

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
FOR
THE YEAR 1910



WASHINGTON
1912

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1911.

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 the association for the year 1910. I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

C. D. WALCOTT, *Secretary.*

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 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,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1911.

SIR: In accordance with the act of incorporation of the American Historical Association, approved January 4, 1889, I have the honor to transmit herewith the annual report of the association for the year 1910. The report contains the proceedings of the association at its twenty-sixth annual meeting held at Indianapolis in December, 1910, as well as the eleventh report of the public archives commission, and the bibliography of writings on American history for 1910.

That the association is fulfilling the purposes of its founders and the intentions of Congress as set forth in its act of incorporation is evident from a survey of the activities carried on during the past year, a few of which may be mentioned in this connection. Of especial public utility has been the work of the public archives commission, which has not only continued the preparation and publication of reports on the archives of the various States, but took an active part in the international congress of archivists held at Brussels in August, 1910, and has organized an annual conference in the interests of American archives, National, State, and local. The association, deeply concerned for the preservation of the records of the National Government and aware that these records are, in many cases, stored where they are in danger of destruction and where their material deterioration is evident and rapid, has petitioned Congress "to take such steps as may be necessary to erect, in the city of Washington, a national archive depository, where the records of the Government may be concentrated, properly cared for, and preserved."

Bibliography, the indispensable aid of the historian, and the guide of the layman who seeks information on a given subject, has not been neglected. The annual bibliography of writings on American history, for the second time included in the association's report, constitutes an inventory which in respect to comprehensiveness and completeness surpasses any similar undertaking in other countries. The advantage to the study of American history resulting from the wide distribution of such a work can readily be appreciated. The preparation of a bibliography of modern English history, so important for the study of American history, is being carried on by the joint activities

of the association and of the English Royal Historical Society. The association's permanent committee on bibliography is preparing a report on the collections in European history possessed by the principal libraries of the country, so that in the future the steadily increasing body of American students whose labors are devoted to the study of European history will be able to ascertain, without waste of time and effort, the location of the materials necessary for their work.

The association has joined with other learned societies in the preparation and publication of a new annual, the American Year Book, designed to record the events and progress of the year in the various fields of statistics, history, politics, economics, science, and industry.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully, yours,

WALDO G. LELAND, *Secretary.*

Mr. CHARLES D. WALCOTT,

Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
I. Report of the proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the American Historical Association, by Waldo G. Leland, secretary . . .	23
II. Report of the proceedings of the seventh annual meeting of the Pacific coast branch, by Jacob N. Bowman, secretary of the branch	55
III. The efforts of the Danish kings to secure the English crown after the death of Harthacnut, by Laurence M. Larson	69
IV. The records of the privy seal, by James F. Baldwin	83
V. Royal purveyance in fourteenth-century England in the light of Simon Islip's Speculum Regis, by Chalfant Robinson	89
VI. Anglo-Dutch relations, 1654-1660, by Ralph C. H. Catterall	101
VII. Some critical notes on the works of S. R. Gardiner, by Roland G. Usher . .	123
VIII. The Mexican policy of southern leaders under Buchanan's administration, by James Morton Callahan	133
IX. The decision of the Ohio valley, by Carl Russell Fish	153
X. North Carolina on the eve of secession, by William K. Boyd	165
XI. The inception of the Montgomery convention, by Armand J. Gerson . .	179
XII. The attitude of Congress toward the Pacific Railway, 1856-1862, by Allen Marshall Kline	189
XIII. The work of the Western State historical society, by Jeanne E. Wier . .	199
XIV. The study of history in secondary schools	209
XV. Proceedings of the seventh annual conference of historical societies . . .	243
XVI. Eleventh annual report of the public archives commission, by Herman V. Ames, chairman	267
Appendix A. Proceedings of the second annual conference of archivists	279
Appendix B. Report on the archives of the State of Indiana, by Harlow Lindley	315
Appendix C. Report on the archives of the State of Kentucky, by Irene T. Myers	331
Appendix D. Report on the archives of the State of Nebraska, by Addison E. Sheldon	365
Appendix E. Notes on the archives of the Philippines, by James A. Robertson	421
XVII. Writings on American History, 1910, by Grace G. Griffin	427

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 secretary of the council, 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 ELECTED DECEMBER 30, 1910.

PRESIDENT:

WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, PH. D., L. H. D., LL. D.,
Columbia University.

VICE PRESIDENTS:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, LL. D.,
Oyster Bay, N. Y.

WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, PH. D., LL. D.,
Columbia University.

SECRETARY:

WALDO GIFFORD LELAND, A. M.,
Carnegie Institution of Washington.

TREASURER:

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, PH. D.,
150 Fulton Street, New York.

SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL:

CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, PH. D.,
Harvard University.

CURATOR:

A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M.,
Smithsonian Institution.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

(In addition to the above-named officers.)

(Ex-Presidents.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quogue, N. Y.

JOHN BACH McMASTER, A. M., PH. D., LITT. D., LL. D.,

University of Pennsylvania.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

JOHN FRANKLIN JAMESON, PH. D., LL. D.,

Carnegie Institution of Washington.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, PH. D., LITT. D.,

Yale University.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.,

Harvard University.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, PH. D., LL. D., LITT. D.,

Harvard University.

(Elected Councillors.)

EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, PH. D.,

University of Illinois.

CHARLES HENRY HULL, PH. D.,

Cornell University.

FRANKLIN LAFAYETTE RILEY, PH. D.,

University of Mississippi.

EDWIN ERLE SPARKS, PH. D., LL. D.,

State College of Pennsylvania.

FRED MORROW FLING, PH. D.,

University of Nebraska.

JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN, PH. D.,

Indiana University.

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH.

OFFICERS ELECTED MARCH 31, 1911.

PRESIDENT:

HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT, A. M.,
San Francisco.

VICE-PRESIDENT:

ROCKWELL DENNIS HUNT, PH. D.,
University of Southern California.

SECRETARY-TREASURER:

HAVEN WILSON EDWARDS, A. M.,
Oakland (Cal.) High School.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

(In addition to the above-named officers.)
JOSEPH M. GLEASON, A. M., S. T. B.,
Palo Alto, Cal.
EUGENE IRVING McCORMAC, PH. D.,
University of California.
NICHOLAS RICCIARDI,
Fremont High School, Oakland, Cal.
PAYSON JACKSON TREAT, PH. D.,
Leland Stanford Junior University.

TERMS OF OFFICE.

(Deceased officers are marked thus: †.)

EX-PRESIDENTS:

ANDREW DICKSON WHITE, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-1885.
†GEORGE BANCROFT, LL. D., 1885-1886.
†JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1886-1887.
†WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1887-1888.
†CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1888-1889.
†JOHN JAY, LL. D., 1889-1890.
†WILLIAM WIRT HENRY, LL. D., 1890-1891.
JAMES BURRILL ANGELL, LL. D., 1891-1893.
HENRY ADAMS, LL. D., 1893-1894.
†GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1895.
†RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1896.
JAMES SCHOULER, LL. D., 1897.
†GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1898.
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., 1899.
†EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1900.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1901.
ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1902.
†HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1903.
†GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1904.
JOHN BACH MCMASTER, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., 1905.
SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1906.
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, Ph. D., LL. D., 1907.
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, Ph. D., Litt. D., 1908.
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1909.
FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1910.

EX-VICE PRESIDENTS:

†JUSTIN WINSOR, LL. D., 1884-1886.
†CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS, LL. D., 1884-1888.
†WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL. D., 1886-1887.
†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., 1891-1894.
†GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, LL. D., 1894.
†RICHARD SALTER STORRS, D. D., LL. D., 1895.
JAMES SCHOULER, LL. D., 1895, 1896.
†GEORGE PARK FISHER, D. D., LL. D., 1896, 1897.
JAMES FORD RHODES, LL. D., 1897, 1898.
†EDWARD EGGLESTON, L. H. D., 1898, 1899.
†MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1899, 1900.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL. D., 1900.
†HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, Ph. D., LL. D., 1901.
ALFRED THAYER MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., 1901.
†HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL. D., 1902.
†GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D., 1902, 1903.
†EDWARD MCCRADY, LL. D., 1903.
JOHN BACH MCMASTER, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., 1904.
SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL. D., 1904, 1905.
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, Ph. D., LL. D., 1905, 1906.
GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, Ph. D., Litt. D., 1906, 1907.
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1907, 1908.
FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1908, 1909.
WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE, Ph. D., L. H. D., LL. D., 1909, 1910.

SECRETARIES:

†HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS, Ph. D., LL. D., 1884-1899.
 A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889-1908.
 CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, Ph. D., 1900—
 WALDO GIFFORD LELAND, A. M., 1908—

TREASURER:

CLARENCE WINTHROP BOWEN, Ph. D., 1884—

CURATOR:

A. HOWARD CLARK, A. M., 1889—

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

WILLIAM BABCOCK WEEDEN, A. M., 1884-1886.
 †CHARLES DEANE, LL. D., 1884-1887.
 †MOSES COIT TYLER, L. H. D., LL. D., 1884-1885.
 EPHRAIM EMERTON, Ph. D., 1884-1885.
 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., 1887-1888.
 JOHN W. BURGESS, Ph. D., 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, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., 1891-1894.
 GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, Ph. D., Litt. D., 1891-1897; 1898-1901.
 THEODORE ROOSEVELT, A. B., LL. D., 1894-1895.
 †JABEZ LAMAR MONROE CURRY, LL. D., 1894-1895.
 HENRY MORSE STEPHENS A. M., 1895-1899.
 FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1895-1899; 1901-1904.
 EDWARD MINER GALLAUDET, Ph. D., LL. D., 1896-1897.
 †MELVILLE WESTON FULLER, LL. D., 1897-1900.
 ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Ph. D., LL. D., Litt. D., 1897-1900.
 ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, LL. B., 1898-1901; 1903-1906.
 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, Ph. D., LL. D., 1900-1903.
 HERBERT PUTNAM, Litt. D., LL. D., 1901-1904.
 GEORGE L. BURR, LL. D., 1902-1905.
 EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, A. M., 1902-1905.
 †EDWARD G. BOURNE, Ph. D., 1903-1906.
 †GEORGE P. GARRISON, Ph. D., 1904-1907.
 REUBEN G. THWAITES, LL. D., 1904-1907.
 CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Ph. D., L. H. D., 1905-1908.
 JAMES H. ROBINSON, Ph. D., 1905-1908.
 WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD, A. M., 1906-1909.
 WILLIAM MacDONALD, Ph. D., LL. D., 1906-1909.
 MAX FARRAND, Ph. D., 1907-1910.
 FRANK HEYWOOD HODDER, Ph. M., 1907-1910.
 EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, Ph. D., 1908—
 CHARLES HENRY HULL, Ph. D., 1908—
 FRANKLIN LAFAYETTE RILEY, A. M., Ph. D., 1911—
 EDWIN ERLE SPARKS, Ph. D., LL. D., 1911—
 JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN, Ph. D., LL. D., 1911—
 FRED MORROW FLING, Ph. D., 1911—

COMMITTEES—1911.

Committee on program for the twenty-sixth annual meeting.—Prof. Charles H. Hull, Ithaca, N. Y., chairman; William E. Dodd, William S. Ferguson, Jesse S. Reeves, Ferdinand Schevill, George M. Wrong.

Local committee of arrangements for that meeting.—Henry W. Hill, chairman; S. B. Botsford, Willis O. Chapin, William A. Douglas, William H. Gratwick, E. S. Hawley, Edmund Hayes, Charles H. Hull, Harry D. Kirkover, jr., S. N. McWilliams, Frank H. Severance, Carleton Sprague, Morris S. Tremaine.

Editors of the American Historical Review.—Prof. George B. Adams, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., chairman; George L. Burr, J. Franklin Jameson, Andrew C. McLaughlin, William M. Sloane, Frederick J. Turner.

Historical manuscripts commission.—Worthington C. Ford, Esq., Massachusetts Historical Society, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Julian P. Bretz, Herbert D. Foster, Ulrich B. Phillips, Frederick G. Young.

Committee on the Justin Winsor prize.—Prof. Claude H. Van Tyne, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., chairman; Carl Becker, Francis A. Christie, John H. Latané, William MacDonald.

Public archives commission.—Prof. Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Robert D. W. Connor, Gaillard Hunt, Victor H. Paltsits, Dunbar Rowland, Jonas Viles.

Committee on bibliography.—Prof. Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; W. Dawson Johnston, Frederick J. Teggart, George P. Winship.

Committee on publications.—Prof. William A. Dunning, Columbia University, chairman; and (ex officio) Herman V. Ames, George L. Burr, Worthington C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, Waldo G. Leland, Ernest C. Richardson, Claude H. Van Tyne.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—Prof. George L. Burr, Cornell University, chairman; Guy S. Ford, Edwin F. Gay, Charles D. Hazen, James W. Thompson.

General committee.—Prof. St. George L. Sioussat, Vanderbilt University, chairman; Walter L. Fleming, Albert E. McKinley, Clarence S. Paine, Frederic L. Paxson, Lucy M. Salmon, and (ex officio) Waldo G. Leland and Henry W. Edwards.

Committee on a bibliography of modern English history.—Prof. Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Ernest C. Richardson, Williston Walker.

Committee to study and report to the council upon the certification of high-school teachers of history.—Prof. Dana C. Munro, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Kendric C. Babcock, Charles E. Chadsey, Edgar Dawson, Robert A. Maurer.

Conference of State and local historical societies.—Prof. Isaac J. Cox, University of Cincinnati, chairman; Waldo G. Leland, secretary.

ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES.

The American Historical Association was organized at Saratoga, N. Y., on September 10, 1884, with an enrollment of 40 members, and incorporated by act of Congress of January 4, 1889.

Any person approved by the executive council may become a member. Applications for membership and nominations (by persons already members) of new members should be addressed to the secretary, 500 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

The annual dues are fixed at \$3, payable on September 1 for the ensuing year. Life membership, with exemption from annual dues, may be secured upon payment of \$50.

The publications regularly distributed to members are the American Historical Review, the Annual Report, and the Handbook. The first of these is published quarterly (October, January, April, July) under the direction of a board of editors elected by the executive council. Each number contains 200 or more pages and is composed of articles, documents, reviews of books, and notes and news. The Annual Report, printed by order of Congress, is in one or two volumes and contains the proceedings of the annual meetings, the annual bibliography of writings on American history, the report of the public archives commission with its appendices, consisting of inventories, catalogues, etc., of materials in State and other archives, and collections of documents edited by the historical manuscripts commission. The Handbook, containing the names, addresses, and professional positions of members, is published biennially. Back numbers of the American Historical Review may be obtained from the Macmillan Co., of New York. Copies of the annual reports of past years, or of separates of articles or publications appearing therein, may be obtained, so far as available, from the secretary of the association.

The prize essays of the association are published in a separate series, one volume appearing each year, and are supplied to members for \$1 each, to non-members for \$1.50.

The Study of History in Elementary Schools, being the report of the committee of eight (1909), is published by Charles Scribner's Sons of New York, at 50 cents.

The Study of History in Secondary Schools, being the report of the committee of seven (1899), is published by the Macmillan Co., of New York, at 50 cents. A further report (1911) has lately been published by the same firm, at the same price, on the same subject, by the committee of five.

Original Narratives of Early American History is a series of reprints edited for the association by J. F. Jameson and published by Charles Scribner's Sons of New York, at \$3 a volume.

The annual meetings of the association are held during the period December 27-31, in various cities. At these meetings are sessions with formal papers, sessions partaking of the nature of round-table conferences, and conferences of archivists and of historical societies. Annual meetings of other associations, the interests of which are allied to those of the American Historical Association, are generally held at the same time and place.

Committees on archives, on historical manuscripts, on bibliography, on various phases of history teaching, on historical sites and monuments, as well as other committees appointed from time to time for special purposes, carry on the activities of the association throughout the year.

HISTORICAL PRIZES.

The Justin Winsor prize committee.—Claude H. Van Tyne (chairman), University of Michigan; Carl L. Becker, University of Kansas; Francis A. Christie, Meadville (Pa.) Theological School; John H. Latané, Washington and Lee University; William MacDonald, Brown University.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize committee.—George L. Burr (chairman), Cornell University; Guy S. Ford, University of Illinois; Edwin F. Gay, Harvard University; Charles D. Hazen, Smith College; James W. Thompson, University of Chicago.

For the encouragement of historical research the American Historical Association offers two prizes, each of \$200—the Justin Winsor prize in American history and the Herbert Baxter Adams prize in European history. Each is awarded biennially (the Winsor prize in the even years and the Adams prize in the odd years) for the best unpublished monograph submitted to the committee of award on or before July 1 of the

given year—e. g., by July 1, 1911 [but in 1911 essays may be submitted until October 1], for the Adams prize in European history, and by July 1, 1912, for the Winsor prize in American history. The conditions of award are as follows:

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

II. *A. For the Justin Winsor prize.*—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 1783, of other territories, continental or insular, which have since been acquired by the United States, of the United States, and of independent Latin America. 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.

B. For the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.—The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigations in European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental, insular, or colonial, excluding continental French America and British America before 1783. 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. The monograph should not exceed 100,000 words in length. The manuscript should be typewritten, and must be neat, correct, and in form ready for the printer.¹

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. Galley and page proofs will be sent to the author for revision; but, should changes be made by him exceeding in cost an aggregate of 10 cents per page of the completed book, such excess shall be borne by him and the amount will be deducted from the prize.

IX. The prize, together with 10 bound copies of the printed volume, will be sent to the author after the publication of the book. Further copies, not to exceed 25, he shall be entitled to purchase at the reduced price (\$1) at which a copy is furnished

¹In the typewriting of essays competitors are urged to use a strong, rather heavy paper, to have text and notes alike double spaced, to number the notes consecutively for each chapter, and to insert each note in the text immediately after the line in which its index number occurs, separating the note from the text by lines above and below extending across the page. Care should be taken to make clear and consistent the abbreviations of the titles of the works cited.

to each subscribing member of the Association. Should he further desire unbound copies, not for sale, the committee will endeavor to furnish them to him at cost.

Address all correspondence relative to the Justin Winsor prize to Prof. Claude H. Van Tyne, Ann Arbor, Mich., and all correspondence relative to the Herbert Baxter Adams prize to Prof. George Lincoln Burr, Ithaca, N. Y.

