

---

*Annual Report*  
OF THE  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION



FOR THE YEAR

1962

+

VOLUME 1

+

*Proceedings*

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

*Washington, D.C.*

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 45 cents

## Letter of Submittal

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1963.

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 of submitting to Congress the Annual Report of the Association for the year 1962.

Respectfully,

LEONARD CARMICHAEL, Secretary.

## Letter of Transmittal

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1963.

SIR: As provided by law, I submit herewith the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1962. This consists of two volumes in one.

Volume I contains the proceedings of the Association for 1962, and the report of the secretary-treasurer for the Pacific Coast Branch for 1962.

Volume II will contain the Writings on American History for 1960.

BOYD C. SHAFER, Executive Secretary.  
TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D. C.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Act of incorporation.....	IX
Organization and activities of the American Historical Association.....	XI
Constitution.....	XV
Officers and members of the Council for 1963.....	XIX
Committees and delegates for 1963.....	XXIII
Ad interim appointments for 1962.....	XXVI
Pacific Coast Branch officers for 1963.....	XXVIII
Proceedings of the American Historical Association for 1962	
The Chicago Meeting, 1962.....	3
Minutes of the meeting of the Council, December 27, 1962.....	20
Minutes of the business meeting, December 29, 1962 ..	23
Report of the Executive Secretary and Managing Editor for the year 1962.....	25
Report of the Treasurer for the fiscal year 1961-62 ...	30
Report of the Auditors for the fiscal year 1961-62.....	35
Report of the Board of Trustees for 1961-62 .....	37
Draft budgets, 1962-63, 1963-64, unrestricted funds ...	40
Statistics of membership .....	42
Committee reports for 1962 .....	43
Other reports .....	56
Report of the Pacific Coast Branch for 1962.....	61



## 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 as far as may be necessary to its lawful ends, to adopt a constitution, and make bylaws 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 report, 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.

The real property situated in Square 817, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lot 23, owned, occupied, and used by the American Historical Association, is exempt from all taxation so long as the same is so owned and occupied, and not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Act entitled, "An Act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942.

[Approved, January 4, 1889, and amended July 3, 1957.]

# ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES

## THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

### THE ASSOCIATION

The American Historical Association, incorporated by Act of Congress in 1889, is defined by its charter to be: A body corporate and politic . . . for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interests of American history, and of history in America.

It is a society not only for scholars, though it has for the last half century included in its membership the outstanding historical scholars in America, not only for educators, though it has included the great American teachers of history, but also for every man and woman who is interested in the study of history in America. Its most generous benefactors have been nonprofessionals who love history for its own sake and who wish to spread that love of history to a wider and wider circle.

### LEADERSHIP

Among those who have labored as members and later served it also as President, the American Historical Association can list such distinguished names as George Bancroft, Justin Winsor, Henry Adams, James Ford Rhodes, Alfred Thayer Mahan, Henry C. Lea, John Bach McMaster, Frederick Jackson Turner, Theodore Roosevelt, Edward Channing, Woodrow Wilson, J. Franklin Jameson, Charles M. Andrews, James H. Breasted, James Harvey Robinson, Michael Rostovtzeff, Carl L. Becker, and Charles A. Beard.

### ANNUAL MEETING

It meets in the Christmas week at a different place each year to accommodate in turn members living in different parts of the country. The attendance at these meetings has been increasing steadily. In recent years registration has varied from 2,300 to 3,100. The formal programs of these meetings include important contributions to every field of historical scholarship, many of which are subsequently printed.

### PUBLICATIONS

The publications of the Association are many and their scope is wide.

The Annual Report, usually in two or more volumes, is printed for the Association by the United States Government. It contains

the Proceedings of the Association, as well as bibliographies and guides to materials. The American Historical Review, published quarterly and distributed free to all members of the Association, is the recognized organ of the historical profession in America. It prints authoritative articles and critical reviews of new books in all fields of history.

