

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

FOR

THE YEAR 1904.



WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1905.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1905.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association, approved January 4, 1889, I have the honor to submit to Congress the annual report of that Association for the year 1904.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. P. LANGLEY,
Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

HON. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
Vice-President of the United States.

ACT OF INCORPORATION.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Andrew D. White, of Ithaca, in the State of New York; George Bancroft, of Washington, in the District of Columbia; Justin Winsor, of Cambridge, in the State of Massachusetts; William F. Poole, of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; Herbert B. Adams, of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland; Clarence W. Bowen, of Brooklyn, in the State of New York; their associates and successors, are hereby created, in the District of Columbia, a body corporate and politic, by the name of the American Historical Association, for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history and of history in America. Said Association is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the District of Columbia so far only as may be necessary to its lawful ends to an amount not exceeding five hundred thousand dollars, to adopt a constitution, and to make by-laws not inconsistent with law. Said Association shall have its principal office at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and may hold its annual meetings in such places as the said incorporators shall determine. Said Association shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings and the condition of historical study in America. Said Secretary shall communicate to Congress the whole of such reports, or such portions thereof as he shall see fit. The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are authorized to permit said Association to deposit its collections, manuscripts, books, pamphlets, and other material for history in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum, at their discretion, upon such conditions and under such rules as they shall prescribe.

[Approved, January 4, 1889.]

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1905.

SIR: In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association, I have the honor to transmit herewith a general report of the proceedings of the twentieth annual meeting of the Association held at Chicago, Ill., December 28, 29, and 30, 1904. Several of the papers read and discussed at that meeting are recommended for publication in this report, together with the Justin Winsor prize essay on the Nootka Sound Controversy, and a valuable report by the Public Archives Commission, showing the condition and contents of the archives of several of the States.

Very respectfully,

A. HOWARD CLARK,
Secretary.

MR. S. P. LANGLEY,
Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

CONSTITUTION.

I.

The name of this society shall be The American Historical Association.

II.

Its object shall be the promotion of historical studies.

III.

Any person approved by the executive council may become a member by paying \$3, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of \$3. On payment of \$50 any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not resident in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members, and be exempt from the payment of fees.

IV.

The officers shall be a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary, a corresponding secretary, a curator, a treasurer, and an executive council consisting of the foregoing officers and six other members elected by the Association, with the ex-presidents of the Association. These officers shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting of the Association.

V.

The executive council shall have charge of the general interests of the Association, including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers to be read, and the determination of what papers shall be published.

VI.

This constitution may be amended at any annual meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at the previous annual meeting, or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the executive council.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Organized at Saratoga, N. Y., September 10, 1884. Incorporated by Congress
January 4, 1889.

OFFICERS FOR 1905.

PRESIDENT :

JOHN BACH McMASTER, PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D.,
Professor in the University of Pennsylvania.

VICE-PRESIDENTS :

SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D.,
*Professor in Yale University, Associate Judge of Supreme Court of
Errors of Connecticut.*

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D.,
Professor in the University of Chicago.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR :

A. HOWARD CLARK,
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY :

CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D.,
Professor in Harvard University.

TREASURER :

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D.,
130 Fulton street, New York.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL :

In addition to above-named officers.

(Ex-Presidents.)

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D.,
Ithaca, N. Y.

JAMES SCHOULER, LL. D.,
Boston, Mass.

JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D.,
President of the University of Michigan.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor in Yale University.

HENRY ADAMS, LL. D.,
Washington, D. C.

JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D.,
Boston, Mass.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D.,
Boston, Mass.

ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D.,
New York.

HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D.,
Philadelphia.

GOLDWIN SMITH, LL. D.,
Toronto, Canada.

(Elected Councillors.)

GEORGE L. BURR, LL. D.,
Professor in Cornell University.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, A. M.,
Professor in the University of Pennsylvania.

EDWARD G. BOURNE, PH. D.,
Professor in Yale University.

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. M.,
Carnegie Institution of Washington.

GEORGE P. GARRISON, PH. D.,
Professor in the University of Texas.

REUBEN GOLD THWAITES, LL. D.,
State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

TERMS OF OFFICE.

EX-PRESIDENTS.

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-85.
† GEORGE BANCROFT, LL. D., 1885-86.
† JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1886-87.
† WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1887-88.
† CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1888-89.
† JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1889-90.
† WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1890-91.
JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1891-1893.
HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1893-94.
† GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1894-95.
† RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1895-96.
JAMES SCHOUER, LL. D., 1896-97.
GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1897-98.
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., 1898-99.
† EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1899-1900.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1900-1901.
ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901-2.
HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1902-3.
GOLDWIN SMITH, LL. D., 1903-4.

EX-VICE-PRESIDENTS.

† JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1884-1886.
† CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1884-1888.
† WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1886-87.
† JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1887-1889.
† WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1888-1890.
JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1889-1891.
HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1890-1893.
† EDWARD GAY MASON, A. M., 1891-1893.
† GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1893-94.
† RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1894-95.
JAMES SCHOUER, LL. D., 1894-1896.
GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1896-97.
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., 1896-1898.
† EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1898-99.
† MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1897-1900.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1899-1900.
† HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, Ph. D., LL. D., 1900-1901.
ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1900-1901.
HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1901-2.
GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901-3.
† EDWARD McCRADY, LL. D., 1902-3.
JOHN BACH McMASTER, LL. D., 1903-4.

SECRETARIES.

† HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, PH. D., LL. D., 1884-1899.
 A. HOWARD CLARK, 1889—
 CHARLES H. HASKINS, PH. D., 1900—

TREASURER.

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D., 1884—

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

WILLIAM BABCOCK WEEDEN, A. M., 1884-1886.
 † CHARLES DEANE, LL. D., 1884-1887.
 † MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-85.
 EPHRAIM EMERTON, PH. D., 1884-85.
 FRANKLIN BOWDITCH DEXTER, A. M., 1885-1887.
 † WILLIAM FRANCIS ALLEN, A. M., 1885-1887.
 † WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1886-1888.
 † RUTHERFORD BIRCHARD HAYES, LL. D., 1887-88.
 JOHN W. BURGESS, LL. D., 1887-1891.
 ARTHUR MARTIN WHEELER, A. M., 1887-1889.
 GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1888-1891.
 † GEORGE BROWN GOODE, LL. D., 1889-1896.
 JOHN GEORGE BOURINOT, C. M. G., D. C. L., LL. D., 1889-1894.
 JOHN BACH McMASTER, LL. D., 1891-1894.
 GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., 1891-1897; 1898-1901.
 THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D., 1894-95.
 † JABEZ LAMAR MONROE CURRY, LL. D., 1894-95.
 HENRY MORSE STEPHENS, A. M., 1895-1899.
 FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., 1895-1899; 1901-1904.
 EDWARD MINER GALLAUDET, PH. D., LL. D., 1896-97.
 MELVILLE WESTON FULLER, LL. D., 1897-1900.
 ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., 1897-1900.
 ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, A. B., LL. B., 1898-1901; 1903—
 WILLIAM A. DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D., 1899-1902.
 PETER WHITE, A. M., 1899-1902.
 J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D., 1900-1903.
 A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, A. B., LL. B., 1900-1903.
 HERBERT PUTNAM Litt. D., LL. D., 1901-1904.
 GEORGE L. BURR, LL. D., 1902—
 EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, A. M., 1902—
 EDWARD G. BOURNE, PH. D., 1903—
 GEORGE P. GARRISON, PH. D., 1904—
 REUBEN GOLDTHWAITES, LL. D., 1904—

Deceased officers are marked thus †.

COMMITTEES—1905.

ANNUAL COMMITTEES.

Committee on the Programme for the Twenty-first Annual Meeting: (Baltimore and Washington, 1905): John Martin Vincent, Charles M. Andrews, F. A. Christie, Charles H. Haskins, and Andrew C. McLaughlin.

Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the American Historical Association, American Economic Association, and American Political Science Association: Theodore Marburg, J. H. Hollander, John Martin Vincent, W. W. Willoughby; with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman.

Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies: Mrs. Annie M. L. Sioussat, Miss Ida M. Tarbell; with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman.

STANDING COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, AND BOARDS.

Editors of the American Historical Review: H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, Albert Bushnell Hart (these five hold over); Andrew C. McLaughlin, reelected for term ending January 1, 1911.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Edward G. Bourne, Frederick W. Moore, Reuben G. Thwaites, Worthington C. Ford, A. C. McLaughlin, T. M. Owen.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Charles M. Andrews, E. P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, Roger Foster, Williston Walker.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Charles Gross, George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James Harvey Robinson, John Martin Vincent.

Public Archives Commission: Herman V. Ames, William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, E. E. Sparks.

Committee on Bibliography: Ernest C. Richardson, A. P. C. Griffin, George H. Fies, William C. Lane, Reuben G. Thwaites, Max Farrand.

Committee on Publications: Charles H. Haskins, A. Howard Clark, F. M. Fling, S. M. Jackson, Miss Elizabeth Kendall, A. D. Morse, Earle W. Dow.

General Committee: Henry E. Bourne, Charles H. Haskins, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Miss Lilian W. Johnson, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, F. H. Hodder, F. L. Riley, B. F. Shambaugh, R. G. Thwaites, F. G. Young; with power to add adjunct members.

Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools: J. A. James, Henry E. Bourne, E. C. Brooks, Wilbur F. Gordy, Mabel Hill, Julius Sachs, Henry W. Thurston, James H. Van Sickle.

Finance Committee: J. H. Eckels, Peter White.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
I. Report of the Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting, at Chicago, Ill., December 28-30, 1904, by Charles H. Haskins, corresponding secretary-----	17
II. The Treatment of History, by Goldwin Smith-----	65
III. On Roman History, by Ettore Pais-----	79
IV. On the Necessity in America of the Study of the Early History of Modern European Nations, by Friedrich Keutgen -----	89
V. The Chief Currents of Russian Historical Thought, by Paul Milyoukov -----	109
VI. The Work of American Historical Societies, by Henry E. Bourne-----	115
VII. Public Records in Our Dependencies, by Worthington Chauncey Ford-----	129
VIII. The Exploration of the Louisiana Frontier, 1803-1806, by Isaac J. Cox-----	149
IX. The Campaign of 1824 in New York, by C. H. Rammekamp-----	175
X. Report of the Conference on the Teaching of History in Elementary Schools, by J. A. James-----	203
XI. Report of the Conference on the Teaching of Church History, by Francis A. Christie-----	211
XII. First Report of the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies, by Frederick W. Moore-----	219
XIII. State Departments of Archives and History, by Thomas McAdory Owen -----	235
XIV. Report of the Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch, by Max Farrand-----	259
XV. Bibliographical Notes on Early California, by Robert Ernest Cowan-----	267
XVI. The Nootka Sound Controversy, by W. R. Manning-----	279
XVII. Report of the Public Archives Commission-----	479
XVIII. Report on the Collection of Materials in English and European History and Subsidiary Fields in Libraries of United States, by Wilbur H. Siebert-----	651

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

CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 28, 29, 30, 1904.

By CHARLES H. HASKINS,
Corresponding Secretary.

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.^a

By CHARLES H. HASKINS, Corresponding Secretary.

