

I.—REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF TENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

By HERBERT B. ADAMS, Secretary.

At the ninth annual meeting of the American Historical Association, held at Chicago July 10-12, 1893, it was agreed to celebrate at Saratoga in September, 1894, the decennial of this organization. It was found, however, impossible to prepare for that time and place a sufficiently attractive programme, and it was deemed wiser to hold the tenth annual meeting during the Christmas holidays in Washington, D. C. The American Historical Association is a chartered national society in organic relations with the Smithsonian Institution. Obviously the most fitting place for annual historical conventions is in the capital city of the nation, where the association now belongs. Experience has demonstrated this fact.

Arrangements were made as usual for three evening sessions at the Columbian University and two morning sessions at the United States National Museum. The pleasant rooms of the Cosmos Club House were a convenient social rendezvous after the evening sessions. The best results of a scientific convention are sometimes reached in conversational ways. Men widen their acquaintance and get new ideas.

The American Society of Church History, the American Jewish Historical Association, the Folk Lore Society, and the Forestry Association held their annual meetings in Washington during the Christmas holidays, at times not seriously conflicting with the appointments of the American Historical Association. The holiday season is becoming more and more the time for the annual conventions of scientific bodies. Four great cities along the Atlantic Seaboard were this year the chief centers

of attraction. In New York the American Economic Association assembled. In Philadelphia the American Oriental Society, the American Philological Association, the Modern Language Association of America, the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, the American Dialect Society, the Spelling Reform Association, and the Archæological Institute of America held their meetings. In Baltimore, at the Johns Hopkins University, were convened the Geological Society of America, the American Society of Naturalists, the American Morphological Society, and the American Physiological Society.

These various reunions, together with those in Washington, clearly show that the time has come for organizing annual American congresses of learned societies in our great cities. Kindred subjects like history, politics, economics, and social science should be kept together in the same congress by means of allied associations. There is an enormous waste of energy in the present management and social entertainment of large conventions of educators and learned bodies. By means of a general committee of arrangements a national congress of all kindred societies could be brought about, and their various members might thus enjoy larger opportunities for acquaintance, converse, and discussion. With conventions held in different cities, members of kindred societies have difficulty in determining which meeting to attend, and are thus sometimes cut off from desirable scientific connections.

Dr. Justin Winsor, of Harvard University, presided at the various sessions of the American Historical Association in Washington. The president of the association, Mr. Henry Adams, was prevented, by absence in South America, from discharging this duty, but a communication from him was read by the secretary. A paper was read by Prof. George B. Adams, of Yale University, on the "Beginning of the idea of imperial federation." In 1869-70 a rapid series of events revealed to the British public that Gladstone's cabinet were apparently on the point of turning the colonies adrift. In this connection the plan of imperial federation was brought into prominence and first discussed as a practical scheme. Mr. W. E. Forster sanctioned it in 1875, and in 1884 the Imperial Federation League was organized. Appropriate tributes were paid to the memory of Herbert Tuttle, John Jay, Robert C. Winthrop, the Hon. Hamilton Fish, President James C. Welling, and Dr. William F. Poole, all members of the association. Mr. Jay and

Dr. Poole were ex-presidents. Bibliographies of the writings of these distinguished members are printed in the Report for 1889.

Rossiter Johnson, of New York City, presented an incisive and critical paper on "Turning points in the American civil war." These were (1) Kentucky's refusal to secede, which deprived the Confederates of the natural line of defense along the Ohio; (2) the battle of Bull Run, which confirmed the Southern people in their belief in their superior prowess and certainty of success; (3) the emancipation proclamation, which placed the struggle on its true issue; (4) the battle of Gettysburg, which ended any hope of carrying the war into the North; (5) the reelection of President Lincoln, which decided that there should be no cessation of hostilities till the Confederacy ceased to exist.

Mrs. Lee C. Harby, of New York, discussed in the morning session at the National Museum "The Tejas: Their habits, government, and superstitions." George Parker Winship, of Harvard University, explained why Coronado went to New Mexico in 1540. Prof. Bernard Moses, of the University of California, presented a scholarly monograph on the Casa de Contratacion of Seville, a body created in 1503 for the control of the economical affairs of Spanish America, which was like the East India House in English administration. Dr. Walter B. Scaife, of Allegheny, Pa., explained some European modifications of the jury system. He showed that the jury system was introduced on the Continent by the French Revolution, but for criminal matters only. The Code Napoleon retained it, but required merely a majority vote for the verdict, and abolished the jury of accusation, which corresponded to our grand jury, and which never since has found a footing either in France or the neighboring countries. Instead, the preliminary investigation is conducted by a judge of examination, who generally acts in secret, though the Swiss Canton of Zurich already admits the accused with his counsel to all stages of the process. A movement to secure the same right is on foot in Germany.