The AHA Newsletter, published bi-monthly October through June and distributed free to members, contains news of general educational interest and staff appointments and changes, as well as notices of the Professional Register. The Association also co-operates with the National Council for the Social Studies in the publication of Social Education, one of the most important journals in America dealing with the problems of history teaching in the schools.

The Association possesses a revolving fund out of which it publishes from time to time historical monographs selected from the whole field of history. It has as well three separate endowment funds, the income from which is devoted to the publication of historical studies. The Albert J. Beveridge Fund of \$100,000 was established as a memorial to the late Senator Beveridge by his wife, Catherine Beveridge, and a large group of his friends in Indiana. The income from this fund is applied to the publication of historical monographs. The Littleton-Griswold Fund was established by Alice Griswold in memory of her father, William E. Littleton, and of her husband, Frank T. Griswold. The income from this fund, the principal of which amounts to \$35,000, is applied to the publication of material relative to the legal history of the United States in the colonial period. The Matteson Fund, now amounting to approximately \$95,000, was willed to the Association by the late David M. Matteson. The income from this fund may be used only for bibliographies and indexes.

#### OTHER ACTIVITIES

The Association from time to time, through special committees, interests itself actively in promoting the sound teaching of history in the schools. It has done much and is doing more to collect and preserve historical manuscripts in public and private repositories.

The Association maintains close relationships with state and local historical societies and with the federal government. For many years it has had a Pacific Coast Branch for members living in the Far West.

#### SOURCES OF SUPPORT

The American Historical Association is in a position to do significant and useful work, not only in the advancement of learning but also in the dissemination of knowledge. It commands the resources of the learned historians, but it also recognizes the necessity of bringing the fruits of learning to the average American. It needs to be supported. Its funds, restricted and unrestricted, and including foundation grants, amount to \$885,018.50 if the book value of permanent investments is used. If market values, according

to the August 31, 1962 appraisal are used, the total assets of the Association amount to \$1,112,030.00. These funds are carefully managed by a Board of Trustees composed of men prominent in the world of finance. But much of the income is earmarked for special publications. For its broader educational purposes it has to depend chiefly upon its membership dues. It has about 11,000 members.

#### MEMBERSHIP

The American Historical Association welcomes to its membership anyone who subscribes to its purposes. There is no initiation fee. The annual membership, including subscription to The American Historical Review, is \$10.00, and student membership is \$5.00. The life membership is \$200.00. Inquiries about any phase of its activities may be addressed to the Executive Secretary of the Association, 400 A Street, S. E., Washington 3, D.C.

#### PRIZES

The Association offers the following prizes:

The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize of \$300 is awarded biennially in the even-numbered years for a monograph (first or second book), in manuscript or in print, in the field of European history.

The George Louis Beer Prize of \$300 is awarded annually for the best work (first or second book) on any phase of European international history since 1895. Competition is limited to citizens of the United States and to works in the English language. A work may be submitted either in manuscript or in print.

The John H. Dunning Prize of \$300 is awarded biennially in the even-numbered years for a monograph, either in print or in manuscript, on any subject relating to American history. Eligibility of printed works submitted in competition for this prize shall be limited to books printed within 2 years and 5 months prior to June 1 of the year in which the award is made. Entries are restricted to "first books" or unpublished manuscripts, and preference is given to those of younger scholars.

The Watumull Prize of \$500 is awarded biennially (next award 1964) for the best book originally published in the United States on any phase of the history of India.

The Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize of \$100 is awarded every 5 years to the author of the best work of scholarship published during the preceding 5-year period in the field of modern British and British Imperial and Commonwealth history since the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth (exclusive of American colonial history) before 1783. The author must be an American citizen, and the books must have been originally published in the United States. The prize is made possible by the Taraknath Das Foundation (next award 1966).

All works submitted in competition for the above prizes must be in the hands of the proper committee by June 1 of the year in which the award is made. The date of publication of printed monographs submitted in competition must fall within a period of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years prior to June 1 of the year in which the prize is awarded.

