Historical News

The Mid-Century Meeting

I

The American Historical Association held its sixty-fifth annual meeting at the Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, December 28–30, 1950. Seventeen affiliated societies and groups met concurrently with the Association. One third of the convention's fifty-seven sessions were joint meetings arranged by affiliated societies in co-operation with the American Historical Association. In addition, several of the affiliated organizations held conventions of their own, at the Stevens and elsewhere.

With 1,239 registered, this was the second largest meeting in the Association's history, and the largest held in Chicago. (Some 1,332 registered in Washington in 1948.) In spite of late trains, nearly 1,000 were at the first (Thursday morning) sessions; and, notwithstanding the usual tendency to leave early, nearly as many were present at the Saturday morning gatherings. The Friday afternoon sessions drew 1,100, those on Thursday afternoon 1,200, those on Friday morning more than that. Although there were more sessions than usual, and although the sessions were crowded into two and a half days, instead of the usual three, the average attendance per session exceeded one hundred.

A heavy load rested on the Committee on Local Arrangements, which was headed by Stanley Pargellis of the Newberry Library. Of those who assisted Dr. Pargellis, special mention should be made of Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago, who spent most of the convention at the information desk; Ray A. Billington of Northwestern University, who handled publicity with the aid of several students from the Northwestern School of Journalism; and Paul M. Angle of the Chicago Historical Society, who arranged a tea at his society building for those attending the convention. The staff of the Hotel Stevens, and especially James C. Collins, helped in many ways. Guy Stanton Ford and his co-workers at Association headquarters in Washington did much to make the convention a success.

The program was planned by a committee consisting of Fred Harvey Harrington of the University of Wisconsin (chairman), Charles C. Griffin of Vassar College, Fulmer Mood of the University of Texas, and R. John Rath of the University of Colorado. The Program Committee received generous assistance from David Owen of Harvard University, who was program chairman for the Boston meeting in 1949; from the persons who arranged programs for the affiliated societies; from all those who participated in the sessions, formally and informally; and from many other members of the Association.

There was no effort to bring all sessions into a single pattern. The effort rather

was to provide a program that would appeal to many different groups and call attention to as many as possible of the fields in which significant research is in progress. There were, however, several points of focus. A number of sessions centered on American foreign policy. Several and parts of others were given over to subjects relating to the history of Russia and adjacent countries. The key question of imperialism was considered in general, and there were special sessions on significant areas long under the control of colonial powers. Many of the papers considered the impact of one government or one culture on another. Here and elsewhere an effort was made to call attention to opportunities for future research. In addition, several sessions treated specific problems of the profession: graduate training, access to research materials, publication, teaching.

II

The annual dinner was held in the Grand Ballroom of the Stevens, on Friday, December 29. Stanley Pargellis, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, introduced the toastmaster, Ralph Budd, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority. Mr. Budd, long a friend of the historical profession, introduced the President of the Association, Samuel Eliot Morison of Harvard University. Professor Morison's presidential address, "The Faith of a Historian," has been published in the January issue of the *American Historical Review*.

Before presenting his address, President Morison read a letter from the President of the United States. This communication is here reproduced in full:

December 22, 1950

DEAR DR. MORISON:

As the American Historical Association assembles for its sixty-fifth annual meeting, I wish to extend to its members my best wishes for another year of constructive work. I regret that I am not able to extend these greetings in person, as I had hoped to do. You are aware of the circumstances which prevent my being at your meeting.

In the critical effort which the free nations of the world are now making to preserve peace, the work of American historians is of the utmost importance. Communist countries are distorting history and spreading untruths about our achievements, our traditions, and our policies. We must keep the record clear, so that all the world may know the truth about what we have done and what we are continuing to do to build a peaceful and prosperous family of nations.

Since the Federal Government's activities are of central importance in our national defense effort, and since historians of the future will wish to probe deeply into the Government's activities, I am directing that a Federal historical program be instituted, with a primary purpose of recording the activities which the Federal Government is undertaking to meet the menace of communist aggression. Such a program will need the advice and assistance of the American Historical Association. The Government will need your help in defining the objectives of the program, obtaining qualified historians, and insuring that its work meets the high standards of the historical profession. I shall be pleased to receive the views and advice of the American Historical Association on these matters.

Communist imperialism has made falsehood a dangerous weapon; but truth can be a far more potent weapon. American historians can contribute to the cause of the free nations by helping the Government to record and interpret the policies our Nation is following to secure peace and freedom in the world.

Very sincerely yours,

(Sgd) HARRY S. TRUMAN

The executive secretary of the Association, Guy Stanton Ford, announced the award of prizes. The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship was won by Reynold M. Wik of Bethel College and the University of Minnesota. Professor Wik's manuscript, "Steam Power on the American Farm: A Chapter in Agricultural History, 1850–1920," will be published in the Beveridge Series. Miles Mark Fisher's manuscript of a book on "Negro Slave Songs in the United States" was chosen by the Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications. The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize went to Professor Hans W. Gatzke of the Johns Hopkins University for his volume *Germany's Drive to the West* (Baltimore, 1950). Henry Nash Smith of the University of Minnesota was awarded the John H. Dunning Prize for his study *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

III

Several sessions were devoted to key problems that face the historical profession today. The basic issue of academic freedom was the topic chosen for the Mississippi Valley Historical Association dinner, presided over by Elmer Ellis of the University of Missouri. The speaker, John W. Caughey of the University of California at Los Angeles, gave an address entitled "Trustees of Academic Freedom." Professor Caughey discussed the general question of academic freedom, and talked about pressures exerted on professors during a crisis situation. He drew many of his illustrations from the present controversy at the University of California. There was great interest in Professor Caughey's speech. It may be noted, too, that the American Historical Association took a strong stand at its business meeting on the basic issue involved (see p. 742 below).

Harry J. Carman of Columbia University presided at the session on "What's Wrong with Graduate Training in American History?" Fred A. Shannon of the University of Illinois pointed out that professors in graduate schools too frequently permit mediocre students to complete work for the doctorate. William B. Hesseltine of the University of Wisconsin stressed the research character of the Ph.D. Ralph W. Haskins of the University of Tennessee felt that those in charge of graduate instruction inadequately prepare students for their later work. Frederick H. Jackson of the University of Illinois claimed that graduate training should be pointed toward preparation for teaching.