For some years the successive meetings of the American Historical Association have vied one with the other in interest and usefulness. In describing these meetings it is no longer possible to use descriptive adjectives in the comparative or superlative degree. All of them have been practically above criticism or complaint. The recent meeting at Chicago—December 28 to 30, 1904—was no less satisfactory in all respects than its predecessors, and candor forbids the use of more laudatory phrases. The programme was excellent, the social arrangements were admirable, the courtesy of those in charge of the meeting and the attentions of friends of the Association in Chicago unfailing and unremitting.

Most of the sessions were held at the University of Chicago, in the Reynolds Club House, and in the Leon Mandel Assembly Hall adjoining, which were well adapted to the purposes and gave facilities not only for the stated programme, but for committee and board meetings, and for social intercourse, which after all is the most important feature of these gatherings. The American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association held meetings at the same time and place, and there were three joint sessions. At the first the chief paper was the address of the president of the Political Science Association; at the second, the addresses of the presidents of the Economic Asso-

^a This general account of the Chicago meeting of the Association is reproduced, with slight modifications, from the report prepared for the American Historical Review (April, 1905) by the managing editor of the Review, Prof. A. C. McLaughlin.

ciation and the Historical Association were read; at the third, topics in industrial history were discussed by the economists and the historians.

At the end of the first session a luncheon was served to visiting delegates in Hutchinson Hall, the university commons—a charming reproduction of the hall of Christ Church College, Oxford. The same afternoon the ladies were invited to a tea by Mrs. William Gardner Hale. Wednesday evening a reception was given by the Chicago Historical Society at its building, and the next afternoon the delegates were received by President and Mrs. Harper. An enjoyable smoker was held at the Hotel del Prado on Thursday evening. The same evening the ladies were entertained at the residence of Prof. James Westfall Thompson by Mrs. Thompson and Mrs. Mary J. Wilmarth. The Quadrangle Club, the Union League Club, the City Club, and the University Club gave non-resident members the free use of their clubrooms, and the same courtesy was shown the ladies of the Association by the Chicago Women's Club. The success of the meeting was in no small measure due to the tireless work and good judgment of Prof. J. Franklin Jameson, chairman of the committee on programme, and of Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson, chairman of the committee on arrangements.

Most of the sessions were held at the University of Chicago, but one was held at the rooms of the Chicago Historical Society, and one, the last, at the Northwestern University building in the central part of the city. The attendance was large and representative, more members being registered and probably many more being present than at any previous meeting. As was the case at New Orleans, nearly all sections of the country were well represented. Though not so many came from the Pacific coast or the South Atlantic States as were in attendance a year ago, New England and the Middle States were largely represented, as were nearly all of the States of the Mississippi basin.

The meetings once more gave evidence of the wide interests of American historical scholars, of the spirit of cooperation, and of the best of scholastic good-fellowship. One of the meetings was given up to conferences or "round tables" on special subjects, a feature of the programme which

proved peculiarly attractive, as is likely to be the case where topics of live interest are discussed and where practical methods are considered. The practice of dividing the Association into sections, which years ago was followed for a time, had its evident disadvantages, since it destroyed the unity of the meetings and simply added to the number of formal papers to which one might listen if he chose; but such a plan as that adopted at Chicago, of giving one session to a number of special gatherings in which matters of interest may be freely discussed by a comparatively small number of men, is of very evident effect in increasing the interest and the value of the meetings. One would hesitate to say that the plan should always be followed in the future, but this at least is certain, that the morning session given up to the round-table conferences was the most profitable and interesting of all. The meeting as a whole was of unquestioned service to western scholars, and perhaps of special value because it brought together an unusual number of workers in local history and gave them new courage and interest.

At the first session, held in Leon Mandel Assembly Hall, an address of welcome was given by President William R. Harper, after which Prof. Frank J. Goodnow, of Columbia University, president of the American Political Science Association, gave the first annual address, choosing for his topic the work of the new association. He dwelt chiefly on topics and fields of study that need attention from investigators in political science and on the desirability of co-operation between practical workers and theorists which the association might promote, and emphasized the desirability of a thorough and scientific examination of the principles and practice of administration.

After these addresses had been delivered before the three societies two papers were read in a joint meeting of the Historical and Political Science Associations. Prof. William M. Sloane, of Columbia University, in a paper entitled "The Contrast of Political Theory and Practice in France under the Convention," examined critically the French Government under the convention from 1793 to 1795, inclusive. He declared that an assembly chosen to make a constitution usurped the sovereign power without excuse, and that the plea of necessity was invalid. The coalition against France

was not formidable, because it had no solid basis and no consistency. The internal affairs of France gave the Jacobins no monopoly in saving the country, for there was already a constituted executive, and the boundless resources of the country were just as available for the republicans as a whole as they were for one faction of the party. The convention was not merely a usurper; it was irregular and illegitimate in both its membership and its organization. Surrendering its power to two committees, the executive council and that of public security, it devoted itself solely to party ends. Its earliest effort in arrogating sovereignty to an oligarchy by the committee of general defense was a failure. Thereupon it deliberately sacrificed for its own ends the entire Girondin party and created the committee of public safety, which took advantage of the public disorders to create a Jacobin autocracy. The most efficient organ of this shameless tyranny—the revolutionary tribunal—steadily declined into a factional committee of assassination. Any effort to judge the “Terror” even as a means justified by the end is foredoomed to failure, for France has been saved several times in moments quite as critical; but it was done by sane men, and the success did not deliver her bound to governments like the disreputable directory, and an eventual military despotism.

Mr. Jesse S. Reeves read a paper on “The Napoleonic Confederacy in the United States,” an organization by the French refugees in America having for its purpose the placing of Joseph Bonaparte upon the throne of Mexico. In the summer of 1817, G. Hyde de Neuville, the French minister at Washington, obtained possession of certain letters sent by Joseph Lakanal to Joseph Bonaparte. These letters disclosed a conspiracy among French refugees in America, but though the attention of the State Department was called to the matter no steps were taken to apprehend the leaders. In the spring of 1818 a company of 200 men, under General Lallemand, left Philadelphia, landed at Galveston, and proceeded up the Trinity River. A settlement called “Champ d’Asile” was founded, but its existence was short; menaced by the Spanish and suffering for want of food, the wretched Napoleonic soldiers abandoned their settlement and returned to Galveston, where they were found by General Graham.

who had been sent by Monroe to investigate the purposes of the expedition. Inasmuch as Lallemand's plans came to naught and there was no proof that Joseph Bonaparte had any part in the undertaking, the Government of the United States did not think it best to take further notice of the purposes and plans of the conspirators. Mr. Reeves's narrative was based on the correspondence on file in the Department of State.

The afternoon of Wednesday was given to a meeting of the council and of various committees and boards which now have in charge many of the important functions of the Association. In the evening a joint meeting of the Historical and Economic Associations was held in the Chicago Historical Society building. Mr. Franklin H. Head, in behalf of the Chicago Historical Society, welcomed the associations in a felicitous address. President Frank W. Taussig, of the Economic Association, discussed the present position of the doctrine of free trade. After considering the general arguments for free trade and protection, he said that conclusions as to the general argument for protection for young industries have an uncertain ring; and that while protection can not be proved to be useless, certain economic phenomena in this country show that it is not indispensable. The essence of the doctrine of free trade is that international trade brings a gain, and, in consequence, all restrictions upon it a loss. Departures from this principle may perhaps be justified, but they need to prove their own case, and if made in view of the pressure of opposing interests such departures are a matter of regret.^a The address of the president of the Historical Association, Prof. Goldwin Smith, which in his absence was read by Prof. Benjamin Terry, appears in this volume.

The session of Thursday morning, when the round-table conferences were held, was of peculiar interest; and the fact that many felt when the conferences were finished that much remained to be said is ample proof of the profitableness and utility of the discussions. The officers of the association have long felt that an effort should be made to bring

^a Professor Taussig's address is printed in full in the Publications of the American Economic Association for 1905.

the State historical societies into closer relations with one another and with the general association, in order that, by means of greater co-operation, objects of common interest might be attained and unwise and unnecessary duplication of work avoided. With the hope of establishing this closer relationship, a conference of representatives from State and local societies was made part of the Chicago programme, and its success was marked. The sessions were held in the library of the Reynolds Club House. Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, who acted as chairman, in opening the meeting stated in a few well-chosen words the purposes in view and what might be gained for mutual benefit by a better understanding among local societies. In a paper on the forms of organization and the relation to the State governments Mr. Thomas M. Owen, director of the Alabama Department of Archives and History, spoke of the obligation resting upon the State for the preservation and care of its archives, and of the desirability of having an officer specially charged with this duty. This work should be consigned to some one who is interested in historical matters and appreciates the value of documentary material, inasmuch as the average administrative officer is not likely to have much respect for documents that have no immediate and evident utility. The State historical society is unable to care for the public records, and only by the establishment of a distinct department can suitable appropriations commonly be expected. The speaker described the organization existing in Alabama, where there is a separate department of the government, under the general management of a board of trustees, and a director is appointed as a State trustee; the State Historical Society of Alabama has decided to surrender to the State the task of collecting manuscripts, and to content itself with holding meetings, publishing material, and stimulating interest in history.^a Mr. Warren Upham, secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society, spoke in approval of the methods existing in those States where the expenses of the historical society are met by legislative appropriations. Without denying the value of such an organization as that of Alabama, and without underestimating the immense work

^a Mr. Owen's paper is printed in full in this volume.

done by such associations as the Massachusetts Historical Society, he pointed out the evident advantages of such a system as that of Wisconsin and of some of the other States in the Northwest. A State department of history is in danger of being subjected to political influence. An historical society, aided by the State in an evident public duty, can collect and care for historical documents and also arouse popular interest, as a public officer can not. Mr. C. M. Burton, of Detroit, president of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, and well known as a devoted collector of historical materials, spoke earnestly of the need of cooperation to the end that unnecessary duplication of work might be avoided and more thorough work accomplished. He advocated the preparation of a general index to the publications of historical societies, a task which would be easily performed if the historical societies of the country would be willing to work together. Prof. B. F. Shambaugh, of the State Historical Society of Iowa, spoke briefly of the proper division of the field between the State society and the local societies within the same State, and pointed out the value of local societies in preserving documents and in aiding the State society in the task of collection.

Prof. F. L. Riley, of the Mississippi Historical Society, commenting on the general subject under discussion, spoke favorably of the arrangement in Mississippi, where there is an active historical society and also a well-organized State department, the former at the university, the latter at the State capital. Prof. A. C. McLaughlin, at the suggestion of the chairman, gave a short statement of the proposed work of the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution. Referring to the work already done in England by Prof. C. M. Andrews, he said that it is the intention to make a thorough report on the British archives and, in the coming year, to begin the examination of the Spanish archives, with the hope of being of service not only to investigators, but to historical societies that wish to have transcripts made. It is also the intention of the bureau to gather information concerning all manuscript collections of historical societies, in order that there may be in one place knowledge of the materials that are scattered throughout the country.

The round-table conference on the teaching of church history had a fair attendance, and the proceedings were of great interest to all present. Prof. F. A. Christie, of the Meadville Theological School, presiding, opened the conference by a plea for a consideration of the problems of church history as problems of historical science without the control of dogmatic or ecclesiastical interests. Regret was expressed that the body of workers in this field does not compare favorably in numbers or energy with those who contribute to other divisions of the field of history, and that the production of results is equally disappointing. Having indicated certain problems of the definition and treatment of the subject, the speaker held that a higher scientific activity calls for ampler material equipment in theological schools and for the introduction of the study in institutions other than theological. When colleges afford an outline of knowledge, the instruction in theological schools can use more intensive methods and yield higher results.

