

* * * * *Historical News* * * * *

The New York Meeting, 1951

The American Historical Association held its sixty-sixth annual meeting on December 28, 29, and 30 in New York. Registrations at headquarters in the Hotel Statler numbered 1,533. This was the largest meeting in the history of the Association. Except for two meetings of the American Society of Church History, which took place in the Hotel McAlpin, all the Association sessions and those of the sixteen affiliated societies in attendance were held in the Statler.

Local arrangements were excellently handled by Henry F. Graff, Columbia University, who enjoyed hearty co-operation from Wallace K. Ferguson, New York University, Robert W. Hill, New York Public Library, Louis L. Snyder, the City College of New York, Chilton Williamson, Barnard College, and John H. Wuorinen, Columbia University. The hotel staff worked efficiently and successfully to overcome many of the physical handicaps of an inadequate lobby and mezzanine, rooms either too large or much too small for the sessions, and their location on several floors.

The Committee on Program, with William H. Dunham, Jr., of Yale as its chairman, provided an unusually far-ranging series of topics. With his assistants, Evalyn A. Clark of Vassar, Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, Louis Gottschalk of the University of Chicago, and Anatole G. Mazour of Stanford, he continued the tendency toward an international approach that has appeared in the program since the end of World War II. Indeed, the entire program, consisting of some fifty-five sessions, might well have been entitled "Toward a Definition of the Practical Role of History and the Historian in Present-Day World Affairs." Topics such as "Supra-National Ideologies," "James Madison and Our Times," "Has the Past a Place in Modern History?" and "Contemporary History: Its Validity," all revealed a preoccupation with the question, what are the values and aids history has for the present? The presence of so many federal historians and members of the armed services who attended the sessions, both as participants and as auditors, would indicate that the historian's talents are being used by the government in understanding contemporary problems and in shaping policy.

A second theme of the sessions, closely related to the first, was the concern over the historian's training and his positive role in society. Sessions were held to discuss "Graduate Training," "Teaching Ph.D.'s How to Teach," "Writing History," and "Book Reviewing."

Still a third major theme appeared in the programs: that of a reappraisal of some of the established schools of historical interpretation. Hans Kohn of the City College of New York delivered a paper on "Re-Thinking German History,"

while David H. Willson of the University of Minnesota spoke on "The Emancipation of British History from Liberal Control." And from the American side, James C. Malin of the University of Kansas led a biting attack on the present tyranny of the liberal tradition in American historiography. Undoubtedly the high point in historical soul-searching was reached, however, when Frank Craven of Princeton asked whether American history started before or after 1783.

II

Two of the general sessions which met on Friday, December 28, dealt with American history, and two had to do with the much broader subjects of supranational ideologies and of writing the history of civilizations. At the session on James Madison's role in American history on the two-hundredth anniversary of his birth, Chairman Thomas Perkins Abernethy of the University of Virginia introduced Irving Brant, who discussed "Madison and His Times." Brant said that the time has come to restore Madison as a major historical figure. Madison, he found, had actually preceded Jefferson in beginning the political cleavage that led to the creation of the American two-party system, but he has never been given credit for his activity in founding the Republican party. Adrienne Koch of New York University, in speaking of Madison's importance for the present, praised his accomplishments as a founding father and particularly his reconciliation of the paradoxical issues of "power and liberty." Unlike John Stuart Mill, Madison saw power as a necessary condition for the realization of liberty. Unlike Karl Marx, he saw factions as a natural condition of man and society, and so was able to provide checks against undue force, and yet to escape a utopian view of a classless society. Power to extend liberty, and the United States as a "Workshop of Liberty" provide, in Madisonian terms, a living philosophy which can effectively combat that of communism. In commenting upon these two papers, Harry M. Tinkcom of Temple University felt that Brant's efforts to fix a precise date for the beginnings of party cleavage failed to take into consideration that conflict in colonial, revolutionary, and confederation eras which had already created basic opinion groups by 1790. He also warned that overemphasis of the "great man" explanation of party origins should be countered by a grass-roots study of party growth in each of the thirteen states.

At the afternoon session on "The Start of American History: 1783, Before or After?" Viola F. Barnes of Mount Holyoke College reviewed the battles that have taken place over the conflicting approach to, and philosophies of, American history. She observed that the conflict is not merely between the old and the new, but among the differing patterns of thought held by those struggling for a philosophy of history which will fit their particular idealism in world relationships today. Frank Craven of Princeton, the main speaker, held the thesis that too many members of the profession had accepted a view that American history is naturally divided into a British and an American period, and that one effect

had been to obscure in some measure the essential unity of the American experience. Edmund S. Morgan of Brown University suggested that more attention to the colonial period as an essential part of American history might regain for the professional historian that larger audience enjoyed by Bancroft and perhaps fill a public need now being met only by journalists and historical novelists. Ruth V. Miller of Vassar, on the other hand, spoke for a clear integration of American history with the mainstream of European.

Kenneth M. Setton of the University of Pennsylvania introduced the three speakers on "Supra-National Ideologies." The first, Peter Charanis of Rutgers University, in discussing the "Aims of the Medieval Crusaders and How They Were Viewed by Byzantium," traced certain changes which took place in the foreign policy of Byzantium, in her relations with both eastern and western peoples, as a result of the appearance of the Crusaders in the East. In the next paper, a long one, George Lenczowski of Hamilton College explored the "Aims of the Comintern and Cominform." The Comintern, which was originally conceived as a militant force for world revolution, was transformed, after Trotsky's eclipse, into an instrument of Soviet foreign policy. Its formal dissolution in 1943 changed little in the master-and-pupil relationship which had existed between Moscow and foreign communists, for the tradition of complete subordination was renewed in 1947 by the Cominform. The main task of this organization was to act as the watchdog of doctrinal purity among the satellite communist parties. Russell Fessenden of the State Department read the third paper, on "Soviet Imperialism in Hungary"; Fessenden emphasized that, despite the abundant use of the clichés of international communism, the military, agricultural, industrial, and financial activities of the government of the USSR in Hungary were designed to exploit Hungary for the benefit of the Russians. Their methods and effects were imperialist and nationalist, at variance with the obligations acknowledged and the objectives announced by Soviet propaganda, and they seem certain to alienate the Hungarians who are now being mulcted by the foreigners who dominate their entire political and economic life. Marshall W. Baldwin of New York University, in commenting on the papers of this session, observed that Fessenden alone had used the term "supra-national ideology" and tried in some measure to illustrate its meaning and significance.

The Friday afternoon session on "Uniformities in History," chaired by Rushton Coulborn of Atlanta University, marked a significant departure from the strict fold of history. A. L. Kroeber of the department of anthropology at Columbia spoke on "The Delimitation of Civilizations." Since neither historians nor anthropologists have seriously faced the problems of considering and comparing total civilizations, Kroeber sought to point up the "uniformities or recurrent regularities" which exist in all civilizations. Such factors as discontinuity in space or time, language, religion, political and military development, economics and technology, and style ("all the arts and intellectual creativities such as phi-

losophy and science") may well be used to delimit different civilizations. Art, for example, expresses values which reflect the value systems in a civilization. Such systems have a history, and in their culminations they are sometimes accompanied by bursts of achievement in government and in wealth. The courses of such culminations are perhaps as close to constituting reasonable uniformities as any which occur in history. Kroeber made it clear, however, that this intercultural uniformity is not in content but in the form taken by the historical process; not in the events but in the pattern of events as something tending to recur; and it is connected in its occurrence with those distinctive larger aggregations or nexuses of culture which we call civilizations. The form and structure possessed by civilizations therefore invite a comparative morphology. Yet, he concluded, the fact that the forms are always in process means that they are also historical phenomena and must be viewed historically. "Uniformities and Differences in the Growth of Nations" by Karl W. Deutsch of M.I.T. was the subject of a second paper at this session. Comment on the two papers was by Marshall Knappen of the University of Michigan and John H. Mundy of Columbia.