The Littleton-Griswold Prize in Legal History of \$500 is awarded biennially for the best published work, not to exceed 150,000 words, in the legal history of the American colonies and of the United States to 1900. Submit by June 1.

The Albert J. Beveridge Award, established at the annual meeting in 1945, is awarded annually for the best complete original manuscript on American history. By American history is meant the history of the United States, Latin America, and Canada. The award has a cash value of \$1,500. The winning manuscript in each annual competition is published without cost to the author in the series of Beveridge Fund publications. The deadline for the submission of applications and manuscripts is May 1.

# CONSTITUTION

## ARTICLE I

SECTION 1. The name of this society shall be the American Historical Association.

## ARTICLE II

SECTION 1. Its object shall be the promotion of historical studies.

## ARTICLE III

SECTION 1. Any person approved by the Council may become an active member of the Association. Active membership shall date from the receipt by the Treasurer of the first payment of dues, which shall be \$10.00 a year or a single payment of \$200.00 for life. Life membership is given members who have belonged to the Association for fifty years. Any graduate or undergraduate student registered in a college or university may become a junior member of the Association upon payment of \$5.00 and after the first year may continue as such as long as he is registered as a student, by paying the annual dues of \$5.00. Annual dues shall be payable at the beginning of the year to which they apply and any member whose dues are in arrears for 1 year may, 1 month after the mailing of a notice of such delinquency to his last known address, be dropped from the rolls by vote of the Council or the Executive Committee. Members who have been so dropped may be reinstated at any time by the payment of 1 year's dues in advance. Only active members shall have the right to vote or to hold office in the Association. Persons not resident in the United States may be elected by the Council as honorary or corresponding members, and such members shall be exempt from payment of dues.

## ARTICLE IV

SECTION 1. The officers shall be a President, a Vice President, a Treasurer, an Executive Secretary, a Managing Editor of The American Historical Review, and, at the discretion of the Council, an Editor and an Assistant Secretary-Treasurer.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Executive Secretary, under the direction of the Council, to promote historical scholarship in America through the agencies of the Association. He shall exercise general oversight over the affairs of the Association, supervise the work of its committees, formulate policies for presentation to the Council, execute its policies and perform such other duties as the Council may from time to time direct.

SEC. 3. The other officers of the Association shall have such duties and perform such functions as are customarily attached to their respective offices or as may from time to time be prescribed by the Council.

SEC. 4. The President, Vice President, and Treasurer shall be elected in the following manner: The Nominating Committee at such convenient time prior to the 1st of September as it may determine shall invite each member of the Association to indicate his or her nominee for each of these offices. With these suggestions in mind, it shall draw up a ballot of nominations which it shall mail to each member of the Association on or before the 1st of December, and which it shall distribute as the official ballot at the Annual Business Meeting. It shall present to this meeting orally any other nominations for these offices petitioned for to the Chairman of the Committee at least one day before the Business Meeting and supported by the names of 20 voting members of the Association. The election shall be made from these nominations at the Business Meeting.

SEC. 5. The Executive Secretary, the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the Managing Editor of The American Historical Review, and the Editor shall be appointed by the Council for specified terms of office not to exceed 3 years, and shall be eligible for re-appointment. They shall receive such compensation as the Council may determine.

SEC. 6. If the office of President shall, through any cause, become vacant, the Vice President shall thereupon become President.

#### ARTICLE V

SECTION 1. There shall be a Council, constituted as follows:

(a) The President, the Vice President, the Executive Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Managing Editor of The American Historical Review.

(b) Elected members, eight in number, chosen by ballot in the manner provided in Article VI, Section 2. These members shall be elected for a term of 4 years; two to be elected each year, except in the case of elections to complete unexpired terms.

(c) The former Presidents, but a former President shall be entitled to vote for the 3 years succeeding the expiration of his term as President, and no longer.