Prof. Albert T. Swing, of Oberlin, speaking on methods of teaching, made a vigorous argument for a system that would occupy the student with the problems of exposition and reproduction. In view of the future vocation of the student, an extensive thesis was held to be less desirable than the preparation of addresses in such literary form as would make a living appeal to a mass of hearers. The aim should be twofold: The discovery and analysis of vital movements by the exercise of true historical insight; and the immediate presentation of these ideas with a judicial temper and a sensitive skill of artistic expression. After indicating the divisions and methods of the general survey of church history, Professor Swing urged the historical analysis of the origin and development of doctrines as the crowning work of the department.

Dealing with the problem of the fostering of independent research, Prof. Shailer Mathews, of the University of Chicago, held that a theological school aims at practical efficiency in a profession, and that the general body of its students should not be expected to accomplish special research. The seminary must first teach the body of things known and then in the senior year give some discipline in the

use of sources, not for the production of technical historians, but to show the difference of opinion and fact and to teach the method of construction. On the other hand, students preparing to teach must be given a separate technical training, and the instructor must pursue research for his own good. Professor Mathews advocated the systematic editing and publication of documents of American church history by instructors, with the collaboration of advanced students, and a project of co-operative historical writing after the model of the *Cambridge Modern History*.

On the theme of church history in colleges and graduate schools Prof. Carl Russell Fish, of the University of Wisconsin, made a stimulating and suggestive speech with special regard to American history. Although churches have had a great influence on the growth of our civilization, the attention given to them in general courses is slight and confined to the bizarre and the picturesque. Vital problems are seldom handled. As the multiplication of college courses forbids the average student to take a special course in church history, it is necessary to correlate the subject with general history. The advantage of this is seen in the broadening and consequent simplification of the whole view of history. An illustration is the growth and the history of united organizations in the churches and the political union of the country. If college teachers are to have the basis for such correlation, it must be furnished by the specialists in church history and by those who have made a comparative study of the several churches, as well as of religious and civil institutions. This is the most profitable field for the graduate student, who will find whole series of problems by simply placing side by side the ascertained facts in these several subjects and observing the relationships and the discrepancies which there appear.

The conference on the teaching of history in the elementary school was likewise interesting and profitable. Prof. J. A. James, of Northwestern University, who acted as chairman, opened the meeting with a few words concerning the importance of the problems that were to come up for discussion. He showed that there is at the present time no agreement in practice or in theory; there are few indications of any

tendency to uniformity in the schools. Occasionally men competent to speak with wisdom have been called to plan a course of study for the grades, but expert recommendations have in the past been of little use. The time, however, may now have come for a thorough and, if possible, an authoritative study of the whole situation. Mr. Henry W. Thurston, of the Chicago Normal School, read a paper on "Some Suggestions for an Elementary Course of Study in History." The aim of history teaching is to help the child to understand in a true sense what his American fellows are now doing and to help him to intelligent voluntary action in agreement or disagreement with them; a course of study with this general aim would begin with the child's problems in his social environment and carry on from grade to grade the examination of such contemporary social problems as are within the child's comprehension. This study would embrace likewise attention in every grade to genetic problems in the past. The events studied should be in the industrial, political, social, and religious fields, and be chosen primarily from direct physical and psychical ancestry of Americans. Different "unit topics" should not, the speaker said, be presented in chronological order, but rather in such a way that there will be the strongest tendency in the child to relate the past to himself, that he may feel that the ways and thoughts of the present are the product of development and evolution.

In continuing the discussion, Dr. George O. Virtue, of the Winona State Normal School, Minnesota, said he did not think that in choosing material for preparatory work stress should be laid on the interest of the child; the safer guide is the child's future needs. A proper course would not be very different from that now followed in many American schools. It gives a prominent place in the seventh and eighth years to American history, which might well be preceded by ancient and English history. The momentary interests of such a course might be made to conform roughly to the demands of those holding to the culture-epoch theory and be fitted to the needs of children of varying experience and abilities; it is rich in possibilities for developing the imagination, rousing the enthusiasm, and building standards of personal and civic conduct. The mental training from the study of history,

which some persons assert to be only a by-product of history study in the lower schools, could be made really valuable and significant if proper attention were paid to conditions of preparation, to the time employed, and to securing skilled instruction. Miss Emily J. Rice, of the School of Education of the University of Chicago, spoke briefly on the preparation of the elementary teacher. She emphasized the fact that new ideals in education are making new demands on the teacher; her task is not to compel her pupils to commit a few pages or to memorize a few meaningless details; she must help to bring the subject-matter of history home to the child and to relate it to his experience. Stress should be laid on industrial history and the development of the arts. The test of a teacher's success is to be found in the habits of study which her pupils acquire under her guidance and inspiration.

Following these papers was a general discussion, in which a number of persons participated, among them Prof. A. H. Sanford, of the Stevens Point Normal School, Wisconsin, who declared that general principles should be laid down and superintendents left to work out the details in a way suited to their own needs; Prof. J. S. Young, of the Mankato Normal School, Minnesota, who said that history study should begin with the first grade and develop by regular stages; Prof. J. B. McMaster, of the University of Pennsylvania, who believed that in the process of Americanizing the foreigners we must fill their minds with facts of American history, which they may not understand, but which they must take as so much medicine; and Prof. James Sullivan, who said that we now have a disproportionate amount of American history. Some of the speakers radically disagreed with Professor McMaster, declaring that a mere accumulation of facts was of little moment. There seemed to be general agreement as to the wisdom of a wide and substantial course in American history, as the best preparation for civic duties and for the comprehension of the meaning of American society in which the boys and girls of the school are called upon to pass their lives. One would judge from the course of the discussion that there should be no serious difficulty in marking out a course of study for the grades, if the task is entered upon seriously and intelligently. That the subject might secure the requisite attention the conference asked the council

to appoint a committee, similar to the Committee of Seven, which should recommend a history course for the elementary schools.

At the conference which considered the doctoral dissertation in history and the doctor's degree there was a large attendance. The room where the sessions were held was too small to contain all who sought admission, and the discussions were of unusual interest. There was a general feeling that the problems under consideration are vital and important. In opening the discussion, the presiding officer, Prof. George B. Adams,^a of Yale, said that in following German practice in this country we had, in his opinion, followed the wrong road; by granting the degree freely to every one completing a required course, and by demanding as a dissertation a piece of original work, we are likely in the end to magnify the importance of little things and run the risk of creating the impression that what is only the beginning is the real end; we shall fall also into a state in which process seems the only thing, without regard to the value of the result. For the first of these conditions the thesis is largely responsible; for the student—and sometimes the instructor—labors under the impression that the product of the student's minute toil is really an important contribution to knowledge, whereas in the majority of cases, certainly in medieval history, these laborious theses merely cumber the shelves and are but impediments in the way of the really creative scholar. Professor Adams called attention to the number of men who do nothing after compiling their dissertations, and fall back with an undeserved and unnecessary feeling of failure into the work of the secondary schools. As a remedy, he advised the establishment of two doctorates, the first of which should stand for about the amount and kind of training now required for the doctorate. For this degree the thesis need not be an original contribution to knowledge, and there should be no requirement that it be printed; the more advanced should be similar to the French degree, obtainable only by mature scholars after a searching examination and on the

^a Professor Adams's paper introducing this discussion, rewritten and enlarged, will appear in an early number of the *Educational Review*.

presentation of a dissertation indicative of real scholarship and creative ability. If it were possible, he said, to advance our present master's degree to about our present doctor's degree, and the doctor's to the point of the French doctorate, the arrangement would be altogether desirable. By agreeing on an advanced degree, American universities would gain the advantages of both German and French practices; they would not lose their influence on the secondary schools; we should avoid conveying to the student a wrong impression of his own attainments and prospects, and should escape a barren and desolating flood of printed dissertations of no substantial value, which threatens to be a burden to every branch of knowledge.

Prof. D. C. Munro, of the University of Wisconsin, spoke of the various kinds of students who seek the doctorate. The training given those who are to be writers of history should be different from that offered those who are seeking only a broad scholarship and a fuller knowledge than can be acquired in the undergraduate course. If the former class is to be properly prepared, training in the technique of history requires so much time that no thesis fairly worth printing can as a rule be written. In this respect history stands, perhaps, on a different plane from that of the physical sciences, where it is not impossible for the comparatively immature student to make a serious contribution to his science. Professor Munro could not agree with Professor Adams as to the usefulness of the proposed second doctorate. Prof. James Harvey Robinson, of Columbia, said that the doctor's degree might be taken too seriously; certainly for some purposes the master's degree is more useful. There are great differences, he said, in the capacities of students, some of them reaching their limit by the end of the first year of graduate work. To obtain an elaborate literary production would be very difficult in these days, when so few can write the English language in accordance with accepted usage. Perhaps a translation might prove an agreeable substitute for a thesis in some cases, for it requires the intelligent use of two languages and a knowledge of the subject in hand. Prof. George E. Howard, of the University of Nebraska, on the other hand, pleaded for

the retention of the doctorate as a scholar's degree, declaring that the last decade has seen a decided improvement in the standard, that the present thesis is creditable, and that in American and English history it is better than the typical German thesis. He could not see the wisdom of establishing a new degree, but he did believe that the master's degree should be given more meaning, for it has a distinct academic function. The main thing is to keep the standards high.

Prof. N. M. Trenholme, of the University of Missouri, considered the present doctor's examination too severe for the students who have had no preparation for such an ordeal, and advocated making an examination for the master's degree a preliminary training for the doctor's examination. Prof. J. M. Vincent spoke of the value of the work on the thesis in the intellectual development of the student; to work over old topics may be good, but to do something new is better; the printing of theses is considered a reward of effort and industry. Prof. C. M. Andrews advocated the maintenance of high standards for the degree. The result of not printing the theses would, he thought, be the cheapening of the degree; both the instructor and the student need the stimulus, the check, and the encouragement that come from the knowledge that the dissertation is to be printed and must bear the inspection of others. Subjects for theses should be wisely selected and suited to the needs of the science. Prof. F. M. Fling believed we should have no inflexible rule about printing and that college students should be so grounded in the principles of historical method and so taught by continuing practice to express their ideas that, when the need comes, they will be able to prepare a thesis in intelligent and readable English. Prof. F. H. Hodder and Prof. F. M. Anderson both dwelt on the desirability of strengthening the master's degree. Prof. J. F. Jameson said we should adjust our degrees to American needs; the master's degree should indicate that its possessor has the scholarly preparation for teaching in the secondary schools; the doctor's degree, that he is fitted for the college. The person who is to handle college classes should have experienced the pains and pleasures of discovery and have ascertained by his own trials how history is written. Three-fourths of all theses, he said, are in American history, and of these the

larger portion is good. Like Professor Andrews, he believed the certainty that the dissertation would be inspected by others is of salutary influence, but thought it might possibly be wise not to print the dissertation, in a given case, if it were judged good by a professor in another university. Prof. A. B. Hart said he had not seen the evil of the doctorate, for the educational development of recent years was due to the desire for the degree of doctor of philosophy and to the fact that it is a good standard measure for professional purposes. The dissertations had, moreover, added considerably to our knowledge; and he advocated that time be devoted to the study of topics that would yield positive and helpful results. Prof. C. H. Haskins thought there had been a marked improvement in the real value of the doctorate, and that much more was asked than twenty years ago; he believed that standards should be raised for both the master's and the doctor's degrees, the latter to be given only to students showing unusual promise and likely to follow a university, as distinguished from a college, career. In a word, without establishing a new degree, the universities might well provide for the type of man that Professor Adams had in mind. At present we are in a transitional stage; and while we provide fairly well for the future college professor we do not do enough to develop the type of man who looks forward to a university career, and who should have the power and the training to conduct profitable investigation. At the end of the discussion, Professor Milyoukov, comparing the conditions in Russia with those prevailing here, said that the Russian degree of "magister" is as a rule obtained by men who are already too old, and that in his country the attainment of a degree is too difficult, and here too easy.