Dayton Phillips of Vanderbilt University was the main speaker at the session on "History and the Tradition of Learning." His paper "Has the Present a Place in Medieval History?" supported the view that although the present, strictly speaking, has no place in history, still history is influenced by the present because it depends upon present procedures. The present also creeps in illegitimately through misinterpretation of experience and through misuse of theoretical conceptions. The basic factor in historical interpretation, he argued, is empirical recognition of the relatively recurring ways that things act upon other things to produce certain consequences, and this is a matter of experience rather than abstract ideas. The main problem of the historian is that of using abstract conceptions to arrive at knowledge of temporal relations and causal connections. The claim that he should study the structure of past civilizations overemphasizes theoretical conceptions and leads to "pattern thinking." This sort of study, he concluded, has led to a misinterpretation of the place of histories written in the Middle Ages in the history of historiography. A reconsideration of these works, he believes, should lead us to place the origins of modern historiography deep in the Middle Ages, not in the Renaissance. William C. Bark of Stanford University, however, argued that the most unfortunate aspect of "presentism" was that it made the way easy for propagandists by appearing to give their so-called historical efforts the support of reputable scholars. He contended, against Phillips' view, that the authors of histories written in the Middle Ages, and in other periods, had too frequently used the past for present and even future needs. Margaret Hastings of New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, suggested that Phillips "had closed the front door to presentism while admitting it to the rear entrance." She inclined to support Bark on the question of medieval historians and sug-

gested that Augustine appeared to be the "great grandfather of the relativists." Howard M. Ehrmann of the University of Michigan looked at the controversy from the point of view of the modern historian. The last forty minutes of the session were devoted to an interchange of remarks between the floor and the speakers. Some fifteen individuals took part in the discussion moderated by E. Faye Wilson of Wellesley.

A second meeting concerned with "History and the Tradition of Learning" took place Saturday afternoon. Archibald S. Foord of Yale introduced the speaker, Charles E. Nowell of the University of Illinois, who discussed the question, "Has the Past a Place in Modern History?" All past generations have been "present-minded," Nowell explained. Each has felt that the events of its own time were of such outstanding and obvious significance that nothing of equal importance had ever before occurred in history. American historians are in danger of this approach today with their overemphasis, both in teaching and writing, on events of current significance and possibly of only ephemeral importance. Recent meetings of the American Historical Association gave Nowell cause for pessimism when he found that a high percentage of the sessions were devoted to "historical" matters well within the living memory of any middle-aged person, and these are invariably the sessions that draw the crowds. College history teaching and American history texts reflected a similar trend. Of the 1,300 doctoral dissertations now in progress, over half are concerned with the twentieth century! Such a heavy occupation with the timely and the "practical" appears to have killed the writing of grand-scale history in the United States, and to have left historical philosophy and all the great subjects to Europeans. Our professionals, Nowell concluded, are being jockeyed into a position that will turn many of them into scarcely more than glorified commentators on passing public events. Charles C. Bayley of McGill disagreed with some of Nowell's conclusions. The past meant a different thing for each era, he said. Thus for medieval man, the "living past" began with the Redemption; for the humanist, it began with the rise of classical literature in antiquity, and the chronological range of the "living" past was further telescoped in the French Revolutionary calendar of 1794 which declared 1792 to be the "Year One of the Republic." The conservative reaction, with its emphasis on tradition and custom, ensured a lengthening of the historical perspective, while the rapid advances of archaeology and of anthropology also contributed to press back the chronological limits of the past. Bayley agreed with Nowell, however, that "present-mindedness" has always existed in the sense that significant and continuous progress was generally regarded as a relatively recent phenomenon in the time-scale of history.

The program theme of analysis and reappraisal of existing schools of historical interpretation was well treated in two Saturday sessions. David H. Willson of the University of Minnesota traced "The Emancipation of British History from Liberal Control" and observed that the Whig or Liberal interpretation of his-

tory, as set by Hallam and Macaulay, provided a glorification of the Whig principles of 1689. J. A. Froude strengthened their interpretation by approaching history with a deep antipathy toward Rome and by a tendency toward hero worship acquired from Carlyle. The history written by the Gladstonian Liberals, such as E. A. Freeman and J. R. Green, was distorted by a worship of progress, a passionate love of political liberty, a sympathy with resistance to constituted authority, a hostility to the Church of England, and a hatred of war as utterly useless. The appearance of the works of Stubbs, Gardner, Ranke, Maitland, Gardiner, Firth, Chadwick, and Round marked an emancipation from the crudities of the liberal interpretation. With the breakdown of the liberal tradition, however, there has appeared a Tory or conservative point of view in books by Keith Feiling, D. L. Keir, Neale, Dietz, and Rowse. Francis C. James of Tulane University took issue with some of Willson's conclusions and asserted that party history did not begin with Hallam but with the formation of parties. The pioneers of modern English historiography who wrote during the Stuart period were motivated largely by the desire to justify Whig or Tory policies and although controversy fostered prejudice, it also begat accuracy and thoroughness. As a result of mutual criticism they came to recognize the value of the scientific method as employed in the new physical sciences. They also fostered a popular interest in history and encouraged the collection and preservation of manuscripts. Godfrey Davies of the Huntington Library remarked that with all the weaknesses of the liberal historians, one must not forget the fundamental liberties won with blood and tears and described with toil and sweat which they wrote about. The chairman of the session was Frederick C. Dietz of the University of Illinois, and the third commentator was Mary Albertson of Swarthmore College.

A reappraisal of "Current European Historiography" was the subject of the session presided over by President George N. Shuster of Hunter College. In a paper entitled "Re-Thinking Recent German History," Hans Kohn of the City College of New York surveyed the field of contemporary German historical writings having to do with the evaluation of developments in Germany since the Napoleonic time. He found many stones and an abundance of weeds, but also blooms which he thought likely to grow into highly significant fruit. Whereas historians like Ranke had been too greatly concerned with the state—though not in a chauvinistic sense—a number of contemporaries have elected to take their departure from Burckhardt, whom Kohn interpreted as being an exponent of the worth of the individual human being. He cited in particular Gerhard Ritter, whose recent writings give evidence of an honest effort to account for the sources of the German catastrophe; Friedrich Meinecke, a convert to a Christian liberalism from his earlier conservative Prussian past; Franz Schnabel, critic of Bismarckianism from the point of view of the federalism once advocated by Constantin Franz; and Ludwig Dehio. Reference was also made to Max Lehmann's *Bismarck*, described as a series of lectures interesting primarily as an illustration

of the transformation of a once arch-conservative German historian's thought. John Bowditch, University of Minnesota, expressed an initial regret that French historians have manifested little eagerness to grapple with questions raised by the cataclysmic events through which their country has recently passed. As exceptions, he cited works by Labrousse and Duveau in social and economic history, and Marc Bloch's *Etrange défaite*, termed "a classic expression of an intellectual's faith in the humanistic tradition." The greater portion of Bowditch's paper critically surveyed nonprofessional commentaries, memoirs, and interpretations. He began with Daniel Guérin's Marxist interpretation of the French Revolution and ended with Paul Boncour's *Entre deux guerres*. Robert G. L. Waite, Williams College, in his comment on Kohn's paper, contended that the supply of stones and weeds was far greater than that of the blooms presented as evidence. He was skeptical of Ritter's acceptance of liberal democracy, and he believed that Schnabel's federalism was retrospective rather than constructive. Waite argued that although some repudiation of Bismarckian nationalism was currently discernible in Germany, basic improvement of outlook would come only when German historians wrestled with the problem of the social structure of their country. Paul H. Beik, speaking briefly about Bowditch's conclusions, felt that his criticism of French professional historians had been too severe. The astringent criticism to which Guérin's book had been subjected was an example of the continuing value of observant scholarship.

At a session on "Constitutionalism: Safeguard of Freedom?" Ronald Thompson of George Washington University and Alison Reppy (whose paper was read by Sidney Asch) of the New York Law School, presented the obverse and reverse sides of the picture of constitutionalism. Thompson discussed "Constitutionalism versus Terrorism in the Soviet Order" and pointed out that history offers scarcely any examples of the antithesis of constitutionalism, for almost all countries have had a certain measure of constitutional organism. The antithesis is found in the systematic annihilation of constitutional safeguards in the Soviet order by the institution of terrorism. He discussed the need for an entirely different frame of reference in the investigation of such an order, and showed the way in which a façade of constitutionalism has accompanied the erection of a system of terror. This façade had deceived some analysts, but the escape clauses in the Soviet constitutional provisions have cleared the path for an operative system of force. He concluded that there is no other government in the world where the power of the state is so large and the right of the individual so small, nor where constitutionalism is so clearly superseded by terrorism, nor, in fact, where constitutional forms are so clearly designed to be evaded as in the Soviet Union. In Reppy's paper, attention was focused upon the continued maintenance and even extension of constitutional safeguards in the form of civil rights as construed by the United States Supreme Court. He referred to the recent and current cases before the Court pertaining to the principle of separation of church and state, as it mani-

feats itself in the question of released time in the schools, and to the equal rights of Negroes as they are involved in full access to public education. His discussion showed that the present Supreme Court remains a sensitive and vigorous agency for upholding the principle of constitutionalism through broad interpretation and full enforcement of civil rights in the United States. David M. Potter of Yale University served as the chairman of this session.