The Justin Winsor prize (which until 1906 was offered annually) has been awarded to the following:

1896. Herman V. Ames, "The proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States."

1900. William A. Schaper, "Sectionalism and representation in South Carolina," with honorable mention of Mary S. Locke, "Antislavery sentiment before 1808."

1901. Ulrich B. Phillips, "Georgia and State rights," with honorable mention of M. Louise Greene, "The struggle for religious liberty in Connecticut."

1902. Charles McCarthy, "The Anti-Masonic party," with honorable mention of W. Roy Smith, "South Carolina as a Royal Province."

1903. Louise Phelps Kellogg, "The American colonial charter: a study of its relation to English administration, chiefly after 1688."

1904. William R. Manning, "The Nootka Sound controversy," with honorable mention of C. O. Paullin, "The Navy of the American Revolution."

1906. Annie Heloise Abel, "The history of events resulting in Indian consolidation west of the Mississippi River."

1908. Clarence Edwin Carter, "Great Britain and the Illinois country, 1765-1774," with honorable mention of Charles Henry Ambler, "Sectionalism in Virginia, 1776-1861."

1910. Edward Raymond Turner, "The Negro in Pennsylvania—slavery, servitude, and freedom, 1639-1861."

From 1897 to 1899 and in 1905 the Justin Winsor prize was not awarded.

The Herbert Baxter Adams prize has been awarded to—

1905. David S. Muzzey, "The spiritual Franciscans," with honorable mention of Eloise Ellery, "Jean Pierre Brissot."

1907. In equal division, Edward B. Krehbiel, "The interdict, its history and its operation, with especial attention to the time of Pope Innocent III," and William S. Robertson, "Francisco de Miranda and the revolutionizing of Spanish America."

1909. Wallace Notestein, "A history of English witchcraft, 1558-1718."

I. REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL
MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

INDIANAPOLIS, DECEMBER 27-30, 1910.

By WALDO G. LELAND,
Secretary

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.¹

By WALDO G. LELAND, *Secretary*.

Indianapolis is not a great university center, though it has a good suburban college and excellent schools. Though a pleasant and hospitable city, it has not much distinguished architecture nor many impressive "sights." It presented little to divert the mind of the historical student from the sessions and the company of his colleagues, nor was that mind distracted (while enlarged) by the simultaneous meetings of non-historical societies. On the other hand, Indianapolis is a railroad center conveniently reached from a great region abounding in members of the historical fraternity, and the hotel chosen as headquarters was so well arranged as to give every opportunity both for sessions and for sociability. Accordingly, the number of members registered was unusually large, 290, and by general agreement the convention was more than usually successful. The presence of large numbers of the younger men and women was especially observed. The credit for all this success belongs primarily to the committee on local arrangements, of which Mr. Calvin Kendall was chairman and Prof. Christopher B. Coleman, of Butler College, secretary, and to the committee on the program, Prof. Evarts B. Greene, of the University of Illinois, chairman.

It must be noted, as a further mark of the success of the meeting, that nearly all the practical conferences of workers in special fields were attended by increased numbers and characterized by interesting proceedings and in some cases valuable permanent results.

The economists and the students of political science held their meeting this year in St. Louis. The allied societies which met with the American Historical Association were bodies whose interest is likewise in history—the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Ohio Valley Historical Association, and the North Central History Teachers' Association. Sessions of these bodies preceded that of the national organization. Tuesday evening, December 27, was occupied with a joint session of the first two. A business meeting on the afternoon preceding had been devoted mainly to a discussion

¹ This report is substantially that which appeared in the *American Historical Review* for April, 1911.

of propositions for their union. For the present the view that the Ohio Valley Historical Association had a distinct sphere of usefulness in which it could not be wholly replaced by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association so far prevailed that further consideration of the proposed union was postponed for a year.

In the joint session held in the evening Prof. Orin G. Libby, of the University of North Dakota, read a paper entitled "New Light on the explorations of the Verendrye." He placed the Verendrye family—father and sons—in a class with La Salle and with Lewis and Clark in respect to the wide sweep of their explorations in the regions about the upper valley of the Missouri River, extending as far west as the Rocky Mountains, and he discussed the elder Verendrye's discovery of various tribes of Indians unknown to the world before his explorations.¹ Prof. Clarence W. Alvord, of the University of Illinois, followed Prof. Libby with a description of Verendrye's discovery of the tribes of Indians about Lake Winnipeg.

Prof. Isaac J. Cox, of the University of Cincinnati, read the second paper of the session, on the American intervention in West Florida.² Although Mr. Henry Adams, Mr. Fuller, and Admiral Chadwick have depicted the diplomatic controversies in which West Florida was involved and Prof. McMaster has given something of a picture of local affairs in that district preceding the revolt of its inhabitants and the American intervention, yet in all accounts so far, Mr. Cox maintained, the diplomacy in Europe and in Washington and the local events in West Florida appear as distinct movements lacking in visible purpose and connection. He put forward, as the connecting link joining the two and completing the picture of American intervention, the correspondence of Gov. Claiborne of Orleans Territory and Gov. Holmes of Mississippi Territory, the former giving the best notion of those various frontier movements which rendered the absorption of the territory by the United States inevitable, the latter giving the inner history of the transactions leading immediately to American intervention. With the aid of these sources, essential yet not heretofore extensively used in any account of the episode, and with other documentary material, Mr. Cox described the movements of 1810 and 1811 which ended in the occupation of the Baton Rouge district by Gov. Claiborne assisted by Gov. Holmes. The emphasis was placed upon the position of Gov. Holmes, his attitude toward events occurring in West Florida, his relations with the leaders in these events, his reports to the American Government, and his precautions toward insuring the tranquillity of the Mississippi Territory and toward giving moral support to the West Florida insurgents. The later attitude of the United States, in the executive, legislative, and judi-

¹ Prof. Libby's paper will be printed in the Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

² Mr. Cox's paper is printed in the American Historical Review for January, 1912.

cial departments of its Government, with respect to justification of the movement, was also delineated.

In discussing the paper Prof. Frederic A. Ogg, of Simmons College, raised the question whether the administration of President Madison had not been censured with too much severity by reason of its actions with regard to West Florida in 1810 and 1811. Abandoning the ground that West Florida was rightfully a part of the Louisiana purchase he dwelt upon the hopeless decay of Spanish authority in the district, upon the influx between 1800 and 1810 of an American population which by the latter date dominated the district, upon the fact that if there were to be any change of status annexation to the United States was the solution most expedient for all concerned, and upon the reality of the reasons for apprehension lest West Florida be acquired by France or by Great Britain. Dr. Dunbar Rowland, director of the Department of Archives and History in Mississippi, speaking upon the basis of materials in the archives of that State, defended the action of the United States on similar grounds.¹

Prof. Archer B. Hulbert, of Marietta College, in a paper entitled "A century of steamboat navigation on the Ohio," set forth with emphasis the developments in industrial and social history which had flowed from the launching of the *Orleans* at Pittsburgh in March, 1811, the first steamboat to be operated upon the Ohio River, and argued for a worthy celebration next spring of the centennial anniversary of so great an event. He proposed mechanical, economic, and historical features of the celebration, and the enlisting of various public bodies in cooperative endeavor toward a fitting commemoration.

Prof. R. B. Way, of Indiana University, in discussion of the paper, enlarged upon the wide range of historical investigation which such a centennial should evoke and urged that the general history of transportation in the Mississippi Valley, the history of westward migration before and during the period of the steamboat, the development of corporations, the contests for trade, and many other aspects of the life of the West should be extensively treated in connection with the celebration.

At a meeting of the executive committee of the Ohio Valley Historical Association definite action was taken assuring a celebration at Pittsburgh and elsewhere in the latter part of September, 1911. The Fulton-Livingston steamboat *Orleans*, launched at Pittsburgh in March, 1811, made a trip to New Orleans in the following September under command of Capt. N. J. Roosevelt, a grand uncle of Col. Theodore Roosevelt. A Pittsburgh committee will reproduce the steam-

¹ The papers of Prof. Ogg and Dr. Rowland and that of Prof. Hulbert, which followed, will be printed in the Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

boat, with the intention that it shall repeat the voyage made by the original boat, halting at the places where it visited, and giving opportunity for various historical exercises, beginning with suitable addresses at Pittsburgh itself.

The Wednesday morning was occupied with a session devoted to the teaching of history and civics, held chiefly under the auspices of the North Central History Teachers' Association and with Prof. James A. Woodburn, of Indiana University, as chairman. Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor in Vassar College, spoke on the evolution of the teacher, urging as the main suggestion that the teacher must be a producer in order to prevent arrest of his own development, to be able to train his pupils to produce, and to do his duty toward his profession and toward future times. Therefore, educational authorities should encourage productivity by providing for the sabbatical year, by establishing fellowships for research open to the teachers of the community, and by encouraging teachers to avail themselves of fellowships offered by universities, while the teacher must do his part to create an intelligent public opinion in respect to these things.¹

Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Chicago, speaking upon the question, Is government teachable in the schools? advised especially that civil government should be made concrete to the student's mind, commented on the lack of appliances and illustrative material which now impoverishes the teaching on the subject, and discussed the question whether certain important features of civil government—the influence of personal forces, including the boss, the actual methods of political parties, the darker side of our political life—could be instructively taught without implanting discouraging views in the pupil's minds. He believed that civil government and history should be taught together.

Mr. Arthur W. Dunn, civic secretary of the City Club of Philadelphia, spoke upon local history and the city community as means for the teaching of civics, laying emphasis upon the superior appeal which interest in the local community might make to the youthful mind, and the opportunity thus afforded for developing citizenship of good quality. Mr. Frank P. Goodwin, of the Woodward High School, in Cincinnati, showed how the Cincinnati public schools were using the local history of Cincinnati and the Ohio Valley as part of the regular course in American history, making more concrete the course of the national development and giving a broader significance to that of the local growth.² Miss Flora Swan, of Indianapolis, with a class from the eighth grade in one of the Indianapolis public schools, illustrated methods by conducting publicly a class in civics.

¹ This paper will be printed by the North Central History Teacher's Association.

² These two papers were printed in the History Teacher's Magazine for March, 1911. The February number of that magazine contained an excellent account of the whole meeting.

The proceedings peculiar to the American Historical Association proper began with a group of conferences held on Wednesday afternoon—a conference in ancient history, another in modern European history, another in American diplomatic history with special reference to Latin-American relations, and the fourth the usual annual conference of historical societies. These conferences, according to a procedure now settled as inevitable, were held simultaneously. That on ancient history was attended by about 100 persons. Noteworthy among the facts encouraging to the teacher of ancient history which were brought forward in the opening address by the chairman of the conference, Mr. Henry B. Wright, of Yale University, was the statement that out of 283 colleges and universities replying to a questionnaire, only 39 responded that ancient history was not taught at all within their walls, 81 that it was taught by the departments of philology (which 10 years ago nearly monopolized it), while in 163 ancient history is now taught by members of the historical department. A helpful feature of the procedure of this conference was that printed outlines of the papers read were provided for those attending.

The first paper, by Prof. Robert W. Rogers, of Drew Theological Seminary, dealt with the western campaigns of Sennacherib, using as sources the inscriptions of that monarch and especially the so-called Taylor cylinder, the newly published fragmentary text of Scheil and Ungnad, and the Biblical sources, and arguing that these authorities sustain best the theory of two western campaigns rather than one.

After a paper by Prof. Henry A. Sill, of Cornell University, entitled "Niebuhr, 1810-1910," written apropos of the one hundredth anniversary of Niebuhr's appointment as professor at Berlin, Prof. R. F. Scholz, of the University of California, discoursed on some aspects of Roman imperialism. The aspects to which he adverted were chiefly the spread of the municipal system in Italy and in the provinces, with the evolution of a uniform municipal type (the *decurionate*) and of municipal law, and on the other hand the growth of the great estates and the feudalization of Italy and of the provinces. The relations of the two processes to each other and to the spread of Roman citizenship and the edict of Caracalla were traced.

Finally, in a paper on the Monument of Ancyra,¹ Prof. W. L. Westermann, of Wisconsin, attempted to define the political motive lying behind the form and manner of publication of the *Res Gestæ* of Augustus. He approached the problem through internal evidence, such as that of the significant omission of certain names and the partial avoidance of the term "*respublica*," and through such external evidences as are afforded by our knowledge of the weakness of the

¹ Printed in the *American Historical Review* for October, 1911.

succession to the principate, the unpopularity of Tiberius, and the use made of the document by publication after the death of Augustus. He thought it might safely be said that the endeavor to secure inheritance of the power in the family of Augustus was at least one motive which played a part in the composition and publication of the document. The paper was discussed by Messrs. Scholz, Sill, and Wright in the light of Kornemann's theories.

In the conference on modern European history, over which Prof. Guy S. Ford, of Illinois, presided, the general topic was European history as a field for American historical work. The discussion was opened with a paper by Prof. Charles M. Andrews, of Yale, on the doctor's dissertation in European history.¹ The paper dealt with some of the advantages and disadvantages which accompany the efforts of American students in handling subjects for doctoral dissertations selected from that field. The manifest advantages concerned the professional and intellectual expansion of the individual; the disadvantages, the difficulties of distance, expense, and similar practical considerations, and, above all, of language and of unfamiliarity with the traditions and temperament of another people. The want of adequate guides and seminaries was pointed out and the greater complexity of the subject was considered at length. The speaker discussed the differences that exist between the materials and methods for modern as contrasted with medieval history and the nature of the qualifications demanded of the student specializing in the modern field. He endeavored to ascertain the causes for the greater complexity of the documentary material for modern history, discussing their nature, their whereabouts whether in print or in manuscript, and the conditions under which documents in archive depositories are to be used. Attention was called to the growing importance of a knowledge of archives and of archive regulations in the countries of Europe and to some of the differences prevailing in the theory and practice adopted. In conclusion, Mr. Andrews said that "to the student able and equipped to invade the archives of another country than his own the advantages to himself and to his profession are so marked and the results likely to be so fruitful that it is eminently desirable for the graduate departments of our American universities to encourage such invasion whenever and wherever it is possible to do so."

In discussing Prof. Andrews's paper, the *pièce de résistance* of the conference, Prof. Archibald C. Coolidge, of Harvard, after admitting and to some extent dwelling upon some of the linguistic and pecuniary difficulties that beset the student of modern European history, and the need of more laborious preparation for tasks in that field, showed that on the other hand there were compensations, and that

¹ Printed in the April, 1911, number of the History Teacher's Magazine.

the very difficulties to be encountered were of a nature to stimulate the more ambitious mind. It should also be remembered that America owes something to the cause of general historical scholarship and that it is highly desirable that a certain proportion of the work in European history should be done by Americans. Prof. John M. Vincent, of the Johns Hopkins University, while likewise admitting the difficulties which had been set forth, called attention to the considerable number of fields of research in which printed materials abound and in which therefore some of the difficulties are reduced. Prof. James W. Thompson, of the University of Chicago, while agreeing in the main with Prof. Andrews's conclusions, took issue with him as to the relative value of medieval and modern history, expressing some doubt as to whether modern history required greater ability to combine and construct, and held that training in critical work in the medieval field might develop properly the young mind for work in modern history. He suggested a number of open fields for historical investigation, and expressed the belief that the immediate future would see much greater attention paid to topics in the psychological interpretation of history. Prof. Fred M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska, agreeing that American scholars must of necessity engage in research work in modern European history, laid emphasis upon the need of beginning their critical training in their undergraduate years by intensive work in the original sources. Prof. Frank M. Anderson, of the University of Minnesota, suggested that much of the difficulty incident to the thesis in modern history could be lessened by selecting subjects which ran into both American and European history, and expressed the hope that American universities might some time so arrange that there should be each year in Paris an American professor of modern history somewhat familiar with the archives of that city, who might assist American students occupied with researches there.

In order to secure continuity in the work of the modern history conference a committee was appointed, consisting of Profs. Vincent and Thompson, to consider the matter and to confer with a similar committee to be appointed by the conference in medieval history.

The third conference, that on American diplomatic history, was presided over by Prof. James A. James, of Northwestern University. The opening paper, by Prof. Joseph Schafer, of the University of Oregon, was on George Canning's policy respecting the Oregon boundary question.¹ Upon the basis of correspondence preserved in the archives of our Department of State, Prof. James M. Callahan, of the University of West Virginia, displayed the Mexican policy of southern leaders on the eve of the Civil War.² James Gadsden,

¹ An expanded form of this paper was printed in the *American Historical Review* for January, 1911.

² The full text of this paper will be found in the present volume, pp. 133-151.

before his negotiations for territory were completed in 1853, was sent confidential instructions authorizing him to purchase Lower California and the entire region beyond the Rio Grande to the watershed and to 32° north latitude on the Gulf of California. Negotiations were renewed under President Buchanan through John Forsyth and Robert M. McLane for the acquisition of additional territory in this region, an acquisition which under the influence of southern leaders was regarded as the most satisfactory solution of the Mexican problem short of an American protectorate. Unsuccessful in this effort, the administration set itself to secure concessions as to transit across Mexico and as to direct intervention for enforcing treaty stipulations. The treaty which was finally signed on this basis was delayed in the Senate, and finally the secession movement and the beginning of the Civil War made its ratification impossible, taking from the Senate almost all the members who had voted for it.

In remarks upon trade and diplomacy between the United States and Latin America, Mr. Joseph H. Sears, of New York City, described the lack of facilities for transportation and banking, the indifference of North Americans to Latin-American customs of trade and life, and the manner in which similar ignorance has hindered success in diplomatic relations. Mr. Albert Hale, of the Pan-American Union, followed along similar lines, but thought the situation improving, and called attention to the interesting field of historical research which certain phases of Latin America presented. Dr. Don E. Smith, of the University of California, suggested a school or institute of Latin-American historical studies in Mexico, analogous to the American schools in Athens and Rome. Other university teachers described the development of diplomatic history in their curricula. A committee was appointed to arrange, if practicable, for a similar conference at the next meeting of the association.