Prof. John S. Bassett, of Trinity College, Durham, N. C., presented a new view of the regulators of North Carolina (1766-1771). The uprising was merely a popular tumult, like the uprising of discontented peasants against their lords. It was due to economic and political causes, but it was not an attempted revolution against Great Britain. Prof. Frank W.

Blackmar, of the University of Kansas, sketched the life of Charles Robinson, the first governor of that State. He appears to have been the most important influence in upbuilding the Commonwealth of Kansas; more prominent, indeed, than John Brown or James H. Lane. Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, of Philadelphia, called attention to a neglected portion of American Revolutionary history, or to the voluminous and unused papers of the Continental Congress. Thus far only the military, diplomatic, and financial affairs of the old Congress have been investigated. Other matters are worthy of historical study in this connection; for example, methods of Congressional procedure, economic relations, and modes of supplying the army. Of special interest are the reports of committees, as well as the journals and correspondence of the Continental Congress.

In his paper on the origin and development of the labor movement in national and municipal politics in England, Mr. Edward Porritt showed that the outstanding fact is that the labor movement began in Parliament and worked downward into municipal politics. Labor representation in the House of Commons dates back to 1874, while labor representation in town and county councils is a much more recent development of the movement, dating back only to 1889. The parliamentary movement had its beginnings before the working classes were enfranchised. Workingmen living in the towns first exercised the parliamentary vote in 1868; those living in the rural districts, in 1885. In 1867, however, a royal commission was appointed to inquire into the organization and conduct of trade unions, and the appointment of this commission led to the appointment by the trade unionists of a representative national committee, which subsequently developed into the organization now known as the Trade Union Congress. It took this name in 1868, and the following year, at the congress held in Birmingham, labor representation in Parliament first became a definite policy of the trade-unionists. At the general election in 1868 two trade-union leaders unsuccessfully sought seats in the House of Commons, and it was not until the general election in 1874 that trade-unionists were elected to Parliament. The first representatives of labor in the House of Commons were those sent there by the miners of Northumberland and Staffordshire. The miners were the first to take advantage of the reform act passed in 1868; and they

also, more generally than any other trade-unionists, took advantage of the reform act of 1884. This activity on the part of the miners is accounted for by the fact that they are in much closer and more frequent contact with the law than any other workmen, and that in many of the constituencies on the great coal fields the miners are the dominating force in the electorate. In these constituencies the parliamentary candidate who secures the unanimous support of the miners is certain of election. Since the Trade Union Congress in 1869 first declared in favor of the representation of labor in the House of Commons, five Parliaments have been elected. In the first there were 2 labor members; in the second there were 3; in the third there were 10; in the fourth there were 12, and in the fifth there are 16. Mr. Porritt next traced the legislation in behalf of labor which has been passed since 1868, and indicated the effect the labor representation and the labor vote have had on the programmes of both political parties. With regard to municipal politics, the labor policy has been formulated since 1889. So far the labor party has principally confined itself in municipal politics to demands for the establishment of municipal workshops; for an eight-hour day for municipal work people; the abolition of the contract system in all public works; remunerative work for the unemployed, and reduction of the salaries of the legal, engineering, and clerical staffs in the municipal service, and to attempts to compel school boards and town councils to usurp many of the functions and duties which Parliament has, since 1834, imposed on the boards of guardians for the relief of the poor.

At the close of the first morning session Prof. William A. Dunning, of Columbia College, gave a rapid review of American political philosophy. He said the thoughts of the colonial theorists were but the familiar doctrines of the English revolution. Jefferson embodied in the Declaration of Independence the philosophy of all Europe in the eighteenth century, and his leading idea of human equality dates back to imperial Rome.

Tucker, of the Jeffersonian school, in his edition of Blackstone, transferred the principles of the current social contract theory of the State to the explanation of the United States Constitution, and thus became, in a measure, the founder of State sovereignty as a philosophical dogma. Calhoun defended it, however, on different grounds. His "Disquisition on government" is a valuable essay in political philosophy. Francis

Lieber was the first American writer to make a near approach to speculation both broad and systematic, but his civil liberty is rather more in the field of ethics than of politics. Woolsey followed Lieber, but with a theological leaning. The convulsions of our civil war brought out much political literature. Hurd and Draper philosophized on the lines of Austin and Buckle. Brownson wrote cleverly from the standpoint of the Roman Catholic Church. Mulford reproduced the doctrines of Hegel and Stahl. More satisfactory and more original work has been done by J. A. Jameson and John W. Burgess, combining the historical and the juristic method, and in them is to be found the nearest approach as yet to a distinctly American school.