At the general session on Sunday morning E. L. Woodward of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, discussed "Contemporary History: Its Validity." Defining his subject as "the histories of yesterday which are being written today," he argued that the disadvantages—and advantages—of the writer of such histories, as compared with those of his colleague writing of a more remote period are not absolute but a matter of more or less. Woodward raised serious doubts whether historians of a more distant past are thinking clearly when they boast of an approach freer from emotion or a truer perspective than the "contemporary" historian can have. Obviously the contemporary historian has the advantage of more information and also a better chance to understand basic matters that leave no record except in the memory of contemporaries. Finally, Woodward argued that the denial of access to certain temporarily "secret" records is of relatively little importance in a democratic society in the context of a free and active discussion of public affairs.

In the discussion, Catherine S. Sims, Agnes Scott College, pled with historians to interest themselves more in bringing their knowledge and perspective to bear on contemporary discussions of public affairs. Philip Crowl, Department of the Army, spoke from experience to the point that the records of recent history are by no means unmanageable by reason of their abundance. Arthur Link of Northwestern without contesting Woodward's points, felt that he tended to underestimate the difficulties of writing recent history. These are such indeed that it is questionable whether they can be overcome except by co-operative undertakings in historiography, such as those of the armed forces to which Crowl referred.

Despite the departure of many from the convention, and the competition of a number of other sessions on Sunday morning, that on "The Problem of Conservative and Liberal Traditions in the Historiography of the United States" attracted more than a hundred hearers. James C. Malin, University of Kansas, delivered a paper which, beginning with a guarded detachment, worked up into a frontal attack on the attitudes and social tendencies of recent leaders in American historiography. The terms liberal and conservative, he suggested, are apt to be misused, since individuals are rarely wholly one or the other. Against collectivist liberalism Malin protested. To a larger degree than is recognized, he insisted, American thinking has become totalitarian. In history this has proceeded through the development of a subjectivist-relativist-presentist point of view, first effectively developed by Becker and Beard, then given a national currency through

such publications as *A Charter for the Social Sciences* (1932) and *Theory and Practice in Historical Study*, S.S.R.C. Bulletin 54 (1946). On examination, this philosophy proves to be an eclectic mixture of ill-assorted splinter ideas, deriving originally from such disparate and contradictory authorities as Croce, Marx, Turner, Dewey, existentialism, and the scientific relativism of Einstein. The recognizable totalitarian elements, said Malin, are élitism, racism, statism, scientism, planning, attacks on religion, challenge to ethical values, and actionism, with the New Deal standing as the vivid realization of this last. As a result of the presentism and actionism of recent thinking there has been a drift away from history itself, in favor of social sciences more immediately functional. Malin closed with a plea for emancipation from the dominant present. While historians should recognize that they cannot be completely objective, they should nevertheless strive for objectivity. The younger generation has "the opportunity, if they only possess the will, to pursue the most exacting, and the loneliest, of all the professions—that of independent and objective scholarship in history."

Although no one of the three commentators agreed fully with the speaker, yet all conceded some validity in his charges. Joseph Dorfman, Columbia University, questioned the interpretation of Charles A. Beard. Dorothea E. Wyatt, Goucher College, wished that propagandists would label their books better, e.g., *A Biased Account of F.D.R.'s Foreign Policy*, or *A One-Sided Story of How Jefferson Did Everything Worth-While in American History*. Emotionalism and absolutism, observed Wallace E. Davies, University of Pennsylvania, were not altogether missing from Malin's own paper. In any case, the winds of doctrine are now veering decidedly into the conservative quarter—and he marshaled the recent writings in deft and informative review. Ever since the professionalization of history, the intellectuals have been alienated from the dominant business culture. But now both Babbitt and Robber Baron are being given a much more dispassionate, even friendly, treatment—while the liberals are scrambling in search of a more tenable middle ground. "An era in which an Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., discovers the existence of evil is bound to have some qualms about the old liberal dogmas. . . ." Surprisingly enough, there was practically no comment from the floor. The audience sat still, as if realizing that this last repast of the convention might be digested better in slow and quiet afterthought.

III

The cold war has so focused European attention on the United States and its role in world affairs that the teaching of American history abroad has become an important part of many European universities and schools. Particularly appropriate, therefore, was it that the sessions on professional problems should open with a survey of the status of American history at Salzburg, Aberdeen, Oxford, and in Germany. The teaching of American history at these was discussed by Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester, James W. Silver, University of Missis-

issippi, and Charles S. Sydnor of Duke. David S. Sparks of the University of Maryland spoke on the American history programs being carried on in Germany. Merrill Jensen, University of Wisconsin, presided at this session.

A session closely related in subject matter to "American History Abroad" was held on "Graduate Training: Study and Research Abroad." Chairman James F. Mathias of the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation introduced four graduate students in history who had recently studied in Europe. Hanna D. Holborn, a Fulbright Scholar, and William R. Emerson, a Rhodes Scholar, both told of their experiences at Oxford, while Elizabeth A. Salmon and Pearce Williams reported similarly on their graduate research in France.

Gilbert A. Highet's (Columbia University) brilliant performance at the session on "Teaching Ph.D.'s How to Teach," served as an example of how all history departments would like to have their members lecture. The commentators, Thomas C. Mendenhall, Yale University, Dorothy Stimson of Goucher College, and Chester P. Higby, University of Wisconsin, as well as some of the large audience attending the session, disagreed over the amount of training needed to produce good teachers. Some, including Highet, felt that it was difficult to train any teacher, while others argued that they could be trained, but that the problem lay in the method of training. Theodore C. Blegen of the University of Minnesota was chairman.

The specific problems arising out of teaching history in the technical institutes were discussed in two papers presented Saturday morning. Duncan S. Ballantine, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, read a paper entitled "History and General Education: The Virtues of Necessity." Allen A. Gilmore, Carnegie Institute of Technology, spoke on "The Methods and Concepts of History in Professional Schools." Two representatives from professional schools, W. Appleton Aiken of Lehigh University, and David Elliot of the California Institute of Technology were the commentators. D. G. Brinton Thompson of Trinity College was the chairman of the meeting.

"The Place of History in Adult Education" was discussed at a very lively session under the chairmanship of Felix E. Hirsch of Bard College. The first speaker, Hans Simons, president of the New School for Social Research, noted that, for the adult student, his courses are not the core of his life experience but a voluntary, additional intellectual effort. Therefore, the instructor has to make the most of the little time his listeners can contribute. He will have to satisfy the adult's interest in the applicability of historical findings to the current situation, and the possibility of forecasts which are better than guesses. The teaching of history has to take the present as its starting point, its frame of reference and its basis, when it comes to making comparisons. For the adult student, the movement of ideas and their effect on history, including ideas about history itself, are more important than the skeleton of what are regarded as significant events. The adult can gain from such a study of history a better sense of proportion and a

deeper understanding of the relation between his own country and the rest of the world. Simons concluded that the study of history may mean a great human experience instead of a mere accumulation of facts. Stringfellow Barr, president of the Foundation for World Government and visiting professor of political science at the University of Virginia, concentrated on the "great" historians. He believed that the works of Thucydides, Herodotus, Plutarch, Tacitus, Bede, and Gibbon are more desirable for adults to use than a mediocre college textbook, for these authors had wide and deep sympathies, a broadly humane point of view and a judicious mind, and they did not suffer from the occupational diseases of the mediocre historian. Barr took issue with those "scientific historians" of our time who respect accurate data more than the ideas that might have brought intelligibility to these data. Had the need of the adult student for such a deeper historical interpretation "been met in my own country during my own lifetime," he said, "it is unthinkable to me that we Americans would find ourselves in the plight we are currently in." An extended discussion was led by Ruth Lawson of Mount Holyoke College, who considered from her own varied observations as a scholar and teacher the three questions: what are we educating adults for; what are the ruling tendencies of our time; and what light can history throw on an age such as ours?

