

\* \* \* \* *Historical News* \* \* \* \*

## The Sixty-Third Annual Meeting

### I

The sixty-third annual meeting of the American Historical Association took place on December 28, 29, and 30 at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C. Eleven allied societies met jointly with the Association. Forty-five sessions were held during the three days, and the program carried the names of one hundred eighty-two persons, of whom one hundred and three delivered papers. Even so, there seem to have been none too many sessions to accommodate the assembled throng, for it was the fate of latecomers at many meetings to find standing room only, in some cases not even inside the doors.

Increased railroad fares and other high prices failed to dampen the annual conclave and outing. The final count showed a total of 1,332 persons registered, almost a hundred more than the previous high established at New York in 1946. Many who had attempted to reserve rooms at the headquarters hotel were disappointed, not only because of the large total numbers, but because so many canny colleagues had reserved their rooms long before the program was mailed, though it was mailed in the second week of November. Members of the program and local arrangements committees, only too aware of the effects of inflation on people like themselves, were agreeably surprised to find that the cost of dinners and luncheon-conferences proved not too forbidding; almost all dinners and luncheons were booked to capacity, and 560 persons attended the presidential dinner. There were times when many wondered whether it is possible, on purely quantitative grounds, for the Association to go on in future years holding its annual meeting in any single hotel, in the way to which we have become accustomed.

The program committee, consisting of Shepard B. Clough, W. F. Craven, and Felix Gilbert, together with the undersigned as chairman, began its planning almost a year in advance. Relations were soon established with the local arrangements chairman, Dean Elmer Louis Kayser, who with his assistant, Robert Osborn Mead, bore the unenviable burden of foreseeing and coping with the problems of housing, registering, and bookkeeping, of arranging for the dinners and luncheons, for a certain number of events not listed on the printed program, for the publishers' exhibits, the publicity, and the innumerable details of the sort that seldom meet the eye. To Dean Kayser and his co-workers, to the management and to the waiters and other employees of the hotel, the Association is indebted for smooth operations in a situation that seemed sometimes to verge on the impossible. Those who were able to go will remember likewise with particular pleasure the trip to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, where members of the

Association and their wives visited the grounds and met the staff, transported both ways by Navy buses. To our host on this occasion, Rear Admiral J. L. Holloway, jr., and to Captain Heffernan in Washington we must again express our appreciation.

The program committee, at the outset of its planning, attempted to provide as broad as possible a basis of participation in the program. A ground rule was adopted (to which a few exceptions were later made) that no one who had appeared on the program in the preceding two years should be invited to take part; the purpose was of course to favor those who had either never or not recently appeared. An especial effort was made to recruit younger scholars, on the theory that their introduction to professional associates was one of the most useful functions the convention could perform, but to mix them in the same sessions with scholars of established standing, who would be likely to draw audiences and would speak with authority on their subjects. It was also thought desirable to have a wide geographical representation, resisting the tendency to draw a very high proportion of participants from the region in which the convention was planned and held. Of the 182 persons who were finally scheduled as speakers, discussion leaders, or chairmen, the Middle Atlantic region supplied 29 per cent, the Middle West 22 per cent, New England and Washington, D. C., each 14 per cent, the West 11 per cent and the South 10 per cent.

The year being 1948, it was decided to celebrate the centennial of the Revolution of 1848. At the same time it was obvious, in view of the diversity of interests within the Association, that this subject would lack appeal for many members; and the committee was aware of the widely felt critical attitude toward "unifying themes," especially themes involving the artificiality of centennials or other phenomena of the decimal system. It was decided to have no more than a third of the meetings deal with 1848; as it turned out eighteen out of forty-five meetings did so, so that the one third proportion was exceeded. About a third of the meetings were arranged by affiliated societies (thirteen meetings by eleven societies); and two bodies within the American Historical Association itself, namely the Conference on Latin American Studies and the Modern European History Section, planned and staged three of the meetings. The program committee owes its thanks to the individuals who planned these joint sessions. At the same time the committee undertook to limit these joint meetings to about a third of those carried on the official program, in the belief that to have more than this proportion would give an overspecialized and disunited character to the convention. The remaining sessions, those neither dealing with 1848 nor arising from affiliated bodies, were projected by the program committee, or by persons acting in its behalf, to give coverage to fields, areas, or periods which required attention. Among these categories of meetings there was overlapping; two affiliated societies presented papers on 1848, and others, to the great satisfaction of the program committee, gave their attention to fields in which the coverage was otherwise too

light. This was especially true of United States history. A final analysis shows that about a third of the sessions dealt with 1848, another third with one aspect or another of the history of the United States, and a final third with a wide array of other topics.

## II

It is convenient to begin with the last and most miscellaneous third, in which some of the most notable of the meetings were included. Deserving first mention among these, and always the pre-eminent event for members of the Association, was the presidential dinner, at which, as noted already, well over five hundred people filled the main ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel. Dean Kayser presented General Ulysses S. Grant III, who acted as toastmaster and civic host. He in turn felicitously introduced, in the after-dinner sense, introduction as such being hardly necessary, the president of the American Historical Association, Professor Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale University, who delivered a memorable address on "The Christian Understanding of History." Readers of this *Review* will have had the opportunity to read and ponder his paper, published as it is in the January number, and raising some of the deeper and more far-reaching problems in the interpretation of the world's destinies. At the dinner also, as is customary, the award of prizes was announced.

The first award of the James Hazen Hyde Prize was made to Louis R. Gottschalk of the University of Chicago, for the manuscript of his book, "Lafayette between the American Revolution and the French Revolution." The John H. Dunning Prize was presented to William E. Livezey, of the University of Oklahoma, for his *Mahan and Sea Power*, with honorable mention to Robert Luther Thompson for his book, *Wiring a Continent*. The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize was won by Raymond de Roover for his book, *The Medici Bank: Its Organization, Management, Operations, and Decline*. The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Award went to Donald Fleming for his manuscript, "John William Draper and the Religion of Science," with honorable mention to Clement G. Motten of Temple University for his manuscript, "Mexican Silver and the Enlightenment: A Study in the Promotion of Useful Knowledge." Both these manuscripts will be published in the Beveridge series.

Two other repasts gave an opportunity to hear ideas from outside the strict fraternity of historical scholars. At the dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association the speaker was Mr. Joseph A. Brandt, who, though in truth a historian in his own right, brought to bear the experience of one who has been also a college president and head of three different university presses and of a great New York publishing house. Mr. Brandt spoke on "A New Role for the Historian." He urged that historians, without loss of time in a fast-moving age, make the attempt, perhaps in concert with labor organizations, to publish brief and simply written pamphlets in history for mass reading. At the luncheon confer-

ence of the Agricultural History Society the originally announced speaker, Mr. Dennis A. Fitzgerald of the Department of Agriculture, was debarred from appearing by official duties which called him from Washington. The society and its numerous friends were much favored by Mr. Norris E. Dodd, director general of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, who spoke on the work, problems, and purposes of that superlatively important body. His talk was warmly appreciated by the large audience which heard it.

Three meetings dealt with aspects of the inexhaustible subject of Asia. Albert Howe Lybyer of the University of Illinois presided at a session on the Near East, at which three papers were read. Lewis V. Thomas of Princeton presented a report on "Ottoman Awareness of Europe, 1650 to 1800." As a whole, he found, even educated Turks had little knowledge of Western Europe in the seventeenth century. They received and used some Western products, and they were sometimes at war with Central Europe. But having no newspapers, and even no printing until well into the eighteenth century, they lacked means of acquiring information. Nevertheless a few, by travel, conversations, or reading, developed a keen interest in the West, and imparted it to limited circles of friends. Noteworthy among these was Hajji Khalfa, whose great activity was made very clear by Mr. Thomas. Dr. Vernon J. Puryear of California developed from French Foreign Office material "The Genesis of the Bonapartean Expedition to Egypt." This, he declared, was far more than the individual plan of a brilliant young general. Various persons assisted in forming the policies of the expedition, such as the hope of marching through Palestine and Syria toward India or Constantinople, the assembling of a group of scientists to study the antiquities of Egypt, and the detailing of practical men to investigate natural resources, the use of the Nile waters, and the possibility of a Suez canal. Dr. Frederick S. Rodkey discussed acutely, on the basis of memorandums taken in the British Foreign Office, the "Ottoman Awareness of the Challenge of the West in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." He covered closely the years 1850 to 1856. Many Turks were then anxious for "reforms," such as might modernize their country in a salutary way, but they were afraid of Western financial assistance. They feared long-time contracts for payment, and the pledging of such resources as the Egyptian Tribute and the customs receipts of important cities. But the vast expenditures during the Crimean War broke down their resistance. In the end they accepted loans on unfavorable terms, which moreover served as precedents for later loans that led to national disaster.

