Historical News

The Boston Meeting, 1949

Breaking its established New York-Chicago-Washington sequence for the second time in the postwar period, the American Historical Association held its sixty-fourth annual meeting in Boston on December 28, 29, and 30. Headquarters were at the Hotel Statler, whose meeting rooms were supplemented by those of the Old South Meeting House, the Boston Public Library, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Some fifteen affiliated societies met concurrently, all of them, with a single exception, collaborating in joint sessions.

Local arrangements fared well at the hands of Walter Muir Whitehill, director of the Boston Athenaeum, whose responsibilities covered the complicated details of tickets, menus, housing, and the like. Not only did committee and hotel staff co-operate to fashion a smoothly running convention mechanism—the lobbies and mezzanine of the Statler proved generally equal to the between-session pressure on them—but Mr. Whitehill had also prepared various helpful aids for members who wished to combine sightseeing in the Boston area with attendance at the convention.[1]

Since the last Boston meeting of the Association took place nearly two decades ago, a brief comparison of the two conventions may provide an instructive measure of some of the changes of the 1930's and 40's. Registration at the 1949 convention totaled 1173 as against 817 in 1930. (This comparison is perhaps not significant, since the 1930 attendance broke all previous records by a margin of 200, while the 1949 turn-out was exceeded by New York in 1946 and by Washington in 1948, when 1332 were registered. Clearly the average attendance has doubled in the course of the two decades.) The 30 sessions announced for 1930 had increased to 47 in 1949, with 111 and 204 participants—chairmen, speakers, panel members, and commentators—listed by the respective program committees. Likewise, the number of affiliated societies had doubled, from seven in 1930 to fifteen in 1949.

When the two programs are compared as to content, certain differences in emphasis appear. Most significant, perhaps, is the emergence during the two decades of new areas of historical interest. In 1930, for example, there were two sessions on Latin America and one on the Far East, but the Near East, Russia, and India were unrecognized, though there was a session on "Europe in Africa." Save for this and the Modern History luncheon, Europe after the French Revolutionary period was unrepresented, and at no session was the world position of the United States or the foreign relations of the American people considered. On the

[1] Professor Owen omits what all in attendance would want added, that the interesting program he reports also "fared well" as the result of the planning and hard work of Professor Owen himself and the other members of his Program Committee. EDITOR.

other hand, some of the earlier periods of both American and European history were admirably represented, and certain problems of scholarship were explored.

No doubt, some of the contrasts between 1930 and 1949 are purely fortuitous—two other years chosen at random might give a different impression. Yet recent programs have reflected new historical interests. In fact, the pressure of new fields and new interests accounts, in a large measure, for the fifty per cent increase in the number of sessions on the program for 1949. At the recent convention, eight of the sessions dealt with areas other than Western Europe and the United States, nearly as many as those dealing with all periods of European history, while six (duplicating two of the above) had to do, more or less directly, with the world contacts and world responsibilities of the United States.

The Program Committee—composed of B. C. Keeney, E. C. Kirkland, Sherman Kent, and the undersigned—decided against attempting to focus the discussions on a central theme. Instead, it chose diversity, both of subject and method, in the hope that the program would, in some degree, reflect the variety of intellectual interests of the membership. In the make-up of the program, however, one theme was given more than casual emphasis. This had to do with the problem suggested above—that of international order and, more specifically, with the new world position of the United States. Several sessions undertook to explore different phases of the question—world controls in certain periods of the past, the development and nature of American interests in particular areas, and American influence abroad considered in a more general sense. Seven or eight of the sessions might fairly be regarded as belonging in this sequence.

It remains to note that, with two major exceptions, the program was carried out as scheduled. Unfortunately neither General Clay, who was to speak at the joint session with the American Military Institute on "Some Problems of Military Government," nor Robert E. Sherwood, who had agreed to take part in a discussion on "Writing History for the Wider Audience," was able to appear. As a whole, the sessions were well attended and well received, and in most cases the discussion was lively and pointed.

Although the report which follows appears over the signature of the program chairman, it is in fact the work of many hands. The principal contributors are the chairmen of the individual sessions, many of whose accounts, without benefit of quotation marks, have been incorporated in the general report. The committee gratefully acknowledges their assistance.

I

In accordance with recent program practice, the only session for which no competing attraction had been arranged was the annual dinner of the Association. This was held on the evening of December 29 in the ballroom of the Statler, which was filled to comfortable capacity by some 381 diners. Mr. Whitehill, for the Committee on Local Arrangements, introduced President W. K. Jordan of Radcliffe Col-

lege as toastmaster. In presenting the president of the Association, Professor Conyers Read of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Jordan recalled his great services to the Association as well as his distinguished work in the field of Tudor and Stuart history. President Read's challenging address on "The Social Responsibilities of the Historian" will already have appeared in print in the January number of the *Review*. Here it is sufficient to describe it as an eloquent statement of the proposition that the historian, if he is to discharge his responsibilities in this era, must acquire and proclaim a positive social philosophy.

The award of two prizes was also announced at the dinner. The Beveridge Memorial Fellowship was won by Glyndon G. Van Deusen of the University of Rochester for his manuscript life of Horace Greeley. Honorable mention was received by Neil A. McNall of Pennsylvania State College for his study, "An Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley, from 1790 to 1860." Both of these manuscripts will be published in the Beveridge series. The Watumull prize, for the best book on the history of India, was divided between Gertrude Emerson Sen for the first volume of her *Pageant of Indian History* and Holden Furber of the University of Pennsylvania for his study, *John Company at Work*.

II

Four sessions had to do with the ancient and medieval periods of European history. In keeping with the sub-theme of the program, the session on the ancient world was devoted to a consideration of the *"Pax Romana:* Problems of Universal Peace in Antiquity." C. A. Robinson, jr., of Brown University, introduced three speakers who dealt with different aspects of the *Pax*. John V. A. Fine of Princeton, discussing "Contributions of the Hellenistic Age to the *Pax Romana,"* emphasized the trend from particularism towards unity in the Hellenistic Age in the realms of politics, economics, and ideas. This trend, combined with the crushing of the Greek spirit, especially in the first century B.C., facilitated the establishment of the *Pax Romana* after Actium. In his paper on "The Maintenance of the *Pax Romana,"* T. Robert S. Broughton of Bryn Mawr College pointed out that with the establishment of the Augustan frontiers the problems of the *Pax* became those of maintenance and of internal evolution until the equilibrium of the Antonine period was attained. This evolution, by giving a sense of participation and unity to the various parts of the empire, tended to preserve its structure and aid its survival. In analyzing "The Results of the *Pax Romana,"* C. Bradford Welles of Yale stated that Roman peace was the counterpart of the Roman Empire. Both meant the organization of the known civilized world into one society, progressively more urban, until the consequent decay of the peasantry and the failing supply of slaves brought about such weakness that the empire could not maintain itself against armed attack from outside. Some eighty persons listened to the papers, which were followed by an active discussion from the floor.

Both Eastern and Western Europe received emphasis in the two regular medi-

eval sessions. One of these, "East and West in the Middle Ages" was chiefly concerned with Eastern and Central Europe, while the other had to do with England. A. E. R. Boak of the University of Michigan served as chairman of the former session, which attracted an audience of about two hundred. In the first paper, "Germans and Slavs: Albert of Bremen and the Foundation of a Western Christian State in Livonia," Edgar N. Johnson of Nebraska, treating his subject as an example of the penetration of an area of low culture by a people of higher cultural status, gave a detailed account of the methods of conquest and their disastrous effects upon the local population of Lios, Letts, and Esthonians, as well as of the contacts of the Germanic conquerors with neighboring Russian states. The second paper, by Robert L. Wolff of Wisconsin, "Greeks and Latins Before 1204 and After," showed the results of the impact of Western institutions and Western invaders upon the Byzantine Greeks, particularly in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries; the degree to which Latin rulers accepted Byzantine social and religious organization; and the reasons for the lack of cultural, social, and political integration of the two elements during the life of the Latin states. Discussing the first paper, F. H. Cramer of Mount Holyoke College drew a parallel between the brutality of the conquest of the Wends and that of the Livonian peoples, pointed out that in each case this was largely the work of Saxons, who had suffered similarly from the Franks, and raised the question whether the harshness of the conquest could be attributed to its religious leadership. In his comments on the second paper, Peter Charanis of Rutgers endorsed Professor Wolff's treatment of his topic, added new examples of the cleft between the Greeks and the Latins, and stressed the Greek feeling of cultural superiority as one of the main factors in preventing cooperation and understanding between the two peoples.