The session on book reviewing was well attended and those present felt the discussion would bear comparison with the 1912 session when Carl Becker read the leading paper. This time the leading role was taken by William B. Willcox of the University of Michigan, who stressed the central responsibility of editor and reviewer in determining the fate of a book. A good review could not make a book, but a bad review might ruin it. He classified and illustrated adequate reviews and pleaded for consideration for young authors making their first contribution. To editors, he made two suggestions: to submit the review to the author before publishing it and to put reviews on the same competitive basis as that applied to the selection of articles. The three participants in the discussion, all editors, pointed out the practical difficulties of these devices. To George B. Carson of the *Journal of Modern History* they seemed unworkable, nor was he sure that one unfavorable review among many ruined a book. He felt that an editor having selected a reviewer should stand by him, short of total incompetence or legal liability. His further remarks were a clear exposition of the problems offered by reviews to the editor of a strictly professional historical periodical. Francis Brown of the *New York Times* put in a plea for a type of review that Willcox had disparaged, the review that said little of the book and went on with a pleasing exposition of the topics suggested to the reviewer. In selecting reviewers, he had in mind a staff of dependable, literate, and broadly informed writers. With problems of space and deadlines for a weekly, he was obliged to exercise greater freedom in editing reviews. Charlotte Kohler, of the *Virginia Quarterly Review*, who professed to take the part of the reviewer, claimed something of

the same editorial privilege, especially in eliminating clichés and making the reviewer talk tersely. The chairman, Guy Stanton Ford of the *American Historical Review* closed the discussion with some tart remarks on a reviewer not hitherto mentioned, the reviewer who does not review and ignores all reminders, and on the author who reduces the panel of possible reviewers by having his manuscript read in whole or in part by all the other specialists in the field. He agreed with Willcox that an editor should seek and experiment with young scholars and thus encourage them.

The session on "Writing History" which convened on Friday afternoon heard Ralph E. Turner of Yale report on the UNESCO project to write a multivolume "Scientific and Cultural History of Mankind." As chairman of the United Nations commission established to write this history, Turner gave a vigorous defense of the validity and timeliness of the project. Donald C. McKay of Harvard read a paper on "The Sumner Welles Series," and comments were made by Mary Latimer Gambrell of Hunter College and Henry Dater of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The chairman, Samuel H. Brockunier of Wesleyan University, handled expertly an acrimonious discussion.

On Sunday at the session on "The Current Religious Revival and Historical Interpretation," E. Harris Harbison of Princeton discussed "The Meaning of History in Current Christian Thought." He observed that, since the outbreak of the Second World War, a renaissance of Christian thought has quickened an interest in both theology and history. A new and sharpened perception of the role of Providence in history, as well as of the demonic, seems to him discernible. There is an impressive effort to preserve and to renovate the Christian idea of history as moral and spiritual progress nourished by divine grace and the redemptive merits of Christ. But most Christian writers and thinkers he believed to be just as suspicious as professional historians of vast philosophies of history. Salo W. Baron of Columbia spoke on "The Impact of Wars on Religion." In analyzing the consequences to religion of the Roman-Jewish War of 66-70 A.D., the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, and World War I, he noted two consequences: a religious awakening among previously agnostic, or superficially religious, persons, and an arousing in men of dormant sadistic impulses. The three wars set in motion quests for new religious absolutes. In his comment, Roderic H. Davison, George Washington University, agreed with Harbison that the day of belief among historians in secular utopias is passing, if not already past.

IV

Of the twelve special sessions, four dealt with American diplomatic and military topics since the First World War. Indeed, the first session on "Inter-Bellum Diplomacy, 1919-1945," opened with a paper by Gordon A. Craig, Princeton University, on "The Professional Diplomat and His Problems, 1919-1939." He emphasized that neglect of the advice of the professional diplomat was not

limited to totalitarian dictatorships but was a general phenomenon in many of the democratic countries. In examining the decline of professional diplomacy in Britain and France during the interwar years, Craig pointed out that the leading ministers by-passed the foreign offices or kept them uninformed about negotiations. He illustrated this point by referring to the conduct of foreign affairs by Lloyd George, Ramsay Macdonald, and Neville Chamberlain. He also stressed the tendency of the home offices to accept as true only those diplomatic reports which corresponded to their preconceived ideas or to the requirements of domestic policies. Almon R. Wright of the Department of State, in his discussion of the "Diplomacy of the Panama Canal, 1936-1947," showed the great difficulties which the United States, in its concern to maintain a good neighbor policy, experienced in its negotiations with Panama. Since the Convention of 1936 provided for consultation and agreement upon measures necessary for the protection of the Canal, the United States had to make far-reaching concessions after the outbreak of the war in order to obtain the right of occupation for sites necessary for defense. After the war, American military authorities demanded an extension of these leases for ten to thirty years, and very complicated negotiations were necessary before an agreement was reached. Even then the Panamanian Assembly, under the pressure of public opinion, rejected this agreement and by mid-February, 1948, all sites were evacuated. The commentators, Robert Strausz-Hupé of the University of Pennsylvania, and William L. Neumann of the University of Maryland, agreed with the main points in Craig's paper. An extended discussion centered mainly on two questions: to what extent has the nature of modern democratic industrial society made traditional diplomacy impossible? and, how valuable a source are modern diplomatic documents, since the decline of professional diplomacy has limited their importance?

At the session devoted to "Experiences with Soviet Russia as an Ally," Forrest C. Pogue, a historian on the staff of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, and T. H. Vail Motter, of Princeton, New Jersey, spoke. In his treatment of "American-Soviet Relations in the Persian Corridor in World War II," Motter asserted that, although the United States forces were there to supply the USSR with millions of tons of much needed goods, the United States representatives negotiated from a position of weakness. In large part this weakness arose because the Russians regarded the Americans as the heirs of a long rivalry between Russia and England; from the lack of a unified command over the entire corridor in view of the separate zones established under Russian and Anglo-American control; and from the extreme Soviet insistence on the letter of the bond in each operation. The hostility encountered in the Soviet zone in Iran Motter explained in terms of the Soviet government's long-standing aims for extension of its influence to the Indian Ocean through Iran, and of its constant assumption that the United States was engaged not in a wartime operation of supply to an ally but in establishing a postwar domination in Iran. He concluded

that it is necessary to negotiate with the Soviet leaders from strength and not to separate different aspects of the negotiation into political, military, or economic factors since the Russians themselves regard them all as a single complex.

In his discussion of "Why the Russians Got Berlin and Prague" Pogue said that a careful examination of the evidence produced no basis for saying that the decision to halt the advance of the Allied forces at the Elbe and in western Czechoslovakia was the result of a political decision or promise made to the Russians in advance. Rather, it was General Eisenhower's conclusion that he should, on military grounds, seize the Baltic coast and clean up the forces in the South rather than push on to the Elbe. Accordingly, he informed the Russians that he would stop along the middle and upper Elbe for the time being, so that they would know how to fit their plans into his. Both the British chiefs of staff and Mr. Churchill urged President Roosevelt to join in reversing this decision and in pushing on to Berlin. The President, however, maintained that military factors were primary and that a prestige victory, such as was involved in pushing on to Berlin, was not worth the additional military cost. Similarly, the decision to stop the American and Allied advance in western Czechoslovakia, thus leaving Prague to be liberated by the Czechs and the Russians, was based upon a military decision to set up in advance a demarcation line between the Soviet and SHAEF forces. Pogue concluded that the U. S. military leaders were opposed to political solutions to questions that could be settled, as in this case, on a military basis; that there was no evidence that public opinion in the United States supported a move to Berlin or Prague; and that the decision made on a purely military basis to end the war as quickly as possible with the smallest possible number of casualties was a proper decision. Harry Schwartz, of Syracuse University and the *New York Times*, felt that Pogue's paper added up to an indictment of military thinking in that it showed the naïveté of the Western leaders and a failure to evaluate the experience with administration by zones in Iran. It also illustrated the failure of Intelligence to evaluate the threat of a German redoubt in the South, as a factor which contributed strongly to the reluctance to push on in the north to Berlin. He felt that the United States was slow to see the interconnection of political and military factors in decision-making and asserted that only an alert public opinion could improve this situation. Douglas K. Reading, of Colgate University, held that the United States had been too much bound by legalisms in its policy in Iran during the war, that it had striven to remain oblivious to great power politics and to Soviet aims in the East. While the Soviet policy in Iran had been clear, he said, the American policy had not been clear as to its long-range purposes. Philip E. Mosely, Columbia University, served as chairman.