The fourth of the conferences, that of historical societies, on Wednesday afternoon, presided over by Mr. Clarence M. Burton, of Detroit, was attended by about 40 persons, representing nearly that number of organizations.¹ Dr. Dunbar Rowland reported on behalf of the committee on cooperation among historical societies and departments respecting the preparation of a calendar of the documents in the French archives concerning the Mississippi Valley, active work on which was commenced in November, 1909, and which, it is expected, may be ready for print before the end of the year 1912. Mr. F. A. Sampson, of the Missouri State Historical Society, spoke on publicity as a means of adding to collections, describing the modes by which societies or departments might bring home to the public a better knowledge of what should be brought into historical collections and a warmer interest in supplying them with the things which

¹ A full report of the proceedings of this conference is printed in the present volume, pp. 243-266.

it is their function to preserve. Prof. Clarence W. Alvord, of Illinois, treated of the preservation and care of collections, occupying his remarks mainly with the processes of restoration and treatment of manuscripts, and illustrating those processes by the exhibition of examples.

The first general session of the association took place on Wednesday evening. It was opened by an address of welcome on behalf of the community, by the Governor of Indiana, Hon. Thomas R. Marshall. The presidential address which followed, was on social forces in American history,¹ by Prof. Frederick J. Turner, of Harvard University, who dealt, as only a devoted and accomplished student of western history could do, with the new light cast on our whole history by the extraordinary developments of the last 20 years, and with the new duties which this imposes on the historian.

Appropriately to the fiftieth anniversary of the winter of secession, a large place was given in the public sessions of the association to the political events of 1860-61, Thursday morning's session being occupied with affairs at the North, Friday's at the South. The former series was opened by Prof. Carl R. Fish, of the University of Wisconsin, with a paper on the decision of the Ohio Valley,² the purpose of which was, first, to show the essential unity of that valley in 1860 and the necessity that the whole valley should come to the same decision in the division of the country; and, secondly, to show that its voice was necessarily given in favor of the unity of the whole country.

In a paper on the Dred Scott decision,³ more particularly on the declaration that the eighth section of the Missouri compromise act was unconstitutional, Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton, declared his persuasion that the usual historical verdict with reference to that announcement needs revision on two points: First, as to its being obiter dictum, and secondly, as to its basis.

Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin, of the University of Chicago, read a paper on the doctrine of State sovereignty and secession. It showed the necessary basis of that doctrine to be the assertion that the States were separate sovereignties before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and that they adopted the Constitution separately. The doctrine does not rely to any great extent on any expressed intention of the men of 1788 to retain the States in undiminished sovereignty or on any such conscious purpose, for there is practically no contemporaneous testimony or evidence that the men who adopted the Constitution believed that the States remained sovereign and could secede at will. The theory rests upon the meta-

¹ Printed in the American Historical Review for January, 1911.

² Printed below in the present volume, pp.153-164.

³ Printed in the American Historical Review for October, 1911.

physical supposition that if the States acted separately, their action did not result in the establishment of unity or a government with power of compulsion over them. The Virginia and Kentucky resolutions were based on the principles of the American Revolution, not on those of the war of secession. The paper also called attention to the struggles in the early part of the nineteenth century concerning the right of the central government to judge of its own powers. The question of this right, rather than of any clear-cut doctrine of State sovereignty and secession, was the question under discussion in the first quarter of the century. After a consideration of the theories of Judge Roane, John Taylor, and others of the South, the paper ended with a consideration of the pivotal points in the arguments of Calhoun.

The morning session was concluded with a paper by Judge Daniel W. Howe, of the Indiana Historical Society, respecting the development of war spirit in the North, in which he described, with vividness and warmth derived from personal remembrance, the events of secession, the varying opinions prevalent in the closing months of 1860, the peace measures of Congress, the discussions respecting the Charleston forts, the vacillations of Buchanan, the hesitancy during the first month of Lincoln's administration, the bombardment of Fort Sumter, the call to arms, and the immediate and impressive response.

As on the previous day the afternoon was given up to conferences—a conference on medieval history, presided over by Prof. Earle W. Dow, of the University of Michigan; a conference of archivists, presided over by Prof. Herman V. Ames, of the University of Pennsylvania, chairman of the public archives commission; and a conference of teachers of history in teachers' colleges and normal schools, of which the chairman was Prof. Albert H. Sanford, of the State Normal School at La Crosse, Wis.

The first of these was in practice almost confined to the medieval history of England. A paper on royal purveyance in England during the fourteenth century,¹ by Prof. Chalfant Robinson, of Yale, rested mainly upon the *Speculum Regis* of Simon Islip, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, a document consisting of a series of remonstrances addressed to Edward III, in whose reign the abuses of purveyance were peculiarly burdensome. Taken in conjunction with the great statute of 36 Edward III, on purveyance, this document furnishes a comprehensive picture of the wrongs suffered by humble Englishmen from the action of the King's officers. The *Speculum Regis*, compiled in 1337 and 1345, furnishes graphic pictures of what happened in specific instances of the exercise of royal purveyance.

¹ Printed in the present volume, pp. 89-90.

The only other formal paper read in this conference was one by Prof. James F. Baldwin, of Vassar College, on the records of the privy seal,¹ his endeavor being to show how the wide scope of operations under the privy seal made the miscellaneous records of its office useful for a multitude of topics in English medieval history. He dwelt specifically upon the warrants of the treasurer and chancellor; upon the letters and writs not destined for the great seal; upon the wardrobe and its diplomatic functions; and upon the various records illustrative of the history of the King's council.

The remainder of the proceedings in this conference was given to a less formal consideration of profitable opportunities for investigation in English medieval history. In opening the discussion Prof. Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania, inquired into what might be done by the use of a sane comparative method, especially as between legislative development in France and England, and several of those who followed him dwelt in one way or another on the same point, Prof. Vincent especially urging work depicting medieval society in motion rather than the exclusive study of the origin and growth of institutions, while Prof. C. H. McIlwain, of Bowdoin College, pleaded for more attention to the study of historical jurisprudence and of legal ideas.

The conference of archivists, held now for the second time, distinctly justified its existence.² Very appropriately it was opened by an account of the International Conference of Archivists held at Brussels last August, at which the American Historical Association was represented by four delegates. The narrative was prepared by one of these, Mr. A. J. F. van Laer, of Albany, who set forth fully and clearly the discussions and results of the congress. The progress in the acquisition of modern administrative records, the development of archives for economic history, and the improvements in the training of archive officials, were well brought out. Among the resolutions voted at Brussels the one most important for American archivists was that which declared emphatically the general European opinion that the arrangement of papers in archives should respect the *principe de provenance*, keeping original deposits together and basing classification strictly on the organic relations between the offices from which the documents were derived.

In a paper on the concentration of State and National archives, Dr. Dunbar Rowland, of Mississippi, endeavored to apply the lessons of European experience and of the historical use of archives to the problem of bringing better order and system into the management of American archives, now frequently chaotic in respect to collocation, administration, and classification. He advocated concentration

¹ Printed in the present volume, pp. 83-88.

² The proceedings of this conference are printed in full in the present volume, pp. 279-314.

into State archives, furnished with adequate buildings, and uniform State care. Mr. Gaillard Hunt, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, speaking with respect to the archives of our National Government, dwelt especially upon the need of a proper national archive building in Washington, and gave a rapid survey of the best points in the archive repositories of Europe, with a view to showing what such a building should be, in order to serve at the same time the needs of Government business, which must of necessity come first, and the purposes of the historical student.

Further remarks in this conference were made by Prof. Frederic L. Paxson, of the University of Wisconsin, on the practice of the English and other archives with respect to the fixing of the dividing date between papers which may be examined and those which for governmental reasons are withheld; by Mr. Dan E. Clark, of Iowa, on the progress of legislation respecting archives in that State and the administration of the present excellent system; by Prof. Eugene C. Barker, of the University of Texas, on the recent law in that State organizing the Library and Historical Commission; by Prof. Harlow Lindley, of Earlham College, on the question what materials should go into the archives of the State; by Mr. R. D. W. Connor, of the North Carolina Historical Commission, on its work; by Mr. Demarchus C. Brown, on the efforts now making in Indiana; by Mr. Asa C. Tilton, of the Connecticut State Library, on the relations between State archives and State libraries; by Prof. Justin H. Smith, who spoke with reference to the needs and interests of the private investigator; and by Mr. J. F. Jameson, on the movement in Washington for a proper national archive building and the work of the association's committee on that subject.

The last of the conferences of this afternoon, that of teachers of history in teachers' colleges and normal schools, was occupied with the question of the preparation which teachers of history in schools should be required to have. Prof. Edgar Dawson, of the Normal College in New York City, contrasted the preparative work expected in France and Germany of teachers of history in secondary schools—including university work at least equal to that required for the doctor's degree—with the much lower standards of eligibility for high-school teachers of history in America, and warmly commended the California requirement of a year of graduate residence at a university and a recommendation from the university department in which the candidate has studied. Prof. Thomas N. Hoover, of the State Normal College of the Ohio University, described systematically the defects in the present teaching and the ways in which these might be remedied by better academic education followed by

superior professional training.¹ Prof. Frank S. Bogardus, of the Indiana State Normal School at Terre Haute, believed that the path of success in any endeavor after improvement lay in cooperation with the general movement toward improving the qualifications of secondary school teachers of all sorts, and dwelt, as did Prof. Harold W. Foght, of the Missouri State Normal School at Kirksville, on the proper proportions between the requirements in respect to academic training (substantially a college degree) and the requirements in respect to professional or pedagogical training.

Miss Sarah M. Riggs, of the Iowa State Teachers' College at Cedar Falls, read the concluding paper of this conference, on the preparation necessary for the teaching of history in the grades, describing the course which schools aiming to prepare teachers of history should provide, not only in history but in allied subjects, such as geography and economics, and in psychology, with special reference to the development of the mind of the child.² The discussion of these papers made evident an earnest and general conviction that we should have in America far better preparation than hitherto for the work of teaching history in schools. A committee—Prof. Edward C. Page, Miss Julia A. King, and Prof. Henry Johnson—was appointed with reference to provision for similar conferences at subsequent meetings.

A general session devoted to papers in European history was held on Thursday evening. Five papers were read. The first, by Prof. Laurence M. Larson, of the University of Illinois, was on the efforts of the Danish Kings to recover the English Crown after the death of Harthacnut.³ The speaker believed that it was Cnut's intention to leave the empire to Harthacnut. This arrangement was disturbed by the failure of direct heirs, and by revolutionary movements in Norway, leading to intermittent warfare between Norway and Denmark lasting for more than two decades. The Danish attempts at invasion in 1069, 1075, and 1085 were discussed with especial reference to the causes that brought failure—in the first instance the breakdown of Sweyn's ambitious plan of reducing Norway, in the second the lack of cooperation on the part of the English, who remembered the devastation of the Vale of York, and in the third the renewal of war on Cnut's Saxon frontier immediately after the death of Gregory VII. The Domesday survey may have been in part a result of financial difficulties brought on by William's elaborate preparations to meet the threatened invasion; but it can hardly be true that the Salisbury oath was the outcome of this danger.

¹ The papers of Profs. Dawson and Hoover may be found in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for May, 1911.

² See *ibid.*

³ Printed in the present volume, pp. 69-81.

Dr. Roland G. Usher contributed some critical notes on the works of S. R. Gardiner.¹ As his readers are well aware, Dr. Gardiner leaves them to infer his views of the character and of the general development of the story from brief remarks interjected from time to time into the narrative. An attempt to elaborate from these fragments a connected and clear statement of Gardiner's conceptions concerning the characters of Charles, Laud, Pym, Strafford, and Cromwell, and concerning his conception of the English constitution, and the sense in which he used the word "nation," had seemed to Dr. Usher to lay bare grave inconsistencies of language and even of thought, which he proceeded to discuss in detail.

Upon the basis of extensive researches in both the English and Dutch archives Prof. Ralph C. H. Catterall, of Cornell University, discoursed upon Anglo-Dutch relations, 1654-1660.² During these years, and indeed before and after, these relations center about the attempt of the Dutch to persuade the English to adopt a policy of freedom in regard to commerce and navigation. After the peace of 1654 efforts were made to secure the revocation of the navigation act. Failing in this, the Dutch ambassadors pushed for a marine treaty which should recognize the principle of "free ships, free goods," remove the great abuses attending the exercise of the right of search upon the part of the English, and restrict the definition of contraband goods to objects directly used in waging war. Nieupoort's persistent but skillful endeavors to secure these objects, the counter propositions of the English, and the negotiations, especially during the years 1656 and 1657, were described in detail. Delayed by the constitutional debates in England and suspended as nearly hopeless at the end of 1657, the negotiations were made impossible of renewal by the Dutch blockade of Lisbon in the autumn of the next year, and though Nieupoort persisted, the Restoration found matters in exactly the same state as had existed in 1654.

After this paper Prof. H. Morse Stephens, of the University of California, gave an entertaining informal address upon the historiography of the French Revolution, with special reference to and commendation of the work of Aulard.

The last paper of the evening was read by Prof. Charles D. Hazen, of Smith College, on Alexis de Tocqueville and the Republic of 1848. When the second republic was proclaimed Tocqueville immediately rallied to it, although he had never believed a republic suitable for France. He now considered, however, that it offered the only means of preserving her from anarchy or a dictatorship. He was appointed by the National Assembly a member of the committee to form the constitution, served as minister of foreign affairs under Louis Na-

¹ Printed in the present volume, pp. 123-132.

² Printed in the present volume, pp. 101-121.

poleon from June to October, 1849, and was a member of a committee on the revision of the constitution in 1851. Mr. Hazen described in detail the acts and opinions of Tocqueville respecting the formation of the constitution during the period of his service in the first of these three capacities, and his endeavors in the latter two to preserve the republic by foiling the ambitions of the prince president.

The session of the last morning was, as has been mentioned, devoted to further papers related to the fiftieth anniversary of secession. The formal papers were preceded by a most delightful informal talk on the part of Dr. James B. Angell, president emeritus of the University of Michigan, entitled "Some Recollections of a Horseback Ride through the South in 1850." Starting from Winchester, Va., the route of this expedition passed through Charlottesville, Charlotte, Columbia, Charleston, Augusta, Atlanta, into Florida, with subsequent visits to Montgomery, Mobile, and New Orleans. From a political point of view the matters mainly touched upon were on the one hand the general restiveness and tendency toward secession in that year, and on the other hand the conservatism in respect to such movements which the commercial spirit had inspired in the cities. But the speaker dwelt more largely and most entertainingly upon the social and picturesque features of southern life which in successive places of sojourn impressed the mind of a young northern observer.

Prof. David Y. Thomas, of the University of Arkansas, discussed the lower South in the election of 1860.¹ He showed that the county and State conventions had assumed a radical position, but that among the delegates to them there was a decided preponderance of lawyers and officeholders and very few planters. Upon careful comparison of the election returns, county by county, and the statistics with respect to slavery, Prof. Thomas concluded that the general tendency of the slaveholders, especially those who held many slaves, was to support the conservative Bell, while that of the poorer non-slaveholders was to support the radical Breckinridge. The wealthy slaveholders were almost unanimously agreed upon their rights in the Territories, though they differed as to the expediency of pushing radical demands. The speaker set forth the reasons why the non-slaveholders maintained their alliance with the slaveholders, or continued to follow contentedly their lead.

The second southern paper was that of Prof. William K. Boyd, of Trinity College, on North Carolina on the eve of secession.² Some phases of southern life often lost from sight in discussions of slavery and secession are illustrated by the case of North Carolina. These are, a social system in which the predominant type was the small farmer of moderate means; an economic and political cleavage be-

¹ This paper has been printed in the *Political Science Quarterly* for June, 1911.

² Printed in the present volume, pp. 165-177.

tween the eastern and western counties; a less extensive development of slavery than in the far South, and indeed an attitude in the western counties of protest against domination by the interest of slavery; and, finally, a political opinion in regard to Federal relations strongly affected by the Whig control, which had lasted from 1836 to 1850. From 1850 to 1860 the main struggle was between those who wished to cooperate with the far South in demanding opportunity for slavery in the Territories, and the Whigs and conservative Democrats who opposed that propaganda. The speaker reviewed the other issues of the time, political and personal, and the action of the North Carolina delegates to the Democratic national convention of 1860. An analysis of the votes of that year seemed to him to show that the small majority of Breckinridge was really a rebuke to the radical Democracy, an attitude evidenced again in February, 1861, and maintained until Lincoln's call for troops.

The paper of Prof. William E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, on the fight for the Northwest in 1860,¹ described the struggle of southern leaders to maintain the Democratic hold upon the Northwest, especially upon Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, the contests in the churches between those who were conservative on the subject of slavery and those who were radical, and the effect which immigration, especially into the lands sold by the Illinois Central Railroad, had upon the balance of parties in those States. That of Mr. Armand J. Gerson, of the University of Pennsylvania, on the inception of the Montgomery convention,² began with a consideration of the work of those commissioners whom the seceding States appointed to confer with each other and with other slave States in December, 1860, and January, 1861. The adoption of February 4 as the date of the proposed convention was due to a proposal to that effect agreed upon by the South Carolina commissioners before they departed to their respective destinations. The adoption of Montgomery as the place was due to a suggestion let fall by the South Carolina commissioner to Alabama in an address before the Alabama convention, upon which ensued an invitation from that State. Many writers have attributed one or both of these decisions to the action of Mississippi, but this Mr. Gerson showed to be erroneous.

The final session of the association, held on Friday evening (the annual business meeting having already taken place in the afternoon³), was devoted to the reading of a single paper, of much brilliancy of style and importance of content, and its discussion from various points of view. The paper, by Prof. James H. Robinson, of Columbia University, was on the relation of history to the newer

¹ Printed in the *American Historical Review* for July, 1911.

² Printed in the present volume, pp. 179-188.