At its 1949 business meeting, the Association stated its interest in historical activities of the federal government, and called for appointment of a committee to improve co-operation between scholars and the government. Because of this

action and the importance of the subject, a session was organized on "The Historian and the Federal Government." Harvey A. DeWeerd of the University of Missouri was chairman. G. Bernard Noble, chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research of the State Department, outlined the policies of his department as to the accessibility of manuscript records. Kent Roberts Greenfield, Chief Historian, Department of the Army, discussed the opportunities for private scholars in Army records. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, called attention to the rich resources of the National Archives, with its many untapped collections awaiting the interest of scholars. Philip M. Hamer of the National Archives, in "A National Program for Documentary Historical Publications," indicated that the future might see the federal government helping to make basic research materials available on a large scale.

Closely related to the problem of the accessibility of material is that of the "Evaluation of Historical Manuscripts." Paul M. Angle of the Chicago Historical Society dealt with this subject at the joint luncheon session of the American Historical Association and the Society of American Archivists. Dr. Angle urged administrators not to buy or accept as gifts manuscripts of no historical importance; and he favored weeding out useless items from existing collections. He also discussed the criteria involved. In the floor discussion, some questioned the legal or moral right and the expediency of disposing of materials accepted as gifts; but all recognized the seriousness of the space problem. Solon J. Buck, chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, presided at this session.

In the meeting devoted to the freshman history course, Sydney H. Zebel of Rutgers University analyzed existing offerings. He felt that most history of civilization courses left out or gave insufficient time to vitally important areas of knowledge, e.g., primitive man and the Far East. Thomas C. Mendenhall of Yale University emphasized the value of source materials. Alan Simpson of the University of Chicago showed how a freshman course stressing the history of ideas could be fitted into an interdepartmental general education program. All three speakers felt that the elementary course should help students understand the present age. In the discussion, Stebelton H. Nulle of Michigan State College said that interest in the present should not rule out adequate consideration of the direction of historical development. Dwight C. Miner of Columbia University welcomed experimentation, but warned against overloading the freshman course. Eugene N. Anderson of the University of Nebraska was chairman of this session.

Teaching problems were also considered in the joint session of the Association and the National Council for the Social Studies. This meeting, presided over by Erling M. Hunt of Columbia University, dealt with *American History in Schools and Colleges,* a report prepared by a committee of the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the National Council for the Social Studies. Both speakers—Edgar B. Wesley of the University of Minnesota and W. Francis English of the University of Missouri—felt that the report had had less influence than was desirable. Professor Wesley noted that in-

fluence had been greatest on elementary school texts; next, on junior high school texts; third, on senior high school books. Dean English observed that college survey courses had changed little, and deplored the continuing tendency to rely on lectures and a textbook almost exclusively. The discussion leader, Wesley Roehm of the Oak Park, Illinois, High School, believed that the report had been useful, and more influential than the speakers thought. He suggested similar reports in other fields, such as world history and civics. The floor discussion brought forth praise of the growing use of documents and literary materials; and there was disapproval of the tendency to entrust the basic college course to junior staff members. Several speakers felt that, while state legislatures of course have the power to establish requirements in the teaching and study of American history in schools and colleges, nevertheless, it is unfortunate and perhaps dangerous to have legislation which deals specifically with the content and organization of courses.

Carter Harrison of the Houghton Mifflin Company was chairman of the session on "The Publication Problem." M. M. Wilkerson, director of the Louisiana State University Press, described the selection and editing of manuscripts by university presses. He pointed out that, since subsidies are limited, university presses had to bear in mind the marketability of manuscripts. Frequently, however, popular titles can carry part of the cost of scholarly works of limited appeal. Alfred A. Knopf, the New York publisher, outlined some of the difficulties involved in publishing scholarly books in a period of rising costs. He indicated, however, that commercial publishers were by no means hostile to professional historians, and suggested that many scholars could, if they tried, reach a larger audience. Henry M. Silver of the American Council of Learned Societies talked chiefly about limited-market titles. For these, he proposed cheaper methods of publication, since neither commercial publishers nor university presses could afford to handle many such items.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the Association for State and Local History was devoted to the problem of "Bringing History to the Public." S. K. Stevens, state historian of Pennsylvania, presided. The central problem, and various new approaches, were treated in a panel discussion, by Ronald F. Lee, chief historian of the National Park Service; H. Bailey Carroll, director of the Texas State Historical Association; and AnnaBelle Lee J. Boyer, executive secretary of the Detroit Historical Society. Their statements, and the floor discussion, indicated the great progress made in this field during the past decade. Among the points stressed were the importance of historic restorations; reaching high school students; securing newspaper and radio publicity; and the tasks ahead.

IV

Several of the sessions that touched on American history dealt also with the history of other areas. No less than four sessions linked American and British

history. One of these dealt with Puritans and Quakers, another with British migration to the United States, a third with the Canadian and American plains, the fourth with foreign policy.

William L. Sachse of the University of Wisconsin was chairman of the session on the Atlantic community in the seventeenth century. Speaking on "Puritanism and Absolutism in Old and New England," George L. Mosse of the State University of Iowa saw the English and American sections of the Atlantic community drifting apart in political thought late in the century, as Parliament adhered to, and New England departed from, certain Renaissance political concepts, notably "reason of state." Marshall M. Knappen of the University of Michigan suggested that many Puritans were less concerned with theory than with practical problems, and felt that the origin of some Puritan theories might be Calvinistic rather than Machiavellian. In a paper on "Transatlantic Quakerism," Frederick B. Tolles of Swarthmore College and the Friends Historical Society noted that there was a standardized Quaker outlook on both sides of the Atlantic. Migration and travel helped explain this fact, and Quaker ideas and schisms spread rapidly from one side of the Atlantic to the other. Samuel C. McCulloch of Rutgers University supported this thesis, and pointed out several problems in Quaker history that need investigation.