"The Far East in United States Strategy" was the subject of a successful session which convened under the chairmanship of Arthur W. Hummel, chief of the Division of Orientalia of the Library of Congress. Although he was originally

scheduled to speak on "Formosa," Robert Ross Smith of the Department of the Army changed his topic to "The Strategic Background to the Approach to the Philippines." In reviewing the Allied efforts to recapture the Philippines during the Second World War, Smith pointed out that while there was general agreement that they would serve as a key base from which Allied forces could cut Japanese lines of communication, and from which they could attack Japan itself, there was considerable debate concerning the best method of approach to the islands. General MacArthur, whose views were seconded by many Army and Navy planners, favored an advance along the northern coast of New Guinea to the islands between New Guinea's northwestern tip and Mindanao, while the United States Pacific Fleet under Admiral Nimitz would cover his right flank by destroying or containing the Japanese Fleet. The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the other hand, believed that the Central Pacific route of approach to the Philippines should be given priority since it would more directly threaten Japan; provide for the optimum employment of the U.S. Pacific Fleet; would be logistically easier; and, finally, would be better hygienically. Smith then traced the factors which operated to modify both the MacArthur and the Joint Chiefs of Staff plans, and explained the strategy which was finally pursued to gain an initial entry into the Philippines. The second speaker, Riley Sunderland, also of the Department of the Army, read a paper on "China as Ally." Comment upon the two papers was made by John J. Nolde of the University of Maine, and Woodbridge Bingham, of the University of California at Berkeley.

Alfred A. Knopf presided over the meeting on "American Conservation Policies" which convened Friday morning to hear two papers. In the first, "Natural Resources and Conservation Policies," A. William Smith of the Conservation Foundation, New York City, traced conditions in the England from which the settlers came, and noted the conditions they found in the colonies. By the nineteenth century, however, the Americans had developed a new attitude toward natural resources. Primed by population pressure, technical improvements such as the self-scouring steel plow and the seemingly limitless amount of land available, the pioneer with axe and flame began to practice the exploitative farming techniques for which we are paying today. In closing, Smith noted that, in addition to government conservation policies, the present high land values, the need for heavy investment in stock and equipment, and the great demand for produce has at last persuaded the farmer himself to engage in sound conservation policies.

A more specific aspect of the conservation movement was treated by Thomas G. Manning of Washington in his paper "Yellowstone Park and the First Forest Reserve." Despite the early appeal of the Park as a place of scenic wonders and as "a great breathing-place for the national lungs," the public did not take enough interest in Yellowstone to prevent attempts to exploit the Park's natural resources. The difficulties of reaching the Park were so great, and the expense of a trip so prohibitive that the friends of the Park urged that the Yellowstone

country be designated a wild game preserve and a forest reservation. Even though twenty-thousand people, mostly hunting enthusiasts, petitioned Congress in 1888 to enlarge the size of the Park and to make it a game and timber reservation, there was little public support. Moreover, a power lobby in Washington backed by strong support in Montana was working against the basic National Parks idea. There was a legislative stalemate until President Harrison signed a proclamation establishing the Park on March 30, 1891. Discussion was led by E. Louise Peffer of the Food Research Institute, Stanford University.

"Christian Assumptions in Occidental Histories of China" was the subject of a paper by Professor S. Y. Teng of Indiana University on Friday afternoon. In an impressive survey of Occidental accounts of China over several centuries, Teng developed the general thesis that although there were periods in the past when Western accounts were very fair, and while some scholars, such as Chavannes, had approached the subject in a truly scientific manner, Western writers have usually judged Chinese culture by the standard of contemporary "Christian" nations. However, Teng recognized that Western scholars have contributed much to Chinese historiography by extending its scope from mere chronological arrangement to systematic interpretation that includes social and economic materials. Two commentators, Harold C. Hinton of Georgetown University and M. S. Bates of Union Theological Seminary, took violent objection to some of Teng's remarks. Both thought that the speaker had erred in virtually identifying religion and culture so that "Christian" often became the equivalent of "Western." Nor did the many unfavorable opinions of Chinese society by nineteenth-century writers mean that they possessed a superiority complex. Hinton closed his remarks with the denial that the evidence of Teng's paper proved that Western scholars have usually looked at things Chinese through the eyes of Christians. Bates pointed out the impossibility of the historian's pleasing all Chinese, and then outlined a set of rules which might be followed by a historian writing of a culture other than his own. He suggested that many missionary writers had actually observed these tenets in writing Chinese history. The chairman of the session was Paul H. Clyde of Duke University.

"New Points of View in Economic History" was the subject of two papers presented Friday morning by David S. Landes of Harvard University and M. Postan, of Cambridge University, a summary of whose paper is not available. Landes recommended the use of social and psychological factors to humanize economic history. Since the war, he said, sociology has developed a sizable body of empirical hypotheses concerning social attitudes and values and their influence on human behavior which could be of great use if applied to private records of businessmen, to the official archives of business firms, and to other actors in the economic process. This effort to study the human being in economic history and to place him in his social context would mark a new departure in economic history. John W. Oliver of the University of Pittsburgh served as chairman of

this session and J. C. Russell of the University of New Mexico was the commentator.

"Ottoman Influences in the Balkans" was the subject of a session presided over by Harvey P. Hall, editor of the *Middle East Journal*. Sydney Nettleton Fisher of Ohio State University, in the opening paper, traced in detail "Ottoman Feudalism and Its Influences upon the Balkans" from its beginnings down to its disappearance in the nineteenth century. He found that foremost among the effects of this feudal system upon the Balkans was the emergence of national states devoid of a class of hereditary nobility. At the same time, however, it created a wide gulf between peasants and proprietor and prevented the national assimilation of one by the other. Finally, the unfortunate state of Ottoman feudalism in its decline left in the Balkan peasants an attitude of deep suspicion toward all government and a distrust of all political affairs. G. G. Arnakis of the University of Kansas City next spoke on "The Futuwwa Tradition among Akhis, Bektashis, and Craftsmen as a Factor in the Establishment of the Ottoman Empire." In his comments, Wayne Vucinich of Stanford University complimented the speakers for both content and interpretation, but he felt that Fisher might have explained more precisely the difference between Ottoman feudalism prior to the seventeenth century and after that period. Similarly, Arnakis did not give sufficient attention to the craftsmen, their guilds, their inter-relation, and in what way they differ from one another.

Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina was the principal speaker at the session held Saturday morning on "Nationalism in the Ante-Bellum South." Fred Cole of Tulane University presided at the meeting. The four speakers approached the subject by developing the careers of prominent southerners of the period. Green's paper, "Duff Green and States Rights," showed that Green (1791-1875) was educated in the strict construction, state rights philosophy of the Jeffersonian school and was consistent in support of these views to the end. He noted Green's stand on the issues which confronted the country between 1820 and 1860 and indicated his role in developing the political, economic, and cultural solidarity of the South that had merged, by 1861, into a southern nationalism. Margaret L. Coit, West Newbury, Massachusetts, speaking on "Southern Nationalism and the Secession Movement," which she illustrated from her acquaintance with John C. Calhoun's career, contended that fear of the freed Negro, bottled up in the South, competing with and underselling the poor whites, had united poor white and slaveholder and made southern nationalism possible at last. The other bases for nationalism in the South, she emphasized, were only secondary to this central factor. Russell E. Miller of Tufts College, in commenting on Abel Parker Upshur, a contemporary and political friend of Duff Green, said that Upshur exhibited a strong sectional allegiance which was expressed as both political and cultural nationalism. James Rabun of Emory University stressed the emotional bases of southern nationalism.

While many of the variable factors that give people a consciousness of nationhood were present in some degree in the South, he insisted that the strongest of the roots of secession and southern nationalism were to be found in emotional impulsions that were derived mainly from the struggle over slavery.