Those who were deterred by the rather specialized titles of the papers from attending the session on "England in the Later Middle Ages: Politics and Political Ideas" apparently had reason to regret their absence. For the meeting was described by many as one of the high points of the convention. Charles H. McIlwain presided. Bertie Wilkinson of the University of Toronto discussed "Political Trials, 1308–1340, Especially in Relation to Parliament." He sought to establish the development of Lancastrian constitutionalism in the early fourteenth century during the reign of Edward II. During the course of the political trials the Lancastrian party showed itself genuinely concerned with legality in government. Gaines Post of the University of Wisconsin, whose subject was "The Community of the Realm and the Estate of the Realm," spoke on the Roman law background of the development of parliamentary and representative institutions and of the estate of the realm. Post suggested that the idea of representation and the idea of action by representative bodies through the community of the realm emerged from a background in which the canon law formed a notable element and that this legal system substantially influenced the development of certain concepts of government, notably the Statute of York. Helen M. Cam of Harvard and Radcliffe and Joseph R.

Strayer of Princeton introduced a discussion which proved to be both animated and knowledgeable.

The final medieval session to be noted was the dinner of the Mediaeval Academy, held on December 28 at the Algonquin Club, with Fred Norris Robinson of Harvard, president of the academy, in the chair. The speaker was Lynn T. White, jr., of Mills College, who demonstrated that his duties as college president have by no means crowded out his interest in medieval research. In his paper on "The Mediaeval Exploration of Mechanical Power and Devices," Dr. White brought together evidence from various fields of technical development which tended to show that the Middle Ages were making fundamental advances in the use of power machinery. Such devices as the windmill for waterpower, the clock, the crank, and the flywheel were all employed. In short, the developments of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries will go far to explain the technological changes usually associated with the Renaissance. A noteworthy feature of Dr. White's analysis was his attempt to establish, with some precision, the period of origin of the various devices and to adduce evidence of their spread.

Historiography formed the theme of the major session on the Renaissance. Wallace K. Ferguson of New York University was chairman, and papers were presented by Theodor E. Mommsen of Princeton and Felix Gilbert of Bryn Mawr. Mommsen, in considering "Petrarch's New Approach," emphasized the novelty of Petrarch's conception of history, particularly with reference to his *De viris illustribus*. Although there was nothing essentially new either in the writing of history as a collection of lives of famous men or in the moral pragmatism that centered the work about the concept of *virtus*, Mommsen argued that Petrarch was breaking new ground in selecting as *viri illustres* men of action and in his untheological conception of *virtus*. Petrarch departed from medieval precedent in his purely secular interpretation of history, in substituting a national theme for the universal history of Augustinian tradition, and in a new tripartite periodization, which foreshadowed the division of history into ancient, medieval, and modern periods. Felix Gilbert, under the title, "Fundamental Concepts and Ideas in the Historiography of the High Renaissance," discussed the work of the early sixteenth century historians, Vettori, Nerli, Nardi, and Guicciardini. What these writers had in common was a questioning attitude toward the humanist pattern of history and an interest in the specific problems of history, through which they sought a better understanding of the contemporary political situation. This search for answers to specific problems rather than for examples to illustrate general laws meant assigning to history a new function, and from this sprang the advances in historical technique—critical method, organization, and motivation—which the work of these historians demonstrates. Hans Baron of the Newberry Library, in his discussion of the two papers, doubted whether it was possible to measure the relationship of historical thought in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries without considering the intervening period. Fifteenth century humanism and the gen-

eration of Machiavelli first produced what may be called historical science, characterized by a comparative approach to the past in order to illuminate the present and by the discovery of a natural dynamics of human energies which was stimulated by freedom and competition and suffocated by the imperialism of universal states. The notion of the constancy of dynamic flux destroyed the medieval belief in the permanence of a God-willed universal empire. From this reconstruction of the historical outlook of the mature Renaissance, Baron reached the conclusion that Petrarch, as a historian, must be placed on the medieval side, because his views of antiquity were still bound up with the static idea of perennial empire. As for Gilbert's interpretation of the historiography of the 1520's as a revolutionary movement, Baron thought that comparison with the writing of the Quattrocento would show that some crucial features of the apparently new pattern were merely an epilogue of the humanist Renaissance.

The Society for Reformation Research took as the special subject of its joint session "Swedish 'Motif-research' as Applied to Luther and the Reformation." Edgar M. Carlson of Gustavus Adolphus College, who presented the paper, outlined the principles of motif-research, a historical-theological method of inquiry developed by Swedish scholars since the beginning of the present century. He noted two essential phases of the method—one the particular motif behind the particular doctrinal formulation, the other the discovery of the basic or fundamental motif, the affirmation that underlies all other affirmations and determines the entire structure of a theology. Motif-research may, therefore, be described as "typological" or "structural" research. Carlson cited a number of Swedish works in the field of Reformation research where the method had been fruitfully applied. Harold J. Grimm of Ohio State acted as chairman.

Judged by the response from the large group which attended it, the session on "The European Nobility in the Eighteenth Century" proved to be one of the most stimulating of the entire meeting. Although it was difficult to maintain a rigorously comparative basis in the discussion, the individual contributions (dealing with the French, English, Prussian, and Polish nobility) were significant and enlightening. Walter L. Dorn of Ohio State presided, and the principal paper on "The Regrouping of the French Nobility after Louis XIV" was the work of Franklin L. Ford of Bennington College. Concentrating on the so-called "feudal reaction" between 1715 and 1750, he showed how the effort of the French peers after 1715 to emulate their British counterparts by seizing control of the central institutions of government collapsed because of the incompetence of the nobles of the sword. Henceforth, leadership passed to the *noblesse de robe,* and the history of the resurgence of the French nobility is the history of the high robe's winning general recognition as the real defender of privileged interests. The sovereign court magistracy was in a position to do this because of its focal position in the constitutional structure, its firm corporate organization, its wealth and education, and the hold which it had acquired on the public imagination.

In the end the magistrates became the recognized standard bearer of the nobility which otherwise would have lapsed into impotence. This was more than an artificial alliance between the robe and the sword; it signified a social fusion which had proceeded to the point where the political distinction between the robe and the sword was meaningless. A new feudality reinvigorated the old. In discussing the English peerage, Lewis P. Curtis of Yale emphasized the position of the peerage as a political aristocracy, an aristocracy which possessed a social conscience, a sense of trusteeship, and held the balance between court and commons. He emphasized their political adaptability, and raised the question of whether the English governing class, with the peerage at its head, may not have helped to stave off the forces of revolution. In commenting on the Russian nobility, A. A. Lobanov-Rostovsky of the University of Michigan could make only slight use of the concepts employed by Ford and Curtis. He discussed the effect of the Petrine reforms on the nobility, especially Peter's making noble status contingent on service. The Russian ruling class was thus transformed into a bureaucracy manned by nobles who had satisfied the education and ability tests. Such requirements were whittled down by the Charter of 1785 issued by Catherine the Great, which gave to the nobility a status comparable to that of the noble orders of Western Europe. Hans Rosenberg of Brooklyn College emphasized the fact that the Prussian nobility shared characteristics with both Eastern and Western Europe. The Prussian nobility in 1750 was a highly heterogeneous body, a condition which precluded the formation of a common political front. During the latter half of the century, however, the nobility took over the Prussian civil service, and the state was transformed from a despotic into a bureaucratic absolutism. Frank Nowak of Boston University contended that the victory of the Polish nobles—the most numerous in Europe—over the crown was too swift and too complete. Fear of royal absolutism had driven them to the opposite extreme of wrecking the Polish constitution and, indeed, to pure obstructionism. When the shock of the first partition brought them to their senses, it was already too late.

European national histories in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were represented by sessions on Britain, France, Germany, and Russia. For Britain the theme, designed to parallel the ancient history session on the *Pax Romana,* was the *Pax Britannica.* Albert H. Imlah of Tufts College, in his paper on "The *Pax Britannica* in a Balanced Europe, 1815–1870," stressed the fact that balance of power was accepted as a European principle. Under Britain's leadership the conception of a public law in Europe was regnant. The success of the *Pax Britannica* was assured chiefly by the fact that diplomacy was supplemented by Britain's "promoting the attractive economic, social and political opportunities of the century." The economic liberalism of Huskisson and Peel, and parliamentary reform, by fostering social welfare in Great Britain and presenting attractions to other nations, served the *Pax* well until Bismarck presented a counter-attraction and gave a new lease of life to the notion that war was profitable.

