session Dr. Lewis H. Boutell, of Chicago, read a paper on "Roger Sherman in the National Constitutional Convention." Prof. Charles H. Haskins, of the University of Wisconsin, discussed the "Eleventh amendment of the Constitution." This amendment was introduced into Congress in 1794 and declared in force in 1798. It provides that the judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity begun or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state. Its judicial construction involves important and intricate questions of

constitutional law, and earlier opinions have been somewhat modified in the recent cases, many of them arising from the repudiation of debts in the Southern States, which have been persistently forced on the courts. Thus, in 1890, in the case of *Hans v. Louisiana*, the Supreme Court decided that a sovereign State could not be sued, even by her own citizens, and that the decision in *Chisholm v. Georgia* was incorrect. The term "sovereign State," however, as here used denotes financial rather than political independence and differs widely in meaning from the use of one hundred or even fifty years ago. The free repudiation of public contracts in many States, and the impossibility of enforcing many of the constitutional restrictions upon States, have led some to propose a repeal of the eleventh amendment, though there has been as yet no general movement in that direction.

Prof. James A. Woodburn, of the Indiana State University, described the "Historical significance of the Missouri compromise." Hon. William Wirt Henry, of Richmond, Va., presented a paper on the "First legislative assembly in America." Although Virginia, the oldest English colony in America, was at first under military government, it was allowed the privilege of a legislative assembly in 1619 under the commission of Governor Yeardley. This, the first legislative assembly in America, met at Jamestown July 30, 1619, more than a year before the sailing of the Pilgrims. It was composed of the governor and his council and two representatives, chosen from each plantation, making twenty-two burgesses. The place of meeting was the Episcopal church at Jamestown. This building, the manner in which the assembly was constituted, and its personnel, were sketched by Mr. Henry, and the proceedings of the legislative body were fully given. The Virginia assembly as early as 1623, and continuously afterwards, claimed the sole and exclusive right to tax the colony and boldly took issue with parliament in 1765, on the passage of the stamp act, declaring that, as it imposed the tax upon the colonies without their consent, it tended to destroy British as well as American freedom. This brought on the Revolution, which established the independence of the United States, with the grand results which have followed.

Miss Cora Start, of Worcester, Mass., read a valuable monograph on "Naturalization in the English colonies of America." Prof. B. A. Hinsdale, of the University of Michigan, showed

the importance of the "Thirty-first parallel in American history." At the Thursday evening and closing session Prof. Simeon E. Baldwin, of Yale University, described "The historic policy of the United States as to annexation." This paper is printed in full in the *Yale Review*, August, 1893. Prof. J. Franklin Jameson's paper on the "Origin of the standing-committee system in American legislative bodies" was read in part by the secretary.

Prof. F. W. Blackmar, of the University of Kansas, read an interesting sketch of the "Annals of an historic town." He showed that, by the passage of the Douglass bill, Congress removed the battle field of slavery from Congressional halls to the plains of Kansas. National issues were referred to a local community for final settlement. Lawrence was the first Free-State town of any importance and it became the center of the Free-State movement in the Territory of Kansas. The municipal life of Lawrence is instructive as illustrating the development of free institutions. The town was settled by New Englanders, sent out by the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Society, and they brought with them New England institutions. They came to establish religious and political liberty in Kansas, and in this respect they partook of the spirit of the Puritans and Pilgrims of New England. But they sought the freedom of others as well as their own improvement, and were not obliged to leave their own country on account of oppression. The people who settled Lawrence were not abolitionists, but they intended to make Kansas a free State according to the legal act of Congress. They respected and obeyed Federal authority and desired to avoid open conflict. Their steady, persistent determination to abide by Federal law, and at the same time to oppose false local legislation, made Kansas a free commonwealth.

---