Frances S. Childs presided at the well-attended meeting on "The French Revolution Abroad." John Hall Stewart of Western Reserve University opened with a paper on "The Fall of the Bastille on the Dublin Stage." In estimating the significance of two popular plays which appeared dealing with the Bastille theme, Stewart stressed their propaganda, rather than their dramatic, value and noted their inevitable effect on shaping Irish public opinion on the French Revolution. Richard M. Brace of Northwestern University explained that "The Libertine Crusade of 1792" meant to its supporters a humanitarian movement to secure the natural rights, the liberty and the equality expressed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. He related these ideas to their setting in the period of the Enlightenment and then traced their gradual evolution into the militant Jacobinism of 1792. Frances Acomb of Duke University in her comment told how the French crusade appeared to a conservative publicist, Jacques Mallet du Pan, citizen of Geneva and political editor of the *Mercure de France* from 1784 to 1792. E. L. Higgins of the Arkansas State Teachers College asked why the fall of the Bastille was of such interest to Irishmen, and what elements in society made up the enthusiastic Dublin audiences? After commenting amusingly on the revolutionary contradictions in terms such as "foreign patriot," and more profoundly on the Propaganda Decrees, he compared the propaganda techniques of the French revolutionaries to those of the totalitarians of our day.

"Spengler in 1951" was the subject of a paper presented by H. Stuart Hughes of Harvard University at a meeting devoted to "Freedom of Thought in Philosophies of History." Hughes sought to bring up to date the controversy, which began with the publication of Spengler's *Decline* in 1918, between that group which engaged in specialized disapproval of specific aspects of the work and another consisting of enthusiastic and impressionistic admirers. Hughes viewed Spengler's work as "a manifestation of the enormous effort of intellectual re-orientation that has characterized our century." He agreed with the criticism made by idealist historians of Spengler's cyclical interpretation, but he maintained that the core of the latter's interpretation remains intact. In two major respects his cyclical interpretation fares well, as literature and as prophecy, notwithstanding his shortcomings in the latter field. Hughes argued that the *Decline* remains one of the major works of our century because it is a symbol of a whole age as "a massive concretization of a state of mind—the state of mind of an old society anticipating its end."

R. F. Arragon of Reed College appeared as the second speaker at this session. His paper, "The Place of Reason in Historical Change," described the attitudes taken by ancient and modern philosophies of history toward freedom of thought

as a corollary of the role attributed to reason in social and cultural change. Thus, in ancient thought the view that reason might establish and maintain a just, or at least a stable and balanced, state was countered by the apparently more realistic cyclic theory that condemned all states to deterioration and made moral forces more important than rational ones. The positive role of reason in modern thought, Arragon observed, has been the means of material and cultural progress, and this view has been supported by the confidence in science as the product of thought-inquiry and by the doctrine of the immanence of a universal rational spirit in the historical process. Though British liberalism considered freedom the means and end of a process, positivist and Marxian dogmatism and Viconian and Hegelian philosophies of immanence have tended to make reason authoritarian and to interpret all historical changes as inevitable and rational. Moreover, the cyclic theory has been revived and given an organic inevitability that is in keeping with the view of historical process as the working out of an immanent principle, and this has renewed the suspicion of critically inquiring reason as contradictory to social solidarity. Confidence in the potential effectiveness of rational inquiry and tested knowledge for shaping society, and in the freedom necessary for such inquiry, has not been abandoned in all quarters, but it has been gravely compromised in contemporary thought. Garrett Mattingly of Columbia and James H. Nichols of the University of Chicago were the commentators at this session, and Leo Gershey of New York University presided at the meeting.

The last special session met on Sunday morning to hear F. Dvornik of Harvard University speak on "The Origins of the Muscovite State." He opened with the remark that there is nothing in history to indicate that the Russian is by nature predisposed to accept absolute autocracy. He described as an example of a democratic system of government the old Kievan state in which the city *veche* exercised as great a role in government as the prince himself. Dvornik then noted changes in population movement and economics which allowed for the centralization of government under the new princes of Moscow. He also explained the role which the church and other elements played in enlarging these powers until the Muscovite government became such an autocracy that even the western ideas imported by Peter the Great could not modify the pattern. Andrew Lossky of U.C.L.A. agreed in the main with Dvornik, but thought that more emphasis should be placed on the work of Joseph of Volokamsk and his followers when tracing the rise of the Muscovite State. Peculiar conditions of time and place must not be omitted from the factors that shaped autocracy, Nicholas Riasanovsky of Iowa State University, the second commentator, asserted. He thought that the problems with which the Muscovite princes were faced in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the economic and social conditions of the time, were perhaps of more moment than Byzantine political traditions. In particular he discounted Mongol influence, the weakness of which he ascribed to their cultural poverty. Stuart R. Tompkins of the University of Oklahoma was the chairman.

V

Thirteen joint sessions with affiliated societies met with the American Historical Association this year. The topics treated at these meetings were so varied and some of them were so specialized as to subject matter that it is difficult to summarize them adequately. The Hotel McAlpin was the scene of the joint meeting with the American Society of Church History. Ray C. Petry of Duke University presided at the meeting and introduced the two speakers, Robert T. Handy of Union Theological Seminary and Quirinus Breen of the University of Oregon. Handy's paper on "Christianity and Socialism in America, 1900-1920," discussed the question of the relation between Christianity and socialism. Although a majority of Christians and many socialists believed that the traditional gulf between the two was unbridgeable, a small but aggressive group of Protestant Christians became strong supporters and active members of the Socialist party. Theologically, they reconciled their position by identifying the coming kingdom of God on earth and the co-operative commonwealth of socialism. This identification came to be applied specifically to the Socialist party of America after its organization in 1901, but the shock of World War I led to its failure by dissension over such issues as America's entry into the war and the Russian Revolution. With the central inspiration thus destroyed, the movement of Christians in socialism disintegrated. Breen's learned paper concerned the life and writings of Celio Calcagnini (1475-1541), professor of Greek and Latin letters at the University of Ferrara, canon of the cathedral, and apostolic prothonotary. Although Calcagnini played a minor role in his era, he was engaged in many important church activities. His scientific writings are perhaps more significant for in his *Quod coelum stat, terra moveatur*, he defended the rotation of the earth philosophically, in the scholastic manner of disputation, and humanistically, by appealing to the classical literature.

The Conference on Latin American Studies was chaired by G. H. T. Kimble of the American Geographical Society. In the first paper, "Portuguese Overseas Contacts before Henry the Navigator," Bailey W. Diffie pointed out that we know little of such Portuguese contacts before Henry simply because this aspect has not been studied, for such contacts were abundant. Charles Verlinden's (University of Ghent) paper, "Italian Influence in Iberian Colonization," made much the same point in calling attention to the number and effectiveness of Italians in Portugal. The concluding paper, "Some Aspects of the Peninsular Background of Ibero-American Life," by Charles F. Bishko, examined the development of cattle ranching as an institution peculiar to Spain and Portugal. Such factors as mercantilist economics and the opposition of the Mesta to sheep herding in the New World made it a cattle and not a sheep region.

The development of the railways serving New York City formed the subject for three papers read at a meeting of the Lexington Group. The hundredth anni-

versary of the New York and Hudson River Railroad occurred in 1951, and so a review of the New York Central System was presented. A paper, "Highlights of a Century," by William F. Gaynor of the New York Central System emphasized the great achievement of John B. Jervis in building a road along the steep and winding banks of the Hudson River. George A. Reilly talked on the role of the Camden and Amboy in New Jersey politics, 1850-53, where the management of the railroad and the New Jersey Democratic machine were closely related. This tie-up was perpetuated by the clause in the railroad charter that gave the state a share of the profits as long as the railroad retained a monopoly of the New York-Philadelphia traffic. A large part of the state's return from the railroad, which by 1850 was sufficient to pay the cost of government, arose from high rates on through traffic that did not hurt New Jersey shippers. During the Civil War the legislature relinquished its monopoly, and in 1871 the Camden and Amboy was leased for 999 years by the Pennsylvania Railroad. David M. Ellis in his discussion of New York City and the western trade, 1850-1905, pointed out that prior to 1869 the Erie Canal was the chief route of freight to and from the West. In consequence New York City had an advantage over her rivals to the south. After 1870 the east-west trunk lines became more efficient and took freight away from the canal. This meant that henceforth Baltimore and Philadelphia had slightly lower rates from the West than New York City. But other factors, such as increasing industrialization, financial leadership, and better steamship connections, worked to maintain and even advance New York's relative position by the first decade of the twentieth century. Thomas C. Cochran of the University of Pennsylvania acted as chairman.