British migration to the United States was considered in a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Economic History Association. Chester W. Wright of the University of Chicago presided. Herbert Heaton of the University of Minnesota used a special State Department census to analyze "British Migration to the United States, 1788–1815." He found that migration varied with business conditions; that the newcomers (half of whom came from Ireland) were young and engaged in widely scattered pursuits. Charlotte Erickson of Carthage College described "The Recruitment of British Immigrant Labor by American Industry, 1850–1900." She noted the methods used by American employers, and the abandonment of the program, as new machinery decreased the need for the more skilled workers and when Congress repealed the contract labor law in 1885. She also described and analyzed British employer and labor attitudes. Oscar Handlin of Harvard University and Daniel B. Creamer of the National Bureau of Economic Research led the discussion, which centered around the general character of immigration at different periods.

The session on "Canada and the United States: The Northern Great Plains," was presided over by A. L. Burt of the University of Minnesota. This program represented an effort to examine the possibilities of applying the regional approach on an international level. In a paper entitled "The Northern Great Plains: A Study in Canadian-American Regionalism," Paul F. Sharp of Iowa State College noted that the Canadian and American westward movements had both similarities and differences; and he stated that historians could learn much by studying both interdependence and contrasts. W. L. Morton of the University of Manitoba explored the problem from the point of view of one common element in his

paper on "The Significance of Site in the Settlement of the West." He stressed the importance of the competition for site, particularly in the early period of settlement. He found Canadian and American experience different before 1870, but found that contrasts tended to disappear after that date. Donald F. Warner of Macalester College, as discussion leader, endorsed the international approach to regionalism, suggested new research topics, and proposed applying the approach to such other regions as the Pacific Northwest and the Maritime–New England area.

In a joint session of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the American Historical Association, Marshall M. Knappen of the University of Michigan spoke on "The United States as Britain's Heir." He said that the United States, as the leading Great Power with a democratic-liberal form of government, had inherited the world role formerly played by Great Britain. He found the quality of our performance about the same as that of democratic-liberal Britain after the Reform Bill of 1832, but felt that aristocratic-liberal Britain before 1832 had handled diplomacy more capably. The basic problem of the satisfied liberal "have" power is the containment of aggressive, dictatorial rivals; and dependence on the wishes of a mass electorate put democracies at a disadvantage in competition with dictatorships. He proposed work in adult education and pressure-group activity as a way out. The discussion leaders, Selig Adler of the University of Buffalo, and W. Stull Holt of the University of Washington, disagreed to some extent with Professor Knappen.

In the same session, Jeannette P. Nichols of Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, read a paper on "The Dollar as Tool and Hindrance in Modern Diplomacy." She found that the State Department had tried to direct investment abroad into productive channels between the world wars, but that depression had brought defeat. Renewed efforts to use the dollar after 1945 had also failed, largely because of the weakness of political and military policies.

John S. Curtiss of Duke University presided over a session on Russian-American relations. William A. Williams of Washington and Jefferson College gave a paper entitled "New Light on Russian-American Relations, 1917–1933." He stressed the efforts of Raymond Robins and William Boyce Thompson to keep Russia in the war in 1917, and to keep the Bolsheviks out of power. After the October Revolution, Robins still hoped to keep Russia in the war, and later, he, Thompson, William E. Borah, and others worked for the recognition of Soviet Russia, only to meet with State Department opposition, and defeat, for a decade and a half. Harold H. Fisher, director of the Hoover Institute and Library, stated that the Soviet regime is a despotism based on exploitation, in his paper, "No Peace, No War." He denied Soviet claims to a new system of diplomacy based on the abolition of exploitation and aggression, and said that the Soviet Union, like the states of the sixteenth century, used sabotage, espionage, and subversion as adjuncts to diplomacy. There was an active floor discussion. Dr. Fisher an-

swered several questions; and Professor Williams, when challenged on certain of his conclusions, indicated the hitherto-unexploited manuscript collections on which he had based his statements.

The session on "American Entry into World War II" attracted the largest audience of the convention. Samuel F. Bemis of Yale University was the presiding officer. Charles C. Tansill of Georgetown University gave the first paper, on "Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan, 1931–1941: the Pacific Road to War." Professor Tansill said that Franklin D. Roosevelt "gave his ultimatum to Japan, November 26, 1941, with a complete understanding of the fact that it was a battle cry." Reviewing Japanese-American relations since Theodore Roosevelt's day, the speaker was critical of American efforts to check Japan, particularly in view of the fact that Japan was opposing Russia. Professor Tansill condemned Stimson's nonrecognition doctrine, and termed the Chicago quarantine speech of 1937 "really an invitation to war with Japan." Dexter Perkins of the University of Rochester took a very different view in his paper on "The Rooseveltian Foreign Policy and Public Opinion, with Some Commentary on Revisionist History." Using the evidence of polls, he said that Roosevelt's foreign policy was on the whole geared to the public opinion of the period. Congressional votes on the repeal of the arms embargo, lend-lease, and the arming of merchant ships, he said, pointed in the same direction, as did the nomination of Wendell Willkie in 1940. Less conclusive evidence, he added, indicates the movement of public opinion along lines coincident with administration policy in the Orient. In the discussion that followed, Harry Elmer Barnes of Cooperstown, New York, took a revisionist position, while Ruhl J. Bartlett of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy spoke on the other side.

Two sessions dealt with the military history of the Second World War. Kent Roberts Greenfield, chief historian of the Department of the Army, presided over the first of these, a joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Military Institute, which considered "The Tactical Use of Air Power in World War II." Henry M. Dater of the Department of the Navy traced the development by the United States Navy of doctrine and procedures for the use of aircraft to increase the striking force of its fleet, cover amphibious assaults, and support ground forces ashore. Thomas J. Mayock of the Department of the Air Force showed how the model furnished by the co-operation between the Royal Air Force and Montgomery's Eighth Army helped resolve the conflict set up by the aspirations of the United States Air Forces for independent command and the need of the United States Ground Forces for air strikes in the "isolation" of the battle area and in the battle area itself. James A. Huston of Purdue University reviewed the doctrines by which this conflict was resolved, and pointed out the continuing defects of tactical co-operation with ground troops. He attributed these to the low priority given to tactical co-operation in competition with strategic bombing. Mr. Mayock stressed the War Department's 1943 an-

nouncement of the principles of air power. Professor Huston, however, felt that procedures worked out in combat were more important than officially stated doctrines in bringing about the tactical co-operation finally achieved by the Air and Ground Forces in 1944–1945.