At the fourth session five papers were read on a variety of subjects. Prof. C. W. Colby, of McGill University, characterized in an interesting manner the personnel and the work of the historical congresses at St. Louis. Prof. Ettore Pais, of the University of Naples, beginning with a tribute to the late Theodor Mommsen, and a reference to the marvelous breadth of his scholarship and the value of his contributions to Roman history, proceeded to point out the work that remains to be done. The soil of Italy still has

many archaeological treasures, and new discoveries will add new knowledge and raise fresh problems. The study of primitive life in other lands and the study of ancient law will throw light on the early development of Rome. Even for the study of the empire much remains to be done, for we know much more of the administrative system than of the real history of the people; we know more of their law than of their ideas, their moral movements, or their social development. Because of the similarity between the character and the history of modern America and those of ancient Rome, American scholars are especially called upon to study and interpret Roman life and history.^a

Prof. Henry E. Bourne made a report upon the work of American historical societies, a summary of impressions received from the inquiry for the general committee of the Association. Describing with considerable care the different forms of organization and effort, he dwelt on the desirability of cooperation, and especially on the need of good understanding between the local societies and the general association.^a

The next paper, by Prof. E. G. Bourne, was a clever and interesting effort to test the trustworthiness of the *Travels* of Jonathan Carver, by an application of the principles of modern historical criticism. Even the conclusions, not to speak of the proofs, can not be given here in a word; and we must content ourselves with saying that Professor Bourne demonstrated that the book ascribed to Carver has no standing as a piece of first-hand testimony, that in all probability he did not write it, and that while portions were probably written by adroit literary hacks from Carver's own statements, much was but a rehearsal of the sayings of Charlevoix and other early explorers, including the mendacious Lahontan.

In the first paper of the evening, Mr. Isaac J. Cox, of the University of Cincinnati, spoke of the explorations in the Southwest by Hunter, Dunbar, Pike, and Freeman in the first three years after the purchase of Louisiana. Although these expeditions were much less comprehensive than originally planned, they furnished valuable informa-

^a The paper is printed in the present volume.

tion concerning the geography of the territory, marked the first step in deflecting the border Indians from their nominal Spanish allegiance, and were a material factor in the final assertion of American claims to large portions of the Southwest.

Prof. Friedrich Keutgen, of Jena and Johns Hopkins, gave the first paper of the Friday morning session on the necessity in America for the study of the early history of modern European nations.^a The real antecedents of America, he said, are to be found in the early life of the European nations, whose history is continuous from the time of their formation on the ruins of the older Roman world. But not for this reason alone, not from any merely patriotic motive, should American students study this early history, but because the backbone of every science is its method, and this method can best be learned where the materials are most easily mastered. In the early period of European history conditions were comparatively simple, and the evidence we have to handle can be tested by certain and intelligible rules. Opportunity is given for training and practice in paleography and diplomatics, while power of correct observation and inference can be developed in students with comparative ease. Prof. Paul Milyoukov, formerly professor in the University of Sofia, read a paper on Russian historiography,^a in which he traced the periods through which the writing of history has passed from early days to the present. It is now, he said, under the influence of the wider sociological conceptions, to which American scholars have made notable contributions.

Following these papers by distinguished European historians, three papers were read describing certain archives and the materials to be found in them of particular interest to historical investigators. Prof. A. C. McLaughlin, of the Carnegie Institution, gave the results of his investigation of the diplomatic archives of the Department of State.^b Confining his description to the period from 1789 to 1845, he pointed out the amount, character, and apparent interest of

^a The paper is printed in the present volume.

^b Printed by the Carnegie Institution under the title, "Report on the Diplomatic Archives of the Department of State, 1789-1840." Washington, 1904.

the great quantity of unpublished materials, which throw light not only on our diplomatic history, but on conditions in foreign states. Special attention was called to the dispatches of William Short, John Quincy Adams, and Jonathan Russell, and to the papers bearing on our diplomatic relations with the Republic of Texas. Prof. C. M. Andrews, of Bryn Mawr, described briefly the character of the material relating to American history to be found in the leading British archives, especially the Public Record Office, where exist great masses of documents, of some of which little has hitherto been known.^a For the internal history of the colonies in the seventeenth century documentary evidence is scanty, though of the highest importance. On the other hand, for the study of British colonial policy and the development of the organs of administration the evidence is of great extent and of corresponding value. The materials bearing on British trade and revenue, on the cost of general administration, and on the expense of managing the military are enormous, especially for the years 1745, 1755-1763, and for the Revolution. Professor Andrews also spoke appreciatively of the Stevens Index, which contains references to more than 160,000 documents in England, France, Spain, and Holland relating to the period 1763-1783. Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Library of Congress, briefly described the extent and condition of the public archives at Manila and the richness of these papers in historical material.^b While the great bulk of them is concerned with questions of local administration, the large collection of royal decrees and orders distinguish the archives from those obtained in previous acquisitions of Spanish territory. The insular government has appointed a keeper of the archives, and is taking measures for preserving the papers from further loss and damage, even sending a special student to Europe to obtain additional matter relating to the history of the Philippines. The Guam records, few in number and much mutilated, have in part been transferred to the Library of Congress, Washington, where they can receive greater care and attention. The archives of Porto Rico probably contain some material of value for his-

^a The paper is printed in the *American Historical Review*, January, 1905.

^b The paper is printed in full in the present volume.

torical purposes; but the archives of no dependency are complete, having suffered much in the past from carelessness and from changes of sovereignty or from revolution. The history of the Spanish colonial policy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is closely related to that of the British colonies in America, and should be studied in connection with the attempt of Spain to maintain a trading monopoly in the face of rivalry from England, France, and Holland.

The last session—a joint meeting with the Economic Association—was held on Friday evening in the building of the Northwestern University, in the center of the city. Prof. E. F. Gay, of Harvard, read a paper on the significance of the inclosure movement in England, an important contribution to the subject of English industrial history, its conclusions being in some respects quite at variance with those commonly accepted. The distinction should be made, the speaker said, between the inclosure of common waste and the depopulating of the common fields, the former being much older and more widespread but less disquieting than the latter. The depopulating inclosures of the common or open fields, especially characteristic of the sixteenth century, were not so serious a matter as contemporaries believed and almost all modern writers think. These inclosures were mainly confined to the midland counties; even there, till late in the eighteenth century, they were, in general, small piecemeal affairs, and the whole movement was one of gradual and not of violent change. Professor Gay brought out with especial distinctness the conditions under which this great agrarian change was made—the strong economic and social motives that tended to hasten it, and the equally strong obstacles, likewise economic and social, that retarded it. In conclusion, he said that the comparison of the inclosure movements of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries as usually made overlooks the continuity of the development in the different sections of England and does not sufficiently take into account the differing social effects of the movements in the two periods.*

After Professor Gay's paper, the rest of the evening was taken up with a discussion of the plan for preparing an eco-

* Professor Gay's paper is printed in full in the Publications of the American Economic Association for 1905.

conomic history of the United States. President Carroll D. Wright, head of the department of economics of the Carnegie Institution, who is responsible for the inception and the general management of the undertaking, briefly outlined the plans that have thus far been agreed upon. The whole field of American industrial history is divided into eleven main parts, and the general management of each one of these is in the hands of a specialist, whose duty it is to provide for the special investigation and the preparation of desirable monographs within his field. The divisions and the persons in charge of them are as follows: (1) Population and immigration, Prof. Walter F. Willcox; (2) agriculture and forestry, including public domain and irrigation, President Kenyon L. Butterfield; (3) mining, Mr. Edward W. Parker; (4) manufactures, President Wright; (5) transportation, Prof. B. H. Meyer; (6) domestic and foreign commerce, Prof. Emory R. Johnson; (7) money and banking, Prof. Davis R. Dewey; (8) the labor movement, President Wright; (9) industrial organization, Prof. J. W. Jenks; (10) social legislation, including provident institutions, insurance, and poor laws, Prof. Henry W. Farnam; (11) Federal and State finance, including taxation, Prof. Henry B. Gardner. At the present time there are some seventy-five persons engaged in one capacity or another, and it is expected that many more will soon be at work. It is plain, from Colonel Wright's statement, that his plan contemplates, at least for some time to come, the study of eleven or more parallel lines of industrial development, leaving any general scheme of co-ordination or combination to be dealt with at a later day. In the meantime, within these special fields where work is to be carried on by separate investigation, the work is to be in many, if not in most cases decidedly monographic; and, naturally, the task must be that of collecting data which at some future time can be properly arranged in chronological or logical relationships.

The general plan, as presented by President Wright, was commented on by several speakers, but the time was so limited that anything like a thorough discussion was impossible. The matter is one of such general interest, and the cooperation of historical scholars and economists so desirable, that it is regrettable that a thorough debate and interchange of views

were impossible. Professor McMaster in a few luminous remarks called attention to the fact that real history in which events are brought out in their significant aspects can not be written by following with precision any number of parallel lines. While such special treatment may be of much value, the investigator must remember that even in his choice of facts, as well as in their interpretation, much more must be considered than the changes taking place in one phase of human activity. In the period after the Revolution, for example, all social and industrial conditions had their bearing on constitutional change and on the need of establishing a new political order. The ultimate effect of industrial conditions must affect the choice, arrangement, and presentation of facts. The next speaker, Prof. C. H. Hull, of Cornell, fortifying his argument by the enumeration of various European and American examples, contended that among subsidized and co-operative undertakings of wide range, whether in ecclesiastical or in political history, those had proved on the whole most useful whose managers had confined their efforts chiefly to the editing of sources, and had left the production of co-ordinated narratives to the enterprise of individual writers and of commercial publishers. He maintained that this experience ought to have weight in planning the economic history of the United States; and especially so because, unlike the official materials of ecclesiastical and political history, the materials of economic history do not become accessible after a few years as a matter of course. He therefore welcomed President Wright's announcement that "the real and important work of the department of economics and sociology of the Carnegie Institution is * * * to place the largest possible collection of materials in the hands of both" the economist and the historian. Prof. Henry R. Seager, of Columbia, spoke in approval of the general plan, and said that the work was properly undertaken by economists because the historians have as yet taken so little interest in the writing of economic history. He believed, however, that there were certain omissions, notably in the failure to provide for the study of the growth of trade in the ordinary sense as distinguished from commerce and transportation. Prof. Jacob H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, said that the description of economic status rather than the

narrative of economic development is the urgent need of economic study in the United States. Descriptive investigation, as distinct from historical study and local inquiry, must bear the same relation to political economy that field-work does to geology and the clinic does to medicine. The immediate environment should first be utilized as an economic laboratory for the development of scientific spirit in economic study and sound method in economic research, and as the field from which bases of working hypotheses may be derived. Thereafter the investigator must extend the range of his inquiry by visits to representative localities and even residence in them with a view to collecting wider and more varied data and to testing tentative conclusions. Such a procedure involves two essentials—leisure and resources. The investigators for scientific inquiry must certainly not be unduly absorbed by the routine engagement of the student or the teacher. With respect to resources, the investigator must be in command of funds sufficient to enable him to visit, and upon certain occasions temporarily to reside in, representative localities for the purpose of gathering additional evidence and of testing and verifying tentative conclusions. Here seems to lie the present prime usefulness of private or public endowment in economic research.