John C. Amundson of the University of Pittsburgh, in his paper on "The *Pax Britannica* in an Unbalanced Europe, 1870–1914," pointed out that, with the weakening of the *Pax* in Europe, a new fulcrum was found in the world community of British peoples, the British Commonwealth of Nations. A revived imperialism flowing into colonial areas and British capital penetrating a world economy became powerful factors in maintaining the *Pax*. Chamberlain, with his emphasis on imperial defense and imperial trade, and his belief in a welfare empire and in peace as good business, looked forward keenly to an Anglo-Saxon alliance. From Dilke's time on, the broader concept of an Anglo-Saxon *Pax* was a vital element in British thought. In opening the discussion, Samuel C. McCulloch of Rutgers called attention to the organization of international finance and suggested that the Rothschilds, an international family, stood to lose too much by a general war. He emphasized Britain's traditional insistence on freedom of the seas, independence of the Low Countries, and protection of the life lines to the East, and he pointed to the great degree of interdependence in nineteenth century Europe through trade and investment. In the course of the discussion, Paul Knaplund of Wisconsin stressed, as an element in the *Pax*, the religious humanitarianism activating British statesmen and Colonial Office officials. The chairman, Chester W. New of McMaster University, drew attention to the fact that the achievement of independent nationhood within the British Commonwealth was beneficial to the *Pax* largely because it was developed gradually and enjoyed the friendly support of Great Britain and the United States. The experienced Anglo-Saxon nations must skillfully maintain friendly and helpful contacts with the new Asiatic nations if the *Pax Americana-Britannica-Commonwealth* is to be as successful in the next century as was the *Pax Britannica* between 1815 and 1914.

The session on France, "The Labor Movement and the Question of Political Action," Shepard B. Clough of Columbia presiding, was somewhat more specialized in its subject matter. Jean T. Joughin of New York City surveyed "The Formative Decade, 1876–1886," tracing, on the one hand, the attempts of the first Marxist political party in France—the Guesdist Workers' party—to take over the reborn trade union movement and, on the other, the evolution of an apolitical, direct action tendency on the part of the trade unions, which was anticipatory of revolutionary syndicalism. At the same time, the events of the decade anticipated what was to be axiomatic for the future: the weakness of organized labor in France, its dependence on the political state, and consequently the inevitability of its collaboration with outside, nonlabor forces. In discussing "The Development of a Syndicalist Philosophy," John Bowditch of the University of Minnesota addressed himself especially to the question of why, in France, the battle within the labor movement was joined between syndicalism and Marxism rather than among the various schools of Marxism. He found the answers to lie largely in the traditions of French labor, especially its distrust of centralization, and the fact that repre-

sentation in the C.G.T. was so arranged as to give the nonindustrialized areas an undue weight. The conditions that made possible the triumph of revolutionary syndicalist principles were purely fortuitous, circumstances that would not obtain indefinitely. Comments by Henry B. Ehrmann of the University of Colorado were focused on contemporary France, which, he suggested, might cast some light on the past. Professor Ehrmann was inclined to think that the French movement had always been pragmatically rather than philosophically inspired, perhaps to an extreme degree. A spirited discussion followed the formal papers and comments.

Germany was represented by a session on "Some Statesmen of the Weimar Republic," with Sinclair W. Armstrong of Brown substituting as chairman for Hans Rothfels of Chicago. Papers were given by Eric C. Kollman of Cornell College on "Walther Rathenau and German Foreign Policy—Thoughts and Actions" and by Felix E. Hirsch of Bard on "Gustav Stresemann and His Foreign Policy in Perspective." The discussion was led by Klemens von Klemperer of Smith and Hans W. Gatzke of Johns Hopkins. Professor Kollman's careful analysis of Rathenau's ideas on foreign policy from 1907 to 1922 discovered a definite pattern despite contradictions and mistakes. Rejecting the idea of an Anglo-German combination in favor of a continental solution for Germany's problem, Rathenau desired an alignment with France or Russia or both, which would safeguard Germany's industrial leadership in Europe and compensate for her exposed geographical position. Even in the difficult conditions of 1921–22, when Rathenau was first minister of reconstruction and then foreign minister, this pattern is visible in his policy of fulfillment, which was of doubtful advantage to Germany and played into the hands of the Rightist opposition, and in his negotiation of the Treaty of Rapallo. Dr. von Klemperer recognized that the Rapallo policy had immediate advantages but he insisted that it also had dangerous implications for Germany. He emphasized the European motive in Rathenau's policies and suggested that the Rapallo treaty was his formula for the peaceful co-existence of Russia and Europe. Professor Hirsch, who had been personally acquainted with Stresemann, portrayed the latter as an ardent exponent of "Western orientation." "Stresemann was never in sympathy with the so-called Eastern orientation and made consistent efforts to restrain the pro-Soviet attitude of the ambassador Count Brockdorff-Rantzau," but Stresemann realized the value of the Russian connection to Germany and maintained "friendly political and economic relations" with Moscow. Professor Gatzke raised a number of challenging questions concerning Professor Hirsch's case for the sincerity of Stresemann's professed desire for peace and European collaboration. Was Stresemann aware, for example, of Germany's illegal rearmament, first in Russia and later in Germany? This question was answered in the affirmative by Professor Sontag of Berkeley on the basis of captured documents of the German Foreign Office which had not been available to Professor Hirsch. Some other pertinent documents, such as those of Stresemann's *Volkspartei,* have, as Professor Hirsch remarked, disappeared or been destroyed.

Eschewing the more immediate phases of Russian history and problems, Russian

specialists elected to devote their session to "Liberalism in Pre-Revolutionary Russia." Papers were read by Alfred A. Skerpan of Kent State University on "The Special Problems of Liberalism in Russia" and by Donald W. Treadgold of the University of Washington on "The Constitutional Democrats and the Russian Liberal Tradition." Albert Parry of Colgate served as commentator and Warren B. Walsh of Syracuse as chairman. Both Messrs. Skerpan and Treadgold stressed the essential dissimilarities between Russian and Western liberalism. The former listed three problems peculiar to Russian liberalism: "the position and significance of the state, of the subject nationalities, and of the working and peasant levels of the population." He devoted most of his paper to analyzing the nature and development of the Russian state, drawing upon geopolitical concepts to aid in explaining the autocracy. Necessity, he said, preserved the autocracy into the twentieth century, and circumstances rendered the nobility and middle class dependent upon the state. Miliukov, who represented the view of the majority of liberals, recognized the essential place of the state, but, nevertheless, set out to destroy its power. Since both peasants and workers, though not otherwise in sympathy with Miliukov's position, were opposed to the state, the institution was so weakened as to be unable to withstand Lenin's final attacks. Only belatedly, Professor Skerpan urged, did the liberal see the other two problems and never took adequate measures with regard to them. Professor Treadgold's paper was chiefly concerned with the Kadet party and its relations with its competitors, the Social Democrats and the Social Revolutionaries. The two vital, interrelated issues which faced the Kadets were: (1) the means to be used in achieving the democratic regime and (2) the relations between the Kadets and their socialist competitors. It was Professor Treadgold's thesis that the crisis over these issues came in 1905–1906 and that the course chosen —constitutionalism and the Duma taking precedence over the need for a socio-economic revolution—largely determined the subsequent failure of Russian liberalism. When the Duma fell, the Kadets fell with it. In opening the discussion, Professor Parry was inclined to discount the state and nationalism as causes of the liberal defeat and insisted that "the problem of long overdue land reform finally wrecked both Miliukov and Kerensky." It was also Professor Parry's view that the decisive moment for the liberals came not in 1905–1906, as Professor Treadgold had suggested, but in 1917, when they forfeited their considerable popular support by failing to give the land to the peasants. Parry attributed this failure to the inability of the Kadets to go against their own class interest. The peasants, he believed, would have supported the liberals' state had the leaders met the demand for land. Professor Parry's critique aroused a lively discussion from the floor in the course of which some speakers questioned his linking of Miliukov and Kerensky and debated the amount of support available to the liberals in 1917.

The luncheon of the Modern European History Section, which this year took as its theme a phase of recent American foreign policy, is reported in another connection.