At the Thursday evening session Professor Emerton, of Harvard University, read a paper on "The papal and imperial electoral colleges." It was a brief review of the problem of the origin of the German institution, especially as influenced by the papacy. The writer thought that the German electorate could best be studied by the analogy of the Roman college of cardinals. Prof. E. G. Bourne, of Adelbert College, presented the paper of his brother, Prof. Henry E. Bourne, of the Cleveland College for Women, on "The first committee of public safety: Its organization, policy, and fall." He ascribed the rise of the committee of public safety in France to the crisis in domestic and foreign politics in April, 1793.

Prof. Charles H. Haskins, of the University of Wisconsin, read the paper of his colleague, Prof. Victor Coffin, on "The Quebec bill and the American Revolution." The writer maintained that the provisions of the Quebec act were not caused by the position of affairs in the other American colonies, but were in accordance with the previous conduct of Canadian affairs, and were advocated to the ministry on grounds apart from colonial quarrels. Prof. Richard Hudson, of the University of Michigan, read a careful study of the German Emperor, considered institutionally.

A group of excellent papers was read at the Friday morning session in the National Museum on "Rhode Island history." Harold D. Hazeltine, a graduate of Brown University, ably discussed the "Appeals from Rhode Island courts to the King in council." The English privy council was the predecessor of our Supreme Court, and consequently the history of appeals made to the English tribunal from Rhode Island is an important

contribution to the study of institutions. Frank Greene Bates, of Cornell University, read a valuable paper upon "Rhode Island and the impost of 1781." He explained Rhode Island's opposition to this impost as based upon the idea of State rights. Arthur May Mowry, of Harvard University, intelligently reviewed the constitutional controversy in Rhode Island in 1841, and the famous Dorr rebellion. Samuel B. Harding, of Harvard University, described the party struggles over the Pennsylvania constitution from 1775 to 1790. His object was to show that the cause of the extreme opposition manifested in Pennsylvania to the new Federal Constitution was to be found in State factions. S. M. Sener, of Lancaster, Pa., described in a familiar way the language, manners, and customs of the Pennsylvania Germans. James A. Wilgus, of the Ohio State University, made a substantial contribution to the history of township government in Ohio. Prof. A. C. McLaughlin, of the University of Michigan, closed the last session in the National Museum by an excellent discussion of the retention of the western posts by the British after 1783. The paper was printed in the *Yale Review*, February, 1895.

The first paper read at the closing session of the tenth annual convention was on "Mountains and history," by Prof. Edmund K. Alden, of Packer Institute, Brooklyn. He called attention to the increasing importance of the study of topography as related to history. He surveyed the historic mountain groups of the world, and illustrated their influence in various ways. He emphasized the value of mountaineering to historical students. Many of the complex questions of early Roman history can be better understood by a study of Italian topography than by work over Livy in libraries. Another valuable paper was that by Prof. A. D. Morse, of Amherst College, on the "Causes and consequences of the party revolution of 1800." The writer maintained that while Federalist quarrels and the impolitic legislation of 1798, together with the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, explained why the revolution took place in 1800 rather than later, and may be termed justly the immediate causes which produced that event, the underlying cause is to be found in the fact that the Federalists had finished the work which they could do for the United States, while for the tasks of the period the Republicans had a greater aptitude. The most important consequence of the revolution was the impulse which it gave to the development of a national and

American character through making the party which represented the people most fully responsible for the national welfare. The paper of Prof. James H. Robinson, of the University of Pennsylvania, on "The tennis court oath," in the absence of the author, was read by title.

An interesting feature of the closing session was a spirited impromptu address by Prof. H. Morse Stephens, an Oxford graduate, who was recently elected to succeed Prof. Herbert Tuttle in the chair of modern history in Cornell University. Mr. Stephens is the author of a scholarly and readable history of the French Revolution, a work which has attracted marked attention in this country, as well as in Europe, and undoubtedly led to Mr. Stephens's call to Ithaca. He spoke for a half hour upon the Oxford school of history and its chief representatives, Professors Stubbs, Freeman, Froude, and York-Powell. Stubbs laid down the lines which the Oxford school still follows. He put great stress upon the study of English constitutional and political history. He required also the special study of some great period of foreign history, and the special use of original sources. Political philosophy, political economy, and geography were additional features of the Oxford school of history. Mr. Stephens said that the greatest sin Gladstone ever committed was in making Stubbs a bishop, for there is always abundant material in England for bishops, but there is only one Stubbs.