"India and Pakistan since Partition" formed the subject of another session, at which W. Norman Brown of the University of Pennsylvania was the chairman. One paper, by Daniel and Alice Thorner, also of Pennsylvania, dealt with the general problem of "Hindu-Muslim Relations." While acknowledging the basic importance of cultural differences, the paper dealt with economic disparities and political rivalries between Hindus and Muslims. The most influential of these, it

was observed, came into being in the nineteenth century as part of the process of transforming India from a self-sufficient economy into a subordinate part of the metropolitan economy of Great Britain. The authors analyzed the incidence of these changes upon the two communities, and concluded that partition, far from resolving the problems, has transferred them into economic disparity and political rivalry at the international level between the Dominions of India and Pakistan. Phillips Talbot, of the Institute of Current World Affairs, in a paper on the "Kashmir and Hyderabad Issues," discussed the background of each conflict, the steps by which each had progressed, the appeals to the United Nations, and present status. In the discussion Dr. Imdad Husain of the embassy of Pakistan, and Mr. S. K. Shastri of the embassy of India, vigorously presented their respective sides; there were many additional comments from the floor. A third paper on "Constitution-Framing" was read by Holden Furber of Pennsylvania. He dealt primarily with India's draft constitution, since it is in a more advanced stage of development than that of Pakistan. This draft, which describes India as a sovereign democratic republic and as a "Union of States," owes much both to Anglo-American precedents and to the legal and administrative framework of the former imperial regime. The constitutional structure is unitary rather than federal, the executive's "emergency" powers great rather than small, and constitutional amendment easy rather than hard.

In keeping with the general attention to the Revolution of 1848, the session on modern Chinese history, with Knight Biggerstaff of Cornell as chairman, was devoted to the contemporary but otherwise unrelated revolutionary movement of the T'ai'ping rebellion (1850-64). Eugene P. Boardman of Wisconsin, in a paper entitled "Biblical Influence upon the Ideology of the T'ai'ping Rebellion," showed that the T'ai'ping leader Hung Hsiu-ch'üan failed to take over the more humanitarian Christian teachings, confining his borrowings for the most part to those elements of the Bible which strengthened his control of the masses and the discipline and devotion of his soldiers. The T'ai'pings adopted enough foreign ideas to turn the Chinese literati class against them, yet at the same time the unorthodoxy of their use of Biblical doctrines alienated the Christian missionaries and other foreigners. In his comments Ssü-yü Têng, of the University of Chicago, stated his belief that the T'ai'ping leaders were actually more influenced by Taoism than by Christianity. In a paper entitled "Military Organization and the Power Structure of China during the T'ai'ping Rebellion," Franz H. Michael (University of Washington) related the rise of local armed bands first to the development of the T'ai'ping military organization and later to the formation of provincial armies which ultimately put down the rebellion. In both cases the military development was related to local demands for economic reform. The victorious provincial troops, who continued to be the only soldiers at the disposal of the emperor, tended thereafter to remain regional in their orientation. Charles C. Stelle (Department of State) underlining some of Dr. Michael's principal

points, called attention to the importance of the T'ai-p'ing rebellion to an understanding of the current civil war in China. John K. Fairbank of Harvard, then closed the discussion with a brief comparison of the T'ai-p'ing rebels with the present-day Chinese Communists under the headings of ideology, leadership, reform programs, regionalism, and foreign support.

To the affairs of Latin America two meetings were devoted. At the luncheon session of the Conference on Latin American History, presided over by Lewis Hanke, a large audience heard a discussion of the role of history in the program of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. Brief talks were given by Arthur P. Whitaker of the University of Pennsylvania, Paul Daniels of the Department of State, Robert H. Randall, vice-president of the Pan American Institute, and Dr. Silvio Zavala of Mexico, who serves as chairman of the institute's commission on history. George P. Hammond of the University of California also spoke on the various programs now under consideration to bring microfilm copies of historical materials on Latin American history to libraries in this country.

Later that afternoon, at a meeting devoted to Latin American historiography, Charles C. Griffin of Vassar College read a paper entitled "Social and Economic Aspects of the Era of Spanish-American Independence." The social results of the struggles for independence were many, he said, and varied from one country to another. In general many people were driven from their homes, livestock expropriated, families uprooted, communications dislocated, commerce injured by privateering, but there were also beneficial results, for careers in the public service were opened to the lower castes, a freer trade sprang up in various countries, access was gained to foreign markets, and mental horizons were widened. Lesley B. Simpson of the University of California talked about "Thirty Years of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*." He pointed out that more than 40 per cent of the leading articles were concerned with the nineteenth century, only 2 per cent with the fifteenth. He found that, excluding articles of general interest, 24 per cent dealt with Mexico, 11.5 per cent with Brazil, and so on down to Portugal. With respect to subject, the distribution ranged from diplomatic history with 28 per cent to social history with 12 per cent. His chief concern was with the book review section of the *Review*, which he held had fallen into "disrepute," like that of other learned journals. He deplored "the general reticence, diffidence, courtesy, or timidity" of the reviewers. There should, he thought, be fewer reviews, but longer and better ones; he cited the classic reviews of Macaulay. In the discussion Howard F. Cline of Yale declared that the contributors to the *Hispanic American Historical Review* had freed a vast field from Hispanicists and American historians and had created a field of scholarship in the United States. Charles W. Hackett of the University of Texas declared that there was no general upheaval in Spanish America against Spanish rule, and that a majority of the Spanish-American colonists were contented in 1807, the revolt being

occasioned by the Napoleonic intrusion into Spain, and won by a smaller percentage of the people than in the case of the thirteen colonies. However, he thought that the topics mentioned by Professor Griffin deserved to be developed. With respect to the *Hispanic American Review*, Mr. Hackett, presenting an analysis of his own, concluded that the journal accurately reflected the interests of scholars. He agreed in the main with the criticisms leveled at book reviews.

The ancient history session, with Mason Hammond of Harvard presiding, dealt with "Cultural Exchange between the Ancient East and West." Professor George M. A. Hanfmann of Harvard showed that the contact of "Greeks and Persians in Asia Minor before Alexander" did not lead to any real cultural exchange or any imposition of the culture of either on the native Anatolian population. The important effect of Persia on Greek thought was that the existence of the Persian Empire rendered the Greeks more conscious of their own liberty and independence. C. A. Alexander of Brown discussed "Alexander the Great and the Barbarian World." He showed how Alexander's plans developed from a Panhellenic crusade into the concept of an ecumenical empire in which both Greeks and barbarians should participate. His ideals were not continued by his successors so that there was no real opportunity for the development of a cultural merger between Greeks and Iranians except in Bactria. R. A. Brooks of Harvard analyzed "Hellenistic and Roman in Cato, Polybius, and Ennius." Cato, despite his use of Hellenistic literary forms, opposed the reception of Hellenism by Rome. Polybius, Scipio Aemilianus, and, in an earlier generation, Ennius consciously promoted the fusion of Hellenic culture and Roman traditional ways of life. Hence was laid the foundation for a development in which the Roman spirit found expression through Greek forms. T. H. Erck of Vassar College showed that as between "Roman and Greek Elements in the Eastern Roman Empire," the former were practical, in the fields of civil and military engineering, in warfare, and in administration and in law. In the cultural sphere, Rome made no impression on the Greek tradition perpetuated by Byzantium. He compared this relation of Roman and Greek to that of the impact of the United States today on Europe and concluded that culture does not pass easily from West to East. Professor Glanville Downey of Dumbarton Oaks being unable to act as commentator, Professor Hammond briefly summarized the discussion.

To the European Middle Ages three sessions were devoted. At the dinner of the Mediaeval Academy of America, Professor François L. Ganshof of the University of Ghent, who had arrived in the late afternoon from Europe for a first visit in America, presented a vigorous analysis of Charlemagne. He examined carefully five distinctive periods of the king-emperor's career and pointed out the empirical characteristics of the Frankish monarch who had, in fact, an untrained mind and was not a man to deal with abstractions. The monarch was finally impressed by his imperial position but had sufficient sense of reality to realize the importance of its kingly basis. Robert L. Reynolds of the University

of Wisconsin presided at the dinner and expressed the regret of all present that Sir Maurice and Lady Powicke were unable to accept the invitation of the Academy to attend. The Reverend Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., was unable to give the Latin grace as had been planned but thoughtfully sent a grace taken from a tenth century manuscript. This was read in his absence by the Reverend Charles P. Loughran, S.J., of Fordham University.