The business meeting, which was held Friday afternoon, showed that the affairs of the Association are in their customary prosperous condition, and that the various committees and commissions are working with zeal and success. In accordance with the desire of the round-table conference of State and local historical societies, a conference of such societies was appointed to be held in connection with the next annual meeting, and Mr. Thomas M. Owen was appointed chairman and Prof. Benjamin F. Shambaugh, secretary. The request of the conference on the teaching of history in the elementary school was answered by a resolution favoring the appointment of a committee of eight to investigate the subject and prepare a report on a course of history for elementary schools and the proper training of teachers for their work. Prof. J. A. James, of Northwestern University, was appointed chairman of the new committee, the other members being Prof. Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University; Supt. E. C. Brooks, of Goldsboro, N. C.;

Supt. Wilbur F. Gordy, of Springfield, Mass.; Miss Mabel Hill, of the Normal School at Lowell, Mass.; Dr. Julius Sachs, of the Collegiate Institute and Teachers' College, New York City; Prof. Henry W. Thurston, of the Chicago Normal School, and Supt. J. H. Van Sickle, of Baltimore, Md. The report of the treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, was not less gratifying than usual, showing the total assets of the Association to be \$22,477.69, an increase during the year, despite the heavy expenses incurred for the numerous activities of the Association, of \$1,243.99. The membership of the Association in 1904 was 2,163, an increase of 93 over the preceding year.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch was transmitted by the secretary,^a Prof. Max Farrand, and Prof. H. Morse Stephens gave a statement concerning the numbers and the plans and purposes of the new western organization. One meeting, a very successful one, has been held in San Francisco, and it is intended to hold a meeting the coming year at Portland in connection with the Lewis and Clark celebrations. The present membership of the branch is 130. The committee on the Justin Winsor prize expressed its gratification at the general character and quality of the papers submitted, and announced the awarding of the prize^b to Mr. W. R. Manning, of Purdue University, for his monograph on "The Nootka Sound Controversy," and that the monograph of Mr. C. O. Paullin on "The Navy of the American Revolution" had received honorable mention. The Association approved recommendations of the committee to the effect that more emphasis should be laid on the critical bibliography and that all mention of universities or former instructors should be omitted. Approval was likewise given the report of the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize, which recommended that for the present the prize should be \$200, that it be awarded every second year, and that the rules governing the competition be practically the same as those in force for the Winsor prize competition. The prize is to be offered for the best monograph "based upon independent investigation in European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental or insular, or any part thereof."

^a Printed in full in this volume.

^b The successful monograph is printed in full in this volume.

Prof. E. G. Bourne, in behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, said that steps had been taken to edit and prepare for the printer the diplomatic correspondence of the Republic of Texas. The editorial work is to be done by Prof. George P. Garrison. In giving the report of the Public Archives Commission, Prof. H. V. Ames said that the commission has representatives in 32 States and has already published one or more reports from 18 States. Six additional reports appear in the "Annual Report" of the Association for 1904, and other investigations are in progress. The work of the commission has helped the passage of laws in several of the States for the better preservation of the public records. Prof. H. L. Osgood is editing the council journals of New York City, the proposed publication of which is directly traceable to his study of the records of the State in behalf of the commission. Dr. E. C. Richardson reported that the Bibliographical Committee had been engaged in making additions to the information collected by Prof. W. H. Siebert concerning collections of material on European history in American libraries. At present the list is limited to special library collections and does not indicate individual books; but the committee intends to make up a list of two or three thousand of the great series, with indication of the libraries in which they may be found. The work of the General Committee consisted in preparing a list of persons eligible to membership in the Association and of assisting the committee on the programme of the Chicago meeting in arranging for a conference of representatives of State and local historical societies. The success of the conference led to the appointment of a subcommittee, composed of Dr. R. G. Thwaites and Profs. B. F. Shambaugh and F. L. Riley, with the special task of reporting at a further conference upon the best methods of organization and work on the part of State and local historical societies. The General Committee, in addition to its usual duties, will undertake the preparation of a list of those members who are engaged in research, classifying them according to the fields in which they are at work. The committee will also investigate, in connection with other historical societies, the extent to which historic sites have been marked or otherwise accurately determined.

The Association voted to meet the coming year in Baltimore and Washington, and in Providence in 1906. The committee on nominations, composed of Prof. F. J. Turner, Charles H. Hull, and A. L. P. Dennis, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Prof. John B. McMaster was chosen president, Judge Simeon E. Baldwin first vice-president, and Prof. J. Franklin Jameson second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Prof. Charles H. Haskins, and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were re-elected to their former positions. In the place of Dr. Herbert Putnam and Prof. F. J. Turner, who had served three years on the council, were chosen Prof. George P. Garrison and Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites.

The following list includes the names of members who registered at the headquarters in the course of the meeting:

George B. Adams, New Haven, Conn.
Henry Carter Adams, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Victoria A. Adams, Chicago, Ill.
C. W. Alvord, Urbana, Ill.
C. H. Ames, Boston, Mass.
Herman V. Ames, Philadelphia, Pa.
Frank Maloy Anderson, Minneapolis, Minn.
Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Edward E. Ayer, Chicago, Ill.
Earle J. Babcock, New York City.
James Baln, Toronto, Canada.
Earnest A. Balch, Detroit, Mich.
Alice M. Baldwin, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. M. Barber, Chicago, Ill.
Levi D. Barbour, Detroit, Mich.
A. J. Baughman, Mansfield, Ohio.
Adelaide S. Baylor, Wabash, Ind.
Myron H. Beach, Chicago, Ill.
William Beer, New Orleans, La.
E. J. Benton, Cleveland, Ohio.
Arthur E. Bestor, Chicago, Ill.
Bessie Boies, Painesville, Ohio.
Josephine O. Bostwick, Kingston, R. I.
Mrs. A. R. Bourne, Bethany, W. Va.
E. G. Bourne, New Haven, Conn.
H. E. Bourne, Cleveland, Ohio.
Clarence W. Bowen, New York City.
E. Mortimer Boyle, New York City.
Edith C. Bramhall, Rockford, Ill.
Edward O. Brown, Chicago, Ill.

George Bryce, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
James C. Burns, Macomb, Ill.
Mrs. James C. Burns, Macomb, Ill.
C. M. Burton, Detroit, Mich.
Edward O. Bynum, Chicago, Ill.
Howard W. Caldwell, Lincoln, Nebr.
J. Morton Callahan, Morgantown, W. Va.
W. H. Cathcart, Cleveland, Ohio.
Ralph C. H. Catterall, Ithaca, N. Y.
Robert C. Chapin, Beloit, Wis.
Francis A. Christie, Meadville, Pa.
H. V. Church, Berwyn, Ill.
Edna R. Chynoweth, Madison, Wis.
Frederick A. Cleveland, New York City.
Catharine C. Cleveland, Baltimore, Md.
Benjamin F. Coen, Rockford, Ill.
Victor Coffin, Madison, Wis.
C. W. Colby, Montreal, Canada.
Horace M. Conaway, Warren, Pa.
Archibald Cary Coolidge, Cambridge, Mass.
I. J. Cox, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Josephine M. Cox, Indianapolis, Ind.
Mary B. Cox, Huntington, Ind.
C. C. Crawford, Madison, Wis.
William H. Crawford, Meadville, Pa.
Arthur Lyon Cross, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Frances G. Davenport, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Jesse B. Davis, Detroit, Mich.
Walter S. Davis, Richmond, Ind.
Alfred L. P. Dennis, Chicago, Ill.
Alfred Pearce Dennis, Northampton, Mass.
Frank H. Dixon, Hanover, N. H.
Walter B. Douglas, St. Louis, Mo.
Earle W. Dow, Ann Arbor, Mich.
William A. Dunning, New York City.
George M. Dutcher, Middletown, Conn.
Albert E. Ebert, Chicago, Ill.
C. C. Eckhardt, Columbia, Mo.
Ephraim Emerton, Cambridge, Mass.
Nelson W. Evans, Portsmouth, Ohio.
John G. Ewing, Notre Dame, Ind.
May L. Fairbanks, Mount Vernon, Iowa.
Sidney B. Fay, Hanover, N. H.
James W. Fertig, Chicago, Ill.
Mayo Fesler, Chicago, Ill.
C. R. Fish, Madison, Wis.
Fred Morrow Fling, Lincoln, Nebr.
Worthington C. Ford, Washington, D. C.
Ernst Freund, Chicago, Ill.