³ The proceedings of the business meeting, with the reports of officers and committees, follow immediately after the present account.

sciences of man.¹ Mr. Robinson pointed out that history had since the middle of the nineteenth century been mainly engaged in making itself scientifically presentable by a scrupulous criticism of its sources, a detailed study of past events and conditions, and the elimination of the older supernatural, metaphysical, and anthropocentric interpretations. This arduous process has proved so absorbing that historical students have not as yet taken full account of either the discovery of man's descent from the lower animals or of the vast period during which he now appears to have been living on the globe. The organic sciences as well as those dealing with man specifically have been revolutionized by the interpretations and explanations suggested by the evolutionary theory. In the work of the historian, strangely enough, the genetic element is as yet far less common than would seem natural and essential. History, in one sense, is as yet less historical in its mode than comparative anatomy. Moreover, during the past 40 or 50 years a number of new social sciences have been developing, the results of which ought to have an important influence in modifying our notions of man and his development. Among these newer ways of studying man are anthropology, the study of comparative religions, palethnology, social psychology and its essential basis, animal psychology. Our conceptions of race, of culture, its origin and transmission, of progress and decline, of "human nature," and of all religious phenomena have been profoundly modified by anthropological and psychological investigations. As yet historical students continue to use the terms in senses which have been outlawed and thus run grave danger of misunderstanding and misinterpreting many vital phenomena.

Prof. George L. Burr said that while, like Mr. Robinson, he held that all the sciences are sisters and should be fellow workers, and while with him he deprecated a history that is merely antiquarian and a historismus that has lost its touch with life, he could see no reason for including under the name of history the sciences which are only her neighbors. The scholars now held up to our admiration by Mr. Robinson are far from doing this. Propositions learned by rote, however true, do not make up a science. A science is our science only in so far as we can use its processes and test its results. When biology and anthropology have explained for us all they can, when the social sciences shall have accounted for every survival, every instinct, every imitation, there will still remain for history a field broad enough and noble enough for any study, and woe betide the social sciences themselves if we forget it.

Further comments were made by Prof. George W. Knight, of the Ohio State University. Since primarily history deals with mankind in past action, it is its business to accept and to use what-

¹ Since printed in his "The New History, and Other Essays in Modern Historical Criticism."

ever solid results of other sciences make possible a better understanding of mankind. But similarly, the other sciences of man rely and must rely upon history to furnish them data which they accept as of assistance in their primary fields. There is a never ceasing mutuality of interest and interchange of results between them all. Without differing from Prof. Robinson as to the influence which the newer sciences ought to have on the historian, he held that that influence had already been working, in a degree greater than the latter had seemed to recognize. He drew particular attention to the duty of the instructor in history to make sure that his students became acquainted with the important verities of the other sciences of mankind.

Prof. George H. Mead, of the University of Chicago, held that the matter of history, man, has in fact become different because of the scientific advances upon which Prof. Robinson dwelt. The older histories had been political because society's conscious efforts had taken the form of endeavors to solve political problems. More recently we have become more occupied with social problems, and history would probably respond to this change by a difference of treatment and a different relation to the sciences.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD AT THE CLAYPOOL HOTEL, IN INDIANAPOLIS, IND., DECEMBER 30, 1910, AT 4.30 P. M., PRESIDENT TURNER IN THE CHAIR.

The report of the secretary, Mr. W. G. Leland, was read in his absence by the acting secretary, Mr. J. F. Jameson. It showed a membership of 2,925 on December 21, 1910.

On behalf of the council, the secretary of the council, Mr. C. H. Haskins, reported that the council had held a meeting in New York, November 26, 1910, and two meetings at Indianapolis on December 28 and 30, and that at these meetings reports had been received from the various standing committees and commissions of the association, and appropriations made for the continuance of the association's work during the coming year. An agreement had been made with Mr. David M. Matteson for the preparation of a general index of all the publications put forth by the association during its first 25 years. Details of the work had been arranged with Mr. Matteson by a committee consisting of Messrs. Albert Bushnell Hart, Worthington C. Ford, and J. Franklin Jameson. The work is expected to last about four years, and the expense is to be spread over that period. The report next described the preparation of a new annual, The American Yearbook, planned and supervised by a committee representing various scientific bodies, in which the representative of the American Historical Association is Mr. Hart. It was reported that the material hitherto embraced in the annual bibliography entitled "Writings on American history," prepared by Miss Grace G. Griffin, would hereafter be published in the annual report of the association, as a part of the duty imposed upon the society by its act of incorporation, to "report annually * * * concerning * * * the condition of historical study in America." The council had a year before appointed a committee on the subject of historical sites and buildings, instructing it to make a preliminary survey of the field and report a proper line of action for the association to pursue. This committee, consisting of Messrs. Edwin E. Sparks, Reuben G. Thwaites, Frank H. Severance, Edmond S. Meany, and Henry E. Bourne, had reported progress and had been continued. A

committee, of which the chairman is Mr. Max Farrand, had been appointed at the November meeting to make a preliminary consideration of the question of preparing a bibliography of travels in America. The council had under consideration the possibility of a report on European historical societies resembling in general that which a committee headed by Mr. Thwaites had printed in the annual report for 1905 respecting the American historical societies.

With respect to the place of meeting for December, 1911, the council recommended, in pursuance of an invitation received from the Buffalo Historical Society and other authorities of Buffalo, that the meeting should be held in that city, with a final day's excursion to Ithaca, an invitation to conclude the sessions in that way having been received. The association so voted.

Upon recommendation of the council the following resolution was adopted:

The American Historical Association, concerned for the preservation of the records of the National Government as muniments of our national advancement and as material which historians must use in order to ascertain the truth, and aware that the records are in many cases now stored where they are in danger of destruction from fire and in places which are not adapted to their preservation, and where they are inaccessible for administrative and historical purposes, and knowing that many of the records of the Government have in the past been lost or destroyed because suitable provision for their care and preservation was not made, do respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to erect in the city of Washington a national archive depository, where the records of the Government may be concentrated, properly cared for, and preserved.

The reports of the treasurer, of the Audit Co. of New York, and of the auditing committee, Mr. Jacob P. Dunn, chairman, were received and accepted. The treasurer's report showed an excess of receipts over disbursements to the amount of \$759.34 and an increase during the year of \$614.78 in the assets of the association.

The report of the Pacific coast branch, chiefly relating to its meeting of December 18 and 19, was presented by the delegate of the branch, Mr. H. Morse Stephens. Brief reports were received concerning the work of the historical manuscripts commission and the public archives commission, the former by Mr. U. B. Phillips in the absence of the chairman, Mr. Worthington C. Ford, and the latter by Mr. Herman V. Ames. The former dealt chiefly with the body of correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb, which it is proposed to print as the second volume of the annual report for 1910. The latter besides describing the material printed in the present volume announced the intention of the commission to prepare a list of commissions and instructions issued to colonial governors and of all representations and reports of the board of trade.

The chairman, Mr. Charles H. Hull, on behalf of the committee on the Justin Winsor prize, reported that the prize for 1910 had been awarded to Mr. Edward Raymond Turner, of Bryn Mawr College, for his essay entitled, "The Negro in Pennsylvania—Slavery, servitude, and freedom, 1639-1861." Upon joint representations from this committee and from the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize it was voted by the association that the regulations of the competition should be so amended that the essays should be submitted on or before July 1 of the given year, instead of October 1. It was agreed that contestants for the Adams prize in 1911 should be invited but not required to submit their papers at the earlier date, but that the change from October 1 should not be enforced in that year.

Brief reports were received from the board of editors of the American Historical Review, from the committee on publications, from the committee on bibliography, from the general committee, from the general editor of the series of reprints entitled "Original Narratives of Early American History," and from the committee on a bibliography of modern English history. The report of the committee of five on history in secondary schools was understood to be already in the press, to be published

by the Macmillan Co. within the next two or three months. The bibliography of modern English history is being prepared by the joint efforts of an American and an English committee, the former dealing with the Tudor period, the latter with that of the Stuarts.

The committee on nominations, Messrs. Frank H. Hodder, Frank M. Anderson, and John M. Vincent, nominated the following officers for the ensuing year, for whom the acting secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the association:

President.—William M. Sloane, New York City.

First vice president.—Theodore Roosevelt, Oyster Bay, N. Y.

Second vice president.—William A. Dunning, New York City.

Secretary.—Waldo G. Leland, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer.—Clarence W. Bowen, New York City.

Secretary of the council.—Charles H. Haskins, Cambridge, Mass.

Curator.—A. Howard Clark, Washington, D. C.

Executive council (elected members).—Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.; Charles H. Hull, Ithaca, N. Y.; Franklin I. Riley, University, Miss.; Edwin E. Sparks, State College, Pa.; James A. Woodburn, Bloomington, Ind.; Fred M. Fling, Lincoln, Nebr.

On behalf of the council its secretary announced the appointment of the following committees for 1911:

ANNUAL COMMITTEES.

Committee on program for twenty-seventh annual meeting (Buffalo, 1911): Charles H. Hull, William S. Ferguson, George M. Wrong, Ferdinand Schevill, Jesse S. Reeves, William E. Dodd.

Local committee of arrangements for the twenty-seventh annual meeting: Henry W. Hill (since appointed), chairman; Frank H. Severance, secretary; Charles H. Hull.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Historical manuscripts commission: Worthington C. Ford, Herbert D. Foster, Ulrich B. Phillips, Frederick G. Young, Clarence W. Alvord, Julian P. Bretz.

Committee on the Justin Winsor prize: Claude H. Van Tyne, John H. Latané, Carl L. Becker, Francis A. Christie, William MacDonald.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize: George L. Burr, James W. Thompson, Guy S. Ford, Edwin F. Gay, Charles D. Hazen.

Public archives commission: Herman V. Ames, Charles M. Andrews, Dunbar Rowland, Victor H. Paltsits, Robert D. W. Connor, Gaillard Hunt, Jonas Viles.

Committee on bibliography: Ernest C. Richardson, W. Dawson Johnston, George Parker Winship, Frederick J. Teggart.

Editor of the American Historical Review for six years from January 1, 1911: A. C. McLaughlin (Messrs. Adams, Burr, Jameson, Sloane, and Turner hold over).

Committee on publications: William A. Dunning; and (ex officio) Herman V. Ames, Waldo G. Leland, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, Worthington C. Ford, Ernest C. Richardson, George L. Burr, and C. H. Van Tyne.

General committee: St. George L. Sioussat, Lucy M. Salmon, Frederic L. Paxson, Walter L. Fleming, Albert E. McKinley, Clarence S. Paine; and (ex officio) Waldo G. Leland and Henry W. Edwards.

Committee on a bibliography of modern English history: Edward P. Cheyney, Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Ernest C. Richardson, Williston Walker.

Committee to study and report to the council upon the certification of high school teachers of history: Dana C. Munro, chairman; Kendrick C. Babcock, Charles E. Chadsey, Edgar Dawson, Robert A. Maurer.

Conference of State and local historical societies: Isaac J. Cox, chairman; Waldo G. Leland, secretary.

The meeting adjourned at 5.30 p. m.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON,
Acting Secretary.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

At the close of the twenty-sixth year of its existence the association may congratulate itself that its growth in membership, in resources, and, above all, in usefulness, continues to be healthy and steady. The total membership of the association on December 21 was 2,925 as against 2,691 a year ago, a gain of 234, or rather more than 10 per cent. Of the present membership, 2,763 are individuals, 116 of whom are life members, while 162 are institutions. Since the annual meeting last December, 412 new members have been added. The loss in membership has been 178; 103 by resignation, 45 from non-payment of dues since September 1, 1908, and 30 by death. At present there are 119 members whose dues remain unpaid since September 1, 1909, and most of these will probably be dropped during the coming year. The geographical distribution of the members is as follows: New England, 495; Middle Atlantic States, 867; Southern States, 297; North Central States, 667; Middle Western States, 215; Pacific Coast Branch States, 304; insular possessions, 2; British and Latin America and West Indies, 30; Europe and British Isles, 45; Asia, 3.

Among the members whose deaths the association most keenly regrets, should be mentioned the names of Goldwin Smith, a former president of the association, and Prof. George P. Garrison, who did not live to complete the work upon which he had been engaged for some years, in behalf of the association, the editing of the Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas.

With regard to publications, Volume I of the report for 1908 was distributed in September, and Volume II, being the concluding volume of Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas, may be expected in about three months. The report for 1909 will soon go to press and it is hoped that it may appear by the end of the spring. For some years the annual reports have been, for various reasons, more or less delayed in publication. Normally the report should go to press on July 1 (the date upon which the printing appropriation becomes available) following the annual meeting of which it contains the proceedings, and should be distributed during the late fall or early winter. It is hoped that from now on it will be possible to have the reports follow this normal procedure. It should be observed, however, that a cause of much delay in the past has been the failure of members participating in the program of the annual meeting to furnish the secretary promptly with copies of their papers.

The prize essays of the association have been published through the secretary's office, but the report respecting them will be presented by the committee on publications. As the biennial handbook of the association will be published during the coming year, all members are urged to furnish the secretary with correct information respecting their addresses, degrees, academic and other positions, etc.

Respectfully submitted.

WALDO G. LELAND, *Secretary.*

PARIS, December 21, 1910.

REPORT OF CLARENCE W. BOWEN, TREASURER.

RECEIPTS.

1909.		
Dec. 15.	Balance cash on hand.....	\$3,862.30
1910.		
Dec. 19.	Receipts as follows:	
	2,717½ annual dues, at \$3.....	\$3,151.50
	3 annual dues, at \$3.50.....	10.50
	2 annual dues, at \$3.15.....	6.30
	1 annual dues.....	3.11
	22 annual dues, at \$3.10.....	68.20
	1 annual dues.....	3.09
	4 annual dues, at \$3.05.....	12.20

1910.		
Dec. 19.	Receipts—Continued.	
	2 annual dues, at \$3.04.....	\$6.08
	1 annual dues.....	2.85
	1 annual dues.....	2.25
	3 annual dues, at \$2.....	6.00
	2 life memberships.....	100.00
	Sales of publications.....	586.67
	Royalty on "The study of History in 'Schools'".....	18.60
	Royalty on "Report of the Committee of Eight".....	140.42
	Interest on bond and mortgage.....	850.00
	Dividends on bank stock.....	110.00
		<hr/> \$10,077.77
		14,060.07

DISBURSEMENTS.

1910.		
Dec. 19.	Treasurer's clerk hire, vouchers 14, 61, 78, 109, 130, 176.....	\$344.25
	Secretary's clerk hire, vouchers 15, 16, 17, 19, 49, 65, 77, 90, 93, 100, 104, 105, 118, 120, 126, 129, 134, 146, 161, 191, 203.....	809.35
	Postage and stationery, treasurer and secretary, vouchers 8, 21, 25, 26, 28, 35, 36, 37, 39, 46, 47, 48, 58, 63, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 91, 95, 101, 102, 103, 106, 119, 121, 127, 128, 131, 132, 135, 137, 141, 145, 153, 156, 158, 160, 166, 172, 179, 192, 206.....	498.72
	Secretary of the council, vouchers 7, 40, 41, 42, 43, 114, 157, 177, 178, 209, 210, 211.....	99.51
	Pacific coast branch, vouchers 2, 3, 4, 189.....	147.69
	American Historical Review, vouchers 29, 55, 62, 71, 80, 81, 82, 96, 112, 123, 124, 139, 148, 167, 207.....	4,477.20
	Public archives commission, vouchers 5, 22, 23, 30, 34, 54, 57, 59, 67, 83, 86, 87, 111, 115, 150, 152, 163, 188, 199, 200, 201, 202.....	321.09
	Historical manuscripts commission, vouchers 45, 138, 140, 162, 174, 175.....	344.97
	Committee on the Justin Winsor prize, voucher 147.....	4.00
	Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize, voucher 50.....	4.35
	Committee on bibliography, voucher 208.....	50.00
	Committee on publications, vouchers 38, 44, 66, 88, 122, 149, 154, 168, 169, 181.....	460.98
	General committee, vouchers 6, 11, 20, 27, 60, 85, 97, 98, 113, 170.....	282.87
	Committee on a bibliography of modern English history, vouchers 94, 116.....	30.00
	Conference of State and local historical societies, vouchers 204, 205.....	22.65
	Annual bibliography, voucher 53.....	200.00
	Annual report 1908, vouchers 142, 143.....	44.50
	Expenses executive council, vouchers 9, 24, 185, 186, 187, 188, 194, 197.....	286.07
	Editorial work, vouchers 56, 64, 76, 92, 107, 117, 125, 136, 144, 159, 190.....	300.00
	Engraving certificates, voucher 52.....	.75
	Furnishing secretary's office, vouchers 70, 79, 108.....	94.43
	Indexing annual report, voucher 89.....	82.50
	Expenses twenty-fifth annual meeting, vouchers 1, 13, 18, 31, 32, 33, 51.....	160.79
	Expenses twenty-sixth annual meeting, vouchers 84, 110, 151, 164, 165, 171, 173, 180, 182, 183, 184, 193, 195, 196, 212.....	213.58
	Collection charges, vouchers 90, 133, 155, 213.....	10.18
	Miscellaneous expenses, vouchers 10, 12.....	28.00
		<hr/> \$9,318.43
	Balance cash on hand in National Park Bank.....	4,741.64
		<hr/> 14,060.07
	Net receipts 1910.....	10,077.77
	Net disbursements 1910.....	9,318.43
	Excess of receipts over disbursements.....	759.34
	The assets of the association are:	
	Bond and mortgage on real estate at No. 24 East Ninety-fifth Street, New York..	\$20,000.00
	Accrued interest from Sept. 29, 1910, to date.....	191.25
	11 shares American Exchange National Bank stock, at 235.....	2,585.00
	Cash on hand in National Park Bank.....	4,741.64
		<hr/> 27,517.89
	An increase during the year of.....	614.78

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE W. BOWEN, Treasurer.

NEW YORK, December 19, 1910.

REPORT OF THE AUDIT CO. OF NEW YORK, 165 BROADWAY.

CLARENCE W. BOWEN, Esq.,

Treasurer American Historical Association, 130 Fulton Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: Agreeably to your request, we have examined the cash records of the American Historical Association, for the year ending December 16, 1910.

The results of this examination are presented, attached hereto, in an exhibit termed: "Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ending December 16, 1910."

We found that all receipts and disbursements, as shown by the books, had been accounted for and that the files were complete.

A mortgage for \$20,000 drawn to the American Historical Association, on property situated at 24 East Ninety-fifth Street, New York City, was examined, together with the bond and property deeds and an extension agreement extending the mortgage for five years to March 29, 1914. Two certificates of stock of the American Exchange National Bank, aggregating 11 shares, were also shown us.

Very truly yours,

THE AUDIT COMPANY OF NEW YORK.