The two sessions devoted specifically to intellectual history showed a char-

acteristic and proper indifference to political boundaries. Continental Europe, England, and the United States were represented in the session on "Nineteenth-Century Ideas of the University," which met under the chairmanship of Margaret Clapp, president of Wellesley College. Paul Farmer of Wisconsin analyzed the various cultural and political trends which conditioned the growth of universities on the Continent. He discussed the various stages in their development and noted the influence of the various methods of thought—intuitionalism, rationalism, empiricism. Professor Farmer expressed some concern over the absence of an integrating idea in the modern university. In the United States a good deal of ambiguity surrounded the term "university," in the view of George W. Pierson of Yale. The name was applied both to horizontal and to vertical educational organization. Indeed, the American university was an institution of relatively slow growth, partly because of uncertainty about its objectives, partly because of meager resources, and partly because of lack of both student and teacher personnel. Later the growth of the university was held back by the fact that, although there were adequate financial resources in the large, the denominational college received much of what the country gave to higher education. Charles C. Gillispie of Princeton noted some of the distinctive features of the English university, particularly a collegiate system dedicated to educational aims that, in our terms, were college rather than university in character. He discussed the gradual encroachment of the university and the professoriate on the position of the college and the gradual transformation of Oxford and Cambridge into universities in the modern sense, though without abandoning their function of educating undergraduates. Dr. Gillispie concluded that the nineteenth century English university, on the whole, succeeded in achieving its aim—which was not chiefly that of advancing knowledge but of developing a pattern of character and inculcating a humanistic culture. Commentators were Frederick B. Artz of Oberlin and Richard J. Storr of Bowdoin.

The methodology and scope of the history of science and the significance of certain scientific ideas in the modern world were the themes of the joint session with the History of Science Society, Lynn Thorndike of Columbia in the chair. Crane Brinton of Harvard offered the view that the history of science is now at about the place that conventional history was when James Harvey Robinson called for the "new history." In addition to the history of science concerned with the how, when, and where of discoveries and their application, there must be a history of science which attempts to answer more complicated sociological questions—for example: In what kind of society does science flourish best? What is the real relation among science, technology, and economic enterprise in any one epoch? Professor Brinton asked that the history of science be regarded as part of the total history of human activity. "Darwinism and the History of Ideas" was the subject of the paper by Bert J. Loewenberg of Sarah Lawrence College. He sought to disentangle some of the semantic difficulties of our notions of Darwinism, and he pled for a careful study of the antecedents of Darwin, not seen as simply part of

the warfare of theology and science but as part of the intellectual life of the period. He noted that the history of evolution has figured chiefly in the works of philosophers, such as Lovejoy and Dewey, and that intellectual historians have never really attacked the problem. The consequence is that, from the point of view of intellectual history, no satisfactory studies of evolution exist. Richard H. Shryock of Johns Hopkins led the discussion.

III

As noted earlier in this report, one of the most conspicuous features of recent convention programs has been the relatively heavy emphasis placed on fields formerly classified as "exotic." These areas, lying outside the familiar North Atlantic and Western Mediterranean complex, have been demanding increasing attention from historians, as from statesmen. At Boston two sessions were given over to the Far East, one to the modern Near East, and one to modern India. Both the Near East session and one of those on the Far East were explicitly concerned with American interests and policies.

In the course of the session on "The United States and the Eastern Mediterranean," three papers were read: E. A. Speiser of the University of Pennsylvania on American relations with the Arab Lands; Sydney N. Fisher of Ohio State on the American interest in Turkey; and L. S. Stavrianos of Northwestern on the evolution of American policy towards Greece. All three noted the revolutionary shift which has occurred in the past three years in both the position and policy of the United States. Although Professor Speiser felt that the principal problem in relations with the Arab Lands was lack of "depth" in time, understanding, and personnel, Professor Fisher summarized a background of private interest and experience in Turkey over the past 175 years but was alarmed lest the present "rapid and somewhat flashy expansion" of United States collaboration and influence there might suddenly cease and thus destroy the "reservoir of good will" stored up by private endeavor. Again, as Professor Stavrianos indicated, though many ties had linked the Greek and American peoples for more than a century, the United States had actively intervened in Greece only with the announcement of the Truman Doctrine of March, 1947. He warned that, although the British policy of keeping Russia away from the Mediterranean, which had been taken over by the United States, appeared for the present successful, this could not be carried out indefinitely unless changes in Greece since the nineteenth century were taken into account. The rise of the Communists, the intensification of internal tensions under Metaxas and the Axis, and economic disequilibrium all mean that reliance on the Greek "Right" to stop Russia would in the long run be disastrous because its platform is based on a *status quo* which cannot last. Harvey P. Hall, editor of the *Middle East Journal,* taking the place of Kermit Roosevelt as commentator, stressed the necessity for the United States to think through its objective clearly and to avoid the pitfalls into which Great Britain and France had fallen

by permitting external factors to influence their Near Eastern policy. He was more optimistic than Speiser about the success thus far achieved, and he thought that only in Palestine had the United States been maneuvered into a false position where its fundamental aim of peace had been obscured. Roderic H. Davison of George Washington University, on the other hand, thought that Near Eastern policy must be made to fit into a global policy, and he suggested that to stop Russia and to please the peoples of the Near East offer no dilemma. The United States should try to educate the American public as well as specialists, while making the most in the Near East of the favorable impression created by private and nonpartisan American activity there. Dwight E. Lee of Clark University was in the chair.

The Near East session was paralleled by a session on "American Policy in a Revolutionary Far East," under the chairmanship of Earl H. Pritchard of the University of Chicago. Paul H. Clyde of Duke, in reviewing the "Traditional Principles of American Far Eastern Policy," pointed out that the Open Door and integrity-of-China principles can make sense only insofar as they are adjusted to the needs of a new social-revolutionary and nationalistic China. In the course of his remarks on "Current and Future Policy in China," Knight Biggerstaff of Cornell noted the absence of a progressive democratic movement in China on which the United States could depend and advocated ultimate recognition of the Communist regime. Delmer Brown of California (Berkeley) indicated that the emphasis in economic and democratic reform in Japan had shifted as a result of the threat of communism and its rise to power in China. American policy in Southeast Asia should promote genuine native nationalist movements and social and economic reforms as a countermeasure to the threat of communism, in the view of George McT. Kahin of the Johns Hopkins University. In his comments G. Nye Steiger of Simmons College urged that American policy in China should show the Chinese that we were doing something for them and not merely helping ourselves. Hugh Borton of Columbia pointed out that various other factors, such as the failure to get a peace treaty with Japan and the cost of the occupation, had contributed to a change in American policy, and Virginia Thompson of New York stressed the economic and social problems faced by the new nationalist regimes in Southeast Asia.

The other session on the Far East, though certainly not without implications for the present, was less directly focused on contemporary politics. The theme of the session, "Typical Chinese Reactions to Imported Ideas," was introduced by the chairman, Derk Bodde of Pennsylvania, who mentioned some of the conditions under which a civilization is likely to accept ideas from without and commented on the appropriateness of the subject in view of the struggle between native and imported ideas in contemporary China. Arthur F. Wright of Stanford presented a paper on "Rejection," as illustrated by Fu I (555–639), a Confucian scholar and strong opponent of Buddhism. The various factors which prevented Fu's contemporaries from sharing his personal rejection of Buddhism were suggested by Pro-

fessor Wright. "Eclecticism" was examined by Hellmut Wilhelm of the University of Washington, who traced the reaction of nineteenth century Chinese statesmen and thinkers to Western ideas and technology. Most of these men were ready to borrow technology from the West, without having any clear understanding of the ideas which had created this technology. They regarded Chinese civilization as the basic "substance" and Western civilization as a subsidiary "function"—thus revealing a dichotomy which goes far back in traditional Chinese thought. It is not surprising that the eclecticism which they attempted to build on this concept met with failure. The third type of reaction, "Acceptance," was dealt with by Benjamin Schwartz of Harvard, who analyzed the thought of Ch'en Tu-hsiu (1879–1944?), founder of the Chinese Communist party. Though Ch'en's ideas changed greatly at various stages, they were characterized throughout by an uncompromising rejection of traditional Chinese thought and wholehearted acceptance of Western ideas. This strong Westernism finally forced Ch'en to break with the more "Chinese" wing of Chinese communism, thus becoming the Trotsky of China. From the three papers the conclusion seemed to be that imported ideas stand greatest chance of success in times of national crisis, when native ideas prove themselves no longer adequate to meet the needs of the day.