A session on "Command Decisions in World War II" was presided over by Bell I. Wiley of Emory University. All three speakers were from the Historical Division of the Department of the Army. In "The Decision to Withdraw from Bataan," Louis Morton stated that MacArthur's decision of December 23, 1941, delayed the Japanese timetable of conquest for four months and kept large Japanese combat forces tied up in the Philippines. Hence, in the larger sense, the decision was wise, although the forces involved endured much suffering. George F. Howe maintained, in "Allied and Axis Command in the Mediterranean," that Allied forces in the Mediterranean were more effectively employed than those of the Axis, largely because of the respective command structures. Treating "Logistics and Tactical Decisions in Europe," Roland G. Ruppenthal showed how logistic limitations can dominate military movements. Tactical decisions made in August, 1944, brought an accelerated rate of advance, which made the supply situation so bad that the Supreme Allied Commander had to halt most offensive operations. Both commentators—James L. Cate of the University of Chicago and Richard W. Leopold of Northwestern University—stressed the importance of the war history projects, and deplored the failure of the profession to make greater use of materials thus made available.

Another World War II session, dealing with Axis documents, will be noted in the section on European history.

V

Wesley M. Gewehr of the University of Maryland served as chairman of the session on Negro slavery in the United States. Kenneth M. Stampp of the University of California presented a paper on "Negro Slavery in American History." He stated that subjective judgments had colored historical works on the institution. Professor Stampp suggested that more use be made of slave testimonials, and that the old approach based on the assumption of Negro inferiority be abandoned. He further said that it is dangerous to assume that slavery was either necessary or inevitable. In a paper entitled "The Measure of Freedom in the Slave States," Richard B. Morris of Columbia University argued that neither freedom nor bondage were absolute, and that "mechanisms of compulsion" often made indistinct the lines between free-white labor, slave labor, and bonded labor. He noted the deterioration of the position of white laborers and free Negroes in the South on the eve of the Civil War. In the discussion, Clement Eaton of the University of Kentucky called attention to neglected source materials; and John Hope Franklin of Howard University, while stressing the need for a continuing re-examination of slavery, warned against the danger of reading the present into the past.

The American history sessions included also a notable meeting on the frontier, with Colin B. Goodykoontz of the University of Colorado as chairman. In "The Fallacy of New Frontiers," Walter Prescott Webb of the University of Texas said that there is no frontier in sight comparable in magnitude to the "Great Frontier," i.e., the whole of the Americas, which for four centuries could be regarded as the frontier of Europe. As this vast region was settled, people began to search for substitutes: new geographic frontiers, as in Alaska and Africa; social-economic "frontiers," as in opening new markets; scientific "frontiers" linked to new discoveries. Professor Webb considered these substitutes inferior to the real frontier. Lee Benson of Cornell University gave a paper on "The Historical Background of Turner's Frontier Essay." Mr. Benson noted that Turner's formative years fell in the era of the "communications revolution," when the world shrank into a single market with tremendous consequences for American farmers. In searching for reasons for the agricultural depression of the 1870's and 1880's, C. Wood Davis and others stressed the impending disappearance of free land. This view was then used by those who wanted to restrict immigration. "Closed-space ideas" were in the air, and Turner was influenced by them. James C. Malin of the University of Kansas said that Mr. Benson's studies had again demonstrated that it was in Europe, not America, that basic thinking was done about social organization. Although agreeing with most of Professor Webb's points as to substitutes for the frontier, Professor Malin took issue with the Great Frontier theory, and argued that each cultural age produces its own unique opportunities.

The biographical approach was featured in the joint session of the Southern Historical Association and the American Historical Association. Frank Owsley of the University of Alabama was the presiding officer. All the speakers dealt with individuals active in the era of sectional conflict—one from the deep South, one a border-state figure, one a northerner. Margaret L. Coit of West Newbury, Massachusetts, read a paper on John C. Calhoun. E. B. Smith of Youngstown College dealt with Thomas Hart Benton. Glyndon G. Van Deusen of the University of Rochester spoke on Horace Greeley. Robert Athearn of the University of Colorado was the discussion leader.

Another biographical session was devoted entirely to Franklin D. Roosevelt. The session was presided over by Herman Kahn, director of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library at Hyde Park, New York. Frank Freidel of the University of Illinois spoke on Roosevelt in the Wilson era, describing Roosevelt's work as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, his close connection with the admirals, and his training in politics under Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Josephus Daniels, and Louis Howe. Martin P. Claussen of the National Archives dealt with "Roosevelt's Training in International Politics, 1920–1939," starting with the League of Nations fight, and stressing Roosevelt's growing interest in diplomacy during his presidential years. David M. Potter of Yale University discussed "The

Memoir Writers: FDR as Seen by His Associates." Indicating the merits and faults of the works that have appeared to date, he noted that the memoir writers picture Roosevelt as a sociable, practical-minded individual, attentive to detail, able to act with firmness and competence, but sometimes politically inept.

The sessions on technology, university history, and urban history centered on subjects frequently neglected by historians. Abbott Payson Usher, emeritus professor at Harvard University, now lecturing at the University of Wisconsin, presided over the session on the history of technology. Louis C. Hunter of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces read a paper on "The Place of Technology in History." He pointed out that social scientists commonly underestimate the effect of technological change, a basic factor in cultural development. Calling for a new synthesis, he noted that the great-man theory obscures many features of the actual processes of change and leads to false emphasis on particular items. Discussing "Opportunities for Research in Technological History," Rudolf A. Clemen of Princeton, New Jersey, mentioned the need for monographs on particular industries, on branches of science and engineering, on the process of invention, on entrepreneurship, and on fundamental research. Richard N. Current of the University of Illinois related technology to promotion with respect to the typewriter, showing how close co-operation between Sholes (the inventor) and Densmore (the promoter) made possible this machine.