The two other medieval sessions dealt respectively with the earlier and the later Middle Ages. At the former, presided over by Einar Joranson of Chicago, William C. Bark presented "Some Observations on the Pirenne Thesis." He suggested that the time may have come to reject Pirenne's idea that the medieval period in Europe resulted from the westward expansion of Islam. Mr. Bark placed the beginnings of the transition to the Middle Ages not later than the fourth century, and brought in many considerations in support of this view—among them the establishment of the Germanic kingdoms in the western provinces of the Roman Empire, which was judged to be a truly fundamental change. Archibald R. Lewis (South Carolina), in commenting on Mr. Bark's paper, held that the main weakness of Pirenne's thesis lies in his having mistakenly ascribed the radical changes of the eighth century to a sea blockade by the Moslems. From 718 to about 827, naval control of the Mediterranean was held by Byzantium, which deliberately withheld trade from ports where the Carolingians were dominant, so that, when the western Moslems broke Byzantium's naval hold, their commercial policy with respect to the Franks essentially continued the Byzantine. Floyd S. Lear (Rice Institute) then delivered a paper on "The Public Law of the Visigoths," which he found to be undeniably permeated with the atmosphere of the Roman Law, but yet to reveal the presence of Germanic ideas in its provisions relating to offenses against the state. He pointed out that the deferential allegiance of imperial Rome is replaced by contractual allegiance, and that the crime of treason, including high treason, is characterized as *infidelitas*—i.e., broken faith. The facts, in Mr. Lear's judgment, tended to re-direct attention to the Germanic contribution in the foundations of medieval civilization. Father A. K. Ziegler (Catholic University), in his comments, suggested, among other things, a study of early uses of the word *fidelitas* to ascertain when it began to be employed in the technical sense it has in the Visigothic Code. In an animated discussion from the floor, Oscar Halecki (Fordham) contended that Pirenne's main point will preserve its essential worth; Pirenne's intention was to bring into focus the difference between the ancient world as a Mediterranean community and the medieval world as the European community. Gerhart Ladner (Notre Dame) noted that Mr. Bark's view finds support in the recent conclusions of Henri Focillon concerning the un-Roman character of Merovingian art, but he believed the impact of Islam contributed greatly toward making Europe conscious of its unity. Professor Ganshof, a former pupil of Pirenne, agreed with Mr. Bark in thinking that Pirenne had vastly exaggerated the role of the Islamic invasion; he stated



that he had made known this opinion to his master, and he brought forward several pertinent considerations, additional to those urged by Mr. Bark.

Gray C. Boyce of Northwestern presided at the session on the later Middle Ages, at which two papers were read, one by Josiah Cox Russell of the University of New Mexico, and one by Robert S. Hoyt of the University of Iowa. Mr. Russell's paper (read in his absence by J. R. Strayer of Princeton) dealt with "Some Research Possibilities in Medieval Spanish History." He suggested fruitful topics of investigation—monastic activities, intellectual history and especially the development of Spanish cathedral schools and universities, urban developments, the Reconquest as a phase of Christian colonization and crusading, and the possible role of the "short dark folk" as a pastoral group in the Iberian peninsula. Robert S. Smith of Duke, as friendly critic, suggested further topics for research, including epidemics, public health administration, the grain trade, slave trade, money, finance and taxation. Mr. Hoyt, in a paper on "Royal Policy and the Growth of the Realm in Medieval England," supported the thesis that the monarchy, by conscious and deliberate acts, had a definite and long-range end in view from the twelfth century on. Margaret Hastings, of the New Jersey College for Women, agreeing with the speaker's general position, suggested further attention to the growth of royal justice, where she believed that the connection between what men thought and what they did could be most clearly traced.

A paper by Jack H. Hexter of Queen's College, on "The Myth of the Middle Classes in Tudor England," provided a lively and mildly disputatious session on the early modern period. Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, and authority on the Elizabethan middle class, was in the chair. Mr. Hexter contended that the concept of the middle class, for Tudor England, was so vague and so subject to fluctuating meanings, from a narrow sense embracing only merchants to a broad sense embracing almost the whole population, as to be almost useless in the analysis of the period, and he questioned whether it is very illuminating to say that the Tudor monarchy was built up with middle-class support. Four others then discussed Mr. Hexter's thesis with respect to four other "new monarchies" of the sixteenth century: Garrett Mattingly of Columbia for Spain, Myron P. Gilmore of Harvard for France, Raymond de Roover of Wells College for Burgundy, and John J. Murray of Indiana for the Scandinavian countries. Interesting variants among the several monarchies were observed.

The early modern age was treated also in a session on "The Working of the Old Diplomacy." Allan Evans of the State Department presided. John B. Wolf of Minnesota spoke on "War and Diplomacy and the Rise of the Great Powers, 1683-1721." He thought that in tracing the rise of the modern state too much attention had been paid to legal aspects, as in the treaties of Westphalia, or to constitutional changes, as in the Glorious Revolution; he pointed out the importance of systematic bureaucracy and of a permanent military force based upon

increasing economic power, and suggested as a critical date the war of the League of Augsburg, in which the impact of French power, the first to be based upon these forces, impelled other states to adopt similar aspects of modernity in self-defense. Caroline Robbins of Bryn Mawr entitled her paper "A Whig Diplomat Reports"; she analyzed Robert Molesworth's relation of his mission to Denmark to show, not only his stimulating personal crotchets but also the observations of a disapproving Whig upon the new French style of the Danish constitution. The extent of his reading public suggests that Molesworth's ideas may have had influence in various fields upon which he touched, notably in education. Arthur Wilson of Dartmouth spoke on "Changing Concepts in the Diplomacy of the *Ancien Régime*." During the eighteenth century, as the influence of religious differences progressively declined, diplomatists, in estimating the capabilities of other nations, dwelt increasingly on considerations of power and economics. The concept of natural frontiers was less influential in France than is sometimes thought; the French, while tending to neglect naval power and the influence of new military developments, showed a new-found appreciation of other factors such as international public opinion.

Three meetings (within the general category of those dealing neither with the United States nor with the Revolution of 1848) took up problems faced by historians as teachers. A joint session with the National Council of the Social Studies was presided over by Mr. Lewis Paul Todd, editor of *Social Education*. There were two papers, by Erling M. Hunt of Teachers College, Columbia, and by Robert E. Keohane of the college of the University of Chicago. Mr. Hunt, speaking on "History and the Other Social Studies in the Program of General Education," defined general education as an education intended neither for specialists nor for an elite. In the social studies its primary aim is to make the social world intelligible to an unselected student body at the secondary or college level. This aim, he felt, was not to be achieved through any one curriculum pattern, but depended on teachers and instructional resources, on the use made of sample national histories, or of narrative and descriptive detail to give color and action, and on the presentation of historical and social-science methods as skills to be learned by students whatever content might be selected. Mr. Keohane, presenting "The Great Debate on the Source Method," drew on his own experience in using historical sources in classes at Chicago, and traced the arguments pro and con on the source method since the 1890's. If sources are employed only as illustrative materials, he said, they tend to drop out of use; they should be used as raw material with which the student learns to think critically and draw conclusions. An active discussion followed.

There was also a meeting devoted exclusively to the college freshman course in history. R. F. Arragon of Reed College presided and summarized; papers were read by George Mosse of the University of Iowa and Dwight C. Miner of Columbia, each on the introductory course given at his own institution. The aim of the

"History of Western Civilization" at Iowa, as described by Mr. Mosse, is to acquaint students with the basic data of modern history chiefly through narrative provided by lecture and textbook, reviewed in weekly section meetings and supplemented by brief illustrations from primary materials. That of the Columbia contemporary civilization course, as described by Mr. Miner, is to examine the development of modern institutions and ideas chiefly through the study in conference groups of selected documents and other writings, with a minimum of textbook continuity. Some American history is included with European at Iowa, but at Columbia American materials are reserved for a sophomore course. Historians alone (the professor in charge and graduate assistants) handle the Iowa course, whereas at Columbia teachers of various ranks from various departments collaborate. The Iowa methods reflect emphasis upon the learning of facts as a necessary preliminary to the drawing of inferences; the Columbia course looks to the encouragement of historical thinking by interpreting historical materials and situations. Hence the one is concerned with chronological coverage, the other is more selective, though not so intensively as to prevent the recognition of continuities. Other ways of focusing attention upon specific matters were referred to briefly in discussion—problems, as at Yale; cities as foci of civilization, as at Pennsylvania; literature joined to political, philosophical, and other writings and documents, as in the humanities course at Reed. It was noted that such courses might have to yield to the narrative course in suitability for large state universities, but this, as well as other issues, was not resolved in the brief time for discussion.

A joint meeting with the American Military Institute addressed itself to the problem of "The Study of Military History in American Colleges and Universities." Douglas S. Freeman presided, and papers were read by James Phinney Baxter of Williams, Robert G. Albion of Princeton, and Theodore Ropp of Duke. President Baxter, noting that the college president is forced by budgetary pressure to decide which things are more important than others, argued that the teaching of military history is one of the more important, war having molded American life quite as much as the frontier; we must today especially, with the destruction of the overseas balance of power on which we formerly relied, give students a firm understanding of the effects of war upon general history, and we should expect the effects of war—economic, political, cultural—to receive attention from all departments of instruction. Mr. Albion reviewed his own experience in teaching military history to ROTC students, and noted with satisfaction the progress of advanced research in military problems, as at the Institute for Advanced Study. Mr. Ropp turned more especially to introductory courses in military history, which he urged should be offered as widely as possible, war being a vital subject for all social science. What is most needed practically, he said, is bibliographical guidance and a list of basic works for the average college library.