Mr. Stephens's comments upon Professor Freeman were very amusing. Freeman disliked teaching, and deliberately fixed his lecture hour at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, when Oxford undergraduates are usually upon the river or playing cricket. Freeman's class seldom numbered more than one, and with him the old historian often went to walk at the lecture hour. Mr. Winsor afterwards capped Mr. Stephens's stories by telling of a visit to Freeman's house in Oxford, where the historian was found with his class of one and his two daughters throwing bean bags in the front hall. When Froude came to Oxford the Freemanites shrieked; but Froude immediately became popular with the undergraduates, to whom he lectured at convenient hours upon such stirring themes as English seamen of the Elizabethan age. Young Oxford became very proud of him, and his audiences rivaled those of John Ruskin in former years. Froude's very faults drew attention to his literary merits. Professor York-Powell has been chosen as Froude's successor.

York-Powell thoroughly understands the principles of the Oxford school of history, and will maintain them. He was a staunch friend and supporter of Professor Freeman, whom he relieved of many burdensome administrative duties, such as sitting on academic boards. York-Powell began his scientific career as a special student of Icelandic literature, but has edited a series of books on English history, based upon original sources. Many people have wondered why Samuel Rawson Gardiner was not chosen to be Froude's successor. Mr. Stephens intimated that Gardiner had expressed his aversion to academic teaching, and preferred to continue his own historical work.

A paper on "The historical archives of the State Department" was presented by Andrew Hussey Allen, chief of the Bureau of Rolls and Library. The paper was designed to correct certain popular misapprehensions concerning the accessibility of historical manuscripts now in the possession of the Department of State. After describing the character and contents of the various collections belonging to the Government, Mr. Allen proceeded to notice and refute certain charges that had been made against the library of the State Department. He referred to the published report of Dr. W. F. Poole's remarks at the Chicago meeting of the association, and reconsidered each specific point, giving positive evidence that the State Department had arranged, classified, and calendared its manuscripts. With regard to making them accessible, the Department is doing everything permitted by its resources. Since 1893 it has published four bulletins: (1) A catalogue of the papers of the Continental Congress, with a miscellaneous index and a documentary history of the Constitution; (2) a calendar of the correspondence of James Monroe; (3) the arrangement of the Washington Papers, with a miscellaneous index and documentary history of the Constitution; (4) a calendar of the correspondence of James Madison. Mr. Allen said the objects of the Historical Association can be better served by the exercise of its influence for legislative action providing for the preservation and publication of state papers than by the suggestion or promotion of measures looking to the erection of a hall of records. Access will continue to be accorded without special favor and with no further discrimination of individuals than that involved in the necessary ascertainment of the carefulness, responsibility, and good faith of the investigator.

An encouraging paper was read by A. Howard Clark, of the Smithsonian Institution, on "What the United States Government has done for history." He said that the Government had spent more than \$2,000,000 in the acquisition and publication of historical records, and had spent many millions more in the erection of monuments and in the celebration of historical events. The United States Government is now annually expending more than a quarter of a million dollars directly in behalf of American history. No nation ever undertook such a magnificent historical work as is now approaching completion under charge of efficient bureaus in the War and Navy Departments. Mr. Clark reviewed the patriotic work of Peter Force, who brought together a storehouse of information concerning colonial and Revolutionary history. Under his direction the United States Government published 9 folio volumes of American archives, but the work encountered some opposition and was suspended. In 1867 he sold to the United States all his papers and manuscripts, which afford materials for 30 volumes covering our history from 1775 until 1789, when the series of State papers begin, with the records of the first Congress under the Constitution. Mr. Clark called attention to the editorial labors of Jared Sparks and Dr. Francis Wharton, to the various historical collections now in possession of the Government, and to the importance of obtaining other collections now in private hands.

One of the most important acts of the United States Government in behalf of history was the incorporation of The American Historical Association by act of Congress, approved January 4, 1889, "for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred historical purposes in the interest of American history and of history in America." Congress requires from the association an annual report concerning its proceedings and the condition of historical study in America. It is the duty of the association to do for history in America what the National Academy has for many years done for natural science. Through the Historical Association the United States Government is brought into touch with every State and local historical society. One of the most valuable publications of the association is its exhaustive bibliography, prepared by an expert, Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, of the published works of all the prominent historical societies in this country, a bibliography including nearly 10,000

titles. During its first decade the association has published 10 volumes of "Papers" and "Reports," aggregating 5,192 pages of valuable historical matter. One-half of it has been issued under the auspices of the United States Government.

Mr. Clark said that the real national work of the association had just begun. Through appointed committees the association can secure valuable information concerning historical manuscripts, and submit the same in copied form to Congress for publication in connection with our annual reports. Information can be furnished to the whole country concerning the historical work of colleges and universities and of the 250 historical societies. The time maybe at hand, said Mr. Clark, for this association to prepare a complete, classified, and fully indexed analytical bibliography of all works in manuscript or print, in English or in foreign tongues, concerning the history of America.