Herbert Friedenwald, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Henry B. Gardner, Providence, R. I.
 George P. Garrison, Austin, Tex.
 Edwin F. Gay, Cambridge, Mass.
 Nicholas P. Gilman, Meadville, Pa.
 Ulysses Grant Gordon, Taylorville, Ill.
 John H. Gray, Evanston, Ill.
 Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.
 Lyman Bronson Hall, Oberlin, Ohio.
 Albert S. Harding, Brookline, S. Dak.
 S. B. Harding, Bloomington, Ind.
 William R. Harper, Chicago, Ill.
 N. D. Harris, Appleton, Wis.
 Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge, Mass.
 Charles H. Haskins, Cambridge, Mass.
 Augustus R. Hatton, Chicago, Ill.
 Nils P. Haugen, Madison, Wis.
 C. D. Hazen, Northampton, Mass.
 Franklin H. Head, Chicago, Ill.
 Mary R. Hellacot, Waterbury, Conn.
 Amos S. Hershey, Bloomington, Ind.
 E. E. Hill, Chicago, Ill.
 Henry W. Hill, Buffalo, N. Y.
 H. H. Hilton, Chicago, Ill.
 Ripley Hitchcock, New York City.
 F. H. Hodder, Lawrence, Kans.
 Cyrus W. Hodgkin, Richmond, Ind.
 Arthur Hoermann, Watertown, Wis.
 D. H. Holbrook, Fond du Lac, Wis.
 Agnes E. Home, San Jose, Cal.
 George E. Howard, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Richard Hudson, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Charles H. Hull, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Carl F. Huth, Madison, Wis.
 Joseph H. Iglehart, Evansville, Ind.
 J. A. James, Evanston, Ill.
 J. Franklin Jameson, Chicago, Ill.
 Marcus W. Jernegan, Chicago, Ill.
 Allen Johnson, Grinnell, Iowa.
 Franklin W. Johnson, Waterville, Me.
 Lilian W. Johnson, Oxford, Ohio.
 R. M. Johnston, Cambridge, Mass.
 Beulah Judson, Oxford, Ohio.
 Harry P. Judson, Chicago, Ill.
 Louise Phelps Kellogg, Madison, Wis.
 Elizabeth W. Kenyon, Kingston, R. I.
 Everett Kimball, Northampton, Mass.
 Julia A. King, Ypsilanti, Mich.
 Susan M. Kingsbury, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Frances A. Knox, Chicago, Ill.
E. B. Krehbiel, Chicago, Ill.
Laurence M. Larson, Milwaukee, Wis.
Florence E. Leadbetter, Boston, Mass.
Orpha E. Leavitt, Dousman, Wis.
Charles H. Lee, Racine, Wis.
Henry E. Legler, Milwaukee, Wis.
Waldo G. Leland, Washington, D. C.
Harlow Lindley, Richmond, Ind.
Isidor Loeb, Columbia, Mo.
G. D. Luetscher, Philadelphia, Pa.
Edith Kathryn Lyle, Milwaukee, Wis.
F. M. Lyon, Boston, Mass.
Charles McCarthy, Madison, Wis.
Margaret McCoy, Chicago, Ill.
William MacDonald, Providence, R. I.
C. H. McIlwain, Oxford, Ohio.
A. C. McLaughlin, Washington, D. C.
John Bach McMaster, Philadelphia, Pa.
John H. McMillan, Monmouth, Ill.
Edgar M. McNeal, Chicago, Ill.
Jesse Macy, Grinnell, Iowa.
Martha J. Maltby, Columbus, Ohio.
Charles W. Mann, Chicago, Ill.
Frank B. Marsh, Ann Arbor, Mich.
William I. Marshall, Chicago, Ill.
O. J. Marston, Ripon, Wis.
George W. Martin, Kansas Historical Society.
Shailer Mathews, Chicago, Ill.
Archibald B. Maynard, Vermilion, S. Dak.
N. P. Mead, New York City.
George L. Melton, Chicago, Ill.
C. E. Merriam, Chicago, Ill.
Roger Bigelow Merriman, Cambridge, Mass.
W. H. Miner, Cleveland, Ohio.
James E. Mitchell, Alma, Mich.
Thomas L. Montgomery, Harrisburg, Pa.
F. W. Moore, Nashville, Tenn.
S. H. Moore, Georgetown, Tex.
Thomas F. Moran, Lafayette, Ind.
Jenny H. Morrill, Atlanta, Ga.
Henry C. Morris, Chicago, Ill.
D. C. Munro, Madison, Wis.
David S. Muzzey, New York City.
George P. Nauman, Naperville, Ill.
Aaron Newell, Dubuque, Iowa.
Elizabeth B. Noyes, Oshkosh, Wis.
Mrs. Kate A. Oliver, Chicago, Ill.
Thomas M. Owen, Montgomery, Ala.

Edward C. Page, De Kalb, Ill.
 Mrs. Edward C. Page, De Kalb, Ill.
 Edwin W. Pahlow, Cambridge, Mass.
 David L. Patterson, jr., Madison, Wis.
 Stephen D. Peet, Chicago, Ill.
 Paul S. Peirce, Ames, Iowa.
 V. V. Phelps, Muskegon, Mich.
 Ulrich B. Phillips, Madison, Wis.
 Mrs. E. J. G. Potter, Alpena, Mich.
 B. E. Powell, Wilmette, Ill.
 Herbert Putnam, Washington, D. C.
 J. W. Putnam, Evanston, Ill.
 Mary B. Putnam, Ypsilanti, Mich.
 William Radebaugh, Chicago, Ill.
 C. H. Rammelkamp, Jacksonville, Ill.
 Samuel H. Ranck, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 E. O. Randall, Columbus, Ohio.
 William A. Rawles, Bloomington, Ind.
 Jesse S. Reeves, Richmond, Ind.
 Paul S. Reinsch, Madison, Wis.
 R. Resky, Harrisburg, Pa.
 James Ford Rhodes, Boston, Mass.
 E. C. Richardson, Princeton, N. J.
 Robert K. Richardson, Beloit, Wis.
 Franklin L. Riley, University, Miss.
 James A. Robertson, Madison, Wis.
 Edward Van Dyke Robinson, St. Paul, Minn.
 Florence Porter Robinson, Milwaukee, Wis.
 James H. Robinson, New York City.
 Dunbar Rowland, Jackson, Miss.
 William H. Runyon, La Grange, Ill.
 F. A. Sampson, Columbia, Mo.
 John B. Sanborn, Madison, Wis.
 A. H. Sanford, Stevens Point, Wis.
 William A. Schaper, Minneapolis, Minn.
 George L. Scherger, Chicago, Ill.
 H. L. Schoolcraft, Urbana, Ill.
 Ferdinand Schwill, Chicago, Ill.
 Paul Selby, Chicago, Ill.
 George C. Sellery, Madison, Wis.
 Allen D. Severance, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Frank H. Severance, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Iowa City, Iowa.
 A. Hunt Shearer, Hartford, Conn.
 Francis W. Shepardson, Chicago, Ill.
 Charles H. Shinn, Sierra Reserve, North Fork, Cal.
 Henry R. Shipman, Hanover, N. H.
 Adam Shortt, Kingston, Canada.
 W. H. Siebert, Columbus, Ohio.

St. George L. Sioussat, Sewanee, Tenn.
William M. Sloane, New York City.
Charles E. Slocum, Defiance, Ohio.
Albion W. Small, Chicago, Ill.
Ernest A. Smith, Meadville, Pa.
Leon E. Smith, Ithaca, N. Y.
Theodore C. Smith, Williamstown, Mass.
Edwin E. Sparks, Chicago, Ill.
Henry R. Spencer, Columbus, Ohio.
H. C. Stanclift, Mount Vernon, Iowa.
Albert Stenmo, Chicago, Ill.
H. Morse Stephens, Berkeley, Cal.
E. L. Stevenson, New Brunswick, N. J.
J. F. Steward, Chicago, Ill.
Mabel A. Steward, Kalamazoo, Mich.
James Sullivan, New York City.
Albert T. Swing, Oberlin, Ohio.
Marion Talbot, Chicago, Ill.
Benjamin S. Terry, Chicago, Ill.
Lucy E. Textor, New Haven, Conn.
James Westfall Thompson, Chicago, Ill.
R. G. Thwaites, Madison, Wis.
A. C. Tilton, Madison, Wis.
N. M. Trenholme, Columbia, Mo.
Frederick J. Turner, Madison, Wis.
Edward Tuthill, Madison, Wis.
A. H. Tuttle, Columbus, Ohio.
Warren Upham, St. Paul, Minn.
Harry S. Vaile, Chicago, Ill.
C. H. Van Tyne, Ann Arbor, Mich.
John Martin Vincent, Baltimore, Md.
G. O. Virtue, Winona, Minn.
Alice E. Wadsworth, Chicago, Ill.
Joseph Parker Warren, Chicago, Ill.
R. B. Way, Evanston, Ill.
U. G. Weatherly, Bloomington, Ind.
Homer J. Webster, Chicago, Ill.
Dora Wells, Chicago, Ill.
Willis M. West, Minneapolis, Minn.
W. L. Westermann, Columbia, Mo.
Peter White, Marquette, Mich.
Arthur H. Wilde, Evanston, Ill.
Alice Bradford Wiles, Chicago, Ill.
J. A. Wilgus, Platteville, Wis.
Westel W. Willoughby, Baltimore, Md.
George G. Wilson, Providence, R. I.
A. P. Winston, St. Louis, Mo.
Arthur M. Wolfson, New York City.
Frank H. Wood, Clinton, N. Y.

James Albert Woodburn, Bloomington, Ind.
 Walter E. C. Wright, Olivet, Mich.
 C. T. Wyckoff, Peoria, Ill.
 Maurice Zéligzon, Cleveland, Ohio.
 J. C. Zeller, Chebansee, Ill.

The American Historical Association, in account with Clarence W. Bowen, treasurer.

		Dr.	
1904. Dec. 21	To disbursements as follows:		
	Treasurer's clerk hire, etc., vouchers 1, 31, 54, 64, 88, 104		\$185.00
	Secretary's clerk hire, etc., vouchers 20, 43, 52, 60, 69, 75		297.20
	Corresponding secretary's expenses, vouchers 9, 36, 82		38.75
	Expenses Pacific Coast Branch, voucher 44		17.00
	Postage and stationery, treasurer and secretary, vouchers 10, 14, 20, 24, 27, 49, 58, 61, 72, 84, 86		181.57
	American Historical Review, vouchers 4, 15, 17, 21, 23, 30, 32, 35, 37, 38, 41, 45, 59, 62, 65, 71, 73, 77, 78, 79, 85, 87, 93, 96, 102		4,269.00
	Public archives commission, vouchers 74, 83, 101		83.65
	Historical manuscripts commission, vouchers 7, 8, 16, 19, 28, 29, 57, 94		262.56
	Winsor prize committee, voucher 46		100.00
	General committee, vouchers 55, 56, 81, 98, 99		52.80
	Account annual report 1902, vouchers 3, 5		34.00
	Printing 1904 catalogue, vouchers 48, 50, 51, 53		118.25
	Expenses nineteenth annual meeting, vouchers 6, 11, 12, 13, 18		85.40
	Expenses twentieth annual meeting, vouchers 97, 100		79.44
	Expenses executive council, vouchers 25, 89, 90, 91, 92, 95		62.50
	Engraving certificates, vouchers 39, 47, 63, 70		4.10
	Bank collection charges, vouchers 2, 22, 33, 40, 42, 66, 67, 80, 103		7.38
	Interest, voucher 68		12.50
	Loan on bond and mortgage, voucher 31		20,000.00
	Flowers for Senator Hoar's funeral, voucher 76		15.00
	Balance cash on hand in National Park Bank		2,293.24
	Total		28,199.34
		Cr.	
1903. Dec. 24	By balance cash on hand		15,117.64
1904. Dec. 21	By receipts as follows:		
	1,990-1/3 annual dues, at \$3		5,971.00
	1 annual dues		2.75
	2 annual dues, at \$3.05		6.10
	3 annual dues, at \$3.10		9.30
	1 annual dues		3.15
	Do		3.36
	Do		3.50
	5 life memberships		250.00
	Sales of publications		70.00
	Royalty on The Study of History in Schools		19.55
	Sale of bank stock		1,147.25
	Herbert B. Adams fund		4,875.00
	Interest on H. B. Adams fund		97.76
	Interest on deposit with United States Trust Co		222.98
	Interest on bond and mortgage		400.00
	Total		28,199.34

We have examined the books and records of the above Association, and certify that the statement of receipts and disbursements as set forth above is, in our opinion, correct.

THE AUDIT COMPANY OF NEW YORK,
 E. T. FERRINE, General Manager.

NEW YORK, December 23, 1904.

H. Doc. 429, 58-3—4

We have examined the above report of The Audit Company of New York on the statement of receipts and disbursements of the treasurer of the American Historical Association and a check certified by the National Park Bank of New York to the order of the treasurer and in his hands for \$2,293.24—the balance of cash on hand—and from said report and check audit said statement and account as correct.