The Asiatic section of the program was completed by a session on Asia, under the chairmanship of H. Donaldson Jordan of Clark University. W. Norman Brown of the University of Pennsylvania, in a paper on "The Role of the Northwest in the History of India," presented a historical explanation of the profound feeling of difference existing between the Northwest—corresponding to Western Pakistan—and the remainder of India. This difference has almost always rested on a clash of culture which is in turn due to the fact that the Northwest passes have permitted wave after wave of immigrants to enter India from Central Asia. All of Indian history illustrates this process and the consequent cultural overlap and ambivalence in the Northwest. The Punjab, most important part of the Northwest, has thus only for brief periods been assimilated, either culturally or politically, to the rest of North India and has always had important characteristics of a frontier area. Since the Northwest is still, as always, economically weak, culturally divided, and militarily vulnerable, the decision of 1947 to separate it from India has weakened the defense of both areas. Discussion, led by Walter E. Clark of Harvard, centered on the suggestion that Professor Brown had overstated the role of "Hellenism" in the history of the Northwest. A second paper, by Richard L. Park of Harvard, was on "Violence and Non-Violence in the Indian Independence Movement, with Special Reference to Bengal, 1905–1914." Avowedly a preliminary study, based not on printed sources but on interviews with former revolutionaries, it was primarily a survey of the interesting but somewhat inconclusive evidence concerning the evolution of revolutionary groups and techniques in Bengal, with suggestions as to how they were linked with the contemporary and subsequent development of Indian nationalism. Daniel Thorner of Pennsylvania introduced

the discussion, in the course of which suggestions were made for further investigation of the general theme.

In addition to the open meeting of the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to a reception held by the Conference on Latin American History in honor of Professor Clarence Haring, two meetings were devoted to the affairs of Latin America. At the Wednesday luncheon session of the Conference, presided over by Madaline W. Nichols of Florida State University, there were two reports on the problems to be faced by the historian interested in research in the archives of Spain. John Tate Lanning of Duke University proposed "Some Possible Reforms in the Archives of the Indies" and indicated the difficulties encountered—despite all the aid of ever-courteous and helpful archivists—in finding the desired documents in the wealth of inadequately indexed materials. Dr. Lanning also called attention to a half-century of royal cedulas which are curiously missing despite their provocative listing by archivists of the secretariats of the Council of the Indies. In his "Hints for the Investigator in the Spanish Archives," George P. Hammond of the University of California at Berkeley warned of the loss of time involved both in discovering which materials have already been utilized and in acquiring the requisite technical skill in paleography and in the use of the Spanish language; he described the various historical archives in Spain and the general environment and governmental setup under which one must learn to live and work. Dr. Ricardo Donoso, national member for Chile of the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History spoke of certain recent Chilean historical publications. Beginning with a reference to the 1853 visit to Boston of Chile's great historian, Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna, and a note of the study at Georgetown University of Isidoro Errázuriz, Dr. Donoso turned to the recent printing of the latter's *Diario* by the Sociedad de Bibliófilos Chilenos, and he mentioned as other publications of that society the volumes of the correspondence of Juan and Mariano Egaña which are of great importance in the study of the political history of Chile. He then alluded to the publication of the Archivo de don Bernardo O'Higgins, with special emphasis on the diplomatic correspondence of Antonio José de Irisarri and Miguel Zañartu, the agents sent by Chile to London and Buenos Aires to gain support for the new nation. After reference to the new *Historia de la Ingenieria en Chile* by Ernesto Greve, Dr. Donoso noted among the new volumes recently published in two long-famous Chilean collections of documents the *Mensura General de Tierras de Ginés de Lillo,* and, in conclusion, he gave his critical appreciation of the thirteen volumes of Francisco A. Encina's *Historia de Chile.*

Arthur P. Whitaker of the University of Pennsylvania presided at the session which considered the problems of the general course in Latin American history. Three brief papers opened up some of the issues. Harold A. Bierck, jr., of the University of North Carolina reviewed the history of the course since its beginnings in the last years of the nineteenth century and discussed changes which have taken

place, as evidenced by an analysis of textbooks currently in print. He called for greater integration of material. In his discussion of problems of the colonial era, John F. Bannon of St. Louis University suggested that an entire semester be devoted to the period before 1830 and suggested periods and topics into which the material for the earlier period might be divided. Joseph Shafer of Syracuse, in his treatment of problems of the national period urged major attention to the history of the A.B.C. powers and Mexico. Teachers in the field, he believed, should follow the example of historians of Europe who have been bolder in interpreting the integrating forces in periods of history. He also stressed the usefulness of making a chronological break at approximately 1890. Following these papers, briefer contributions were made by members of a discussion panel. Charles Cumberland of Rutgers favored the use of a topical treatment of the national period after a short chronological outline. Alexander Marchant of Vanderbilt discussed ways in which Brazil might be dealt with in a general course, both as a unique component of the Latin American area and as an example of general tendencies. Robert Smith of Pennsylvania stressed the value in teaching social history of illustrative material drawn from the arts. Topics touched on in subsequent discussion from the floor included some criticism of the subordination of smaller countries, the necessity of planning the course to meet the needs of students not primarily interested in history, the place of the course in general education, and the problem of the one-semester course.

The third Latin American session, "International Cooperation among Historians: A Case Study," was arranged by the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and was given over to an appraisal of the commission's work. C. H. Haring of Harvard was in the chair. Of the three principal participants, Dr. Silvio Zavala spoke for the commission, while Ralph H. Gabriel of Yale and Raymond J. Sontag of California at Berkeley considered its program from the points of view of a United States and a European historian respectively. The panel was composed of Jorge Basadre of the Organization of American States, Charles C. Griffin of Vassar, Roland D. Hussey of the University of California at Los Angeles, with Richard H. Heindel of the Social Science Research Council substituting for Dorothy Burne Goebel of Hunter, who was absent because of illness. General approval of the present activities of the commission was voiced by the speakers. During the discussion the emphasis was upon the desirability of "instrumental" projects, *i.e.*, preparation of aids to inter-American research, as the most appropriate and most needed contribution by the commission. Doubts were expressed by Professor Sontag and by most of the other speakers as to the feasibility of undertaking a comprehensive, co-operative history of the Americas, and of international co-operative scholarly projects in general. Dr. Basadre referred to the nationalistic tendencies of Latin American historians, factionalism and family and personal considerations, as obstacles in the way of effective co-operation in international historical enterprises. Professor Griffin

stressed the lack of adequate monographic preparation for a general history of the Americas and suggested the need of a definite program for such a history into which individual studies of a comparative sort might fit. Professor Sontag called attention to the lack of balance, as between Latin and Anglo America, in articles and book reviews in the *Revista de Historia de America,* and suggested that its contents be made more truly continental in scope. During the discussion the preparation of adequate guides to the national archives of the several Latin American countries was also recommended. Dr. Waldo G. Leland summed up the sense of the meeting by stressing the principal points made above, by complimenting the commission and its chairman, Dr. Silvio Zavala, for the role of leadership they have assumed, and by suggesting the desirability of frequent conferences among historians of several countries such as that held at Monterrey, Mexico, last September.

IV

The North American section of the program, as usual, offered rich and varied fare, and one in which nearly every kind of historical taste could find nourishment. Cultural, economic, and regional topics appeared in some abundance, while foreign relations and world contacts were given even greater prominence.

Two sessions had to do with intellectual and cultural history. Scientific advance was the theme of the session on the colonial period. Henry Guerlac of Cornell acted as chairman, and Brooke Hindle of the Institute of Early American History and Culture presented a paper on "The American Revolution and the Pursuit of Science," an examination of the change in American science observable during the two decades prior to the Revolution and during the years of the war. He described the founding and growth of American scientific organizations and noted that they universally were dedicated to the glorifying of the New World and that their growth was, therefore, a parallel to the growth of independent political sentiment. Particular stress was laid on the organization of observations of the transit of Venus in 1769, an event which unified the two rival Philadelphia societies into the present American Philosophical Society. Max Savelle of the University of Washington raised the question whether any revolutionary changes actually occurred in any sphere of our national life. He pointed out that the new laws passed by the several states following independence were modifications of older ones rather than newly conceived innovations. Edmund S. Morgan of Brown drew attention to the fact that the scientific societies described by the speaker were voluntary rather than "organized from above." He directed the discussion to a general consideration of voluntary rather than state-inspired organizations in the development of America. I. Bernard Cohen of Harvard pointed out that one must view the development of American science in the perspective of the development of science in Europe, that the chief effect of the Revolution on American science was to shift allegiance from British science to French, and that one must not confuse the social history of sci-

ence and its organizations with the internal history of science itself. Dirk J. Struik of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology noted the need of considering the practical arts as well as the pure sciences, *e.g.*, surveying, bridge and canal building, and the like.