A. W. DUNNING, *President.*

G. H. BOWERS, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, December 22, 1910.

REPORT ON AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the year ending Dec. 16, 1910.

RECEIPTS.

Dues:

2,717, at \$3	\$8,151.50
22, at \$3.10	68.20
2, at \$3.15	6.30
3, at \$3.50	10.50
3, at \$2	6.00
1, at \$2.85	2.85
1, at \$2.25	2.25
2, at \$3.04	6.08
4, at \$3.05	12.20
1, at \$3.09	3.09
1, at \$3.11	3.11
	<hr/>
	8,272.08
Life memberships	100.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,372.08
Royalty on "The study of history in schools"	18.60
Sale of publications	586.67
Royalty on "Report of the committee of eight"	140.42
Interest on bond and mortgage of \$20,000: One year at 4½ per cent. to Sept. 29, 1910	850.00
Dividend on 11 shares American Exchange National Bank stock	110.00

Total receipts for the year	\$10,077.77
Balance on hand Dec. 17, 1909, as per our statement dated Dec. 23, 1909	3,982.30

14,060.07

DISBURSEMENTS.

Treasurer's clerks' hire for year	344.25
Secretary's clerks' hire for year	809.35
Secretary of the council expense	99.51
Twenty-fifth annual meeting	160.79
Twenty-sixth annual meeting	213.58
American Historical Review	4,477.20
Pacific coast branch, expense	147.69
Annual report—1908	44.50
Indexing annual report—1908	82.50
Postage and stationery—Treasurer and secretary	498.72
Bank collection and exchange	10.18
Engraving certificates75
Editorial services	800.00
Furnishing secretary's office	94.43
Miscellaneous expenses	28.00
Conference of State and local historical societies	22.65
Committee expenses:	
Annual bibliographies' committee	\$200.00
Executive council	286.07
Public archives' commission	321.09

Committee expenses—Continued.

Historical manuscripts' commission.....	\$344.97
Justin Winsor prize committee	4.00
Herbert B. Adams prize committee	4.35
General committee.....	282.87
Committee on bibliography.....	50.00
Publication committee.....	460.98
Committee on a bibliography of modern English history.....	30.00
Total committee expenses.....	\$1,984.33
Total disbursements for the year.....	9,318.43
Balance, cash in bank, represented by certified check on the National Park Bank of New York, dated Dec. 19, 1910	4,741.64
	14,060.07

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUSTIN WINSOR PRIZE.

The committee on the Justin Winsor prize in American history beg to report that the variety of subjects chosen and the range of territory represented by this year's competitors are most satisfactory. Of the 11 essays submitted, 4 came from New England or the Middle States, 4 from the Western States, and 3 from the Southern States. Three dealt with the colonial or revolutionary period, 6 with the constitutional period more or less extensively, and 2 with the period of the Civil War. Four of the essays concerned themselves more or less directly with the foreign relations of the United States, 3 of them might perhaps be described as studies in constitutional history, and 4 of them as studies in economic history.

The committee have found great difficulty in examining so many bulky manuscripts in the period between the first of October and the meeting of the association, and, in view of the circumstance that the prize is now awarded only in every other year, the committee recommend that the rules governing the prize be so amended as to require that manuscripts offered in competition must be in the hands of the chairman by the 1st of July in the year in which the prize is available.

The committee recommend that the Justin Winsor prize for 1910 be awarded to Edward Raymond Turner for his essay entitled "The Negro in Pennsylvania—Slavery, Servitude, Freedom. 1639-1861."

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES H. HULL, *Acting Chairman.*

DECEMBER 30, 1910.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL EDITOR OF "ORIGINAL NARRATIVES OF EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY."

During the past year two volumes of this series have been published. The publishers have now decided upon the regular practice of bringing out one volume in the spring and one in the autumn. Last spring they issued an edition of Capt. Edward Johnson's "Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England," the first published of New England histories. No edition of it had been published since that of Dr. W. F. Poole, brought out in 1867 and now out of print. The present edition was prepared by the general editor of the series. In the autumn was published a volume of "Narratives of Early Maryland," edited in a most careful and scholarly manner by Mr. Clayton C. Hall of the Maryland Historical Society.

A volume of "Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, Delaware, and West Jersey," to be edited by Dr. Albert Cook Myers, was to have come next in order, but delays have attended its preparation. Messrs. Scribners have now in press the volume entitled "Narratives of Early Carolina," edited by Mr. A. S. Salley, jr., secretary of the South Carolina Historical Commission, and embracing all the contemporary narratives essential for the history of the Carolinas from 1650 to 1708. This is the

twelfth volume in the series, which is not intended to extend beyond 20 volumes nor beyond the early years of the eighteenth century.

Respectfully submitted.

J. F. JAMESON, *General Editor*.

DECEMBER 30, 1910.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The bibliographical activity of the association during the year has been represented by two special committees and the standing committee. The special committees headed by Prof. Cheyney and Prof. Farrand have been occupied with Tudor bibliography and American travels, respectively. These are independent committees. Although related with the standing committee on a community of interest principle through the ex officio membership in each of the chairmen of the standing committee they are self-governing and report individually. This report has therefore to do only with the activity of the standing committee as such and this activity has been focused on the developing of cooperation between libraries in meeting the needs of historical students.

Historical students constantly and justly complain of the lack of needed books in local libraries and the lack of information as to where copies can be found. The attention of this committee has also recently been called with emphasis to the additional demand for better means of knowledge as to the contents of collections.

The satisfying of these demands requires of course more books, lists of books in other libraries, and better analytical cataloguing; but in the individual libraries these demands are contradictory, since further cataloguing means fewer books, and more books less cataloguing.

Taking many libraries into account, however, it is estimated that by avoidance of duplication, better geographical distribution, cooperative printed cards, especially for analytical entries, and by joint finding lists, efficiency for purposes of research at least might be practically doubled. Very recent statistics show that 23 university libraries spend half a million dollars a year for books. A really businesslike cooperation between these 23 alone would carry the others in train and solve at least half of the present problem.

Vigorous effort to the end of general cooperation has been made by the committee in conjunction with other agencies, and in various directions. It is one of the problems in which all effort counts for something. The needs and the business aspect of the matter are quite obvious and the solution lies simply in initiative and organization. A good deal of additional capital might be used to insure the greatest economy and the largest returns, but mere organization of existing resources would secure a very great share of what is aimed at. It is at this point that members of the association can help by remembering and reminding presidents, trustees, and colleagues in other departments that this is not only a practical question, but a live one. The members of the association can also help in supplying additional entries for the proof edition of the list of collections relating to European history, which is now in type and will shortly be sent out for checking up and for additions and corrections. The list now mentions about 2,500 collections exclusive of periodicals, art, antiquities, and inscriptions, of which short additional selected lists are being prepared. Unless the expectation of the committee is disappointed, we shall be able, within a short time, to arrange that at least one copy of each of these sets shall be found somewhere in America, and it will be a great economic pity if we are not able also to provide for the systematic analysis of these in such a way that all our 400 odd libraries may benefit thereby, without its being necessary that the work of analysis should be repeated even so many as twenty-three times.

Respectfully submitted.

ERNEST C. RICHARDSON, *Chairman*.

DECEMBER 30, 1910.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS.

The second volume in the series of prize essays of the American Historical Association, being the Justin Winsor prize essay for 1908, "Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 1763-1774," by C. E. Carter, has been published during the past year. The third volume, the Herbert Baxter Adams prize essay for 1909, "A History of English Witchcraft from 1558 to 1718," by Wallace Notestein, will be published during the coming year, the committee having allowed the author to retain the manuscript during the past summer in order to revise its bibliographical apparatus by work in the British Museum.

The sale of essays has been as follows: Krehbiel's *Interdict*, 343 copies; Carter's *Illinois Country*, 336 copies; Notestein's *English Witchcraft*, 254 copies ordered.

There have been 177 standing subscriptions to the series. The committee especially wishes that the number of standing subscriptions to the series might be raised to 350 or 400, in order to furnish a guaranty of approximately the cost of publishing the essays.

Respectfully submitted.

WALDO G. LELAND
(For William A. Dunning, Chairman).

PARIS, *December 21, 1910.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN ENGLISH HISTORY.

The report of the committee on a bibliography of modern English history must necessarily be one of progress, not of completed work, as its plan contemplated a period of three years for its accomplishment. The prospects now seem promising for completing it within that period. A number of meetings of the committee have been held, at several of which Mr. Prothero, the chairman of the committee of the English Royal Historical Society, was present. The greatest difficulty so far has been in working out a plan satisfactory to both the English and American committees. This, however, has been at last accomplished, and at present your committee is at work preparing a bibliography of the Tudor period, while the English committee has undertaken the Stuart period. The plan contemplates a list of from 2,000 to 3,000 titles in each of the two periods, these to be printed in one moderate sized volume, to be followed later by another volume dealing with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and ultimately preceded by a small introductory volume. The whole work will therefore consist of three small or moderate sized volumes. The funds appropriated by the association have so far proved adequate to the needs of the committee. The English Royal Historical Society has appropriated a similar sum, £50 a year for the three years, for the expense of their committee. Eventually, however, an appeal will have to be made to other organizations of similar interests to cover later and more extended expenses.

Respectfully submitted.

E. P. CHEYNEY, *Chairman.*

DECEMBER 30, 1910.

PROGRAMME OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, HELD IN INDIANAPOLIS,
DECEMBER 27-31, 1910.

Papers are limited to 20 minutes and discussions to 10 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.

Persons not members of the associations will be cordially welcomed to the regular sessions.

Tuesday, December 27.

12.30 p. m.: University Club, Meridian and Michigan Streets. Luncheon and business meeting of the Ohio Valley Historical Association.

4 p. m.: Clubroom, Claypool Hotel. Conference on historical publication work in the Ohio valley; chairman, Demarkus C. Brown, Indiana State Library. Address by J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution.

8 p. m.: Palm room, Claypool Hotel. Session on western history. Joint session of the American Historical Association, the Ohio Valley Historical Association, and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association; chairman, Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Iowa State University. "New light on the explorations of the Verendrye," Orin G. Libby, University of North Dakota; discussion by Lawrence J. Burpee, Ottawa, Canada. "The American intervention in west Florida," Isaac J. Cox, University of Cincinnati; discussion by Frederic A. Ogg, Simmons College, and Dunbar Rowland, department of archives and history, State of Mississippi. "A century of steamboat navigation on the Ohio," Archer B. Hulbert, Marietta College; discussion by R. B. Way, Indiana University, and John Wilson Townsend, editor Kentucky Historical Register. "The beginnings of the free-trade movement in the Canadian northwest," H. G. Gunn, Winnipeg, Canada. "Early forts on the upper Mississippi," Dan E. Clark, State Historical Society of Iowa.

Wednesday, December 28.

9 a. m.: Meetings of committees. (At the call of the chairmen.)

9.30 a. m.: Assembly room, Claypool Hotel. Session on the teaching of history and civics under the auspices of the North Central History Teachers' Association; chairman, James A. Woodburn, Indiana University. "The evolution of the teacher," Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College. "Is government teachable in the schools?" Albert Bushnell Hart, Harvard University. "Local history and the city community as themes for civic teaching," Arthur W. Dunn, Civic Secretary, City Club, Philadelphia. "How the Cincinnati public schools are using local history," Frank P. Goodwin, Woodward High School, Cincinnati. Discussion.

An illustrative civics class, eighth grade, Indianapolis public schools: "Waste and saving," Miss Flora Swan, Indianapolis.

10 a. m.: Clubroom, Claypool Hotel. Meeting of the executive council of the American Historical Association.

2 p. m.: Conferences.

1. Ancient history. Palm room, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, Henry B. Wright, Yale University. "The western campaigns of Sennacherib," Robert W. Rogers, Drew Theological Seminary. "Niebuhr, 1810-1910," Henry A. Sill, Cornell University. "Some aspects of Roman imperialism," R. F. Scholz, University of California. "The monument of Ancyra," William L. Westermann, University of Wisconsin. Discussion. Outlines of the papers will be sent in advance to all who notify the chairman of their intention to be present.

2. Modern European history. Clubroom, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, Guy S. Ford, University of Illinois. General topic: "European history as a field for American historical work." Discussion opened with a paper by Charles M. Andrews, Yale

University, on "The doctor's dissertation in European history." Discussion continued by Archibald C. Coolidge, Harvard University; John M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University; James W. Thompson, University of Chicago; Fred M. Fling, University of Nebraska.

3. American diplomatic history, with special reference to Latin-American relations. Ladies' café, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, James A. James, Northwestern University. "George Canning's policy respecting the Oregon boundary question," Joseph Schafer, University of Oregon. "The Mexican policy of southern leaders on the eve of the Civil War," James M. Callahan, University of West Virginia. "The United States and Latin America at the Hague," William I. Hull, Swarthmore College. "Trade and diplomacy between the United States and Latin America," Joseph H. Sears, New York. Discussion by Don E. Smith, University of California, and William S. Robertson, University of Illinois.

4. Conference of State and local historical societies. Assembly room, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, Clarence M. Burton, Detroit, Mich. Transaction of business. Introductory remarks by the chairman. Report of the committee on cooperation. Dunbar Rowland, department of archives and history, Mississippi. "The collection and preservation of historical sources, manuscript and printed, as a function of historical societies," Reuben G. Thwaites, State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Discussion on "The collection of materials": (a) "The collection of materials bearing on religious and church history," William H. Allison, Colgate University, and George F. Baker, Northern Indiana Historical Society; (b) "Publicity as a means of adding to collections," F. A. Sampson, Missouri State Historical Society. "The preservation and care of collections, with especial reference to the restoration and treatment of manuscripts," Clarence W. Alvord, University of Illinois, Illinois State Historical Library.

8 p. m.: Assembly room, Claypool Hotel. Address of welcome, Thomas R. Marshall, governor of Indiana. Presidential address, "Social forces in American history," Frederick J. Turner, Harvard University. At the close of the session there will be a reception for ladies and gentlemen at the John Herron Art Institute, Pennsylvania and Sixteenth Streets. Members will be taken in special cars from the Claypool Hotel to the reception.

Thursday, December 29.

9 a. m.: Claypool Hotel. Meeting of the committee on the bibliography of modern English history.

10 a. m.: Assembly room, Claypool Hotel. General session commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of secession; the North in 1860. "Cotton and border politics, 1850-1860," Worthington C. Ford, Massachusetts Historical Society. "The decision of the Ohio Valley," Carl R. Fish, University of Wisconsin. "The Dred Scott decision," Edward S. Corwin, Princeton University. "The doctrine of secession and coercion," Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago. "The development of war spirit in the North," Daniel W. Howe, Indiana Historical Society. Discussion.

2 p. m.: Conferences.

1. Medieval history. Clubroom, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, Earle W. Dow, University of Michigan. "Royal purveyance in medieval England, in the light of Simon Islip's *speculum regis*," Chalfant Robinson, Yale University. Round table discussion; general topic, "Profitable fields of investigation in medieval history." Discussion led by Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, with reference to "Comparative constitutional history," James F. Baldwin, Vassar College, with reference to "The records of the privy seal;" John M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University.

2. Conference of archivists. Ladies' café, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania. "The work of the international conference of archivists and librarians at Brussels, August 28-31, 1910," A. J. F. van Laer, archivist,

State Library of New York. "Concentration of State and national archives," Dunbar Rowland, department of archives and history, State of Mississippi, and Gaillard Hunt, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress. "What material should go into the archives?" Thomas M. Owen, department of archives and history, State of Alabama; Frederic L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin; R. D. W. Connor, North Carolina Historical Commission; Reuben G. Thwaites, Wisconsin State Historical Society; Dan E. Clark, State Historical Society of Iowa; Eugene C. Barker, University of Texas; Ulrich B. Phillips, Tulane University; Harlow Lindley, Earlham College.

3. Conference of teachers of history in teachers' colleges and normal schools. Banquet room T, Claypool Hotel. Chairman, Albert H. Sanford, State Normal School, LaCrosse, Wis. "What preparation school authorities expect from high-school teachers of history," Edgar Dawson, Normal College, New York City. "The professional training of high-school history teachers," Thomas N. Hoover, State Normal College of Ohio University, Athens. Discussion led by Frank S. Bogardus, Indiana State Normal School, Terre Haute, and Harold W. Foght, State Normal School, Kirksville, Mo. "The preparation necessary for the teaching of history in the grades," Sara M. Riggs, Iowa State Teachers' College, Cedar Falls. Discussion led by E. E. Hill, Chicago Normal School, and Mary B. Putnam, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti.

4.30 to 6 p. m.: Tea at the residence of Mrs. E. C. Atkins, 1312 North Meridian Street, to which all visiting ladies are invited.

8 p. m.: Session on European history. Assembly room, Claypool Hotel. "The efforts of the Danish Kings to recover the English Crown after the death of Harthacnut," Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois. "Some critical notes on the works of S. R. Gardiner," Roland G. Usher, Washington University. "Anglo-Dutch relations, 1654-1660," Ralph C. H. Catterall, Cornell University. "The historiography of the French Revolution, with special reference to the work of Aulard," H. Morse Stephens, University of California. "Alexis de Tocqueville and the Republic of 1848," Charles D. Hazen, Smith College.

10 p. m.: Smoker at the University Club, Meridian and Michigan Streets.

Friday, December 30.

10 a. m.: Auditorium Y. M. C. A. Building, New York and Illinois Streets. General session commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of secession; the South in 1860. "Some recollections of a horseback ride through the South in 1850," James B. Angell, president emeritus, University of Michigan. "The lower South in the election of 1860," David Y. Thomas, University of Arkansas. "North Carolina on the eve of secession," William K. Boyd, Trinity College, North Carolina. "The fight for the Northwest in 1860," William E. Dodd, University of Chicago. "The inception of the Montgomery convention," Armand J. Gerson, University of Pennsylvania. Discussion, Ellen C. Semple, Louisville.

12.30 p. m.: American dining room, Claypool Hotel. Luncheon, followed by informal speaking. Price per plate for all members of the allied associations, \$1.50. Places may be reserved and paid for at the registration desk. This must be done before Wednesday noon, December 28. Toastmaster, James A. Woodburn, Indiana University.

3 p. m.: Claypool Hotel. Meeting of the executive council of the American Historical Association.

4 p. m.: Palm room, Claypool Hotel. Business meeting of the American Historical Association.