Arthur C. Cole of Brooklyn College was chairman of the session on "The History of American Colleges and Universities." Ernst Posner of the American University opened the session with a paper on "University Archives." A modern archives program, he said, was an administrative necessity as well as a service to the historian. He urged that the university archives be established through formal action of the governing body and have a clearly defined status as an independent agency or unit of the library, with authority to dispose of useless papers. Earl D. Ross of Iowa State College spoke on "Social Involvements in the History of Land-Grant Colleges." He urged historians to relate the history of land-grant colleges to changing social and economic trends and to the history of science and technology. Ollinger Crenshaw of Washington and Lee University noted the faults of many college histories, and discussed problems of sources and interpretation encountered in writing the history of his own institution. Thomas Le Duc of Oberlin College criticized earlier histories of individual colleges for emphasis on persons and property and for neglect of intellectual history. He favored suspending production of these works until more is known about the "unnoticed intellectual revolution of the nineteenth century—the massive revision of premises in every branch of learning." He felt, however, that individuals or teams could make useful contributions by studying special periods in the history of single institutions or unit ideas as they occurred in several institutions.

Bayrd Still of New York University presided over the session on "New Approaches to Urban History." Blake McKelvey, city historian of Rochester, New

York, surveyed the historical production of two decades in "The Present Status of Urban History Writing in the United States," and called attention to the historian's increasing recognition of the significance of urbanization in American life. In "New Approaches to the Study of Urban Growth," Wyatt W. Belcher of the State Teachers College, Superior, Wisconsin, stressed the economic forces that have stimulated the growth of American cities. Gerald Capers of Tulane University, in the discussion, suggested the importance of special factors, such as epidemics, on urban development; and Frederick D. Kershner, jr., of Ohio University, warned against emphasizing economic factors to the exclusion of political and other forces.

In a session devoted to Alexander Hamilton, James O. Wettereau of New York University read a paper on "The Historical Reputation of Alexander Hamilton." The discussion was led by Broadus Mitchell of Rutgers University, Robert E. Reeser of the University of Arkansas, and John C. Miller of Stanford University. Curtis P. Nettels of Cornell University was the presiding officer.

"Innovation and Management Policies" were treated at a joint meeting of the Business Historical Society and the American Historical Association. John E. Jeuck of the University of Chicago presided. Harold F. Williamson of Northwestern University talked about "The Winchester Repeating Arms Company: A Case Study," discussing the effort of that firm to sustain the expanded production facilities developed during World War I by expanding product lines. The merchandising decision generated new financial arrangements, and a radical change in distributive channels, which turned out to be ill-adapted to the new product lines. In his paper on "The Textile Machinery Industry: Influence of the Market on Management," Thomas R. Navin of Harvard University found the pattern of limited innovation explained largely by the peculiar matrix of customer relationships and demands, and partly by the traditional trade-school (as opposed to engineering) training of industry personnel.

The Lexington Group, devoted to the study of railroad history, held two joint sessions in co-operation with the American Historical Association. Under the chairmanship of Lucian C. Sprague, president of the Minneapolis and St. Louis Railway, the morning meeting opened with a paper by William G. Rector of the University of Minnesota on railroad logging in the Lake States. Since the common carriers could not or would not arrange to bring out timber from areas back from the streams, the lumbermen themselves had to provide transportation. The cost was high, but some logging railroads developed into common carriers. In the discussion, inaugurated by John H. Poore, vice-president of the Northern Pacific Railway, the consensus was that, although the construction of railroads was a financial burden to lumbermen, the effect was to hold down over-all costs. In a paper on "Railroad Administration in World War II," Duncan S. Ballantine of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology paid tribute to the railroad and government officials whose co-operation enabled the industry to rise to the demands of

the war without the need of highly centralized governmental direction. He emphasized the problems of plant capacity, and control of traffic on the coasts. The discussion was led by Ralph Budd of the Chicago Transit Authority, formerly president of the Chicago Burlington and Quincy, and an active participant in the Office of Defense Transportation.

The luncheon session of the Lexington Group honored the Illinois Central Railroad on the occasion of its centennial. Wayne A. Johnston, president of that railroad, presided. Robert M. Sutton of the University of Illinois gave a paper on the southern connections of the Illinois Central, described the steps by which Chicago was linked to the Gulf, stressing delays caused by war, lack of capital, and the character of the country traversed. Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, and Carlton J. Corliss of the American Association of Railroads (and the official historian of the Illinois Central) discussed the paper.

The Agricultural History Society also held two joint sessions with the American Historical Association. In the first of these, Rodney C. Loehr of the University of Minnesota presided. Weymouth T. Jordan, Florida State University, described "Noah B. Cloud's Activities on Behalf of Southern Agriculture." Cloud was a soil builder who tested fertilizers, favored crop diversification, and had much influence in the middle of the nineteenth century, particularly as editor of the *American Cotton Planter*. Gilbert C. Fite of the University of Oklahoma read a paper on "George N. Peek, Farm Lobbyist of the 1920's." Peek and Hugh S. Johnson wanted American farmers to have a protected market at home, while they dumped their surplus abroad. Peek effectively promoted his ideas, which were embodied in the McNary-Haugen bills. The papers were discussed by James C. Bonner of the Georgia State College for Women, and by Paul F. Sharp of the Iowa State College. Everett E. Edwards of the United States Department of Agriculture then presented a report on teaching and research in agricultural history. Robert G. Dunbar of the Montana State University, and Malcolm C. McMillen of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute discussed the report. It appears that an adequate text is needed, and that research covers a very wide range of topics.

Herbert A. Kellar of the McCormick Historical Association presided over the luncheon session. Edward N. Wentworth of Armour's Livestock Bureau spoke on "A Livestock Specialist Looks at Agricultural History." Livestock herds, he said, tend to reflect the personality of their creator; and improvement is the work of gifted individuals rather than the result of mass action. In turn, certain important modern strains of livestock trace back to unusual animals who have transmitted their special qualities to their offspring.