EDWARD O. BROWN,
F. H. HODDER,
Auditing Committee.

The assets of the Association are:	
Bond and mortgage real estate at No. 24 East Ninety-fifth street, New York-----	\$20,000.00
Accrued interest from September 29, 1904, to date-----	184.45
Cash on hand-----	2,293.24
	<hr/>
	22,477.69
An increase during the year of-----	1,243.99
Respectfully submitted.	

CLARENCE W. BOWEN, *Treasurer.*

NEW YORK, December 21, 1904.

American Historical Association.

Total receipts, 1904-----	\$13,081.70
Less sales of bank stock-----	\$1,147.25
Transfer from H. B. Adams fund-----	4,875.00
	<hr/>
	6,022.25
Net receipts-----	\$7,059.45
Total disbursements, 1904-----	25,906.10
Less loan on bond and mortgage-----	20,000.00
	<hr/>
Net disbursements-----	5,906.10
Excess of receipts over disbursements-----	1,153.35

PRESENT ACTIVITIES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

The following list enumerates the present leading activities of the American Historical Association:

(1) The annual meeting of the Association held during the Christmas holidays in the East or the West or the District of Columbia in triennial succession.

(2) The annual report of the secretary of the Association concerning the annual meeting and its proceedings, with the papers, bibliographies, and other historical materials submitted through the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution for publication by Congress.

(3) The preservation of historical exchanges, books, pamphlets, reports, and papers of the Association in the National Museum, at Washington, D. C., in the keeping of Mr. A. Howard Clark, secretary of the Association and curator of the historical collections.

(4) The Historical Manuscripts Commission of six members, established in 1895, and now receiving from the Association a subsidy of \$500 a year for the collection and editing of important manuscripts; Prof. Edward G. Bourne, of Yale University, chairman.

(5) The Public Archives Commission, established in 1899, for investigating the public archives of the several States and of the United States, and now receiving a subsidy of \$500 a year for the expenses incident to preparing its reports; Prof. Herman V. Ames, of the University of Pennsylvania, chairman.

(6) The Committee on Publications, to pass upon papers and monographs submitted to the Association for publication; Prof. Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard University, chairman.

(7) The Committee on Bibliography, to advise the executive council and to cooperate with the American Library Association upon matters of bibliographical interest; Dr. Ernest C. Richardson, of Princeton University, chairman.

(8) The General Committee, representing the local interests of the Association and its relations with State and local historical societies; Prof. Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, chairman.

(9) The "Justin Winsor prize" of \$100 for the best unpublished monographic work based upon original investigation in American history; Prof. Charles M. Andrews, of Bryn Mawr College, chairman of the committee.

(10) The American Historical Review, published quarterly, and subsidized by the American Historical Association, whose executive council elects the board of editors; Prof. A. C. McLaughlin, of the Carnegie Institution, managing editor.

(11) A series of reprints of the chief original narratives of early American history, published by authority of the Association; Prof. J. Franklin Jameson, of the University of Chicago, general editor.

(12) The "Herbert Baxter Adams prize" of \$200, awarded biennially, for the best unpublished monograph based upon original investigation in European history; Prof. Charles Gross, of Harvard University, chairman of the committee.

(13) The Committee of Eight on history in elementary schools; Prof. J. A. James, of Northwestern University, chairman.

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD IN THE MANDEL
ASSEMBLY HALL, CHICAGO, ILL., AT 3.30 P. M., DECEMBER
30, 1904.

Vice-President McMaster in the chair. In the absence of the secretary his duties were performed by the corresponding secretary.

On behalf of the council the corresponding secretary reported that the council had held a meeting at New York November 25, 1904, and two meetings at Chicago, December 28 and 30, 1904, and that at these meetings reports from the various committees and commissions had been presented and considered and the usual appropriations made for the continuation of the work for the coming year. The council recommended that in view of the expectation expressed by the Association at New Orleans, and of similar action by the committee of the American Economic Association, Baltimore and Washington be designated as the meeting place for 1905, and Providence as the place of meeting for 1906, and the recommendation was adopted by the Association.

The council reported that in accordance with a vote passed by the round-table conference of State and local historical societies it had approved the holding of a conference upon the work of State and local historical societies and commissions in connection with the next annual meeting of the Association, and had appointed as chairman of this conference Mr. Thomas M. Owen, director of the Department of Archives and History of the State of Alabama, and as secretary Prof. Benjamin F. Shambaugh, of the State Historical Society of Iowa. The Association voted to approve the action of the council.

In accordance with a resolution passed by the round-table conference on the teaching of history in elementary schools, the Association voted to approve the action of the council in appointing a committee of eight to investigate and report to the Association on a course of history for elementary schools and the proper training of teachers for such work.

The report of the treasurer and the auditing committee was received and accepted.

The report of the organization and annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch was transmitted by the secretary, Prof. Max Farrand, and Prof. H. Morse Stephens gave a brief account of the present condition and activity of the branch.

The following committees made brief reports: The Historical Manuscripts Commission, Prof. Edward G. Bourne, chairman; the Public Archives Commission, Prof. Herman V. Ames, chairman; the

board of editors of the "American Historical Review," Prof. George B. Adams, chairman; the Bibliographical Committee, Dr. Ernest C. Richardson, chairman; the General Committee, Prof. Henry E. Bourne, chairman.

On motion of Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, the following resolution was adopted by the Association:

"In view of the importance of a proper administration and direction of State aid in behalf of historical work and enterprise: Be it

"Resolved by the American Historical Association, That the plan of administration in Alabama and Mississippi through State departments of archives and history is hereby earnestly indorsed and commended."

The committee on the Justin Winsor prize reported that the prize for the year 1904 had been awarded to Mr. W. R. Manning, Lafayette, Ind., for his monograph upon "The Nootka Sound Controversy," and that honorable mention had been made of the monograph of C. O. Paullin on "The Navy of the American Revolution."

The Association approved two certain proposed changes in the rules governing the award of the Winsor prize, to the effect that more emphasis should be laid upon a critical bibliography and that all mention of universities or former instructors be excluded from the monographs handed in for the competition.

The committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize made the following report, which was adopted by the Association:

"The committee on the newly created Herbert Baxter Adams prize in European history, to whose consideration was last year referred the question as to the frequency of award of that prize and as to its amount, recommends that for the present the prize be awarded only every second year, and that its amount be \$200. In making only this recommendation we do not overlook the suggestion, last year advanced, as to a larger Adams prize to be awarded at less frequent intervals for maturer work; but this, for which the residue of the Adams fund may still suffice, can perhaps wisely be left to the later discretion of the Association."

The Association also approved the recommendation of the committee that the rules governing the competition for the Adams prize be the same as those now in force for the Winsor prize, with the exception of the following change in the second paragraph of these rules:

"The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental and insular, or any part thereof."

The committee on nominations, consisting of Messrs. Frederick J. Turner, Charles H. Hull, and A. L. P. Dennis, proposed the following list of officers for the ensuing year, for which the secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association: President, John Bach McMaster, LL. D., Philadelphia, Pa.; first vice-president, Simeon E. Baldwin, LL. D., New Haven, Conn.; second vice-president, J. Franklin Jameson, LL. D., Chicago, Ill.; secretary, A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; corresponding secretary,

Charles H. Haskins, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.; treasurer, Clarence W. Bowen, Ph. D., New York City. Executive council (in addition to the above-named officers and the ex-presidents of the Association), George L. Burr, LL. D., Ithaca, N. Y.; Edward P. Cheyney, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.; Edward G. Bourne, Ph. D., New Haven, Conn.; Andrew C. McLaughlin, A. M., Washington, D. C. (these four were renominated); George P. Garrison, Ph. D., Austin, Tex.; Reuben G. Thwaites, LL. D., Madison, Wis.

The following resolutions, proposed by a committee consisting of Messrs. Richard Hudson, Dunbar Rowland, and Charles D. Hazen, were unanimously adopted by the Association:

"The American Historical Association expresses its hearty appreciation of the generous hospitality of the University of Chicago, its president and faculties, who have so largely contributed to the success of its twentieth annual meeting.

"It desires to make particular mention of obligation to the local committee and its chairman and secretary, Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson and Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, for their untiring efforts in its behalf.

"The Association also places on record its appreciation of the courtesies extended by the Chicago Historical Society, Northwestern University, the Quadrangle Club, the University Club, the Union League Club, the City Club, the Chicago Women's Club, and by individual citizens of Chicago."

On behalf of the council, the corresponding secretary announced the appointment of the following committees:

ANNUAL COMMITTEES.

Committee on the programme for the twenty-first annual meeting (Baltimore and Washington, 1905).—John Martin Vincent, Charles M. Andrews, F. A. Christie, Charles H. Haskins, and Andrew C. McLaughlin.

Joint local committee of arrangements for the American Historical Association, American Economic Association, and American Political Science Association.—Theodore Marburg, J. H. Hollander, John Martin Vincent, W. W. Willoughby; with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman.

Committee on the entertainment of ladies.—Mrs. Annie M. L. Sioussat, Miss Ida M. Tarbell; with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman.

STANDING COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, AND BOARDS.

Editors of the "American Historical Review."—H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, Albert Bushnell Hart (these five hold over); Andrew C. McLaughlin (re-elected for term ending January 1, 1911).

Historical Manuscripts Commission.—Edward G. Bourne, Frederick W. Moore, Reuben G. Thwaites, Worthington C. Ford, Andrew C. McLaughlin, Thomas M. Owen.

Committee on the Justin Winsor prize.—Charles M. Andrews, E. P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, Roger Foster, Williston Walker.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—Charles Gross, George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James Harvey Robinson, John Martin Vincent.

Public Archives Commission.—Herman V. Ames, William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, E. E. Sparks.

Committee on bibliography.—Ernest C. Richardson, A. P. C. Griffin, George Iles, William C. Lane, Reuben G. Thwaites, Max Farland.

Committee on publications.—Charles H. Haskins, A. Howard Clark, F. M. Fling, S. M. Jackson, Miss Elizabeth Kendall, A. D. Morse, Earle W. Dow.

General committee.—Henry E. Bourne, Charles H. Haskins, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Miss Lillian W. Johnson, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, F. H. Hodder, F. L. Riley, B. F. Shambaugh, R. G. Thwaites, F. G. Young (with power to add adjunct members).

Committee of eight on history in elementary schools.—J. A. James, Henry E. Bourne, E. C. Brooks, Wilbur F. Gordy, Miss Mabel Hill, Julius Sachs, Henry W. Thurston, J. H. Van Sickle.

Finance committee.—J. H. Eckels, Peter White.

The meeting adjourned at 5 p. m.

CHARLES H. HASKINS,
Corresponding Secretary.

PROGRAMME OF EXERCISES AT THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL
MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD
AT CHICAGO, DECEMBER 28, 29, AND 30, 1904.

Persons not members of the Association will be cordially welcome to the sessions.

Papers are limited to twenty minutes, and discussions to ten minutes for each speaker. Those who read papers or take part in the conferences are requested to furnish the secretary with abstracts of their papers or remarks.

FIRST SESSION, WEDNESDAY, 10.30 A. M., IN MANDEL ASSEMBLY HALL.

Address of welcome. President William R. Harper, of the University of Chicago.

Annual address (before the three associations): The Work of the American Political Science Association. Prof. Frank J. Goodnow, president of the Association.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.