1. Report of the secretary.
2. Report of the secretary of the council.
3. Report of the treasurer.

4. Report of the auditing committee.
 5. Report of the Pacific coast branch.
 6. Report of the historical MSS. commission.
 7. Report of the public archives commission.
 8. Report of the committee on the Justin Winsor prize.
 9. Report of the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize.
 10. Report of the board of editors of the American Historical Review.
 11. Report of the committee on publications.
 12. Report of the general committee.
 13. Report of the editor of the reprints of Original Narratives of Early American History.
 14. Report of the committee of five on history in secondary schools.
 15. Report of the committee on a bibliography of modern English history.
 16. Report of committee on nominations.
 17. Election of officers for the year 1911.
 18. Announcements of appointments to committees for the year 1911.
- 8 p. m.: Assembly room, Claypool Hotel. Round table discussion: General topic, "The relation of history to the newer sciences of mankind." Paper by James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University. Discussion led by George L. Burr, Cornell University; Max Farrand, Yale University; George W. Knight, Ohio State University; Frederic L. Paxson, University of Wisconsin; George H. Mead, University of Chicago.

II. REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

BERKELEY, CAL., NOVEMBER 18-19, 1910.

By JACOB N. BOWMAN,
Secretary of the Branch.

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION.

By JACOB N. BOWMAN, *Secretary of the Branch.*

The seventh annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association was held at the University of California, Berkeley, on Friday and Saturday, November 18 and 19, 1910. The sessions were held in the faculty room in California Hall, in which building the headquarters were also established; the annual dinner was held at the Hotel Carlton, in Berkeley. Much of the success of the meeting is due to the efficient arrangements of Prof. Scholz and his committee on local arrangements, Mr. L. P. Briggs and Mr. H. W. Edwards. The attendance at the various sessions ranged from 60 to 90 persons.

The first session was opened at 2.40 on Friday afternoon in the faculty room by the president, Prof. E. D. Adams, of Stanford University. This session was known as the "general session," and the first paper was read by Prof. A. B. Show, of Stanford University, on the "Historical significance of the religious problem in the German schools." In his opening words he showed the importance of the question at the present time. He then stated that the present intense struggle to modernize the religious instruction in the German schools finds its explanation in the historical conditions. The system dates back to the Protestant Reformation. In their connection with the reorganization of the Protestant State churches Luther and the other sixteenth century reformers advocated popular education and gave much attention to the founding of universities and schools. The religious instruction was the central element in the school curriculum. It was based on the Shorter Catechism of Luther, which had to be memorized entire. The instruction included also the learning of Bible verses, drill in singing, and participation in public worship. The system tended almost from the beginning to mechanical and lifeless methods.

After the decline due to the Thirty Years' War German education developed rapidly. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the whole course of German thought and culture, including religious education, was shaped by pietism, rationalism, aufklärung, naturalism, and the new humanism. Pietism made more of the religious

than of the dogmatic side of instruction and profoundly influenced both substance and method. Rationalism, with its variant forms, rejected supernatural ideas and reduced instruction to rational and ethical terms. It had wide influence in the universities and the schools. In this period German culture developed greatly in the direction of popular education and of State control of the schools.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the wars of liberation led to a reaction somewhat in the interest of conservative orthodoxy. But on the whole the period has witnessed a gradual weakening of church control over the schools and a positive lessening of the place of Religionsunterricht in the curriculum. It is only a question of time till the progress of democratic ideals will bring about a complete separation between the church and public education.

Prof. Levi E. Young, of the University of Utah, then read a paper on "The place of the Utah pioneers in western history."

The third and last paper of the general session was read by Prof. O. H. Richardson, of the University of Washington. The subject was "Mary, Queen of Scots, in the light of recent historical investigations." He first sketched the present condition of sources and literature and stated that, apart from the certainty of knowledge concerning foreign and domestic affairs resulting from the appearance of the Scottish and Spanish volumes of the Calendars of State Papers, the two lines in which research has made the greatest progress since 1889 relate to Mary's religious policy and her relations with the papacy and to the "casket letters." Father Pollen's article in the *Scottish Historical Review* for April, 1907, dispelled the mysteries which still clung to the Darnley marriage dispensation. The date upon the document is genuine and it was antedated.

With the production of the Lennox papers, which contain a draft of Crawford's declaration, the "casket letters" controversy has entered a new, and perhaps a final, phase. Its present status appears in Mr. Lang's article in the *Scottish Historical Review* for October, 1907, and in Mr. Henderson's reply of January, 1908. The former now accepts the complete authenticity of the Glasgow letter, but merely on the score of old evidence maturely considered; the latter emphasizes the draft of Crawford's declaration and declares, with apparent justice, that it proves priority for the Glasgow letter and disproves interpolation. The controversy therefore shifts from the realm of opinion to that of fact.

The greatest gap which still exists in the Marian records is due to her correspondence with the Cardinal of Lorraine, which has defied all search. The chief desiderata in the way of publication are these three: Moray should receive his first biography, the life of Lethington should be rewritten, and the Lennox papers should be published by

Father Pollen in extenso. It is evident that recent research tells heavily against the Queen.

Before the session ended the president appointed the following committees: A committee on resolutions composed of Prof. H. L. Cannon, Stanford University, Miss Ada Goldsmith, San Francisco, and Mr. W. C. Westergaard, Alameda; an auditing committee composed of Mr. T. M. Marshall, Alameda, and Miss Lucy R. Watkins, Watsonville; and a nominating committee composed of Prof. T. R. Bacon, University of California, Mr. S. P. McCrea, Redwood City, and Mr. F. J. Teggart, University of California.

The annual dinner was held at the Hotel Carlton at 6.30, Friday evening. Prof. H. M. Stephens, University of California, presided, and about 50 persons were present. The presidential address was read by Prof. E. D. Adams, Stanford University, on the "Point of view of the British traveler in America." It dealt with the years 1819 to 1860. Prof. Adams called attention to the necessity of a clear understanding of the viewpoint from which British travelers observed America, in order to determine the value of their works, whether in description, analysis, or judgments. The period selected for illustration was that from 1810 to 1860. A study of the principal travelers of this period—some 80 in all—had resulted in the conviction that, save for the exceptional work, the writers might logically be classified in very nearly decennial periods, each period presenting a distinct point of view and a change of attitude toward America. Without attempting to recapitulate the citations of authors, and quotations from their works given in the address, the decennial grouping, in its larger features, was as follows:

1810-1820. Description of physical features, with minor emphasis on social and political institutions, intended to guide or influence the emigration of middle-class Englishmen who were well to do at home, but who, mainly from political discontent, were looking toward emigration to America.

1820-1830. Two distinct types of books. First, works on emigration written for, or by, Englishmen of the laboring class seeking to escape from harsh material conditions at home. Second, works produced by British travelers of a determined Tory bias in English politics, written with the evident purpose of influencing the approaching political upheaval in Great Britain.

1830-1840. A continuation of the works whose description and analysis were determined by home political conditions, but now divided about equally between old conservative and new liberal convictions, and with a correspondingly unfavorable or favorable view of things American.

1840-1850. Discontinuance of the writing influenced by political bias, and appearance of the book attempting either a serious analysis

and description of America, or an entertaining narrative of travel. During this period also there began that description of America which had as its keynote a wonder, mingled with some apprehension, at the rapid advance of the United States to a position of importance in world politics.

1850-1860. Reappearance of the type of book determined in its examination of America by political conditions in England. The reform movement in Great Britain again determined in large measure the point of view of the British traveler. Now, however, the preponderance of writing was done by the extreme radical who found in the material prosperity of the United States the proof of the rightfulness of his convictions, while a lesser body of conservative writers attempted to controvert him.

The topic was not carried beyond 1860, the speaker merely stating that beyond that date no grouping by periods was possible, because of the greater variety of writers producing works on America and the wide differences of their treatment.

A brief address was then given by Prof. B. E. Howard, Stanford University, on the common and mistaken idea of the permanency of political institutions, especially in America. There is an idea that there is a special divine protection for America and its democracy, and that this democracy can make no mistakes. The soul of government lies not in its form but in the minds and the character of the men composing it; immortality is not guaranteed. The citizens form the center, and their political sense is of vital importance and must be well educated and trained. The keynote of this education in the Fourth of July addresses has been privilege and liberty; the keynote of the newer education is responsibility, and therein lies the union of education and democracy. Education, the evolution of personal forces, is of greater importance to democracy than to other forms of government; and no education is complete that does not lead from patriotism to completeness in citizenship. It is not a vital question that the flag floats over the schools but that children are trained in honor, right, and responsibility, and that they may learn to live for America day by day and, as its citizens, transform the highest thought of things into the highest fact of things.

Greetings were brought from their respective States by Prof. Joseph Schafer, of Oregon; Prof. O. H. Richardson, of Washington; Prof. Jeanne E. Wier, of Nevada; Prof. Levi E. Young, of Utah; and by Prof. R. D. Hunt, of the University of Southern California.

The session on Pacific-coast history was opened at 10.40 by the president. Papers were read by Prof. Jeanne E. Wier, University of Nevada, on "The work of the Western State Historical Society as illustrated by Nevada," and by Prof. A. M. Kline, University of the Pacific, on "The attitude of Congress toward the Pacific Railway,

1856-1862," both of which will be found in another part of the present volume.

The last paper of this session was read by Prof. Joseph Schafer, University of Oregon, on the "Oregon pioneers and American diplomacy." The thesis of the paper was the influence of the pioneer movement upon the diplomatic history of the Oregon question. The speaker showed from the evidence of the printed public documents, from manuscript records in the British Public Record Office, and from private papers in the collections of the Earl of Aberdeen that the introduction of a body of American pioneer settlers into the Oregon country prior to the conclusion of the boundary question in 1846 influenced the negotiations between the two countries in the following ways: First, it rendered impossible any important concessions from the American Government which from the earliest period of the boundary discussion had contended for the forty-ninth parallel; secondly, it showed the British Government why it was that the American Government stood so firmly for that boundary; thirdly, this knowledge which the British Government secured through a virtual survey of conditions in Oregon, conducted by military and naval officers in 1845, brought home the realization that insistence on the Columbia River boundary would mean war, and also that, since American colonization was proceeding at an accelerating rate, the speediest settlement of the boundary question, other things being equal, would probably be advantageous. In other words, the Oregon pioneers prepared, in a measure, the success of American diplomatists.

The business meeting followed immediately after the session on Pacific coast history.

The secretary made a report for the chairman of the committee on archives. This committee was appointed in 1905 and continued at the Portland meeting in 1906. President C. A. Duniway, of the University of Montana, chairman of the committee, wrote that nothing had been done in regard to the California archives on account of the rebuilding and the conditions in the capitol at Sacramento. He urged that the committee be continued. The report was adopted, and the president was authorized to appoint a new committee.

The chairman, Mr. George E. Crothers, of the committee on making libraries available, reported through the secretary that the committee had been appointed in 1905; that it had done some work during the last year in making an effort for the establishment of depositories of the State library in different parts of the State, especially at the State university. He recommended that the committee be continued. The report was adopted. The name of Mr. M. G. Dodge was dropped from the committee and the president was authorized to add to the committee at his discretion.

A résumé of the action of the council regarding the Pacific Association of Scientific Societies was made by the secretary. In accordance with the action of the branch last year the council appointed the president and the secretary to take up the matter of annual meetings at the same time and place with representatives from other societies. On April 9, 1910, a meeting was held in the chamber of commerce rooms in San Francisco and a constitution was arranged and agreed upon. This constitution was submitted to the societies interested. The council adopted the constitution. On September 3, 1910, at the Faculty Club, in Berkeley, representatives from eight societies met, signed the constitution, and elected the following officers: Chairman of the executive committee, Prof. J. N. Bowman, Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association; vice chairman, Mr. Otto Van Geldern, Technical Society of the Pacific Coast; secretary-treasurer, Prof. George D. Louderback, Cordilleran Branch of the Geological Society of America. The executive committee is suggesting to the different societies the 24th and 25th of March, 1911, as the time for the annual meeting; the place has not yet been determined. An annual dinner is also suggested. These questions are for the new council to settle. Expressions from the members of the branch were solicited to aid the council in its work and the matter was left in the hands of the latter with power to act.

The auditing committee made the following report:

The auditing committee hereby states that it has examined the accounts of Prof. J. N. Bowman, secretary and treasurer of the branch, and finds them correct.
Respectfully submitted.

T. M. MARSHALL, *Chairman*.
LUCY REBECCA WATKINS.

The report was adopted.

The report of the committee on State and local historical societies on the coast was then presented by Prof. T. N. Bowman:

At the Stanford meeting of the branch the secretary was instructed to report at the next meeting on the State and local historical societies on the coast. The following is the report:

In the different States I sought answers to the following questions: Name of the society, officers, number of members, publications, meetings, when and where; source and amount of income; attitude of the State toward the society; is the branch of any assistance to the society?

The replies received may be summarized by States as follows:

Arizona.—The Arizona Pioneers' Historical Society. Secretary, Mr. S. R. De Long, Tucson. The society is inactive.

California.—(1) The Historical Society of Southern California, organized 1883. President, Dr. G. F. Bovard; secretary, Mr. J. M. Guinn, both of Los Angeles. About 50 members. Publications, seven volumes of papers read before the society. Meetings, monthly, except July and August, in Los Angeles. Income, about \$200 a year in dues and fees. Attitude of the State, none. Branch aid, none.

(2) The California Historical Society. President, Judge J. V. Coffey, San Francisco. The society has been inactive for several years.

(3) The Santa Clara County Historical Society. President, Judge J. E. Richards; secretary-treasurer, Miss Agnes E. Howe; and two other officers, all of San Jose. About 50 members. No publications. Meetings are held quarterly in San Jose. Income is from the dues from the members. Attitude of the State, none. Branch aid, none.

Colorado.—No replies received.

Idaho.—The State Historical Society of Idaho. President, Mr. J. A. Prinney; secretary-librarian, Mr. John Hailey; and two other officers, all of Boise. About 150 members. No publications. Meetings at the call of the president. Income, \$1,350 a year from the State; the State also furnishes office room. Attitude of the State is very friendly. Branch aid, none.

Montana.—No society at present. A former State Historical Society was merged into the State Historical and Miscellaneous Library.

Nevada.—The Nevada Historical Society. President, Mr. G. F. Talbot; secretary, Prof. Jeanne E. Wier, both of Reno; and a council of the above and four other officers. About 225 members. Publications: Bulletin, 1902, and First Biennial Report, 1909. Meetings annually at Reno during the university commencement week. Income, \$2,000 from the State in 1907-8; from gifts, fees, and other sources about \$2,750 for 1909-10. Attitude of the State, failure to appropriate support was due to typographical error in the general appropriation bill. Branch can be of assistance to the society through resolutions recommending the subject to the attention of the legislature and the governor.

New Mexico.—The Historical Society of New Mexico. President, Hon. L. B. Prince; secretary, Mr. E. A. Johnson, both of Santa Fe; and six other officers. About 100 members. Publications, a series of bulletins. Meetings annually in December, and occasional call meetings, in Santa Fe. Income about \$1,000 from dues and sale of bulletin. Attitude of the Territory, friendly.

Oregon.—The Oregon State Historical Society, organized 1898. President, Mr. F. V. Holman, Portland; secretary, Prof. F. G. Young, Eugene; and three other officers. Membership, 825. Publications, the Quarterly. Meetings, annual in December in Portland. Income, \$2,500 a year from the State; from \$1,200 to \$1,400 a year from membership fees. Attitude of the State, very friendly. Branch aid in information and cooperation.

Utah.—The State Historical Society. President, Mr. J. E. Talmage; secretary, Mr. Byron Cummings, both of Salt Lake City; and five other officers. Meetings, annually in Salt Lake City. Income, about \$200 from the State. No publications. Attitude of the State is very friendly. The branch can be of great aid and benefit.

Washington.—(1) The Inland Empire Historical Society. President, Mr. T. C. Elliott, Walla Walla. The society is now inactive.

(2) The State Historical Society. No replies received.

(3) The State University Historical Society. No replies received.

Wyoming.—The State Historical Society of Wyoming. It is now practically extinct.

I have found it very difficult to secure information regarding the societies. For this reason the report is not as complete as I would wish it. If the information secured above is not satisfactory to the branch, the work of another year, on the basis of the work already done, can produce, I am sure, a more complete report.

Respectfully submitted.

J. N. BOWMAN, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

The report was accepted.

The following report was then received from the committee on resolutions, composed of Prof. H. L. Cannon, Stanford University;

Miss Ada Goldsmith, San Francisco; and Mr. W. C. Westergaard, Alameda:

The committee on resolutions begs to report as follows:

Resolved, That the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, at its annual meeting held on November 18 and 19, 1910, at Berkeley, Cal., desires hereby gratefully to acknowledge the courtesies extended to it by the authorities of the University of California; and, further, to express its appreciation of the efficient conduct of the several sessions by the officials of the branch and by the committee on program and arrangements, and especially to extend its thanks to the members who have so generously participated in the program.

The report was adopted.

Prof. H. L. Cannon, Stanford University, moved the following resolution:

Whereas the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association has for its purpose not merely the contribution to historical knowledge in general, but also the preservation and interpretation of the records of the Pacific slope history in particular; and

Whereas it is fundamentally essential that pioneer records should be collected and preserved as well as the current history of each individual section; and

Whereas the work of collection is unusually difficult in the West;

Therefore be it resolved by the branch, that we urge upon the governors and legislatures of the various States of the Pacific slope that they give this year serious consideration with a view to adequate financial assistance as well as moral support, to the problems of such of their institutions as may be seeking to make such collections, to mark historic sites or in other ways to record in permanent form the history of the past and of the present.

The resolution was adopted.

The committee on nominations reported as follows:

Your committee on nominations begs to recommend the following names for the offices vacant: For president, Prof. Bernard Moses, University of California; for vice president, Prof. Joseph Schafer, University of Oregon; for secretary-treasurer, Mr. H. W. Edwards, Oakland; for the council, Prof. D. E. Smith, University of California; Prof. E. B. Krehbiel, Stanford University; Miss Maud Stephens, Palo Alto, and Prof. Levi E. Young, University of Utah.

Respectfully submitted.