The joint session with the American Society of Church History was this year devoted to aspects of American religious development. Ralph H. Gabriel of Yale, speaking on "A People's Religion and the Formulation of the American Democratic Faith," termed Evangelical Protestantism, as it was developed on the frontier, the folk religion of America. Its characteristics were freedom from authority, individualism, enthusiasm, and emotionalism. At the other end of the scale of sophistication was the transcendentalism of men such as Emerson, whose religious outlook was equally individualistic and romantic. Both Emerson and Bushnell placed much emphasis on nature and man. Attention was also given to the expression of this type of religion, first in the white spirituals of the frontier, and in the hymnody of Lowell Mason. Sidney E. Mead of the University of Chicago analyzed "American Protestantism in the Revolutionary Epoch." American Protestantism was characterized as sectarian-pietistic—*i.e.*, individualistic, nontheological, and with lack of concern for the total community. This was the outgrowth of both the pietism and the rationalism of the eighteenth century, as both were opposed to ecclesiastical authority and tradition. But this strange alliance was broken during the Revolutionary period, when rationalism tended towards deism and what was felt to be infidelity and atheism, and a new alliance was struck between the traditional orthodoxies and the pietistic sectarian spirit.

Party history—specifically, "The Revaluation of Third Party Movements in the United States"—provided the subject for the joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. Roy F. Nichols of Pennsylvania, discussing the period before 1865, emphasized the multiplicity and fluidity of American parties. While the Democratic party was torn by factions—*e.g.*, the Loco-focos—and while the Whigs tended to coalesce with such groups as anti-Masons and Know-Nothings, parties and factions came and went; by 1860 there was little evidence that the United States was a two-party nation. Changes in party structures in this period were symptomatic of the state of flux in which American institutions remained before 1861. Numerous small parties often had reform motives; they were most effective when they secured small blocs in state legislatures so that they held the balance of power. The role of third parties from 1865 to 1900 was treated by Raymond C. Miller of Wayne University. Relating the subject to the general pattern of political behavior, Professor Miller held that American parties are, in general, nonrational—*i.e.*, instead of being ideological, they have taken the form of a collection of loyalties and rewards, allowing notable differences within the ranks and necessitating the reconciliation of interests among fellow partisans. He denied that minor parties have had direct political effectiveness, either as balance of power or as originators and developers of issues. Radicals or progressives, he believed, have

had more chance of producing results within major parties than as separate organizations. Even a million or more ballots for a minor party might be fundamentally only a reorganization of opposition votes. What Professor Miller considered most significant was that lesser parties, by denouncing the concentration of power, economic or political, kept alive a voice of protest in an America which was increasingly being driven to conformity. The period since 1900 was discussed by Eric F. Goldman of Princeton. His central point of emphasis was that there were "two New Deals"—that of 1912 and that of the thirties. The first was not anti-big-business in tone, avoided trust busting, and favored self-regulation of industry under federal aegis; the second followed the more traditional reform pattern by being anti-big-business in tone and antitrust in program. He urged further attention to the fundamental differences shown by these two movements. He also suggested a fresh examination of that group which he considered the most important of the third parties since 1900, the Bull Moosers—a synthesis of a labor-progressive tradition (which had never wanted to break up trusts) with a new type of business thinking. It was Dr. Goldman's view that the more influential third parties of the future will follow the Bull Moose pattern. That these papers, as will be admitted by the speakers, were provocative rather than definitive, was indicated by the subsequent spirited discussion in the hotel lobby.

Of the four sessions with a regional emphasis, two, appropriately enough, had to do with New England. The session on the "Withering" of New England was a sequel to the successful discussion held ten years ago at Washington on its "Flowering." The program committee made an intensive effort to secure for this panel representatives from sections other than the one under examination. Though in this quest they were comparatively unsuccessful, the session, under the chairmanship of Edward C. Kirkland of Bowdoin, came to unexpectedly optimistic conclusions. Howard Mumford Jones of Harvard questioned whether the alleged economic decline was anything more than a wholesome readjustment after a boom-or-bust expansion. In literature, the fine arts, and education there was no withering. Indeed the cultural leaders and institutions of the later period were equal, if not superior, to the earlier ones. Carl Bridenbaugh of the Institute of Early American History admitted that New England was, in the period of withering, divided by religious and racial tensions. He felt that the region was saved from decline by its unique capacity for self-criticism. While the luminaries of an earlier day may have been lacking in the post–Civil War years, New England enlarged its concept of culture and organized it on a new scale. The region maintained intact its concern with ethics and learning. To racial tensions Oscar Handlin of Harvard gave a more central place. New England had always faced difficulties and had always complained of them. Before the mid-century such handicaps were a challenge to action; afterwards they were occasions for the search for security. The difference in reaction was due to the disorganizing impact of immigration which divided the New England community against itself. Richard Shryock of Johns Hopkins con-

cluded the discussion with an appraisal of what New England sectionalism actually meant. While the decline of the region economically and politically was genuine, it was relative rather than absolute. The trend, nonetheless, led to discouragement, caution, and nostalgia. Perhaps the last could be redressed by a more realistic and just appraisal of New England's flowering.

The American Catholic Historical Association took as the theme for its joint session a neglected aspect of New England social history, "French-Canadian Immigration into New England in the Nineteenth Century." The Rev. Robert H. Lord, St. Paul's Church, Wellesley, presided over an unusually well attended session. Iris Saunders Podea of West Long Branch, New Jersey, in a paper entitled "Quebec to 'Little Canada': the Coming of the French Canadians to New England in the Nineteenth Century," dealt with the social and economic phases of the movement into the Northeast, sketching some of the problems faced and created by the immigrant group. "The French Parish and *Survivance* in Nineteenth Century New England" was the subject of the second paper, by Mason Wade of Windsor, Vermont. He stressed the central importance of the parish in the life of the immigrants and described their attempts to establish in New England their distinctively French parishes. Both papers will be published within a few months. The discussion was led by the Rev. Edward Finnegan, S.J., of Boston College, substituting for the Rev. William L. Lucey, S.J., of Holy Cross, who was absent by reason of illness, and J. Bartlet Brebner of Columbia. At the close of the discussion period, M. Eugene Jalbert, past president of the Société Historique Franco-Américaine, congratulated the speakers for their presentation and both associations for having chosen to devote a session to the topic.

The joint session with the Southern Historical Association, with William C. Binkley of Vanderbilt University presiding, was devoted to a consideration of two selected problems in southern economic development. In a paper entitled "Factor Versus Carrier: A New View of the Ante-Bellum Southern Supply System," Bennett H. Wall of the University of Kentucky reviewed the part played by the factor in the financial operations of the ante-bellum plantation system and suggested that much of the blame for excessive costs to the planters should be transferred from the commission houses to the transportation agencies. On the basis of materials drawn from a wide range of plantation accounts, commission house records, and shipping company data, he presented evidence to show that the charges of the factor, who performed a multiplicity of services for his clients, represented a much smaller proportion of the values involved than did those of the carrier, performing the single service of transporting the produce to market. The second paper, by Henry L. Swint of Vanderbilt, was on "The Northern Interest in the Shoeless Southerners." Placing the famous remark by Secretary Perkins in its perspective as one of the latest expressions of a consciousness of the relationship between "civilizing" influences and the growth of trade, Mr. Swint gave special attention to the extent to which the movement to improve the economic and social

status of the freedmen after the Civil War was promoted and participated in by leading businessmen of the North, usually to their own economic advantage. He showed that those who were prominent in this work were not unaware of the material returns that might result from their activities; but he also pointed out that economic and humanitarian motives were too closely intermingled to warrant the singling out of either as the dominant influence. In discussing these papers Fred C. Cole of Tulane University stressed the danger of emphasizing economic interest as the determining factor in attempting to interpret either the ante-bellum supply system or the postwar efforts for improvement. He suggested that in both cases more historical knowledge must be presented concerning the development of southern economy before we can understand the South as it is today or as it was in any other period. What promised to become a lively discussion from the floor had to be cut short in order to avoid encroaching upon the time scheduled for the business meeting of the Association.

A curious aspect of frontier lore was recalled by Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky at the dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. In his paper, piquantly entitled "Virgins, Villains, and Varmints, or Mr. Beadle's Frontier," he considered the manner in which the dime novelist treated early frontier history. Several examples were cited to illustrate the concepts which they peddled concerning Indians, bad men, woodcraft, and kindred frontier phenomena. Since these novels were sold in hundreds of thousands and were widely read, they must be regarded as important sources of interest, if not of fact, in American frontier history. The speaker was introduced by the president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Carl Coke Rister of the University of Oklahoma.