The Newberry Library acted as host for a joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Civilization Committee. The Newberry Library had arranged special exhibits for the occasion. Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania was chairman of the session. Arthur E. Bestor, jr., of the University of Illinois gave the paper, entitled "The Study of American Civilization: Scholarship or Jingoism?" Professor Bestor said that the scholarly study

of American civilization, viewed in its broadest sense, could be the foundation of a genuinely liberal education. David Donald of Smith College was the discussion leader. In a floor discussion of the future of the American Civilization Committee, it was decided not to organize on a formal basis at this time.

VI

The Program Committee made a definite attempt to organize sessions on regions that have received relatively little attention at historical conventions. Several of the areas selected are or have been under control of colonial powers. In consequence, it seemed logical to have a session on imperialism at the very beginning of the convention. At this session, Joseph J. Mathews of Emory University was presiding officer, and Lowell J. Ragatz of Ohio State University read a paper on the topic, "Must We Rewrite the History of Imperialism?" His answer was Yes, and he called for a completely recast treatment in general works, country and area studies. The subject, he said, had been dealt with almost entirely from the viewpoint of western white men; and historians had neglected the findings of other social scientists, as well as many historical source collections. The discussion leaders agreed with the demand for new studies, but felt that Professor Ragatz had been too sweeping in his condemnation of existing studies. William C. Askew of Colgate University defended existing studies of diplomatic rivalries in colonial areas. Rayford W. Logan of Howard University pointed to excellent studies by Negroes, and other writings. Henry R. Winkler of Rutgers University emphasized the need for studying the effects of imperialism on subject peoples, and the need for studies by the subject peoples themselves.

Burr C. Brundage of Cedar Crest College was chairman of the Near East session. A. O. Sarkissian of the Library of Congress surveyed nationalism in the Near East, this ranging from the almost complete lack of nationalistic feeling among the Kurds to the strong nationalism of the Egyptian and Turkish peoples. The Armenians, Iranians, and various Arabic-speaking peoples were covered. Nowhere in the Near East, however, has nationalism appeared in such complex and integrated form as among Euro-American nations. John G. Hazam of the College of the City of New York, in his paper, "Soviet Russia Eyes the Arabs," described Russian efforts to penetrate the Near East, by commercial activity before World War II, by political activity during the war, and by working against western powers since the war. Communist parties and the Orthodox Church played important roles. C. Ernest Dawn of the University of Illinois, the discussant, stressed the lack of political cohesion in the Arab world.

A session on Indonesia was held under the chairmanship of George McT. Kahin of the Johns Hopkins University. Professor Kahin noted the sad and untimely death of Professor John F. Embree of Yale University, who was to have read a paper at this session. Jan O. M. Broek of the University of Minnesota discussed "East Indonesia: Economic Problems and Prospects." He noted that eastern Indonesia was "on the periphery of the Asiatic culture sphere, the

transition zone between the Malay-Moslem and Melanesian-Papuan realms." It is less blessed by physical resources than the western part of the archipelago, and the resources have been much less developed. The Netherlands Indies regime launched an economic "new deal" after the war, and it is hoped that the new, predominantly Moslem Indonesian regime will maintain this policy and refrain from discriminating against the large Christian minority in East Indonesia. Justus M. van der Kroef of Michigan State College talked on "Indonesia and the Reconstruction of the Netherlands Empire," discussing the period of colonial occupation (to 1815); the period from 1815 to 1922, characterized first by economic self-interest, then by a growing recognition of Indonesia's national self-worth; and the years since 1922, with the trend toward autonomy.

An American possession was treated in an Alaska session, with Carl L. Lokke of the National Archives in the chair. Leland H. Carlson of Northwestern University described "The Great Nome Stampede of 1900," with its many disappointments. He closed with a survey of the judicial controversy, engineered by Alexander McKenzie of North Dakota, to secure and exploit several of the richest claims in the Cape Nome Mining District. In his paper on "The Problem of Permanent Settlement," Kenneth Björk of St. Olaf College noted that fishing has maintained more permanent residents than mining, farming, and trapping combined. The Territory still suffers from a shortage of "the three F's of settlement: females, families, farmers." Obstacles include land-title problems, transportation deficiencies, a housing shortage, and long-range bureaucratic control.

Harry R. Rudin of Yale University presided over the session on nationalism in Africa. Dorsey E. Walker of Bethune-Cookman College covered "Needs and Opportunities for Research on Certain Areas of Africa," noting some of the subjects and sources that should receive attention in this neglected field. Arthur N. Cook of Temple University shed light on the subject by the case-study approach, describing and analyzing the rise of nationalism in Nigeria. Raymond W. Bixler of Ashland College was the discussion leader.

Harold S. Quigley of the University of Minnesota presided over the panel discussion on "Recent Developments in China." Derk Bodde of the University of Pennsylvania discussed the failure of American policy-makers to appreciate Chinse ideology, a failure that has helped the Communists to convince the Chinese that we are imperialist. Robert C. North of the Hoover Institute and Library characterized the Chinese Communists as dialectical materialists who plan for a long period. Donald F. Lach of the University of Chicago explained the Chinese view that recognition should precede negotiation, and noted that seventeen states had recognized Peking. In his opinion, challenged during the discussion, American recognition of foreign governments has usually implied approval. Knight Biggerstaff of Cornell University described anti-Communist elements in China as scattered and at present of little significance. There was a lively floor discussion.

A session on Meiji Japan was under the chairmanship of John W. Hall of the

University of Michigan, who pointed out the world significance of the events that transpired in Japan during the Meiji period. Nobutaka Ike of the Hoover Institute and Library discussed "Democracy versus Absolutism in Meiji Japan," touching on the potentially democratic element in the fluid conditions of the early Meiji era. He emphasized the rural landholding and entrepreneurial class. The new leaders of Japan, however, soon crushed dissension and established an authoritarian government. Hyman Kublin of Brooklyn College dealt with "The Japanese Socialist Movement in the Meiji Period." Tracing the origin, course, and eventual suppression of the movement, he observed that Japan alone of the Asiatic nations had a tradition of a third movement between absolutism and communism. Commenting on Dr. Ike's paper, John A. Harrison of the University of Florida questioned the validity of the use of the word "democracy" in describing the anti-government movements of the Meiji period, and stressed the continuity of Japan's political and social tradition from the Tokugawa regime into the Meiji. Ardath W. Burks of Rutgers University, discussing Professor Kublin's paper, added information on the socialist thinkers of Meiji Japan.