1. The Contrast of Political Theory and Practice in France under the Convention. William M. Sloane, professor in Columbia University.
2. The Relation of the Executive to the Legislative Power. James T. Young, director of the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.
3. The Napoleonic Confederacy in the United States. Jesse S. Reeves, of Richmond, Ind.

Wednesday, 1 p. m., luncheon in Hutchinson Hall; 3 p. m., meeting of the executive council and of committees, Reynolds Club House; 3-6 p. m., tea for ladies, at the house of Mrs. Hale, 5757 Lexington avenue.

SECOND SESSION, WEDNESDAY, 8 P. M., AT THE CHICAGO HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION.

Address of welcome. President Franklin H. Head, of the Chicago Historical Society.

Annual address: The Present Position of the Doctrine of Free Trade. Frank W. Taussig, president of the American Economic Association.

Annual address: The Treatment of History. Goldwin Smith, president of the American Historical Association.

Wednesday, 10 p. m., reception by the Chicago Historical Society.

THIRD SESSION, THURSDAY, 10.30 A. M., IN THE REYNOLDS CLUB HOUSE.

"ROUND TABLE" CONFERENCES, IN FOUR SECTIONS.

1. On the Problems of State and Local Historical Societies (library, north room, first floor). Chairman, Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
 - a. Forms of Organization, and Relation to the State Governments. Thomas M. Owen, director of the Department of Archives and History, Alabama; Warren Upham, secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society.
 - b. The Possibilities of Mutual Co-operation between Societies, State and Local. C. M. Burton, president of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society; Benjamin F. Shambaugh, State Historical Society of Iowa.
2. On the Teaching of History in the Elementary School (theater, third floor). Chairman, James A. James, professor in Northwestern University.
 - a. Some Suggestions for an Elementary Course in History. Henry W. Thurston, Chicago Normal School; G. O. Virtue, Winona State Normal School; William H. Elson, superintendent, Grand Rapids.
 - b. The Preparation of the Elementary Teacher. Emily J. Rice, School of Education, University of Chicago.
3. On the Doctoral Dissertation in History, and the Doctor's Degree (south room, second floor). Chairman, George B. Adams, professor in Yale University.
 - a. On the Character of the Thesis. Dana C. Munro, University of Wisconsin; James H. Robinson, Columbia University; George E. Howard, University of Nebraska.
 - b. Subjects for Theses. Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University; Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard University.
4. On the Teaching of Church History (tower room, second floor). Chairman, Francis A. Christie, professor in Meadville Theological School.
 - a. Methods of Teaching. Albert Temple Swing, Oberlin Seminary.
 - b. The Promotion of Research. Shailer Mathews, University of Chicago.
 - c. Church History in Colleges and Graduate Schools. Carl R. Fish, University of Wisconsin.

Thursday, 4 p. m., reception by President Harper.

FOURTH SESSION, THURSDAY, 8 P. M., IN MANDEL ASSEMBLY HALL.

1. The Historical Congresses at St. Louis. Charles W. Colby, professor in McGill University.
2. On Roman History. Ettore Pais, professor in the University of Naples.
3. The Work of American Historical Societies. Henry E. Bourne, professor in Western Reserve University.
4. The Travels of Jonathan Carver. Edward G. Bourne, professor in Yale University.
5. The Exploration of the Louisiana Frontier, 1803-1806. Isaac J. Cox, instructor in the University of Cincinnati.

Thursday, 10 p. m., smoker, at the Hotel del Prado; 10 p. m., reception for ladies, by Mrs. Wilmarth and Mrs. Thompson, 5747 Washington avenue.

FIFTH SESSION, FRIDAY, 10.30 A. M., IN MANDEL ASSEMBLY HALL.

1. The Necessity in America of the Study of the Early History of Modern European Nations. Friedrich Keutgen, professor in the University of Jena.
2. Russian Historiography. Paul Milyoukov, formerly professor in the University of Sofia.
3. The Diplomatic Archives of the Department of State. Andrew C. McLaughlin, director of the Bureau of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution.
4. The Materials for American History in the English Archives. Charles M. Andrews, professor in Bryn Mawr College.
5. Government Archives in Our New Possessions. Worthington C. Ford, chief of the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

Friday, 3.30 p. m., annual meeting of the Association, Mandel Assembly Hall.

1. Report of the Council.
2. Report of the Treasurer and Auditing Committee.
3. Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.
4. Report of the Public Archives Commission.
5. Report of the Committee on the Justin Winsor prize.
6. Report of the Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.
7. Report of the board of editors of the American Historical Review.
8. Report of the Committee on Bibliography.
9. Report of the General Committee.
10. Report of the editor of the "Original Narratives for Early American History."
11. Election of officers.
12. Report of the committee on resolutions.

SIXTH SESSION, FRIDAY, 8 P. M., AT THE PROFESSIONAL BUILDING OF
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, LAKE AND DEARBORN STREETS.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION.

1. The Significance of the Inclosure Movement in England. Edwin F. Gay, professor in Harvard University.
2. An Economic History of the United States. Carroll D. Wright, chairman of the Department of Economics and Sociology in the Carnegie Institution.

Discussion led by John B. McMaster, University of Pennsylvania, and Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, of the American Historical Association; Henry R. Seager, Columbia University, and Jacob H. Hollander, Johns Hopkins University, of the American Economic Association.

To be read by title: Report on the Collections of Material in European History and Subsidiary Fields to be found in the Libraries of the United States, by Wilbur H. Siebert, professor in the Ohio State University.

COMMITTEE CIRCULARS.

[The Justin Winsor prize. Committee: Charles M. Andrews (chairman), Bryn Mawr College; Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania; Roger Foster, New York; Williston Walker, Yale University; Charles H. Hull, Cornell University.]

The Justin Winsor prize of \$100, offered by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1905 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of American history that shall be submitted to the committee of award on or before October 1, 1905.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1776, of other portions of the continent which have since been included in the territory of the United States, and of the United States. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, ethnological, military, or biographical, though in the last three instances a treatment exclusively ethnological, military, or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The monograph must present subject-matter of more than personal or local interest, and must, as regards its conclusions, be a distinct contribution to knowledge. Its statements must be accurate, and the author in his treatment of the facts collected must show originality and power of interpretation.

IV. The monograph must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. It must be presented in scientific form. It must contain references to all authorities. It must be accompanied by a critical bibliography. Should the bibliography be omitted or should it consist only of a list of titles without critical comments and valuations, the monograph will not be admitted to the competition.

V. In length the monograph should not be less than 30,000 words, or about 100 pages of print. It may be more. If possible, it should be type-written; but in any case it should be presented to the committee free from erasures, interlineations, and other evidences of revision. If the work is not type-written, it must be written carefully and legibly on only one side of the sheet and must be in form ready for publication.

VI. In addition to text, footnotes, and bibliography, the monograph must contain nothing except the name and address of the author and a short introduction setting forth the character of the material and the purpose of the work. After the award has been made the successful competitor may add such personal allusions as are customary in a printed work.

VII. In making the award the committee will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and especially literary form. The successful monograph must be written in good English. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence.

VIII. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association in its annual report. The author will be given 25 copies of his work bound separately in paper and 25 bound in cloth; but in case he desire additional copies for personal distribution, or to present as part of the requirement for the doctor's degree, he shall pay the cost of striking off the extra copies. Separate copies of the monograph, bound in cloth, may be obtained of the Secretary by any one desiring them at a cost of 50 cents each.

IX. Under the rules of the Government the successful competitor can purchase copies of his work from the Public Printer and put them on sale at such price as he may see fit. Any competitor may make such use of his manuscript as he desires, even while it is in the hands of the committee, provided that in case he receive the award he defer its publication by anyone else than the Association until after the appearance of the report of the Association containing the work in question. He must, however, relinquish all right of copyright in his essay, since the copyright of material published by the Government is forbidden by statute.

Address all correspondence to the chairman of the committee, Prof. Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

The Justin Winsor prize has been awarded as follows:

In 1896 to Herman V. Ames, for his work entitled "The Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States."

From 1897 to 1899 the prize was not awarded.

In 1900 to William A. Schaper, for his work entitled "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina;" with honorable mention of the work of Miss M. S. Locke on "Anti-Slavery Sentiment before 1808."

In 1901 to Ulrich B. Phillips, for his work entitled "Georgia and State Rights;" with honorable mention of the work of Miss M. Louise Greene on "The Struggle for Religious Liberty in Connecticut."

In 1902 to Charles McCarthy, for his work entitled "The Anti-Masonic Party;" with honorable mention of the work of W. Roy Smith on "South Carolina as a Royal Province."

In 1903 to Louise Phelps Kellogg, for her work entitled "The American Colonial Charter: A Study of its Relation to English Administration, chiefly after 1688."

In 1904 to William R. Manning, for his work entitled "The Nootka Sound Controversy;" with honorable mention of the work of C. O. Paullin on "The Navy of the American Revolution."

[The Herbert Baxter Adams prize. Committee: Charles Gross (chairman), Harvard University; George Lincoln Burr, Cornell University; Victor Coffin, University of Wisconsin; James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University; John Martin Vincent, Johns Hopkins University.]

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize of \$200, offered biennially by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1905 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of European history that shall be submitted to the committee of award on or before October 1, 1905.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental or insular, or any part thereof. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, ethnological, military, or biographical, though in the last three instances a treatment exclusively ethnological, military, or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The monograph must present subject-matter of more than personal or local interest and must, as regards its conclusions, be a distinct contribution to knowledge. Its statements must be accurate and the author in his treatment of the facts collected must show originality and power of interpretation.

IV. The monograph must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. It must be presented in scientific form. It must contain references to all authorities. It must be accompanied by a critical bibliography. Should the bibliography be omitted or should it consist only of a list of titles without critical comments and valuations, the monograph will not be admitted to the competition.

V. If possible, the monograph should be type-written, but in any case it should be presented to the committee free from erasures, interlineations, and other evidences of revision. If the work is not type-written, it must be written carefully and legibly on only one side of the sheet, and must be in form ready for publication.

VI. In addition to text, footnotes, and bibliography, the monograph must contain nothing except the name and address of the author and a short introduction setting forth the character of the material and the purpose of the work. After the award has been made the successful competitor may add such personal allusions as are customary in a printed work.

VII. In making the award the committee will consider not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and especially literary form. The successful monograph must be written in good English. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence.

VIII. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association in its annual report. The author will be given 25 copies of his work bound separately in paper and 25 bound in cloth; but in case he desires additional copies for personal distribution, or to present as part of the requirement for the doctor's degree, he shall pay the cost of striking off the extra copies. Separate copies of the monograph, bound in cloth, may be obtained of the secretary, by any one desiring them, at a cost of 50 cents each.

IX. Under the rules of the Government the successful competitor can purchase copies of his work from the Public Printer, and put them on sale at such price as he may see fit. Any competitor may make such use of his manuscript as he desires, even while it is in the hands of the committee, provided that in case he receive the award he defer its publication by anyone else than the Association until after the appearance of the report of the Association containing the work in question. He must, however, relinquish all right of copyright in his essay, since the copyright of material published by the Government is forbidden by statute.

Address all correspondence to the chairman of the committee, Prof. Charles Gross, 11 Putnam avenue, Cambridge, Mass.