SEC. 2. The Council shall conduct the business, manage the property, and care for the general interests of the Association. In the exercise of its proper functions, the Council may appoint such committees, commissions, and boards as it may deem necessary. The Council shall make a full report of its activities to the Annual Meeting of the Association. The Association may by vote at any Annual Meeting instruct the Council to discontinue or enter upon any activity, and may take such other action directing the affairs of the Association as it may deem necessary and proper.

SEC. 3. For the transaction of necessary business when the Council is not in session, the Council shall elect annually from its membership an Executive Committee of not more than six members which shall include the Executive Secretary and the Treasurer. Subject always to the general direction of the Council, the Executive

Committee shall be responsible for the management of Association interests and the carrying out of Association policies.

## ARTICLE VI

SECTION 1. There shall be a Nominating Committee to consist of five members, each of whom shall serve a term of 2 years. In the odd-numbered years, two new members shall be elected; in the even-numbered years, three; this alternation shall continue except in the case of elections to complete unexpired terms. If vacancies on the Nominating Committee occur between the time of the Annual Elections, the Nominating Committee shall fill them by direct ad interim appointments.

SEC. 2. Elective members of the Council and members of the Nominating Committee shall be chosen as follows: The Nominating Committee shall present for each vacant membership on the Council and on the Nominating Committee 2 or more names, including the names of any person who may be nominated by a petition carrying the signatures of 20 or more voting members of the Association. Nominations by petition must be in the hands of the Chairman of the Nominating Committee by November 1st. The Nominating Committee shall present these nominations to the members of the Association in the ballot distributed by mail as described above. The members of the Association shall take their choice from among these nominations and return their ballots for counting not later than the 20th of December at 6 p.m. No vote received after that time shall be valid. The votes shall be counted and checked in such manner as the Nominating Committee shall prescribe and shall then be sealed in a box and deposited in the Washington office of the Association, where they shall be kept for at least a year. The results of the election shall be announced at the Annual Business Meeting. In the case of a tie, choice shall be made at the Annual Business Meeting from among the candidates receiving the highest equal vote.

## ARTICLE VII

SECTION 1. There shall be a Board of Trustees, five in number, consisting of a chairman and four other members, nominated by the Council and elected at the Annual Meeting of the Association. Election shall be for a term of 5 years except in the case of an election to complete an unexpired term. The Board of Trustees, acting by a majority thereof, shall have the power to invest and reinvest the permanent funds of the Association with authority to employ such agents, investment counsel, and banks or trust companies as it may deem wise in carrying out its duties, and with further authority to delegate and transfer to any bank or trust company all its power to invest or reinvest; neither the Board of Trustees nor any bank or trust company to whom it may so transfer its power shall be controlled in its discretion by any statute or other law applicable to fiduciaries and the liabilities of the individual members of the Board and of any such bank or trust company shall be limited to good faith and lack of actual fraud or willful misconduct in the discharge of the duties resting upon them.



## ARTICLE VIII

SECTION 1. Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by a majority vote of any regular business session of the Association or by a majority vote of the Council and may be adopted by a majority vote of the next regular business session, provided always that the proposed amendment and an explanation thereof shall have been circulated to the membership of the Association not less than 20 days preceding the date of the business session at which the final vote is to be taken. It shall be the duty of the Executive Secretary to arrange for the distribution of all such proposed amendments among the members of the Association.

# Officers and Members of The Council

FOR 1963

## OFFICERS

### PRESIDENT

CRANE BRINTON  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

### VICE PRESIDENT

JULIAN P. BOYD  
The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton, N.J.

### TREASURER

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER  
George Washington University, Washington, D.C.  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR

BOYD C. SHAFER  
400 A Street, S.E., Washington 3, D.C.

## COUNCIL

### EX OFFICIO

THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, TREASURER,  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR

### FORMER PRESIDENTS

CHARLES H. McILWAIN  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES  
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

SIDNEY B. FAY  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER  
Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE  
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

SAMUEL E. MORISON  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ROBERT L. SCHUYLER  
Rochester, N.Y.

LOUIS R. GOTTSCHALK  
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

MERLE CURTI  
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

LYNN THORNDIKE  
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

DEXTER PERKINS  
Rochester, N.Y.