THOS. R. BACON, *Chairman*.

F. J. TEGGART.

S. P. MCCREA.

The report was adopted and the secretary was instructed to cast the ballot for the names nominated. The ballot was cast and the president declared the officers elected.

As delegate to the council of the American Historical Association, Prof. H. M. Stephens, University of California, was elected.

Prof. A. B. Show, Stanford University, moved that the president appoint a committee of three or five (at his discretion), with the secretary an ex officio member, on state and local historical societies. This committee should continue the work already done, keep in touch

with the different societies, and suggest ways and means of furthering their interests.

The motion was adopted.

The "teachers' session" convened at 2.40 on Saturday afternoon. The first subject for discussion was, "Shall the recommendation of the committee of five of the American Political Science Association—that instruction in government and history be taught as separate subjects—be adopted? If so, how?" The paper on this subject was read by Mr. F. H. Clark, Lowell High School, San Francisco. He reviewed the report of the committee of five and agreed with it in general. He differed from the committee, however, regarding "future citizenship" as a reason for teaching government. The word "future" should not be used, as present, actual citizenship is the object of this teaching. Citizenship and voting should and must be separated; age does not make the distinction in the member of the society. Character underlies both, and as the former is of the greater duration its character training should be the greater. This training is not possible in any one course, even in the course in government, but must be carried on by all teachers in all subjects. Ignorance alone is not the cause of bad citizenship; the cause is rather that the party is placed above the public interest, private advantage is placed above public good. Here it is character rather than ignorance that is lacking. The moral attitude and the sense of civic righteousness form the crucial question. The idea of citizenship, he thought, was carried too far by the committee of five.

Mr. Clark believed that history and government should be separated, and that both would be benefited thereby. In his own work he separated them in this proportion: Six months of history and four months of government. He believed that the two subjects should be separated so far as subject matter and lessons are concerned; but he denied that they should be separated in regard to purpose and object. He felt that the committee wished to separate the two subjects in all regards; this he would limit as just indicated.

How is the separation to take place? He would throw the factual side of the government over to this course. It should deal with the colonial conditions leading up to the formation of the Constitution; an acquaintance with the text of the Constitution should be secured. It should deal with the party origins, organizations, and purposes; with the Congress and the other parts of the government; also with the machinery of the State and local governments. But in this separation he would still insist on the spirit of unity with history and also with other subjects.

Miss Agnes E. Howe, San Jose State Normal School, then opened the discussion. She agreed with Mr. Clark. The conditions of the

schools and of the teaching at present she found in the home and in life in general. In the home and the society of childhood the child too often learns to receive but not the blessedness of giving; with him are shared the joys, but not the responsibilities. And the high school all too often continues this condition of affairs. This kind of training does not produce the kind of character that is demanded to-day. A course in government alone can not give this. These courses as they now exist give too much attention to the mere machinery of government, and the method used in teaching is the method of facts rather than the method that leads to action. The subject and facts do not lead to good government or citizenship; action is the end desired—the action of character.

Mr. J. B. Hughes, Oroville High School, discussed the subject still further. He agreed with Mr. Clark in general. He finds difficulty in doing the greatest good to the greatest number. About 75 per cent of the school is in the entering class, about 25 per cent reach the graduating year, where they get the course in government. He felt that the committee made an excellent report, and differed from Mr. Clark as to the meaning that the committee had in mind regarding "future citizenship." He was of the opinion that the committee included character in its idea of citizenship.

Mr. Hughes answered Mr. Clark's question regarding the crowded condition of the seventh and eighth grades and the possibility of adding a course in government.

Prof. H. M. Stephens, University of California, stated that the old committee of seven of the American Historical Association had but little to say regarding this separation of history and government in its report of some 15 years ago, but did have in mind that the government side should be emphasized in the history course. The demand for the separation of the two subjects has arisen since 1895. He felt that the separation was coming, and that it was a question for the high school teachers to settle as they saw best.

Prof. Reed, University of California, insisted on a knowledge of the subject. At present there are a very few teachers who have learned their subject and are really interested in it as they are in the other subjects. To correct this state of affairs he demanded greater insistence on the subject matter. He did not forget the moral side or the need of character, but urged knowledge to aid these.

Mr. Clark then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That this association establish a committee whose business shall be to urge upon the legislature of California at its approaching session such action as will secure the free distribution of a limited number of copies of the regular biennial reports of the State administrative officers and commissions, of a limited number of copies of the volume of "Constitutions" compiled by the secretary of state, and of one copy of the statutes of the California Legislature to every public secondary school.

It was suggested that since the branch is an organization of the Pacific coast it would be best to state the resolution in a general form applicable to all the States.

The resolution was referred by the president to the council for action.

Mrs. Prag, Girls' High School, San Francisco, in her remarks agreed with Prof. Reed regarding the need of knowledge.

The second question for discussion was "To what extent should California history be a part of the course of study? In what grades?" The paper was read by Prof. R. D. Hunt, University of Southern California. The study of history in the schools is no longer in need of defense. Regarding the entrance of the State history in the schools he selected the three following forms of judging the question: First, is it interesting and worthy in itself; second, its relation to the national history; and third, its usefulness to the present and the future. He then showed that California history stood all these tests, and on that basis believed that it should be admitted to the curriculum. He pointed out the problems that its admission raises. Teachers must be prepared in the subject, and text-books must be written for both the teacher and the children. He believed that the demand would bring about the supply of both of these things. He noted with pleasure that the Berkeley High School is arranging such a course in California history, and that other schools were discussing the matter. Normal schools are also taking an interest in the subject. Prof. Hunt stated that he had corresponded with a great number of school officials in the State, from the State superintendent to the teachers in the grades, and that the almost unanimous opinion was that the State history should be placed in the schools.

The reader then discussed the grade in which the subject should be taught. He was of the opinion that it should be entered about the eighth grade, but since there is a difference in the arrangement of the grades in the State, he suggested the seventh to eighth, the eighth to ninth grades. Part of the work could be done with stories in the third and following grades. The formal study of history, which begins in the fifth grade, could also use this subject. In regard to the manner of teaching California history he suggested the discreet use of secondary books and texts, celebrations, journeys to historic places, the use of post cards and pictures, etc.

Prof. J. N. Bowman, University of California, agreed with Prof. Hunt, yet wished to reach the same result from another direction. The historical development of the material used in the study of history makes it clear that the State history should now be admitted. The kinds of facts used for the subject varied with the ages; history has lost many of its parts and some few have been reluctantly added. The German and French schools have long ago taken this step of

utilizing the local and state history, and America is only now coming to a serious consideration of the question. On the other hand, the method of using this material has also varied with the ages. He drew a distinction between the method of pedagogy and the method of the subject. The present method of history is the scientific method, but the struggle to adapt this method from the natural-science world to that of history is not yet completed. It is well completed for the handling of documents and their contents; but the organization of these facts into history is but too little dealt with. Yet this latter is what the grades and high school deal with for the most part. The memory of facts has been and still is the central part of the history instruction; the older manner of memorization has been varied by newer plans—but still the memory is the center. The use of facts according to a historical method of organization and the gradation of this method from the simple to the complex events are still in their beginnings. The speaker believed that this is the important question, and that the discussion regarding the teaching of a new subject would raise it up for serious consideration. He welcomed California history as a set of facts that the children of the coast and State should know; and held that this set of facts could be used as well as any other for instruction in the method of organization so that the child could be independent of teacher and book in handling his own facts.

Prof. E. I. Miller, Chico State Normal School, moved that a committee be appointed to consider the subject of teaching California history in the schools, and to suggest further discussion, and to suggest a line of action.

It was pointed out that the motion should be couched in such a way as to be of benefit to the whole coast, as the branch is a coast organization. The president referred the matter to the council.

With the close of this session the meeting adjourned.

III. THE EFFORTS OF THE DANISH KINGS TO RECOVER THE ENGLISH
CROWN AFTER THE DEATH OF HARTHACNUT.

By LAURENCE M. LARSON,
Assistant Professor of History in the University of Illinois.

THE EFFORTS OF THE DANISH KINGS TO RECOVER THE ENGLISH CROWN AFTER THE DEATH OF HARTHACNUT.

By LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Since the days of Freeman historians have been inclined to believe that Cnut the Great probably did not believe in the permanence of his Anglo-Scandinavian empire. It is thought that a king so wise as Cnut is reputed to have been could not fail to realize the impossibility of maintaining the union between Britain and the north. Like the earlier Charlemagne, therefore, he planned to divide his realms among his three sons, giving a crown to each.¹ There is little to support this belief except the Frankish parallel, and in this case the parallel is imaginary. A vigorous, ambitious king, who is still in the summer of life and has just enjoyed the triumph of conquest, is not likely to be distributing his possessions in anticipation of early death.² There is no evidence that he ever intended to give England to Harold Harefoot. Sweyn's elevation to the Norwegian kingship was practically forced by the death of the regent Hakon and the return of the exiled King Olaf in 1030. The seeming inactivity of Cnut in 1035, when the Norwegians drove his son from the Kingdom, is not to be ascribed to a lack of interest in the Empire. In the early summer of that year he was renewing his friendship with Conrad II and giving his daughter in marriage to the future Henry III.³ We should probably see in this an effort to secure the southern frontier in anticipation of renewed hostilities in the north. A few months later death overtook him.

For more than a century the Danish kings had pursued a conscious policy of conquest. When Sweyn Forkbeard died (1014), he was King of Denmark, England, and large parts of Norway. Cnut merely succeeded to the dynastic pretensions and realized more fully the dynastic purposes. In the summer of 1028, when his vast armament had overawed the Norsemen and secured his recognition as Norwegian king, Cnut called the chiefs together on the shores of

¹ Freeman, "Norman Conquest" (New York, 1873), I, 321.

² If such were Cnut's plans, they must have originated during the period of 1028-1030 when Harthacnut and Sweyn were given the royal title. In 1028 Cnut was scarcely more than 35 years old; his oldest son could not have been more than 14, as Cnut did not come to England before the late summer of 1013.

³ At the hofstag at Bamberg, Whitsuntide, 1035. Manitius, "Deutsche Geschichte unter den sächsischen und salischen Kaisern" (Stuttgart, 1889), 411-412.

Thronðhjem Firth, and in their presence placed his 10-year-old son, Harthacnut, in the royal high seat, gave him the royal name, and charged him with the administration of Denmark.¹ In this assembly there were present magnates from all the three kingdoms. It is probable that among those who heard the proclamation was Earl Godwin, for we learn from the incidental mention of his name in a runic inscription that he accompanied this expedition.² The Encomiast bears testimony to similar intentions when he tells us that all England had taken an oath to accept Harthacnut as king.³ It seems that Cnut, to secure the succession to his legitimate son, had adopted the Capetian expedient of associating the heir with himself in the kingship.

Succeeding events, however, soon disarranged the plans of the great king. For one thing, the physical energies of the Danish dynasty were almost exhausted. Less than seven years after Cnut's death, all his four children had followed him to the grave; his only surviving descendant was a little granddaughter, who closed the career of the line in a German convent. Another disturbing factor was the activity of a rival dynasty which also had developed imperialistic ambitions. A few months before Cnut's death, the Norsemen recalled Magnus, the son of St. Olaf, and reestablished the Norwegian throne. Knowing that war was inevitable, Magnus began hostilities and carried the warfare into Danish waters.⁴ It was this difficulty that prevented Harthacnut from appearing promptly in England in 1035 when Harold Harefoot was plotting to seize the English throne.

Magnus was no mean antagonist. To be the son of a saint was a great asset in the Middle Ages, and Magnus was the son of the first and greatest of all the northern saints. A strong, militant saint like St. Olaf, whose aim was always to strike the first and hardest blow, naturally appealed to the religious instincts of the newly baptized vikings; and during the years of Cnut and Edward the Confessor the cult of St. Olaf spread with amazing rapidity along the shores of all the northern seas.⁵ Magnus also had certain native qualities of the kingly type; furthermore, he developed into a great warrior. From his father he had inherited a battle-ax with a long shaft, a sanctified weapon that bore the unsanctified name of Hel,⁶ the old Norse name for the goddess of death.

After a few years of desultory warfare, Magnus and Harthacnut made peace and entered into a sworn brotherhood, very much like the earlier compact between Cnut and Edmund Ironside. It was

¹ Snorre, "Heimskringla: St. Olaf's Saga," c. 171. The administration of Norway was given to Cnut's nephew, Earl Hakon, who died less than two years later.

² "Afhandlingar viede Sophus Bugges Minde" (Christiania, 1908), 8.

³ "Encomium Emmae," III, c. 1. (Langebek, "Scriptores Rerum Danicarum," II).

⁴ Snorre, "Heimskringla: Saga of Magnus the Good," cc. 1-6.

⁵ On this matter see Daae, "Norges Helgener" (Christiania, 1879), I, cc. 2-3.

⁶ Snorre, "Heimskringla: Saga of Magnus the Good," c. 23.

expressly stipulated that if either king died without heirs the other should inherit his kingdom. Twelve of the best men from each realm swore to maintain the agreement.¹ Three or four years later, the death of Harthacnut gave the Danish crown to Magnus.

To secure the English inheritance was, however, a more difficult matter. In 1042, three men stood forth as candidates for the throne of Alfred: Magnus the Good, as Harthacnut's heir by oath and adoption; Sweyn, the son of Cnut's sister Estrith, now the ranking member of the Danish dynasty, a prince who was most probably an Englishman by birth² and whose aunt was the wife of the influential Earl Godwin; and Edward, later known as the Confessor, who strangely enough represented what national feeling there might be in England, though of such feeling he himself was probably guiltless.

There is no good evidence that Edward was ever formally chosen King of England. Harthacnut died at Lambeth, only a few miles from London. "And before the King was buried all the folk chose Edward to King in London," says the Peterborough manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. If that be true, there could have been no regular meeting of the witan. The circumstances seem to have been somewhat in the nature of a revolution, headed no doubt by the anti-Danish faction in London.³

But even if there were no formal election, negotiations, both formal and informal, must have been conducted for some time after Edward was proclaimed; for we are told that his successful accession was mainly due to the efforts of Earl Godwin and Bishop Lifting.⁴ If Edward succeeded "without opposition," as Hodgkin puts it,⁵ the earl and the bishop must have gone to much unnecessary trouble. But the situation was anything but simple. The election of Magnus would restore Cnut's empire, but would probably mean English and Danish revolts; it may also be that the English lords knew of the King's harshness toward those who had led the opposition to his father, the holy King Olaf. To elect Sweyn would almost surely mean war with Magnus over Sweyn's Danish inheritance. Just then the Danish claimant was making the most trouble, for Sweyn seems to have arrived in England soon after Edward was proclaimed.⁶ The outcome was that Edward kept the crown, but Sweyn, according

¹ Ibid., c. 6.

² Sweyn must have been born about 1018. At that time his father, Ulf, doubtless had already been appointed to the English earldom that he surely held two or three years later. See Kemble, "Codex Diplomaticus," Nos. 735, 740.

³ Freeman believes in a second election at a *gemôt* held at Gillingham ("Norman Conquest," II, 5). It seems clear, however, that Edward was in possession, at least nominally, of the English crown from the time of his accession. The meeting at Gillingham probably had to deal primarily with the pretensions of the other candidates. Regular constitutional procedure is not to be looked for in revolutionary times.

⁴ Florence of Worcester, "Chronicon," I, 196-197. Not much reliance can be placed on William of Malmesbury's account of these negotiations. "Gesta Regum," I, 238.

⁵ Hunt-Poole, "Political History of England," I, 442.

⁶ Adamus, "Gesta Hammenburgensis Ecclesie Pontificum," II, c. 74.

to the account that he gave to Adam of Bremen, was designated as heir.¹ Prof. Oman seems to question the Dane's veracity on this point, but without good reason.² In 1042 there was scarcely anyone else to designate. It was probably common knowledge in the ruling circles that the new King was inclined to and perhaps even pledged to a celibate life. We do not know whether Englishmen were at this time informed of the ethelings in Hungary. The probabilities were that Alfred's line would expire with Edward; under the circumstances, Sweyn was the likeliest heir.

Sweyn returned to Denmark and was invested by Magnus with the earl's dignity and the defense of Jutland. The next year he raised the standard of revolt and assumed the royal title.³ With the resources of Denmark at his command he might find it tiresome to wait for the death of the gentle Confessor; it may therefore be significant that a few months after Sweyn's revolt Edward married Edith, who was Sweyn's cousin. Later medieval writers looked on this marriage as a wicked scheme on the part of Godwin, who wished to become the King's father-in-law.⁴ There may be something in this belief, but it fails to take the wishes of the bridegroom into account. It is quite likely that Edward hoped in this way to draw Godwin and his family farther away from their Danish kinsman who had just seized a throne.

The situation in the North soon came to be such, however, that Edward's kingship was in no immediate danger. According to the sagas, Magnus sent an embassy to England, perhaps in 1043, to demand the surrender of England.⁵ The English sources do not mention any such demand, but the extensive naval preparations in England in 1044 and the following years⁶ indicate that the account in the sagas is correct. But Magnus never came; he was kept busy at home defending his kingdoms against the attacks of Sweyn and of his own uncle Harold, who claimed a share of Norway. In 1047 he died, and the union between Norway and Denmark was dissolved.

Harold Hardrada, the King who did not gladly receive counsel, was now sole ruler in Norway. Harold was an adventurer, a magnificent warrior of the roving type, but a strong, though inconsiderate King. It was to be expected that he would follow up his predecessor's designs on England as soon as opportunity should appear. In the first year of his reign a Norwegian fleet plundered the shores of southeastern England; it was clearly a private venture, though

¹ Ibid.

² "England before the Norman Conquest," 610.

³ Snorre, "Heimskringla: Saga of Magnus the Good," cc. 23-25. In the matter of chronology I follow Munch, "Det Norske Folks Historie," II, 31 ff.

⁴ "Lives of Edward the Confessor" (Rolls Series, No. 3), 58-59.

⁵ Snorre, "Heimskringla: Saga of Magnus the Good," cc. 36-37.