The economic emphasis in the American field was supplied chiefly by joint sessions with several of the allied societies. The Economic History Association turned to "Some Economic Problems of World War II," with Robert G. Albion of Harvard presiding over a session that included papers by Frederic C. Lane of the Johns Hopkins University on "Managing the Managers in Wartime Shipbuilding" and Jarvis M. Morse of the U.S. Treasury Department on "Selling Bonds in Two World Wars." Comment was by Constance McL. Green of the Army Historical Division, Ordnance Section, and by Lester Simonds of Boston. Professor Lane discussed the problems involved in starting new shipyards from scratch. He emphasized the difficult dilemma which the government faced in attempting to encourage output through competition and at the same time imposing adequate safeguards in matters of cost. Dr. Morse described the achievements of the Treasury Department in the marketing of government bonds, comparing the techniques and results of the department's work in the two war periods. He outlined in some detail the various methods, direct and indirect, by which bonds were sold, chiefly to the private investor. Mrs. Green indicated how Army Ordnance had handled problems similar to those mentioned by Professor Lane,

and noted that it had laid its plans carefully in advance, while Mr. Simonds, who had been in charge of bond sales in the Greater Boston area, took exception to Dr. Morse's comments on the depreciation of Liberty bonds in the 1920's. He also stressed the high percentage of World War II bonds which, at least in the Greater Boston area, were absorbed by banks and corporations.

Joint sessions with the Business Historical Society canvassed problems of research and teaching in the field of business history. In the morning meeting, held at the Parker House, three papers were presented, all dealing with research in business history. Thomas C. Cochran of New York University set forth the need for broadening business history to place it in its social context, a task which is being undertaken by the Research Center in Entrepreneurial History at Harvard University. Henrietta M. Larson of the Harvard Business School traced the development of business history at Harvard and emphasized the need of expanding this new discipline around the core of administrative problems and techniques. Mary E. Murphy of Hunter College dealt with special problems confronting the researcher in the history of public accountancy. At the joint luncheon meeting, N. S. B. Gras of the Harvard Business School traced the growth of the Business Historical Society and mapped the alternative courses of its future. At the afternoon session, held also at the Parker House, the teaching of business history was the principal theme. Herman Krooss of New York University viewed the subject at the graduate level, John G. B. Hutchins of Cornell University at the senior and graduate level, and Charles J. Kennedy of the University of Nebraska at the freshman level. All papers presented at the joint meeting with the Business Historical Society will be published in future issues of the *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*.

With the Agricultural History Society the Association collaborated in a regular session and a luncheon. At the formal session, with Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina presiding, three papers were presented on unrelated aspects of agricultural development in the United States. Russell H. Anderson of the Western Reserve Historical Society discussed informally "Agriculture among the Shakers." After tracing briefly the organization and decline of Shaker communities in the United States, Mr. Anderson emphasized the Shaker's efficiency as a workman, his interest in the development of tools and gadgets, and his progressive outlook on agriculture. Cornelius O. Cathey of the University of North Carolina discussed the contributions of the agriculturists of one state to the over-all improvements in the mechanics of farming in a paper titled "Developments in Agricultural Implements in North Carolina, 1783–1860." He concluded that North Carolinians made rapid strides in the invention and adaptation of new farm tools and implements during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Margaret R. Beattie of Vassar College presented a paper on "The Disposal of the Swamp Land Grant in Illinois," in which she traced the evolution of a policy designed to bring these lands into productive use. Miss Beattie paid particular

attention to the investment of speculative capital in those lands. In the discussion that followed, Herbert A. Kellar of the McCormick Historical Association and Paul W. Gates of Cornell University engaged in a spirited debate on the importance of agricultural periodicals to agricultural reform and progress. Mr. Kellar maintained that the press was one of the most effective agencies of progress; contrariwise, Mr. Gates thought the press, by its practice of "puff" advertising of untried tools and half-baked ideas, sometimes checked rather than advanced progressive reforms. The luncheon conference of the society had as its chairman Paul Gates of Cornell and as its speaker John D. Black of Harvard, who took as his subject "An Agricultural Economist Looks at Agricultural History." He described his researches in the agricultural economy of New England.

Railroad history was handled in a joint session with the Lexington Group, at which Charles E. Fisher, president of the Railway and Locomotive Historical Society, served as chairman. Laurence F. Whittemore, until recently president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, opened the program by suggesting the historical implications of various current railroad problems. He stressed the fact that the Transportation Act of 1920 had failed to provide the promised "fair return" to the industry and likened the 1920 situation to the present in that a major overhauling of the regulatory structure appeared necessary. Alfred Chandler of Harvard, basing his remarks on source records recently made available, put forward the thesis that Henry Varnum Poor, editor of the *American Railroad Journal* and of the famous *Poor's Manual,* was the nation's first thoroughgoing railway analyst and historian. He emphasized Poor's contribution in providing for the public the first reliable statistics and financial data of the industry. In the final paper Edward Ullman of the department of regional planning of Harvard University discussed "New Viewpoints on American Railroad Geography." With the aid of slides based on traffic data marshaled in an entirely new way, he analyzed the relation of geography to the origin and distribution of freight tonnage, especially in the heavy-traffic eastern states. He related his findings to efficiency of operation and to the problem of national defense, and concluded with a comparison and contrast of the railway traffic potential of Russia and the United States. Discussion from the floor was prolonged and vigorous.

One of the most stimulating and significant groups of sessions had to do with the external contacts—cultural, social, and economic, as well as diplomatic in the traditional sense—of the American people. Of these perhaps the broadest in scope was captioned, "American Influences Abroad: An Exploration." The session was, in fact, not only an "exploration" but a charted invitation and challenge to push forward in this neglected study of American influences abroad. The papers and discussion, presented under the chairmanship of Richard H. Heindel of the Social Science Research Council, covered a wide range of time, activities, and areas but with selected details to point up the problems, definitions, methods, and results of such studies. There was agreement that studies of American influence ought to produce balance, judgment, and new perspective, that they should be of help in

the conduct of daily affairs of state as well as aiding in the proper placement of our society in a dynamic world of interacting parts. In surveying the status of our knowledge to date, Michael Kraus of the College of the City of New York demonstrated the legitimacy of the field. His paper agreed, too, with the view set forth by Melville J. Herskovits of Northwestern of American influences in Africa as a problem for ethno-historical study and with the fertile prospectus for the future offered by Merle Curti of Wisconsin, on the breadth of data required, on the values of enlisting many disciplines and of interesting foreign historians in the subject. In the course of the discussion no doubt was left that there have been American influences abroad, in Latin America as described by Arthur P. Whitaker of Pennsylvania and in China as noted by J. K. Fairbank of Harvard. Both Gilbert Chinard of Princeton and Louis Wright of the Folger Library, drawing upon literary history, further left no doubt that the topic should be considered from the very earliest periods of American history. Franklin Scott of Northwestern stressed the need for a variety of case studies before integration and generalization can be attempted with hope of success, and he chose to analyze the effect of American law upon Norwegian law as an example of such a study. Richard O. Cummings of Brooklyn College inquired into technological influences and Eugene E. Doll of Philadelphia examined the effect of European histories of the United States as a channel of communication and images. The session did not need to dispose of the anticipated criticism that interest in the topic was somehow a retrograde step toward excessive nationalism. Curti and others urged comparative studies on the impacts made by other countries. The conclusion was that it was not only appropriate to consider the varied influences of a nation upon peoples beyond its frontier as a part of national history, but also that such studies would go far to building up the suitable content of world history and international relations, would "yield generalizations," as Herskovits noted, "that will contribute to a fuller understanding of the processes of human civilization as a whole."

A session which, at least by implication, was not without a certain timeliness was that on "The American Response to 'Foreign Ideologies.'" Introduced by ex-Congressman Thomas H. Eliot of Boston, the first speaker, Professor Dumas Malone of Columbia, discussed "Jefferson and the French Revolution." He warned against confusing foreign policy with attitude toward a foreign ideology. Discussing Jefferson and the Revolution, he suggested that Jefferson, sympathetic with its early purposes, derived his distrust of urban proletariats in part from his familiarity with the Terror. John M. Blum of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in a paper on "Nativism, Anti-Radicalism, and the Foreign Scare, 1917–1920," emphasized the part of political agitation in intensifying the persistent antiforeign and antiradical prejudices which were particularly virulent among insecure groups. Recognizing the dangers of communism but carried away by hysteria, the American people, he suggested, rejected statesmanlike plans for postwar domestic and European reconstruction in favor of a witch hunt. The commentator, Ray A. Billington of Northwestern observed that nativism had

flowered in various earlier periods of unrest and insecurity. In the short discussion that followed, during which the remarks of the speakers were amplified, Samuel Flagg Bemis of Yale noted that even in periods of hysteria Americans had enjoyed substantial civil and personal liberties.