Two other sessions on matters of teaching, one dealing with programs in

American civilization, and one with the teaching of state history, are noted in the immediately following section.

### III

Fifteen meetings in one way or another took up American history. Four of these touched also upon facets of the Revolution of 1848—a meeting on the German “forty-eighters” in the United States, a paper in another meeting on the Jewish “forty-eighters,” a third meeting on the contrasting views of John C. Calhoun and Horace Greeley toward the 1848 revolution in Europe, and at a fourth meeting a paper on American isolationism in connection with 1848. These are grouped with the other materials on 1848 below.

Of widest interest to those present, and certainly one of the high points of the three days’ activity, was a session on “Fifty Years of American Foreign Policy” which filled the Ball Room with a large and deeply attentive audience. Walter Lippmann was in the chair. Edward Mead Earle of the Institute for Advanced Study spoke on “Our Stake in Europe,” followed by Owen Lattimore of Johns Hopkins on “The United States and Asia.” Mr. Earle observed that although the United States was admitted to the circle of the Great Powers at the end of the Spanish-American War, this was only the confirmation of a situation which had gradually developed throughout the nineteenth century. He noted that it meant no change in the presumptions of American foreign policy to be interventionist in the Americas and the Far East, while remaining isolationist with respect to Europe. He characterized this as a dangerous paradox, since Far Eastern developments depended on the European power constellation. Only with the end of the Second World War, he said, have the people of the United States realized that they are “an integral part of Western European civilization and have a vital interest in its survival.” He charged historians with part of the responsibility for the tardy realization of their true position by the American people. Historians, he thought, have discussed American foreign policy too much from a “legalistic rather than broadly political” point of view. They have concentrated on the rights and wrongs of Wilson’s concept of neutrality, instead of criticizing him for his intermittent awareness of the challenge which the rise of Germany represented to American security. From an antipathy to British imperialism, they failed to appreciate the other important change in the power constellation of the last fifty years, namely the decline of British power with its implications for the position of the United States. Mr. Lattimore discussed the changing conditions within which American foreign policy worked in the Far East, particularly in China. The general line of development, he held, was that the Far East from being “under control” had got “out of control,” and he characterized the various stages by which this development took place. The most important steps were the Open Door policy, which, in order to prevent annexation of Chinese territory by Russia,

initiated the process; the Chinese Revolution, which was strong enough to carry out internal reforms, but not strong enough to exclude foreigners; the Russian Revolution, which brought to Asia the realization of the existence of a quarrel among the Great Powers and the possibility of its exploitation; and finally Japan's aggression, which proved that one Far Eastern power had got "out of control." Mr. Lattimore emphasized that most of the present conflicts in the Far East derive from the fact that the other powers realize only slowly and incompletely that the time of outside control for Asia has passed. Mr. Lippmann, in his concluding words, expressed his full agreement with the two speakers, but emphasized the dangers of a vague and unselected universalism, believing it necessary to decide where the vital interests of the United States end.

The American Revolution formed the subject for a session under that title, presided over by Thomas J. Wertenbaker of Princeton, past president of the Association, and featuring a single paper by Lawrence H. Gipson of Lehigh, who, drawing on the monumental work of which he is the author, spoke on "The American Revolution as an Aftermath of the Great War for the Empire, 1754-63." Mr. Gipson contended that the so-called French and Indian War should be termed the Great War, since it was fought for the mastery of a continent and determined the fact that the controlling civilization should be English and not French. He thought also that the overthrow of French power in America was a determining factor in bringing on the Revolution, since so long as the colonists faced the threat of French domination they could have no thought of renouncing the protection of the British navy and British armies. Mr. Gipson emphasized the imperial approach to the causes of the Revolution rather than the economic approach or the constitutional approach, dwelling upon the necessity which confronted the ministry of organizing the vast empire and upon the heavy financial burdens which the Great War had entailed and the justice of calling upon the colonies to help. Referring to the famous Parson's Cause in Virginia, he thought that Patrick Henry's pleas were illogical and that a great injustice had been done the clergy. The discussion was led by Professor J. Bartlett Brebner, of Columbia University, and Professor A. L. Burt, of the University of Minnesota.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association, whose dinner has been mentioned, met in a joint session with the A.H.A. on Tuesday afternoon. George E. Mowry of the University of Iowa examined "The California Progressive and his Rationale: A Study in Middle Class Politics," and Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago presented "Some Vexing Problems in Writing Contemporary History." Mr. Mowry assembled biographical data on forty-seven of the less than one hundred progressive organizers (before 1910 only) to demonstrate that the average progressive belonged to an old American middle-class group. He found these men stirred to action by a rising group consciousness produced by a medley of social, psychological, and economic reasons, and directed equally against organized capital and organized labor. An inquiry into the positive mental orienta-

tion of the California progressive showed that he was a product of the rising social religion, with a firm belief in the essential goodness of man and the desirability of democracy. The paper concluded by noting the paradoxical elements in the progressive creed and their significance for the future of the movement. Mr. Johnson analyzed a half dozen problems that faced historians of recent years: the refusal of heirs to open family manuscripts; the overwhelming mass of material, covering both domestic and wartime events; the tendency of recent diarists and letter writers to keep their records with an eye to history; the interview and the telephone conversation as unique sources; the difficulty of interpreting events in complex times and of excluding bias and point of view. The historian, he thought, should integrate his work with that of other disciplines and broaden his understanding of the whole course of human activities.

A joint session with the Southern Historical Association heard a paper by Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University on "Aristocracy and Politics in Colonial Virginia." Bernard Mayo of the University of Virginia presided. Mr. Sydnor described the balance in Virginia between popular elections and gentry influence, whereby a few hundred families, while filling most of the offices, governed circumspectly and with moderation, and with little tension between classes. The system, he held, explains why Virginia produced so many liberal aristocrats who became leaders at the time of the Revolution. He added that while it worked well in the eighteenth century it would not work well today; but he observed that one of its cardinal doctrines is worth our attention, namely that a democracy is most likely to flourish if it fills its offices, from lowest to highest, with its ablest citizens. Mr. Douglass Adair and Mr. Dumas Malone agreed in general with the speaker; the chairman and Mr. Bernard Drell more critically examined the defects as well as the virtues of the system, believing that not enough attention had been given to class and sectional tensions in Virginia before and after the Revolution.

The vast and comparatively undeveloped subject of international agricultural relationships, particularly as they have affected the United States, was treated at a joint session with the Agricultural History Society. Weymouth T. Jordan of Alabama Polytechnic Institute was the chairman. Four papers were read: "The Early Impact of Japan upon American Agriculture" by Henry F. Graff of Columbia University; "American Interest in World Agriculture, 1861-1865" by Richard O. Cummings of the University of California at Los Angeles; "American Diplomacy and the Repeal of the French Pork Prohibition, 1889-1892" by Richard M. Packard of Lasell Junior College; and "The Marketing of Colombian Coffee" by Robert Carlyle Beyer of the University of Miami. The four papers represented four aspects of the general topic which had been singled out for consideration. Professor Graff revealed that the influence of Japan upon American agriculture so often ascribed only to the years after 1865 was actually well underway before that date, and cited many American adoptions of Japanese farming practices and

products; Professor Cummings demonstrated that the embryonic Department of Agriculture before and during the period 1861-1865 recognized the integral connection between farm welfare and foreign relations and showed that information on agricultural practices at home and abroad was actively collected and distributed at the time by official agencies of the United States government; Professor Packard discussed French restrictions on importations of inadequately inspected American pork, emphasizing efforts of Whitelaw Reid, American minister in Paris from 1889 to 1892, to lift the embargo; and Professor Beyer presented a historical sketch (particularly since 1918) of the system by which Colombian coffee has been marketed, the sources of credit, specialization, the consignment system in New York, and the success with which Colombian coffee interests have competed with foreign investors. An open discussion followed the papers.

The American Catholic Historical Association, in its joint session with the A.H.A., dealt with the general topic of "The American Churches and the Social Movements of the Late Nineteenth Century." Ralph H. Gabriel of Yale University presided. The Protestant aspect of the topic was presented by C. Howard Hopkins, who discussed "Protestant Theories of Social Reform in the Late Nineteenth Century." The Catholic side of the story was set forth by Aaron I. Abell of the University of Notre Dame, who spoke on "Ideological Aspects of Catholic Social Reform in the Later Nineteenth Century." Merle Curti of Wisconsin and the Reverend Henry J. Browne of Catholic University led the discussion. The meeting was well attended.