⁶ See the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for these years.

scarcely undertaken without the connivance of the King.¹ But soon the war with Denmark flared up again, and in 1049 both the Northern Kings were seeking military aid from the English King whose throne they coveted. For a decade or more there seems to have been little peace in Scandinavia, and Edward was consequently permitted to enjoy his honors till his death. But the northern Kings did not forget their claim to the crown of Cnut. It was in pursuit of this that Harold led his host into Northumbria in 1066, only to meet disaster at Stamford Bridge.

The events in England in the autumn of 1066 were doubtless followed with keen interest at the Danish court. The slaughter at Stamford Bridge not only removed Sweyn's warlike rival and destroyed the flower of the Norwegian host—it destroyed for the moment the Norwegian monarchy as well; for, on the return of the surviving remnant, Norway was divided between the two sons of the fallen King, Magnus and Olaf.² Soon came the news from Hastings of the fall of Harold and the ruin of Godwin's house. Sweyn could now come forward in a double capacity—as the chief of two royal families;³ as the heir and avenger of his kinsman Harold and as heir to the rights of his uncle, Cnut the Great.

The Danish King had suddenly become the most commanding figure in all Scandinavia. Norway was divided; Sweden was drifting toward heathen reaction and civil war; the men of the English Danelaw were imploring his help against the Norman usurper. The difficulty was that Sweyn's ambition was too great for the time and the circumstances; he evidently aimed at the reestablishment of Cnut's empire, but he had not the strength to fight Normans and Norsemen at the same time. An ambassador was sent to England to demand submission,⁴ and the peace with Norway was declared to have terminated with the death of Harold Hardrada. The Norsemen accepted the challenge and apparently fought with some success; the death of King Magnus reunited the Kingdom under Olaf the Quiet, and the Danes soon found it expedient to accept the terms of peace that Olaf offered.⁵ But in this way two years were allowed to slip by before an effort was made to dislodge William. English historians have ascribed the delay to "native irresolution,"

¹ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1046, 1047; the year should doubtless be 1048. The account does not say that the fleet was from Norway, but the names of the leaders, Lothen and Erling, are found in the family of Erling Skjalgsson, who in the days of Cnut was the lordliest of all the Norwegian chiefs.

² Munch, "Det Norske Folks Historie," II, 376-377.

³ The young sons of the English Harold could, of course, not pretend to family leadership.

⁴ According to Henry Knighton, Sweyn sent a housecarle (miles) to demand homage and tribute. "Chronicon" (Rolls Series, No. 92), II, 58. See also "Script. Rer. Danic.," III, 252-258 ("Lectioes de Legatione Helsini Abbatis in Daniam circa An. 1067").

⁵ Snorre, "Heimskringla: Harold Hardrada's Saga," c. 101; Munch, "Det Norske Folks Historie," II, 377-381. We can not be sure that Magnus died before the peace was made; but as he seems to have had no part in the resistance, it is thought that such was the case.

"prudence," "caution," and other imaginary causes.¹ Sweyn was patient, but neither irresolute nor timid; he responded to the English invitation as soon as circumstances would permit.

Instead of a defiant reply to the demands of Sweyn, the Conqueror sent an embassy to Denmark to learn the King's intentions and to labor for peace. As chief envoy he selected Ethelsige, abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, also for a time abbot of Ramsey. Ethelsige was intrusted with greetings and gifts for the King, and we are told that he also honored the chief Danish nobles with gifts.² William also called upon the archbishop of Hamburg, the primate of the northern church, to assist in maintaining the peace. But hostilities were not averted, although, says Adam of Bremen, "our archbishop, moved to action by William's gifts, strove to mediate between the kings."³ Still later, perhaps in 1069, an embassy was sent to Norway,⁴ doubtless to secure William against an attack from that country, for Olaf had just made peace with Sweyn and had married his daughter. An alliance with William was out of the question, but Olaf seems for some time to have maintained a strict neutrality.

For two years England had expected invasion; finally, in 1069, the Danish fleet was ready to sail. While we can not be sure, it seems probable that all the forces hostile to William in the North and in Britain were trying to act in concert in the summer of that year, though the understanding can not have been complete.⁵ In June came the sons of Harold from the Norwegian refuge in Ireland, and attacked the southwest.⁶ Two months later a fleet of 240 ships, carrying about 15,000 men, perhaps, attacked the southeast. It seems to have been a force collected, not necessarily "sharked up," from Denmark and the Danish possessions on the Slavic coasts.⁷ It was not a viking expedition, as Ramsay believes,⁸ but a national levy commanded by men of the highest rank—the King's brother Asbjörn; two of the royal princes, Harold and Cnut; an earl, Thurkil, probably grandson of Cnut's great

¹ Freeman, "Norman Conquest," IV, 80; Stenton, "William the Conqueror," 253; Davis, "England under Normans and Angevins," 15.

² "Script. Rer. Danic.," III, 253. * * * munera ac servicia ex parte Wilhelmi novi Regis Angliæ optulit, ac Proceres terræ muneribus honoravit." ("Lectiones de Legatione Helsini Abbatis.")

³ Adamus, "Gesta," iii, c. 53.

⁴ Simeon of Durham, "Opera Omnia," (Rolls Series, No. 75), II, 202-203: "In qua navi etiam legati Wilhelmi regis Norwegiam mittendi subvectionem sibi paraverant."

⁵ For a slightly different view, see Stenton, "William the Conqueror," 270. Stenton underestimates the importance of the Scandinavian element in the Danelaw.

⁶ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1069. The sons of Harold had sought and found refuge at the court of a Celtic king, but their forces were evidently recruited from the Norwegian colonies in Ireland.

⁷ Ordericus Vitalis, "Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Libri Tredecim," II, 191 (Paris edition of 1840), tells us that Sweyn received aid from the Poles, the Frisians, and the Saxons; that Leuticia also sent forces; elsewhere in the narrative Norwegians are also mentioned as in the expedition. By Poles we should probably understand the Pomeranian Slavs, who had long been under Danish rule and influence. That there were Norse, Frisian, and Saxon volunteers in the fleet is also possible, though it is possible that Ordericus merely indulges the medieval fondness for a display of geographical knowledge. Leuticia, as Ordericus describes it, can scarcely be a Slavic or Lithuanian country; its inhabitants were worshippers of Norse gods.

⁸ "Foundations of England," II, 69.

general, Thurkil the Tall, and two bishops.¹ As the princes and the earl were young and the bishops were not supposed to be warriors of the carnal type, the chief command evidently fell to Asbjörn, who as a former resident (perhaps native) of England and at one time a chief in the royal guard, should be specially fitted for leadership as regards both military experience and knowledge of the land.²

The results of the expedition were not in proportion to the energy spent in preparation. No doubt the Danes looked for substantial assistance from the disaffected English, and that there was rebellion in the Danelaw is evident from the haste with which the northern chiefs made their submission to Sweyn.³ But soon William appeared in the north country with his terrible Norman cavalry. Unable to reach the enemy, he conceived the terrible plan of devastating the rebellious region. He also approached the avaricious Asbjörn (who had probably lost courage by this time) and honored him highly with gifts. The Dane was also permitted to plunder the English coast on the condition that he should leave by the close of winter. But the temptation to pillage was great and Asbjörn lingered until June. On his return he was accused of incompetence and sent into exile.⁴

Five years later (1075) a second fleet sailed from Denmark on a similar mission. It was not so large as the earlier one; still it counted 200 ships. This time, too, the Danes came on invitation; it was the year of the "rising of the earls." Young Cnut and Earl Hakon were in command.⁵ But they found that the English dared not join them; the memory of the Vale of York was still too fresh in the popular mind. After plundering St. Peter's minster at York,⁶ the Danes withdrew and the movement collapsed.

The three chief conspirators in England all suffered punishment, but Earl Waltheof alone paid the penalty of death. Waltheof was the least guilty of the three, and William at first seemed disposed to forgive him. We do not know why the King changed his mind, though various conjectures have been put forth. It may be that Waltheof was not executed for his part in the preliminaries of the earls' rebellion, but because his relationship to English and Danish royalty made him an exceptionally dangerous subject. His mother was of Northumbrian royal blood; his father, Siward the Strong, was a nephew of Thorgils Sprakaleg, the grandfather of King Sweyn of

¹ According to Ordericus, *op. cit.*, II, 190, there were three earls in the expedition.

² Asbjörn seems to have been exiled in 1049, when a wave of anti-Danish feeling seems to have swept over England. See Adamus, "*Gesta*," III, c. 13.

³ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1068; Florence of Worcester, "*Chronicon*," II, 3.

⁴ Florence of Worcester, "*Chronicon*," II, 6-7. It is possible that Asbjörn's willingness to treat with William was not due to personal avarice, but prompted by the difficult condition in which the force found itself during the winter of 1069-1070. See "Ordericus," II, 197.

⁵ Lappenberg believes that this Hakon was the son of Sweyn, the son of Godwin. Freeman doubts this, as no evidence is given; "*Norman Conquest*," IV, 397. Munch identifies Earl Hakon with Hakon Ivarsson, Earl of Halland in southwestern Sweden; "*Det Norske Folks Historie*," II, 394.

⁶ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1076 (1075).

Denmark.¹ Waltheof was consequently a third cousin of King Harold of England as well as of King Sweyn. It is therefore not strange that the rebel earls should suggest to him the possibility of winning the English throne. So long as the Danish King lived and was the recognized head of the Sprakaleg family, as well as an active claimant to the English kingship, Waltheof was not particularly dangerous; and it is significant that at the midwinter gemót the earl was not found guilty, though he was not set free.² But four months later (April 28, 1076) King Sweyn died. Three weeks later, at the Pentecostal gemót (May 15–22), Waltheof was again tried and condemned to death.³ It is not unlikely that William feared that the earl might now assert a claim to the English crown; as the most prominent of the native nobility and the senior member of a mighty kindred, he might, at least, prove a very inconvenient subject.

So far as the Danes were concerned, the only result of these expeditions seems to have been that the Danish church secured (or believed that it secured) the relics of two great English saints, St. Alban and St. Oswald. These probably made part of the plunder that Asbjörn brought in 1070. That monasteries were not spared in that raid is evident from the sacking of Peterborough.⁴ The contemporary biographer of St. Cnut, Ethelnoth, an English ecclesiastic, attributes the translation of St. Alban to the King that he glorifies; but Cnut took part in both these raids.⁵ A discussion of the genuineness of these relics would carry us too far afield; but there can be no doubt that the Danes of the time believed that the bones of both St. Alban and St. Oswald were resting at Odense.⁶

Ten years later, the Danes mustered for the last time to invade England. Sweyn had passed to his reward; his son Harold had followed him after a brief reign; and now Cnut of sacred memory sat on the throne of the elder Cnut. St. Cnut seems to have lacked some of the finer qualities of kingship, but he had much rude strength, unbending purposes, and a high conception of kingly honor. What his earlier plans with regard to his supposed English rights were can not be known; but when dissatisfied Englishmen once more came to

¹ It is possible that Siward was Thorgills' grandson, but Steenstrup's view that he was Thorgills' nephew seems more in accord with what we know of the history of the Sprakaleg family; "Normannerne," III, 437–440. With Steenstrup's corrections, the genealogy will be as follows:

Ursus (Björn).		
Björn.	(Thorgills) Spradlingus.	
Siward.	Ulf=Estrid (Cnut's sister).	Gytha=Godwin.
Waltheof.	Sweyn of Denmark.	Harold II.

² See Freeman, "Norman Conquest," IV, 401.

³ Ibid., 402.

⁴ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1070.

⁵ Ethelnoth tells us that Cnut was slain "in Basilica Sancti Albani Martyris, per eum paullo ante de Anglia in Dacliam transvecti. . .;" "Script. Rer. Danic.," III, 372.

⁶ In the struggle about the altar when King Cnut was slain, the shrines of the two saints were overturned—"capsulasque Reliquiarum, pretiosorum martyrum, Albani nec non et Osvualdi;" *ibid.*, 368.

urge an invasion of their country, Cnut seems to have listened eagerly.¹

For such a venture the time seemed exceedingly favorable. The King of Norway had promised to assist; Sweden had just passed through the horrors of civil war; nor was anything to be feared from the Empire; those were the closing days of the greater Gregory, and Henry IV had his face turned away from Denmark. The Count of Flanders, who was William's enemy and Cnut's father-in-law, had promised to join with a strong force. William seemed to have fallen upon evil days; enemies had risen upon every side. In 1079, he was defeated and wounded by his own son at Gerberoi. The King of France supported the rebellious prince. The same year Malcolm of Scotland ravaged the northern borders. The next year the men of Durham rose and slew the bishop that William had given them. In 1082, the Conqueror found it necessary to imprison his own brother, the Bishop Odo.

A year later (1083), apparently, the temptation had come to Cnut. The messengers from England must therefore have come very soon after the imprisonment of Odo; but it would not be safe to affirm that they were, or represented, the good bishop's friends. Preparations must have begun in 1084, for the fleet began to gather the following spring. The entire Danish host seems to have been summoned. We are told that a thousand ships gathered near the western outlet of the Lime Firth,² an inlet that in those days was a strait and not as Freeman conceives it now a strait and formerly an inlet.³ Sixty large Norwegian ships formed the contingent promised by Olaf of Norway. The Count of Flanders had promised to furnish 600 more.⁴

We need not accept these numbers as accurate statements; still it is evident that a mighty effort was being put forth. William realized that his throne was in danger. While Cnut was seeking allies he was in Maine striving to subdue a rebellious vassal; but when he learned of the danger from Denmark he hastened to England with a large force of continental mercenaries, both foot soldiers and knights, a force so numerous "that men wondered how this land could provision all that host."⁵ To make the invasion more difficult he ordered large parts of the eastern coast to be laid waste. But all his precautions were unnecessary, for Cnut and his great fleet never came.

¹ "Unde, Legatis frequentius transmissis, præstantissimi Principis Kanuti deposcunt auxilium; illi magis cupientes, hostibus aggressis, ad Anglorum decertare imperium obtinendum . . ." *ibid.*, 347.

² William of Malmesbury, "Gesta Regum," II, 319; "Script. Rer. Danic.," III, 350 (Ethelnoth); "Knytlingasaga," c. 42.

³ "Norman Conquest," IV, 466.

⁴ William of Malmesbury, "Gesta Regum," II, 319.

⁵ Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1085.

The King was not with the ships in the Lime Firth; he was at Heathby, near the modern city of Schleswig, nearly 200 miles away, "taking counsel with wise and prudent men." The Danes soon wearied of waiting and sent a deputation headed by the King's own brother, Olaf, to Heathby to urge activity. On their arrival Olaf was arrested and sent to Flanders for safe-keeping. When the Danes learned that their remonstrances were unheeded most of them mutinied and returned to their homes. A little later the King appeared at the rendezvous, only to find that the Norwegian ships were almost the only ones remaining.¹

Various reasons have been given for the King's delay and the consequent break-up of the fleet—domestic difficulties, bribery on the part of William, danger from the Slavs, doubt as to the outcome in view of William's great preparations. It may be that all these were contributing causes, but it seems that the chief cause must be sought in the new situation on the southern frontier. The *Knytlingasaga* emphasizes the threatening movements among the Slavs of modern Mecklenburg and Pomerania. There can be little doubt that the Slavs actually were on the warpath and that Cnut was anxious to make peace with them, as the saga relates.² But a still more serious situation had developed on the German frontier. While the Danish ships were gathering in the Lime Firth Hildebrand breathed his last. As soon as the news reached Germany Henry IV made a dash into Saxony, and soon the rival Emperor, Henry of Salm, accompanied by the archbishop of Magdeburg and the bishop of Halberstadt, came to seek refuge in Denmark.³ With a victorious and probably hostile imperial force on the southern border it was plainly inexpedient to withdraw the entire Danish host from the country, and hence the long deliberations at Heathby.

A few months later William had "deep speech" with his wise men at Gloucester. Out of this came the Domesday inquest. It is clear that the large force of mercenaries that had been brought from the Continent to repel the Danes must have proved a severe drain on William's exchequer. Whether it was the need of funds to meet these expenses that led to the great assessment can not be known; still it seems likely that one of the influences that determined the decision of the Gloucester *gemót* was the threatened invasion of the summer before.

Another event that is sometimes associated with Cnut's plans is the meeting of the landholding men at Salisbury in 1086. It is the belief of Stenton that the Salisbury oath "was demanded with the single purpose of providing against the defection of disloyal knights

¹ On Cnut's delay at Heathby and the break-up of the fleet, see "*Script. Rer. Danic.*," III, 351-352 (Ethelnoth); "*Knytlingasaga*," cc. 42-43.

² "*Knytlingasaga*," c. 42.

³ "*Danmarks Riges Historie*," I, 486.

and barons to Cnut of Denmark in the imminent event of his landing."¹ Other historians hold similar views. But in August, 1086, there was no danger from Denmark. Perhaps William did not know that Cnut had been assassinated three weeks earlier, though he seems to have kept in close touch with Danish affairs; but he surely knew that the fleet had deserted a year before, that Cnut had spent the last year of his life in punishing the deserters, and that his severity had kindled the flames of civil war. William surely understood that all such danger was past. It seems that the motive for the Salisbury oath must be sought elsewhere.

In the study of these episodes English historians have usually stated the facts correctly, but the interpretations offered are too often mere conjectures. Three important facts need especially to be understood before the events can be seen in the proper light—the hereditary claims of the Danish dynasty, the relations existing between Denmark and Norway, and the persistence of Scandinavian sentiment in the Danelaw. It is not sufficient to say that the Danish kings had no English rights, as England was an elective monarchy; the Danes had accepted the principle of heredity and saw no reason for limiting its application to their own country. Furthermore, the English principle of election had very little vigor in the eleventh century. Nor will it do to claim very much for English national movements and national feeling in the days of Edward and William. We should not go far wrong in saying that in the tenth and eleventh centuries there were two nations in England—the West Saxon and the Anglo-Danish. It was in the old Danelaw where the Conqueror met the most frequent and the most stubborn resistance; it was no doubt from the Danelaw that the call came loudest to Sweyn and Cnut; the hopes of Danish aid may have had much to do with the rebellious behavior of the chiefs in the north country. At the same time, though divisions in England were a factor favorable to intervention, the ambitions of Norway to be and remain an independent nation made impossible the reestablishment of Cnut's empire and ruined the chances of successful invasion at the moment when such an undertaking might have succeeded, in the year following the conquest.

¹ "William the Conqueror" (New York, 1908), 365.