There were two Latin-American sessions. The luncheon of the Conference on Latin-American Studies had George P. Hammond of the University of California as presiding officer, and Isaac J. Cox, William B. Greenlee, and William S. Robertson as guests of honor. Charles C. Griffin of Vassar College reported on the meeting in Santiago of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. Manoel Cardozo of the Catholic University presented a paper on "Manoel de Oliveira Lima and the Writing of History."

Ruth Lapham Butler of the Newberry Library was chairman of the afternoon session on Latin America. A paper on "Indian Caste in Peru, 1795–1940," by George Kubler of Yale University was read in his absence by Charles E. Nowell of the University of Illinois. As isolation and economic decline affect a region, the Indian caste is the first to disperse beyond control of the state, and is replaced by resident mestizos until some prosperity returns. Evidence of passage from Indian to non-Indian caste suggests that the composition of the Peruvian population is a social and not a biological process. Treating "The Condition of the Chinese Coolie in Peru," Watt Stewart of the New York State College for Teachers, Albany, New York, described as unenviable the lot of the 90,000 Chinese who entered Peru between 1849 and 1874. The Peruvian *hacendados,* guano operators and others who brought them in were interested in profits, not in humane treatment. The discussant, Howard Cline of Northwestern University, sought to amplify rather than to criticize the themes stated.

VII

Modern European history was considered in several of the sessions already noted—for example, those on technology and imperialism. In addition, there were a dozen sessions specifically devoted to modern European questions.

The luncheon conference of the Modern European History Section had

Frederick B. Artz of Oberlin College as presiding officer. Arthur P. Whitaker of the University of Pennsylvania reported on the International Congress of the Historical Sciences, held in Paris in the summer of 1950. Raymond P. Stearns of the University of Illinois then gave a paper on "The Royal Society of London: Retailer in Experimental Philosophy, 1660–1800." The activities of the society were a guide to the intellectual interests of the time, and shed light on the process of disseminating knowledge.

English history was also treated in a session on the Atlantic community in the seventeenth century (already noted) and in a meeting devoted to "The Government and Economic Life." Helen Taft Manning of Bryn Mawr College served as chairman. Mildred Campbell of Vassar College reported on the Anglo-American conference of last summer. The papers were by Conyers Read of the University of Pennsylvania, and Charles Mowat of the University of Chicago, both of whom discussed the relationship of government policy to the English economy. The papers covered widely separated periods, Professor Read speaking on "The Tudor Version of the Welfare State," while Professor Mowat handled the last century in his paper, "One Hundred Years of the Welfare State." Goldwin Smith of Wayne University led the discussion.

Robert B. Holtman of Louisiana State University was the presiding officer at the session on "National Propaganda in the French Revolution." Cornwell B. Rogers of Wiscasset, Maine, in his paper on "National Propaganda as Expressed in French Revolutionary Songs and Hymns," discussed two phases of nationalism as expressed in the songs: the righteousness of the revolutionary cause as opposed to the evil of its enemies; and the universal humanitarianism of the revolution. In his paper on "National Propaganda as Reflected in the Art of the French Revolution," David L. Dowd of the University of Florida considered painting, engraving, and sculpture, arts especially important because of the illiteracy of the masses. Revolutionary leaders used these arts a great deal, and they helped promote the official cult of the "fatherland," which served as the means of restoring the psychological unity of France. The discussion leaders, Paul H. Beik of Swarthmore College and Gordon McNeil of Coe College, called attention to some of the problems involved in using this sort of material in studying nationalism.

The session on "Recent Trends and Approaches to Early Nineteenth Century Austrian History" was under the chairmanship of Friedrich Engel-Janosi of the Catholic University of America. In his paper, "New Views on Metternich," Peter Viereck of Mount Holyoke College pleaded for a re-evaluation of the Austrian chancellor's position. He felt that, while Metternich's ideas had shortcomings, they were basically opposed to totalitarianism and influenced such contemporaries as Disraeli. Jerome Blum of Princeton University, in his paper on "New Views on the Austrian Nobility," analyzed the reformist movement in agriculture led by Austrian nobles in the pre-March period. In the discussion, Golo

Mann of Claremont Men's College asked if Professor Blum's economic interpretation of the period might not be replaced by a political one. Arthur J. May of the University of Rochester spoke of the influence on the American mind of the trends noted in the papers. The chairman suggested that a critical new edition of Metternich's papers might throw new light on his views.

John A. Hawgood of the University of Birmingham, England, was chairman of a session on nineteenth century German economic history, centering around the history of the *Zollverein*. Louis L. Snyder of the College of the City of New York spoke on "The Role of Friedrich List in the Establishment of the *Zollverein*." He stressed the fact that List's contribution to German unification was that he brought the economic factor into German nationalism, and he maintained that the national idea was basic to all of List's thinking. Oscar Hammen of Montana State University gave the other paper, on "The *Zollverein* as an Instrument of Retorsion." Professor Hammen pointed out that an important incentive to the formation of the *Zollverein* was the necessity to protect German industry against the products of other countries. The discussion was led by Arnold H. Price of the State Department, and William O. Shanahan of the University of Notre Dame.

A session on "The East and West in Early Modern Times" was presided over by Waldemar Westergaard of the University of California at Los Angeles. Walther Kirchner of the University of Delaware spoke on "Russia and Europe in the Sixteenth Century." He showed how western Europe (e.g., the Holy Roman Empire) made it difficult for Russia to communicate with the West. Dimitri von Mohrenschildt of Dartmouth College discussed the parallel development of the Enlightenment in East and West in his paper on "Russia and Europe in the Eighteenth Century." The discussion was led by C. Leonard Lundin of Indiana University and Robert R. Palmer of Princeton University.