The American Society of Church History, in its joint meeting, provided a mixed offering, one paper (noted below) on the Revolution of 1848, and one on "The Transcendental Movement in American Religious Thought," by H. Shelton Smith of Duke University. Winthrop S. Hudson of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School acted as chairman. Mr. Smith re-examined the thought of Theodore Parker. He took issue with recent tendencies to deny or minimize Parker's relationship to New England transcendentalism; and from a restudy of primary materials, and reconsideration of Parker's "primal intuitions" (of God, moral law, and immortality), with due regard for the empirical element in his thinking, concluded that Parker may still be placed "within the movement of New England transcendentalism."

Two meetings may be grouped together as bearing upon the problems of historians in the handling of archival or other original and unpublished matter. The Society of American Archivists held a luncheon conference at which Louis C. Hunter, of the American University, delivered an address on "The Neglect of Historians to Use the National Archives," a form of neglect particularly unfortunate in view of the rich resources therein contained. A large afternoon meeting, entitled "Problems of Collaborative Historical Work," undertook to survey the problems of the historian who deals with materials of archival type which are not in public archives but in the private and confidential possession of per-

sons or institutions, with which the historian must establish a *modus vivendi* or "collaboration."

At this meeting, presided over by Dean Kayser, the local arrangements chairman, three papers were presented, each on a different type of project. Raymond J. Sontag of the Department of State discussed "The Tripartite Undertaking to Publish German Foreign Office Documents." He explained that these documents, amounting to hundreds of tons, had come into Allied hands by planning and by accident; the Germans had begun to disperse them in 1943, and to forestall capture had issued orders for their systematic destruction, which fortunately were but partially carried out. Consequently, Mr. Sontag reported, the record for the period 1867-1920 seems generally intact; for 1920-1936 there are a few holes, not especially vital; after 1936, there are troublesome gaps. For this last period, although, for example, records of Anglo-German negotiations in 1938-1939 have disappeared, the main outline to 1939 can be reconstructed through the use of copies. The period 1939-1943 is a partly finished picture, sketchily done. After 1943, the material is very fragmentary. Two volumes are scheduled for publication in March, with over 2,000 pages, reaching to Munich. While these and succeeding volumes are under official sponsorship there is full editorial freedom with no official supervision other than that of the editor. McGeorge Bundy, in a paper entitled "The Memoirs of a Public Man—Henry L. Stimson," discussed his collaboration with Mr. Stimson in the writing of that statesman's account of his years of public service. The method was for Mr. Stimson to do as much as possible, including the making of all basic decisions. Topics would then be discussed with Mr. Bundy in the light of the background with which he had already briefed himself. Each segment was checked by Colonel Stimson. The subject, who was one of the authors, had full liberty to tell the truth as he saw it. While military security was in mind, it involved no problems. Mr. Stimson would embarrass no one still in office, violate no obligation of loyalty and deal with friends only with much reticence. While eventually all the papers will be available, that eventuality will hardly lead to the revision which might be expected. The final paper of the session, by Ralph W. Hidy of the Business History Foundation, was a practical approach to "Problems in the Collaborative Writing of Recent Business History." Among the problems he discussed were the need of comprehensive analysis, the availability of records, the methods of finance for historical studies, and the protection of the author, particularly in the form of written assurance that when the history was written it would be published. Commenting on the papers with a disarming lightness of touch, Henry F. Pringle pointed out that the problem under discussion was definitely not that of ghost-writing. He indicated as worthy of emulation, in dealing with our own State Department papers, the objectivity of the Department in the handling of the captured documents in the German Foreign Office and the speed with which this publication was proceeding.



Two sessions within the general area of American history addressed themselves to questions of teaching. "The Teaching of State History in Colleges and Universities" was the subject of a joint session of the A.H.A. and the American Association for State and Local History. Winfield Scott Downs of the Lewis Historical Publishing Company was in the chair, and three papers were delivered. John A. Munroe, in a talk on "States' Rites," explained the course at the University of Delaware, observed that the lack of suitable text materials increases the responsibility of the lecturer, and felt that the course had produced a beneficial interest in Delaware history both on and off the campus. Whitfield J. Bell, jr., of Dickinson College, discussing "Problems and Promise of a Course in State History," found the most significant question to be whether state history was national history exemplified, or had a meaning of its own. Through it, he thought, students obtained not only a better understanding of national history but an awareness of their own place in the historical stream. Richard P. McCormick of Rutgers, speaking on "Unique Elements in State History," held that attention should fall on matters that have been the primary concern of the state, so that state history might have a distinctive character and the personality of the state be displayed.

A full session was given to a review of "Programs in American Civilization." The Librarian of Congress, Mr. Luther H. Evans, presided. Richard H. Shryock of the University of Pennsylvania, in a paper on "Nature and Objectives of the American Civilization Program," traced the development of the collegiate course in American civilization from its origin more than a decade ago to the present incorporation of complete undergraduate and graduate sequences in the field into the curricula of sixty-four colleges and universities. Dr. Shryock characterized the development as meeting an obvious need for courses integrating the study of the many facets of American life and cutting across the former limiting bounds of subject and departmental interests. Alice Felt Tyler read a paper on "Curricula and Courses in American Civilization," prepared by Tremaine McDowell, her associate in the establishment of the American civilization program at the University of Minnesota. The paper offered a wealth of statistical and substantive detail in a review of the findings of a recent survey of courses offered in American civilization. In the ensuing discussion the value of the new courses was evident in commendatory remarks from many quarters. Several words of caution were introduced as well. The critical need was emphasized for relating the growth of the United States to the participation of this country in a vigorously international postwar world, and thereby effecting an external orientation for all such courses. It was thought by some that while the new programs were avoiding traditional subject specialization, there was danger that they might produce a new pattern of formalism in the study of the culture of one geographic area to the exclusion of the study of other cultures and particular subject fields.

## IV

There remain to consider the sessions on the Revolution of 1848. These constituted the distinctive feature of the year's program. Forty-one persons, not counting "commentators," read papers. It is probably safe to say that never have so many historians in America given so much thought to the Revolution of 1848 as during the past year, for 1848 has never been a common subject of research in this country, and many of those who spoke on it in Washington were approaching it in this way for the first time. Yet there appears to have been no feeling that the efforts were misspent. It seems to be agreed that the Revolution of 1848 had been historically somewhat neglected, in that a better understanding of what really happened in the mid-nineteenth century agitations might have better prepared us to comprehend the drift of our own times. Possibly the centennial papers will turn some scholars to a lasting and productive interest in 1848; if so, they will have served more than a ritualistic or merely commemorative purpose.

It should be said too that none of the speakers was free to choose his own subject. Only by central planning could so many papers be arranged without an intolerable degree of confusion, duplication or omission. The planning fell to the program committee, *faute de mieux*; and the committee, as best it could, invented topics for sessions and papers, on which it then invited colleagues throughout the country to do the work. The response was gratifying indeed; and thanks are hereby rendered to all who consented to take part under such conditions. As for its central plan, the committee determined to avoid a nation-by-nation approach to the 1848 revolutions, and to attempt a synoptic view along topical lines, the topics being chosen in the light of modern preoccupations, on the principle that history is contemporary thought about the past.

The session of most general scope, and serving as a kind of introduction, was entitled "1848 as a Focal Point in Modern History." Carlton J. H. Hayes being prevented by reasons of health from acting as chairman, Louis R. Gottschalk presided in his stead. Hans Kohn of Smith College addressed a sizable audience on "The Contemporaneity of 1848." In the events of 1848 he saw the beginning of a century dominated by the impact of the two new mass forces, socialism and nationalism, which, transported from Western to Central and Eastern Europe, were there so modified as to emphasize aggressive exclusiveness rather than humanitarianism, and collectivity rather than the individual. The new spirit manifested itself in the mass-supported authoritarianism of Napoleon III, the class war proposed by Marx, the pan-Germanism of the liberals at Frankfurt, and the nationalism of Slavs, Magyars, Rumanians, and Italians. Wherever nationalism and liberalism have conflicted, nationalism has prevailed, with increasing insistence (except in the English-speaking countries) on group independence and power rather than on individual liberty, particularly in the last twenty years. The century before 1848, Mr. Kohn declared, had aspired to a world of democracy and peace, but what began to emerge in 1848 was a world of conflict and

violence. The year 1848 was thus really a turning point, but not in the direction hoped for by the 1848ers. Thad W. Riker of the University of Texas followed with "Some Reflections on the Quest for Democracy since 1848." Pointing out that this quest had begun long before 1848, Professor Riker indicated that the mid-century upheaval promoted class consciousness among a huge and scattered proletariat. The spread of written constitutions, a greater articulation of public opinion, wider popular education, a more liberal franchise, the growing political importance of labor and modifications of the *laissez-faire* state have since 1848 effected a steady trend toward political and social democracy. In the way of this trend have stood national temperaments, regionalism, class interests, the force of traditions (with emphasis upon the role of the Catholic Church in Europe), and popular apathy, susceptibility, and ignorance. Fascism (and perhaps communism too), Professor Riker concluded, arose in Europe because believers in democracy, taking it too much for granted or being willfully disloyal to it, left a sort of vacuum.