At the joint meeting of the Business Historical Society, Charles W. Moore, the chairman, introduced three speakers. "The Mercantile House of McKinney & Williams, Underwriters of the Texas Revolution," Joe B. Frantz of the University of Texas assessed the role of two financial supporters of the Texas Revolution, Thomas F. McKinney, a Southwest trader, and Samuel May Williams, a merchant with experience in Baltimore, Buenos Aires, and New Orleans. They had established a typical mercantile capitalist business in Texas by 1833, and when war came they devoted their credit and organization to serve the cause of Texas. In her paper on "Labor in the Early New England Carpet Industry," Nancy P. Norton of Harvard University discussed the establishment of a code of employer-employee relations after 1825 under the new factory system. Since this was the era of the skilled male hand-loom weaver, the experience of adjustment varied from that of other New England textile firms. The final paper, by Vincent P. Carosso of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, analyzed "Werner Sombart and Business History." He noted Sombart's contributions to the development of business history, and stated that he was more than just a major historian of capitalism since he also had a wide interest in such essential aspects of business history as the rise of a "spirit" of capitalism, the role of business and the businessman in

history, the role of accounting in the development of modern capitalism, and the dominant place of man in the whole system.

The joint session of the American Association for State and Local History on "Area Studies in Local History" was presided over by Albert B. Corey, New York State Historian. The three speakers on the program brought to the discussion a variety of interests and backgrounds, but all had a common concern about materials available for, and the problems involved in, writing local history. Granville Hicks of Grafton, New York, explained the difficulties involved in finding data adequate for writing the history of a small town. Angie Debo of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College spoke on some of the problems connected with the research, writing, and publication of her book, *Prairie City*. The difficulties in presenting truthfully the story of real-life personalities and their ancestors in a community can be grievous ones. Miss Debo's solution was to create a composite prairie community instead of using an actual one. However, all her facts and conversations are true, and the incidents she faithfully described all took place in that section of the state. The author of local history, however, must devise some way of insuring accuracy while not offending the friends and relatives of personalities in the book. Allan Nevins, Columbia University, in his comments placed particular stress on the contrast between local histories written a century ago and those published in recent years. Many of the early works were monumental in size but poorly written, and they contributed little to the understanding of history. Recently, a new pattern has evolved emphasizing readability for a large audience. These books have been rich in anecdote and the picturesque. Even though they may represent an improvement over some local histories, they are weak and flimsy. All three of the speakers stressed the universality of local history. It must show the relation of the specific area to other areas, and it must relate the past to the present.

At a joint meeting with the American Military Institute, presided over by Wood Gray of George Washington University, the problem of mobilization and demobilization of the United States Army in World War II was treated by two members of the armed services. M. A. Kreidberg, USA, pointed out that prior to World War II the United States had never begun a major war with any real preparation in advance. Mobilization planning for World War II was far more comprehensive and functional than ever before. Both military and industrial mobilization plans, developed by the General Staff, and industrial mobilization plans, developed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of War, were ready when the war came. Kreidberg listed five flaws in our mobilization planning: insufficient planning personnel; non-co-ordination of defense and foreign policy; failure to confide in Congress and the people in time to permit certain defense measures to be taken; the tendency of Congress to follow the executive in defense matters; and the tendency of peacetime military staffs to become so meticulous in procedures that they become inflexible in thought and action. John C. Sparrow,

USA, thought that the United States had also shown a lack of judgment in its demobilization policy. Although plans were drawn up for demobilization during World War II, they had to be whittled down because of an almost hysterical public demand, directed through Congress and the civilian administrative agencies, to "get the boys home." As a result, the means needed for the enforcement of the victory were taken away from the United States, and other nations not so fully disarmed could take advantage of America's self-inflicted weakness. Sparrow, in closing, said that an educated public is necessary to prevent the repetition of such reckless behavior.

Albert H. Imlah, of Tufts College and the Fletcher School, conducted an extremely successful meeting of the Economic History Association which over a hundred people attended. The joint session was devoted to a consideration of the role of the historian in the analysis of economic growth. Walt W. Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology presented the principal paper arguing that the historian, including "the historian in general," should join in, and perhaps guide the work of synthesizing the social sciences for a more unified application. The particular task in the field of economic history is to analyze more closely, in the light of the great developments of social science techniques and economic theories, the long-term factors in economic growth too much neglected by economic theorists in the Keynesian and post-Keynesian period. Rostow stressed particularly the need for organization of teams of social scientists for this task and expressed confidence that, if specific problems are chosen for analysis and an agreed set of questions are posed, the answers supplied by the various disciplines can be unified. Commenting on the paper, both George R. Taylor of Amherst College and Adolf Sturmthal of Bard College commended the proposal to return to the historical approach of the classical economists and gave qualified approval for team organization. Sturmthal, perhaps with some implied reservations regarding the special fitness of historians to guide co-operative efforts, directed the substance of his comment to an illustrative examination of the Kondratieff cycle and socialist movements, in 1919-1939, in various European countries.

Harold J. Grimm of the Ohio State University presided at the joint session of the American Society for Reformation Research. Harold S. Bender of the Goshen College Biblical Seminary presented a paper on "The Anabaptists and Religious Freedom in the Sixteenth Century," stating that the Reformation brought no gain for religious liberty, that the sixteenth century was one of intensified persecution, and that the Anabaptists were the common target of Catholics and Protestants alike. He quoted both outstanding scholars of the Reformation and the writings of the Anabaptists to show that Anabaptism was the forerunner of modern religious liberty. As a powerful, though small, evangelical reform movement, it challenged Christendom to free religion from compulsion, to separate church and state, and to stop the burning of heretics. In the discussion which followed, John T. McNeill stated that there was a reluctance to persecute people

because of divergent beliefs in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, too. Roland Bainton said that the main reasons for the persecutions in the sixteenth century lay in the desire to maintain the *corpus christianum* and that the Anabaptists believed that the church was free from tares, while the Reformers believed that the tares and wheat were to be found in both church and state. Ernest G. Schwiebert warned against oversimplifying Lutheranism and against characterizing it as an upper-class movement. Quirinus Breen stated that humanism was a force favoring toleration, but not on strictly religious grounds. George W. Forell pointed out that Luther's concept of the two kingdoms was relevant to an understanding of his attitude toward the Anabaptists, that it was not the church which persecuted, but the state which exercised its *exousia* against anarchy.

A joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, presided over by Richard W. Leopold of Northwestern University, was devoted to "Pressure Groups and American Foreign Policy." The importance, difficulties, and inherent limitations of this approach to diplomacy were revealed. In dealing with "The Navy League and American Foreign Policy after the First World War," Armin Rappaport of the University of California sketched the objectives, methods, and arguments of the League in the years through 1930. He concluded that the organization did not have any significant financial backing from munitions makers or shipbuilders; that its influence can easily be exaggerated; and that while it could not divert a prevailing current, it did stimulate action and aided existing forces when conditions were right. In "War or Peace: America First Committee Strategy, 1940-1941," Wayne S. Cole of the University of Arkansas analyzed closely the origins, membership, and purposes of that noninterventionist body. He argued that its leaders sought to narrow the foreign policy debate to the simple issue of whether the United States should become a full belligerent in the European war and that they did so as the only means of insuring unanimity within their diverse group. He concluded that this strategy, though partly successful, was frustrated by the Japanese attack in the Pacific. By way of comment, James L. Sellers of the University of Nebraska questioned whether the Navy League had been wise in concentrating on England as the potential rival. Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago asserted that war or peace was in 1940-1941 a false issue. He felt that more attention should be paid to the economic and geographic pattern of the America First Committee and contended that its opposition to President Roosevelt's foreign policy resulted from its hostility to his domestic program and a fear of wartime controls upon American business.

The Southern Historical Association met in a lively joint session chaired by C. Vann Woodward. In the first paper, "Toward a Reconsideration of Abolitionists," David Donald of Columbia University described the abolitionists' social origins. He had classified 106 principal abolitionists according to age, sex, race, place of birth, occupation of parents, education, religion, and political affiliation, and presented a composite picture of the typical antislavery radical. Social and economic

leadership was being transferred from the country to the city, from the farmer to the manufacturer, from the preacher to the corporation attorney. Expecting to lead, as his fathers had, he found no following, and he became a part of an élite without function, a displaced class. Eventually, he came to make the natural identification between monied aristocracy, textile manufacturing, and southern slave-grown cotton. An attack on slavery was his best, if quite unconscious, attack on a new industrial system, and his call for emancipation was thus a double crusade. Donald admitted that leadership of humanitarian reform may have been influenced by revivalism or by the British antislavery precedent, but its true origin, he liked to think, lay in the drastic reorganization of Northern society. T. Harry Williams of Louisiana State University treated the subject "Toward a Reconsideration of Civil War Generals." One reason why the North won the Civil War was that it developed two things the South did not: a central command system and a central plan of strategy. Since the political and social system of the South was based on the principle of localism, it had to fight a war of localism. Williams traced the development of the Northern command system, discussing Scott, McClellan, and Halleck as generals in chief, and stating that no one of them possessed the qualities to fill the office. In 1864 the North achieved a modern command system with Grant as general in chief and Halleck as chief of staff. In analyzing Lincoln's role in the Civil War, Williams commended him as a great war director and a great natural strategist, one who was better than any of his generals. Although he interfered in the direction of the war, he was acting in the tradition of previous presidents and many of his interventions were necessary.