More directly concerned with foreign affairs in the classic sense was the session on "World War I and American Opinion," presided over by Thomas A. Bailey of Stanford. Speaking on "The Problem of American Intervention, 1917: An Historical Retrospect," Richard W. Leopold of Northwestern critically surveyed the more important writings on the subject, urged a reconsideration of generally accepted views, and pointed to certain neglected fields of research, particularly in regard to security, congressional opinion, and American public opinion. Selig Adler of the University of Buffalo, in a paper on "War Guilt and American Disillusionment, 1918–1928," pointed out that revisionist propaganda, particularly in Russia and Germany, by holding that the Allies were largely responsible for the coming of the war in 1914, had an important effect on American public opinion. Among other things it resulted in the disillusionist complex which helped encompass the defeat of the League of Nations and which crystallized the strong isolationist sentiment of the 1920's and 30's. The discussion leader, Richard W. Van Alstyne of the University of Southern California, found the fundamental cause of American entry into World War I in a conception of security which he defined with reference to the relative power position of the United States. Cumulative experiences and impressions of Germany, he declared, convinced the American mind by 1917 that that country was a sinister power bent upon ruling the world. The unrestricted submarine campaign merely clinched the matter. During the discussion period Professors Fay, Schmitt, and Bemis, all of whose names were mentioned in the papers, took the floor to present their points of view or to add other pieces of information.

The final session on American foreign relations was arranged, less paradoxically than at first appears, by the Modern History Section for its luncheon. Crane Brinton of Harvard, chairman of the section, presided, and S. E. Gleason of Cambridge, Massachusetts, presented a paper on "The Changing Temper of American Opinion from 1939 to Pearl Harbor" and the reaction of President Roosevelt to these changes. The gist of his argument was that the real problem confronting the historian of this period was not so much to explain why the President had allegedly ignored or deceived popular sentiment. It was rather to explain why he so often chose to "appease" the anti-interventionists at seeming cost to the national security.

V

Although the bulk of the sessions had to do, in one way or another with the content of history, other matters of importance to the historian were by no means ignored. Two meetings explored some of the problems faced by the historian as

teacher. The session devoted to the topic, "The College History Curriculum and the Independent School," was opened by Richard K. Irons of Groton School. As a representative of the independent schools, Dr. Irons spoke on the subject, "Do the Colleges Know What To Do with a Well-trained Freshman?" and was inclined to answer his question in the negative. He also raised the question whether the independent schools should, in the light of the present tendency to introduce "problems" or "key idea" courses in the freshman year, go back to a solid course in European history for the sixth form. Edward W. Fox of Cornell University followed with a paper on "What Can Be Expected of an Introductory Survey Course?" in which he emphasized that the average entering freshman is much more poorly prepared than a generation ago. He declared that the freshman course must be kept sufficiently flexible in method and organization to present a challenge even to Dr. Irons' "well-trained freshman." He also urged that the introductory course should maintain high academic standards and provide both a solid body of content and an introduction to historical method. He paid much attention to the ever-baffling problems of chronological scope and lecture-discussion technique. The discussion was opened by Edmond S. Meany of Mt. Hermon School, who pointed out that the student from the independent school often seemed to lose his initial impetus and asked what could be done to solve this problem. Dr. Meany also related the general question to the public-school student. Evalyn A. Clark of Vassar College, in continuing the discussion, declared that Vassar offered several courses in history to freshmen and thus made appeals to students with various preparations. Miss Clark also brought out that Vassar had held conferences with preparatory school teachers in an effort to solve the transitional problems between school and college. There followed a very spirited discussion from the floor with participation from about a dozen speakers representing universities, colleges, junior colleges, independent schools, and high schools, and all parts of the country except the Pacific Coast. The meeting was closed long before the discussion had exhausted itself, and several people expressed to the chairman, John G. Gazley of Dartmouth College, their hope that a session dealing with teaching problems might be made a regular feature of the meetings of the American Historical Association.

The other session directly related to the teaching function of the historian was the joint session with the National Council for the Social Studies. This program, Chester M. Destler of Connecticut College in the chair, began with the presentation by Howard R. Anderson of the Office of Education (Washington, D.C.) of a statistical report on the status of American history in public high schools. This revealed wide variations in the amount of instructional time allotted to courses in United States history there and the heavy encroachment on this that has resulted from the inclusion of local and state history, and by the now customary allotment of twenty per cent of the teaching time to current affairs. Following this William H. Cartwright of Boston University presented a historical review of "Values Claimed for the Teaching of American History." This paper revealed that re-

ligious and moral training have ceased to be stated objectives of instruction in American history as the result of the secularization of education on all levels (save in parochial schools). Citizenship training, the cultivation of an enlightened patriotism, and the liberalizing effect of historical studies continued to be stressed. Earlier emphasis upon intellectual discipline as an objective has been supplanted by the attempt to develop historical skills. The demands of organized minorities that their aspirations be included in the teaching values fostered by instruction in American history is a relatively recent development, in the case of such groups as the Catholics and Negroes. The program provoked an unusual amount of discussion. Both speakers were engaged for a considerable period after the formal program in informal conferences with interested persons.

In the same general connection may be mentioned the interesting joint session with the American Association for State and Local History, in which were discussed the launching of two important projects, the magazine *American Heritage* and the "American States Series." S. K. Stevens, Pennsylvania state historian and associate editor of *American Heritage,* summarized the objectives of the association and suggested that the two enterprises had emerged naturally from its basic program. Earle W. Newton, editor of *American Heritage* and director of the Vermont Historical Society, outlined the objectives and principles of *American Heritage* and the "States Series," emphasizing the combined textual and pictorial technique employed. Mary E. Cunningham, associate editor of *American Heritage,* elaborated on the value of the magazine for school use, and Albert B. Corey, New York state historian, and Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania, chairman of the session, made some general observations and predicted success for the publications which had got off to so auspicious a start.

Waldo Gifford Leland spoke at the luncheon of the Society of American Archivists. He traced the organized activities of American archivists from the First Conference of Archivists, which met in December, 1909, in connection with the meeting of the American Historical Association, to the Eighth Conference, which was held in 1917. At the conclusion of his remarks the chairman, Clifford K. Shipton of Harvard, on behalf of the society presented Mr. Leland with a certificate of honorary membership in the Society of American Archivists.

Two sessions were focused on questions of research materials, one having to do with the discovery of a mass of relatively unexploited Burke manuscripts in England and the other with the policies of our government toward historical research and writing. The former was described in a session entitled, perhaps a bit misleadingly, "Britain in the Revolutionary Age." Stanley Pargellis of the Newberry Library substituted as chairman for Dixon Wecter, who was unable to attend the convention. Ross J. S. Hoffman of Fordham University reported on the mass of Burke, Rockingham, and Fitzwilliam papers from Wentworth Woodhouse, which he characterized as a rich new mine of material for studying the age of the French and American Revolutions. He noted, for example, Burke's letter book as agent

for the New York Assembly, with copies of all his communications from 1771 to 1775. No use whatever has been made of the Rockingham and Fitzwilliam private papers since they were buried in the cellars and muniment rooms of Wentworth Woodhouse. "Problems of the Burke Correspondence" was the subject of a paper by Thomas W. Copeland of the University of Chicago. He told of some 1,600 scattered Burke letters in print and manuscript now being indexed by him and he discussed briefly the possibilities of their publication. Over a hundred were present and, although the subject was not of the type to produce vigorous discussion, much interest was shown after the meeting had been adjourned.

The subject matter of the other session on research materials was perhaps of even more immediate concern to most of the members. Under the chairmanship of Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University, R. A. Newhall of Williams College, Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania, Guy A. Lee, and Ray S. Cline, both of Washington, explored some of the relationships between "The Historian and the Federal Government." The discussion started with a portrayal of the extensive interest of the government in historical activity, including historical research and writing and the preservation and administration of manuscripts, records, and other historical evidence. The general opinion of those on the panel and of numerous speakers from the floor seemed to be that programs such as those of the National Park Service, the National Archives, the Army Historical Division, the Division of Historical Policy Research of the State Department, and the former War Records Section of the Bureau of the Budget represent substantial accomplishments; that there remain many unsolved problems which seriously jeopardize the successful conduct of historical activity in the federal government; that the solutions of these are matters of great interest to historians; and that, specifically, the American Historical Association should take positive steps to assure greater co-operation between the historian and the federal government.

It is the prudent custom of program chairmen to conclude their reports with apologies, offered in advance, to those whose remarks have been omitted, misquoted, or distorted. Limitations of space and historical understanding have made it inevitable that many significant points will have been missed and that color and life will have suffered even where facts and conclusions are not actually misrepresented. To those who have been so wronged one can only hold out the hope, by way of mild consolation, that from such errors of transmission and interpretation committed at their expense they may gain a more realistic appreciation of the imperfect nature of historical evidence itself.

Harvard University DAVID OWEN