Wide also in its scope was the session on "1848 as a Social Movement," at which J. Salwyn Schapiro presided, and for which three papers were planned. The sudden death of Frances E. Gillespie of Chicago, who had undertaken to prepare a paper on social disturbances in England in the 1840's, left a vacancy in the program, as in the circle of her friends. Henry Roberts of Columbia addressed himself to the question, "How Revolutionary was the Agrarian Movement in Central and Eastern Europe?" He pointed out that the peasant uprising was most important in the Habsburg dominions, where the peasants revolted against surviving feudal dues and services, and actual serfdom in Hungary. Since the uprising threatened the whole social order, under conditions of an agrarian economy, the government hastened to concede the peasant demands; after which the uprising subsided, having no integration with the revolutionary movement in the cities. Donald C. McKay of Harvard raised the question, "How Socialist Were the June Days in France?" He considered the uprising of the Paris workers to be a reaction against the severe depression of 1846-47; they were not Marxist, nor led by prominent French socialists of the day, nor followers of a definite program; but they were socialist in their views on remaking the social order. Their repression doomed the Second Republic, and created a bitter class feeling between proletariat and bourgeoisie. Sherman Kent confirmed these views in leading the discussion.

More definitely on revolutionary socialism was the session called "1848 and the Origins of Marxism: The Communist Manifesto," a symposium at which Herbert Heaton of Minnesota presided. In his own words, "it was inevitable that the 'specter' said to be 'haunting Europe' in 1848 should claim a session, for to ignore it would have been playing *Hamlet* without the ghost." Samuel Bernstein, of *Science and Society*, traced the transition from utopianism to Marxism. He showed that there was nothing revolutionary about manifesto-writing; that countless

similar calls to arms or utopia had appeared during the preceding decades; and that these contained abundant denunciations of bourgeois society as well as descriptions of class struggles. The important originality of Marx and Engels was their elevation of the class struggle to the dignity of a law of social change and the part they assigned to the proletariat because of their materialistic conception of history. Herbert Marcuse took over at this point with a close analysis of "The New Theory of History in the *Communist Manifesto*," and explained why this theory led, not to the direct transition from capitalism to communism, but to two phases—capitalism to socialism, and then from socialism, with its emphasis on productivity, discipline, and regimentation of labor, to communism, with its promise of a society free from domination, repression, or hard work. His conclusion was that socialist countries are still only in the early stages of the first phase. Melvin M. Knight of California put the *Manifesto* in its historical setting. Potato famines and bursting railroad booms created acute misery in 1846–48. Hence the superb piece of propaganda was born in a time of dire distress. Prosperity almost immediately consigned it to oblivion; but it reappeared whenever disorder, uncertainty, misery, and ignorance returned to plague the economy.

It was perhaps equally inevitable, in 1948, that a session should also deal with "1848 and the Origins of National Totalitarianism." At this session F. L. Nussbaum of Wyoming was in the chair. Ralph H. Bowen of Columbia, under the heading of "Authoritarian Ideas in Germany," selected the views and career of the liberal F. C. Dahlmann for analysis, especially in connection with the Frankfurt assembly. It emerged from the paper that the doctrine of Dahlmann and the German liberals differed from the libertarianism of the West. In Dahlmann's writings and in the expressions of his party, which was dominant in the assembly, popular controls and any form of democratic constitutionalism were regarded as something to be avoided. The liberalism of the Germans consisted rather in an exaltation of the state. The liberals were so deeply committed to the cause of authority that they could hardly have failed by their action to assure the triumph of the counter-revolution. Franklin D. Palm of California spoke on "Napoleon III: Architect of an Authoritarian Utopia." He described the integrating function which Napoleon III as candidate, president, and emperor, performed among the diverse and conflicting elements of French society. These apparently incompatible elements were brought together in support of the empire by a skillfully calculated assortment of promises, not wholly unrealized, to meet the desires of conservatives and radicals, financiers, industrialists, and labor. The discussion, led by David C. Pinkney of the University of Missouri and O. H. Wedel of the University of Arizona, was concerned largely with the relation of the imperial program to the developing socialist thought of the time.

Kindred questions occupied another session, "1848: Liberalism and National Unity." Kent Roberts Greenfield of the Department of the Army presided; A. W. Salomone of New York University and Walter L. Dorn of Ohio State read the

papers, which dealt respectively with Italy and Germany. Both gave the center of the stage to the Liberal crisis in 1848 and independently reached broadly similar conclusions. The development between 1815 and 1848 in the middle class of each nation of a desire for constitutional-parliamentary government and national union was the great new fact in the situation. In both cases the thought of the class that took the initiative in the revolutionary movement contained unresolved contradictions; in each case the critical factor in its failure was found to be its unreadiness to face the danger on the left, its fear of "the populace," in whom the logic of its philosophy and its political and national ambitions required it to seek the power necessary to overcome the forces of reaction. In Italy the rock on which the Liberals split was the power of the papacy, over which they were initially tided by the myth of Pius IX; in Germany it was the power of the princes, particularly of the Prussian monarchy, by whose pledges they let themselves be too easily deceived. Professor Salomone dwelt on the inner contradictions of Italian Liberal thought, reconsidering this and the behavior of the Italian Liberals during the revolution in the light of recent studies of the *Risorgimento*. Professor Dorn emphasized a point implicit in Professor Salomone's review, namely, that the anxieties of the Liberals over a social democratic revolution were greatly exaggerated. He concluded that if the drive of the German Liberals for political power had been determined and bold, their program would have succeeded, in spite of the danger of foreign war, thus challenging the thesis that success would have produced an attack by Russia, France, and Great Britain. The discussion of Professor Salomone's paper was led by Dr. George T. Romani of Northwestern University; that of Professor Dorn's by Dr. Dietrich Gerhard of Washington University, St. Louis.

Three sessions touched on the interplay between religion and the socio-political movements of 1848. One of the two papers presented at the joint session with the American Society of Church History was entitled "The Church and the Revolution of 1848." Its author was James Hastings Nichols of the Federated Theological Schools, the University of Chicago. In 1848, said Mr. Nichols, liberalism, nationalism, communism, and absolutism all had to come to terms with the Christian faith as the deepest and most universal sanction of political ethics in the West. The corruption of Continental liberalism and socialism to class and national imperialisms at that crisis meant the repudiation of Christian elements of universalism and personal responsibility and marked an epoch in the disintegration of Christendom. Calvinist societies, especially in the English-speaking world, had already largely Christianized liberalism and neither needed a revolution nor experienced its consequent reaction. Lutheranism, on the whole, fell into absolutism and social reaction, losing the liberals and labor to dogmatic atheism. In dominantly Roman Catholic countries the Lutheran experience was paralleled, but in several countries where Roman Catholics were in a minority, 1848 saw the first significant emergence of ultramontane liberalism. Much subsequent history, he concluded,

has been fundamentally affected by the diverse adjustments of the ideologies of 1848 to Christianity in various areas.

"The Origins of Christian Socialism" was further explored by Gordon Griffiths of the University of California at a session on "1848 and the Catholic Church." Geoffrey Bruun presided. Mr. Griffiths traced modern Christian Democracy as a political force to the papal encyclicals of the 1890's and the earlier social Catholicism of the 1830's and 1840's. Summarizing the ideas of Mazzini, Minghetti, and Ventura for Italy, and of Saint-Simon, Lamennais, and Ozanam for France, Mr. Griffiths observed that the 1848 revolution gave some French exponents of Christian Socialism (Melun, Lacordaire, Buchez) a chance to urge their program, which however was vitiated by the June Days and advent of Louis Napoleon, most Christian socialist leaders rallying to the Party of Order by 1849. The movement, he said, was destroyed by the coup d'état of 1851, and for this reason has received inadequate attention. George A. Carbone of the University of Mississippi, as discussion leader, added further comments on Italy. Ross J. S. Hoffman of Fordham read the concluding paper on "The Whigs and the Liberal Pope." He showed how the Whig cabinet narrowly missed the opportunity to strengthen Pius IX in his liberal moves in 1847. Parliament did pass an emasculated act to establish diplomatic representation at Rome, but it came too late; revolutionary republicanism and its suppression by military force changed British popular sentiment, making diplomatic relations with the restored papal government difficult. Mr. Hoffman emphasized, however, how British and papal diplomats have tended to work for the same ends in disturbed times—in 1793, 1815, 1846-48, and from 1914 to 1920. Lillian Parker Wallace of Meredith College, as a commentator of great charm and insight, made a number of emendations which Mr. Hoffman willingly accepted.