At the joint session with the Agricultural History Society, which was presided over by David M. Ellis of Hamilton College, the possibilities for new research in the fields of ancient and medieval agriculture were expounded. Tom B. Jones of the University of Minnesota pointed out the opportunities for research in the agricultural history of ancient Mesopotamia for which abundant archaeological and written sources are available. He cautioned scholars against the dangers of oversimplifying the involved and varied history of three millennia. Jones analyzed in detail the agricultural practices of the period of the Third Dynasty of Ur touching upon such aspects as the cultivation and irrigation of land, the recruitment of labor, and the use of implements. His contention that farming probably began in the hills and subsequently moved to the valleys aroused considerable comment. F. M. Heichelheim of the University of Toronto then traced the rise and fall of agricultural prices between ca. 600 B.C. and A.D. 618 relating price fluctuations to the major political and economic changes of the ancient world. In the final paper, Herbert Heaton of the University of Minnesota spoke, in place of M. M. Postan, on problems of agrarian history in medieval England. He analyzed the period of great agricultural expansion between 1150 and 1350, when the three-field system became widespread, when the Germans settled the eastern and southern frontiers of central Europe and when the spirit of enterprise caused

clergy and laymen to enlarge their domain operations and to seek new markets. After 1350 agriculture in western Europe experienced a period of stagnation and shrunken profits, and landlords were more willing to commute feudal dues.

The joint session with the American Catholic Historical Association took place on Sunday morning. Joseph R. Strayer, Princeton University, presided over this final meeting. Martin R. P. McGuire of Catholic University discussed the development of Christian humanism from the Church Fathers through Thomas Aquinas and Dante. He stressed especially the great intellectual achievement of the fathers in assimilating pagan literature and learning and the equally great achievement of Aquinas in harmonizing the Christian faith and a philosophy based on the pagan Aristotle. Crane Brinton of Harvard described types of modern humanism from the Renaissance to the present. He rejected the term "humanism" as an antithesis of "scientism" and concluded that "humanism" is a "level" of human experience, higher than the naturalistic level, lower than the religious. Franklin L. Baumer of Yale, commenting on Brinton's paper, pointed out that the easy confidence of early modern humanism has disappeared and that many modern humanists are pessimistic about the future. He found, however, a restrained optimism in certain modern humanists. Father Horigan of Georgetown University, who substituted for Father Walsh of Fordham, emphasized the delicate balance between the human and the divine in medieval thought, achieved through the concept of grace perfecting nature.

VI

The annual dinner of the Association took place in the Grand Ballroom of the Statler on the evening of December 29. John A. Krout of Columbia, as toastmaster, presented the president of the Association, Robert Livingston Schuyler of Columbia. His address on "The Historical Spirit Incarnate: Frederic William Maitland" appeared in print in the January number of the *Review*. Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary of the Association, announced the winners of prizes. The Committee on the Beveridge Memorial Fellowship awarded honorable mention to the "History of Marshall Field and Company, 1865-1906" by Robert W. Twyman, assistant professor at Bowling Green State University. Professor Catherine E. Boyd's (Carleton College) manuscript, "The Ecclesiastical Tithe in Medieval Italy," was selected for publication by the Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund. The Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize went to Professor Howard Robinson of Oberlin College for his book, *The British Post Office: A History* (Princeton University Press) and an honorable mention was awarded Professor Ralph W. Hidy of New York University for his book, *The House of Baring in American Trade and Finance: English Merchant Bankers at Work, 1763-1861* (Harvard University Press). The Watumull Prize went jointly to Professor T. Walter Wallbank, University of Southern California, for *India in the New Era* (Scott, Foresman) and to Louis Fischer for *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (Harper and Brothers).

Two affiliated societies also held dinners, and several societies met in luncheon conferences. William E. Lunt of Haverford College, president of the Mediaeval Academy of America, presided at the Academy's dinner on December 28. The speakers were Joseph R. Strayer of Princeton and James L. Cate of the University of Chicago. In his paper on "The Crusade of Philip III against Aragon," Strayer stressed the importance of this crusade in 1285 as marking the end of a period in which the papacy could count on an almost automatic response of the French king to an appeal for help, and hence the end of the crusade as a regular and reliable instrument of papal policy. After this unsuccessful venture by Philip III, his son and successor, Philip the Fair, lost interest in the Mediterranean and concentrated his efforts on expansion to the north and east. This decision, a wise one from the French point of view, weakened the political position of the papacy. In a witty and entertaining satire of English and American heroics, "With Henty in the Middle Ages: A Tale of a Boy's Historian," Cate drew upon the novels of G. A. Henty. Their romanticized versions of the Middle Ages explained Henty's influence in arousing in American boys of a generation ago an interest in medieval history.

Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin presided at a dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association which also took place on Friday. He introduced Wendell H. Stephenson of Tulane University, who spoke on "William E. Dodd, Historian of Democracy." Stephenson characterized Dodd as a dynamic teacher who inspired his students, a writer who united past and present in a stream of history, a citizen who recognized an obligation to enlighten society, and a public servant who faithfully performed his duties. Whether he was writing about the Old South or the New, the southern colonies in the seventeenth century or the United States in the nineteenth, or political and economic issues of the twentieth, the same democratic yardstick was applied to men, measures, and institutions. In recording America's past, Dodd expressed a sympathy for the common man and confidence that practical democracy, if given a fair trial, would exalt his social, economic, and political station. The men who best illustrated Dodd's concept of democracy were Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson. Of Jefferson and Lincoln, he wrote with alarming assurance; of Wilson he was less certain. Whether as a college teacher, a public lecturer, a Virginia farmer, or ambassador to Germany, Stephenson stated, Dodd personified democracy.

At the luncheon of the Conference on Latin American Studies members heard "The Colored Castes and American Representation in the *Cortes* of Cádiz" by James F. King of the University of California at Berkeley. Charles E. Nowell of the University of Illinois presided at the luncheon.

At a mid-day meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Lester K. Born, secretary general of the International Council on Archives, reported on UNESCO efforts to preserve documents in member states both for the use of scholars and for the use of mankind as segments of cultural heritage. Gigantic plans for dupli-

cation of all important source materials in all accessible countries have been formulated, Born said, but the prohibitive cost of such a task, plus the many difficulties involved, has so far prevented their being carried out.

At a third luncheon conference held on Friday, December 28, President Ray C. Petry of the American Society of Church History delivered an address on "Social Responsibility and the Medieval Mystics."

On Friday afternoon a Ladies' Tea, arranged by Caroline Robbins of Bryn Mawr College, attracted, instead of an estimated forty, well over one hundred guests, including a substantial number of gentlemen. This experiment proved a highly successful innovation despite a few administrative difficulties. The response was such as to justify the hope that a Ladies' Tea will become an established custom at our meetings.

Two luncheon conferences met Saturday, December 29. The Modern History Section listened to a paper by Rudolph A. Winnacker of the Department of Defense on "Modern History and National Security." Donald C. McKay acted as chairman of the meeting. At a meeting of the Agricultural History Society, Carl C. Taylor of the Department of Agriculture discussed "The American Farmers' Movement: An Historical-Sociological Analysis." The presiding officer was Lewis E. Atherton of the University of Missouri.

In conclusion the writer of this report would like to thank the many program chairmen and speakers who kindly sent in summaries of the sessions in which they participated. Although every attempt has been made to preserve as much of the style, coverage, and spirit of the summaries as possible, apologies are offered to those whose remarks have been omitted (sessions for which no summaries were submitted have been, perforce, omitted) and to those whose speeches may have been inadvertently distorted. It is hoped that at least a few of the speakers will have recognized the summaries of their handiwork.

Yale University

HOWARD R. LAMAR