C. E. Black of Princeton University presided over a session on "Eastern Europe." In a paper on "The European Significance of the November Rising," Charles Morley of Ohio State University stressed the relationship of the Polish revolt to the tense international situation resulting from the French revolution of July, 1830. Tsar Nicholas I planned an armed intervention in western Europe, with the Polish army as a spearhead, and did not definitely change his plan until the Polish army uprising. Otakar Odlozilik of Columbia University surveyed "Recent Trends in Czechoslovak Historiography," recalling the pioneer work of Palacký and the controversy between the critical school of Goll and the more nationalistic view of Pekař. He noted the stagnation of historical scholarship under the Communist regime. Charles Jelavich of the University of California described "Present Trends in Yugoslav Historiography, 1945–1950," noting the strict control which the Communist regime had established over historical scholarship, with resulting concentration on nationalism, using the ideology of socialism to overcome separatist tendencies. S. Harrison Thomson of the University of

Colorado, in leading the discussion, pointed out parallels between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Poland's position and in Russia's sense of mission. He also drew on personal experiences to describe conditions of historical work in Poland and Czechoslovakia since 1945.

Stuart R. Tompkins of the University of Oklahoma was the chairman of the session on "The Fate of Historiography at Russian Hands." Paul H. Aron of Sarah Lawrence College gave a paper on "M. N. Pokrovsky and the Soviet Historiography during the First Five-Year Plan." He noted how this chief Communist historian purged the research and teaching institutions of nonconforming historians; and how he maintained his positions by adjusting his theories to the shifting party line, as when he changed his interpretation of pre-1917 Russia to fit the first five-year plan. There were three discussion leaders: Michael Karpovich of Harvard University, Jesse D. Clarkson of Brooklyn College, and Oswald P. Backus of the University of Kansas. Professor Clarkson took issue with Professor Aron as to the significance of Pokrovsky's abandonment of the theory of "commercial capitalism," and claimed this was merely a matter of semantics. Professor Karpovich maintained that from the beginning of the revolution there had been an inherent contradiction between Marxist doctrine and the role of strong personal leadership.

In the session devoted to World War II documents, Harold C. Deutsch of the University of Minnesota was in the chair. John Huizenga of the Department of State described and analyzed the German documents which became available at the end of the war, and Thomas C. Smith of Stanford University treated the Japanese documents. E. Malcolm Carroll of Duke University led the discussion.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Society of Church History was presided over by Ray C. Petry of Duke University. William M. Landeen of the State College of Washington read a paper on "Gabriel Biel and the Brethren of the Common Life in Germany," tracing Biel's background to the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life founded by Gerard Groote and later scattered over western Europe. L. J. Trinterud of the McCormick Theological Seminary, in a paper on "The Problem of Puritan Origins," traced the beginnings of the Puritan conception of "Covenant" to Continental sources and to the indigenous religious spirit in England.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Catholic Historical Association dealt with European confessional parties in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Raymond J. Sontag of the University of California presided. Robert F. Byrnes of Rutgers University analyzed "The Failure of the French Catholics in Politics," noting that, socially, Catholic leaders represented groups which were suspect by those who had won power during the revolution; and, culturally, faith in progress and in science affected the situation. John K. Zeender of the University of Massachusetts considered "The

German Center Party and Some National Issues, 1890–1906." He explained why this party held a position of decisive importance, and showed how it used its position to secure removal of restrictions placed on religious organizations by Bismarck. Francis A. Arlinghaus of the University of Detroit led the discussion.

Harold J. Grimm of the Ohio State University was chairman of the joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Society for Reformation Research. George W. Forell of Gustavus Adolphus College read a paper on "Luther's Views concerning the Imperial Foreign Policy," and T. A. Kantonen of Wittenberg College spoke on "The Finnish Church and Russian Imperialism." This was followed by discussion from the floor.

VIII

Tom B. Jones of the University of Minnesota presided over the ancient history session. In his paper on "The Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire," Chester G. Starr, jr., of the University of Illinois maintained that the subjects of the Roman emperors realized autocracy of their government, but that some concluded that this autocracy was a perfect democracy inasmuch as it distributed to each man or class what was deserved. This concept came into full flower in the second century A.D. In the discussion James E. Seaver of the University of Kansas pointed out that more attention might have been paid to the Greek background of Roman imperial thought. Joseph F. McCloskey of LaSalle College, Philadelphia, found similarities between the equestrians as supporters of the Roman autocracy, and the bourgeoisie who supported European absolutism in the early modern period.

The session on medieval education had Gray C. Boyce of Northwestern University as chairman. George B. Fowler of the University of Pittsburgh discussed "Learning in Austria about 1300," showing the positive cultural developments of post-Hohenstaufen times and insisting that decline and confusion were not apposite for all German lands of that age. Commenting on this paper, John R. Williams of Dartmouth College agreed that decline was not the correct description, but stressed the presence of conservative tendencies when comparison is made with trends in France and Italy. In a paper on "Extra-Curricular Activities of Orléans Students," Dorothy Mackay Quynn of Frederick, Maryland, showed how these students, while pursuing legal studies, also received training in the *ars dictaminis* and the *ars notaria,* in vernacular French and the magical arts. In the discussion, Canon A. L. Gabriel of the University of Notre Dame and the Institute for Advanced Study emphasized the natural character of the language study, and noted also interest in music and the dance.

Palmer A. Throop of the University of Michigan presided over a session devoted to the "Twelfth Century Renaissance." The first paper, by Urban T. Holmes, jr., of the University of North Carolina, was on "The Idea of a Twelfth Century Renaissance." This was followed by a paper by Eva Matthews Sanford

of Sweet Briar College, on "The Twelfth Century: Renaissance or Proto-Renaissance?" J. C. Russell of the University of New Mexico led the discussion.

The annual dinner of the Medieval Academy of America had Joseph R. Strayer of Princeton University as the presiding officer. Kenneth M. Setton of the University of Pennsylvania presented the paper, on "The Archaeology of Medieval Athens."

University of Wisconsin FRED HARVEY HARRINGTON