A significant session was devoted also to "1848 and the Jews." With Jacob R. Marcus of Hebrew Union College in the chair, papers were read by Bertram W. Korn of Hebrew Union and by Salo Baron of Columbia. Mr. Korn talked on "The Jewish Forty-eighters in America," of whom he gave data on twenty-six. He concluded that, among Jews at least, the idea of the forty-eighters as anti-religious "requires some revision," since four of the twenty-six were rabbis. He concluded also that the twenty-six made their influence felt not as a Jewish group but as individuals; they included Abraham Jacobi, "the father of pediatrics in America"; Julius Bein, an outstanding lithographer and president for thirty-five years of the B'nai B'rith; August Bondi, who fought with John Brown in the Kansas border warfare; and General Fred Knefler, the highest ranking Jewish officer in the Civil War. Professor Baron followed with a paper on the "Impact of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation." Contrasting 1848 with 1789, he noted that in 1848 the Jewish masses were themselves actively interested, participating for the first time as citizens of Europe; and that where the 1789 revolution had been mainly antireligious, in that of 1848 religionists and the civically disabled synthe-

sized their hopes, so that religion survived the ordeal of emancipation. He found a straight line from the nationality quarrels of 1848 to the concept of national minority rights in the 1919 Versailles Treaty, and held that by the time of World War II the concept of minority rights for Jews was scrapped and replaced by the acceptance of the Jewish State, which thus serves as a supplementary form of emancipation. Discussion was led by Oscar Handlin of Harvard and Robert F. Byrnes of Rutgers, the latter pointing out that the anti-Jewish reaction to the 1848 emancipation was a strong anti-Semitic movement, which ultimately found its crassest expression in the genocide of the twentieth century.

One session was occupied with "1848 and the Arts," in view of the strong mutual influences between social events and imaginative and creative work. The chairman was Gilbert Chinard of Princeton; the speakers were W. P. Friederich, professor of comparative literature at the University of North Carolina, and G. Haydn Huntley, professor of art at Northwestern; Jacques Barzun of Columbia acted as commentator. Mr. Friederich, speaking from encyclopedic knowledge on "The Literature of 'Young Europe,'" sketched the currents of ideas among creative writers in many languages. Mr. Huntley, who entitled his paper "The Reform Movement in Art," dealt mainly with painting; he spoke especially of Gustave Courbet and his political ideas. Through a series of misunderstandings Mr. Huntley was unable to show the slides which his paper had been planned to go with. The two papers were greatly appreciated by those who heard them.

A number of sessions offered a regional if not national emphasis. Eastern Europe received considerable attention, with two papers on Russia, one on Pan-Slavism, one on the historico-nationalist revival in eastern Europe, and a whole session on the Austrian Empire, in addition to Mr. Roberts' paper mentioned above. The United States came into the 1848 series with two full sessions and with halves of two others, of which one was Mr. Korn's paper just noted. There was a paper on Great Britain, which with Mr. Hoffman's helped to fill the gap left in the British picture by the death of Miss Gillespie. The joint session of the Economic History Association provided two papers on Italy, which filled out the treatment of Italy by Messrs. Griffiths, Hoffman, and Salomone.

The two papers on Italy, at the economic history meeting, were by Howard M. Smyth of the Department of the Army and by Peter Warren of Washington, D. C. (The latter was unfortunately not included in the printed program.) Frederic C. Lane of Johns Hopkins presided. Mr. Smyth spoke on "Piedmont and Prussia: The Influence of the Campaigns of 1848-49 on the Constitutional Development of Italy." He argued that Italian parliamentary development should not be ascribed to Cavour but to earlier events in Piedmont in 1848. The *statuto* of 1848, he declared, was meant to be as conservative as the Prussian constitution of 1850; it provided for no responsibility of cabinet to parliament; but the government's mistakes and failures in the war with Austria in 1848-49 (in contrast to Prussia in 1866) allowed theories of parliamentary government to be pro-

claimed on which Cavour was able to build. Mr. Warren, discussing "The Gelf Program of Economic Reform," set forth the program best represented by Pius IX in the Papal States, but found also in Tuscany and Naples. It was, he said, a program suited to a country of poor resources, with slight chance of capital formation, and desiring little assistance from foreign capital. It stood in contrast to the Piedmontese program, inspired by British ideas of free trade, education and material progress. It looked to land reclamation and very limited mechanization. It lasted thirteen years, being ended in 1861 by the impatience of the people. The path then followed by the united Italian kingdom, according to Mr. Warren, led to uneconomic industrialization, to imperialism, and to complete dependence on others.

More should perhaps have been said of the Italians in the session on "1848 and the Austrian Empire," a kind of symposium presenting the position of the several nationalities under Habsburg rule. Time and space allowed only the Germans, Magyars, Poles, Czechs, and South Slavs to be included. The chairman, Hajo Holborn of Yale, acted as leader and summarizer. He observed that the failure of reforms in the Danube countries during the last century was the result not merely of the national movements in the area but of the decline of Western solidarity as well. Robert A. Kann of Rutgers treated the attitude of the Austrian Germans during the revolution, and absolved them from responsibility for its failure. Mr. Aladar Szegedy-Maszák, former Hungarian minister to the United States, sketched the course of the Hungarian revolution of 1848-1849 and its defeat by Austrian and Russian armies. Edmund Silberner of Princeton characterized the attempts of the Austrian Poles to bring about the restoration of an independent Poland and included a brief statement on the nascent Ukrainian nationalism in Galicia. George Waskovich of Hunter College described the aims of the Czech revolution, which, he found, were for the preservation of the Habsburg Empire against Pan-Germanism and the separatism of the Magyars. John C. Adams of Dartmouth analyzed the absence of revolutionary movements in the South Slav regions. The movements of the Croats and Hungarian Serbs, which he singled out, were loyalist and hostile to the Hungarian revolution which had abrogated the historic rights of these provinces. In the discussion Professor Otakar Odložilík, formerly of the Charles University, stressed the necessity for a closer study of the intellectual attitudes of the growing middle classes in order to gain an understanding of the common character of nationalism. Oscar Halecki stated among other points his observation that even nowadays some solid research was being produced behind the Iron Curtain.

Eastern European affairs received a broad portrayal from S. Harrison Thomson of the University of Colorado, who delivered the address at the luncheon of the Modern European History Section of the Association. He entitled his remarks "Pan-Slavism and the Slavs, 1848-1948," and traced the course of Pan-Slavism since before the first Slav congress, held at Prague in 1848. He explained the



changes which Pan-Slavism had gone through, observing how at the outset it had been nonpolitical, romantic, and cultural; how in 1848, when it became political, it was primarily Austroslav—anti-German and anti-Magyar—but by no means pro-Russian; and how after 1848, taken up by certain Russians, it emerged as a Pan-Russism, to which most non-Russian Slavs remained distinctly cool. He concluded, with intimations for the present and future, that the Slavic peoples had repeatedly, at critical moments, refused to let any all-embracing Pan-Slavism swallow up their individual identity in that of Russia.

Russia joined with the United States as subject for a session under the somewhat enigmatic title of "1848 and the Sense of Estrangement from Europe." By estrangement was meant the feeling in each country, after the events of 1848 in Europe, that it had a special character or destiny of its own. Frederick Barghoorn of Yale spoke on "1848 and the Idea of a Special Path of Development for Russia." Discussing Herzen and Chernyshevski in particular, he showed how Russian revolutionaries, after the failure of the European movements of 1848, concluded that the West was played out, its liberalism a cruel fraud perpetrated on the workers, its socialism timid and stupid; and that the true future of revolution and of socialism lay in Russia. Brainerd Dyer of the University of California at Los Angeles examined "The Effect of the Failure of the European Revolutions of 1848 upon Isolationism in the United States." He observed that despite popular enthusiasm many statesmen—Clay, Sumner, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan—opposed any abandonment of America's policy of nonintervention. But others, such as Douglas and perhaps Seward, thought it unwise to trumpet abroad our intention not to intervene when a more reserved attitude might help the cause of the liberals. Mr. Dyer concluded that the course of the 1848 movement had no significant effect upon isolation sentiment in America.

Russia also entered the program in company with Great Britain, under the rubric of "1848: East and West." Preston Slosson of the University of Michigan presided. Philip E. Mosely of Columbia, in a paper on "The Influence of Tsarist Russia on the Revolutions of 1848," traced the attitude of Nicholas I. The tsar, he said, had planned his role in a new era of revolutions on the assumption of a renewed outswEEP of revolutionary expansionism from France. When the Second Republic proved unwarlike, his main aim was to keep Germany disunited. To this end, to support the Habsburgs, he intervened to put down the Hungarian Republic. Finding it unnecessary to lead an antirevolutionary crusade, he concentrated on upholding the balance of power in Central Europe. Goldwin Smith of Wayne University, speaking on "The British Attitude toward the Revolutions of 1848," portrayed the sympathetic but sometimes aloof and condescending British view of the Continental disturbances. Events in France especially seemed to fit the British stereotypes of the political fickleness of Europeans and the superiority of English institutions; and sympathy was in any case abated by the felt needs for a balance of power and for Austria as a barrier to Russian aggression.

Cyril E. Black of Princeton, in the discussion, showed how Russia and Britain, despite ideological differences, both put first the need of peace, stability, and self-preservation in the confusion of 1848; and Jesse Clarkson of Brooklyn College pointed out how they co-operated in practice despite a difference of objectives which led to conflict soon after. The discussion fell on further questions on Russo-German relations, and on the effect of Chartism upon British foreign policy.

The United States was appropriately represented by a session on "Some Forty-eighters in America," presided over by Dean T. C. Blegen of Minnesota. The meeting was a kind of symposium on those of the forty-eighters who had the most advanced social views. Dean Carl Wittke of Western Reserve University led off with a paper on the American career of Wilhelm Weitling, tracing his activity as a radical organizer and journalist and promoter of "Communia" in Iowa. Arthur Bestor of the University of Illinois, to whom we are indebted for the useful word "communitarian," presented Victor Considérant's travels and activities in the United States. Alice Felt Tyler of Minnesota gave an engaging paper on William Pfaender and the founding of New Ulm in that state, and Bayrd Still of New York University dealt with Joseph Weydemeyer, the first and aboriginal American Marxist. Dean Wittke then drew the strands together. Mention has been made of Mr. Korn's paper on the Jewish forty-eighters, read at another session.

American attitudes toward the Revolution of 1848 in Europe were skillfully analyzed at a session called "1848: North and South in the United States." Under the chairmanship of Clement Eaton of the University of Kentucky, contrasting papers were read by Jeter A. Isely of Princeton and Charles M. Wiltse of Washington, D. C. Mr. Isely spoke on Horace Greeley, Mr. Wiltse on John C. Calhoun; the chairman wisely observed that Calhoun represented only an extreme segment of Southern thought, while Greeley was unrepresentative of the Northern majority. Mr. Isely presented Greeley as a socialist who wished to eliminate land monopoly and guarantee by state power the right to work. Revolutions abroad afforded him the opportunity to propagandize his radical convictions, but when reaction occurred he began to stress the self-determination of peoples, censuring British free trade as an ally of wage slavery and condemning Russia as the bulwark of absolutism. Calhoun, Mr. Wiltse pointed out, judged the European revolutions in terms of his conservative political philosophy which rejected the equality of men. Opposing a proletarian revolution which would obliterate class distinctions, and believing that stable government must rest not on an egalitarian base but on some form of federalism, he saw hope for Germany but none for France. The papers were discussed by John Hope Franklin of Howard University and Charles S. Sydnor of Duke. Mr. Franklin observed that Greeley's attitude toward the 1848 revolutions should be evaluated in the light of his interests as an alert newspaperman and practical politician, who did not let his theoretical radicalism drive him from the conservative Whigs into the Free Soil party. Professor Sydnor re-

garded the conflicting views of Greeley and Calhoun as a chapter in the endless struggle between conservatives and liberals, noting that they interpreted the same set of events in Europe from the standpoint of clashing philosophies, "unswayed, apparently, by economic or other considerations."

Two sessions (and the last of the forty-five here recounted) dealt with history as such. One explored historical works written before the Revolution of 1848, in their connection with that event; the other took up histories written after the Revolution of 1848, and purporting to explain it. One, that is to say, was on history as a form of thought preparing the frame of mind of 1848. The other treated the historiography of the revolution.

The former, "1848 and Historical Consciousness," was presided over by Friedrich Engel-Janosi of the Catholic University of America. There were three papers. Dorothy L. Thompson of Stanford University spoke on "History and the Birth of Nationalism in Eastern Europe." She concentrated on Czech and Slovak historical work, showing how the trends flowing from German romanticism contributed to the Slav awakening. She described the attempts of Czech scholars to rebuild their national language, literature, and identity (not excluding certain pious frauds in the form of fabricated "early" documents), and concluded with a survey of the writings of Frantisek Palacky. Theodore H. von Laue, of the University of Pennsylvania, under the general theme of "*Historismus* and Politics in Germany," analyzed the thought of Ranke, whose reputation for objectivity he subjected to reappraisal. He considered that Ranke's tendency to accept human affairs "as they come," a kind of mistakenly scientific approach, diminished his power of judgment and led to a "corruption of timeless spiritual values by ephemeral political aims." Leo Gershey of New York University discussed "The Histories of the Great French Revolution and the French Revolution of 1848." He concluded that the famous works of Lamartine, Blanc, and Michelet had no specific influence in precipitating revolution in 1848, and that none of the authors, for all their exalting the great Revolution, wished to see its more drastic scenes staged again, least of all with themselves as participants. He suggested, however, that memories of the great *épopée* might be mildly upsetting in preventing the French from feeling quite satisfied with any ensuing regime. The chairman concluded with comments on Italy, observing that in Italy the Middle Ages took the place of the great Revolution in France as a remembered time of liberty and independence.

The session on "The Historiography of 1848" came on the final afternoon. It was, in a sense, the close of the centennial sessions, though it was of course not possible for the speakers, nor expected of them, to summarize the papers delivered during the preceding days. The session was presided over by Lawrence D. Steefel of the University of Minnesota, and attended by an overflow audience in which, since the subject was if anything a little technical, many connoisseurs of 1848 were to be observed. The first paper was read by Leonard Krieger of Yale, who

gave an acute analysis of "Marx and Engels as Historians of 1848." In studying the revolution in France, Mr. Krieger said, Marx was confronted with a situation in which economic development and social grouping were complicated by the continuing role of political traditions and institutions. To comprehend both sets of factors he accepted two levels of historical reality and utilized two corresponding methods: the level of actuality, which included the working of political institutions and the specific course of social events, and could be grasped by the usual empirical methods of research; and the level of normative reality, which was given by the theory of the class struggle, and could be ascertained by means of the dialectic philosophy. In the *Class Struggles in France*, the levels of empirical and absolute reality appear on a fairly equal footing; in the *Eighteenth Brumaire*, historical events are subordinated to the process of history as closed and determined. Engels, in the *Revolution and Counter-revolution*, emphasized the role of the Frankfort assembly, "the parliament of an imaginary country," and by omitting local political problems treated the German revolution as a unified process. It was in the treatment of revolutionary process, Mr. Krieger thought, that Marx and Engels were most successful as historians. But they created new instruments by which impersonal economic structure and anonymous masses were brought into the main stream of history, and by which the contemporary world was made a proper subject for historical treatment.

Hans Rothfels of the University of Chicago raised the large question, "Is There a Revisionist Movement in the Historiography of 1848?" and answered it with qualified negative. Beyond a widening of perspective in social terms stimulated by the work of Marx and Engels, he found the basic reinterpretation of 1848 to be crystallizing around or turning against the Marxian thesis. He detected three revisionist trends of sound historiographic significance. One has been expressed especially in small-scale French writings, favorable to the extension of the social revolution. Historiographically speaking, this may be described as a shift from the determinist to the activist Marxian interpretation. A second trend, which can be observed in commemorative articles, stresses the liberal traditions of 1848 as a safeguard against any sort of authoritarianism. A third trend which may be called revisionist goes farther in rejecting the glorification of violence, dialectic or physical, which is implicit in the Marxian theory. It questions the notion that revolutions, especially those in distant countries, are progressive per se. Mr. Rothfels intimated his own doubts on much that is said of 1848, and gave the impression that there ought to be more revisionism than there has been. Discussion was led by R. John Rath of the University of Colorado and Kurt Schwerin of Northwestern, but was as usual cut short by time.

The foregoing account, dry and bare as it is, does little justice to the meetings in Washington as they were experienced by those present, or to the efforts of some two hundred persons which made the program a living reality. The writer

begs the indulgence of those whose statements he may have inaccurately reported. It is a consolation for the shortcomings of such a summary to reflect that many who presented papers are taking steps to have them published. The scholarly journals for the next year or two will doubtless bear the impression of the late meetings. For the papers on 1848, plans are going forward to publish them in a book, under the editorship of Mr. Steefel; but it will be understood that not all the forty-one papers can be included in any volume of practicable size. A book on 1848, if finally published, and though selective in content, will stand as a record of the centennial, and as a better one than this article can hope to be.

*Princeton University*

R. R. PALMER