WILLIAM L. LANGER  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB  
University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

ALLAN NEVINS  
Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT  
Alexandria, Va.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS  
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

CARL BRIDENBAUGH  
Brown University, Providence, R.I.

#### ELECTED MEMBERS

ROBERT F. BYRNES  
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. (term expires 1966)

JOHN W. CAUGHEY  
University of California, Los Angeles, Calif. (term expires 1964)

W. CLEMENT EATON  
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky. (term expires 1963)

WALTER JOHNSON  
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (term expires 1965)

CHARLES F. MULLETT  
University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. (term expires 1965)

GAINES POST  
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (term expires 1963)

GORDON WRIGHT  
Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (term expires 1964)

LOUIS B. WRIGHT  
Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. (term expires 1966)

# Officers and Members of The Council

FOR 1963

## OFFICERS

### PRESIDENT

CRANE BRINTON  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

### VICE PRESIDENT

JULIAN P. BOYD  
The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton, N.J.

### TREASURER

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER  
George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

### EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR

BOYD C. SHAFER  
400 A Street, S.E., Washington 3, D.C.

## COUNCIL

### EX OFFICIO

THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, TREASURER,  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR

### FORMER PRESIDENTS

CHARLES H. McILWAIN  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES  
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

SIDNEY B. FAY  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER  
Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

KENNETH S. LATOURETTE  
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

SAMUEL E. MORISON  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

CRANE BRINTON  
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS  
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

CARL BRIDENBAUGH  
Brown University, Providence, R.I.

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER  
George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT  
Alexandria, Va.

BOYD C. SHAFER  
400 A Street, S.E., Washington 3, D.C.

## Committees and Delegates

FOR 1983

Board of Trustees.--W.A.W. Stewart, Jr., United States Trust Co. of New York, 37 Broad Street, New York City, chairman--term expires 1963; Percy Ebbott, Chase National Bank, Pine and Nassau Streets, New York City--term expires 1966; Cecil Fitzhugh Gordon, Tucker, Anthony and R. L. Day, 120 Broadway, New York City--term expires 1964; Stanton Griffis, Hemphill, Noyes & Co., 15 Broad Street, New York City--term expires 1965; Julian Roosevelt, Dick and Merle-Smith, 48 Wall Street, New York City--term expires 1965.

Nominating Committee.--Franklin Scott, Northwestern University, chairman; Edmund S. Morgan, Yale University; David Donald, Johns Hopkins University; John Tate Lanning, Duke University; John Snell, Tulane University.

Board of Editors of the American Historical Review.--Boyd C. Shafer, 400 A St., S. E., Washington 3, D. C., Managing Editor; Richard Current, University of Wisconsin--term expires 1965; Leo Gershoy, New York University--term expires 1963; Charles Mullett, University of Missouri--term expires 1966; Max H. Savelle, University of Washington--term expires 1964; Joseph R. Strayer, Princeton University\*--term expires 1967; C. Bradford Welles, Yale University\*--term expires 1967.

Committee on Ancient History.--Chester Starr, University of Illinois, chairman; Paul Alexander, University of Michigan; T. R. S. Broughton, Bryn Mawr College; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on Committees.--Donald Emerson, University of Washington;\* Joe Frantz, University of Texas; Louis Morton, Dartmouth College; Caroline Robbins, Bryn Mawr College; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on the Harmsworth Professorship.--David Donald, Johns Hopkins University, chairman; Richard Current, University of Wisconsin;\* Kenneth Stamp, University of California (Berkeley).

Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government.--Charles Barker, Johns Hopkins University, chairman; Samuel Flag Bemis, Yale University; Arthur Bestor, University of Washington; Wood Gray, George Washington University; Thomas LeDuc, Oberlin College; Richard Leopold, Northwestern University; Maurice Matloff, Washington, D. C.; Louis Morton, Dartmouth College;\* Jeannette Nichols, University of Pennsylvania; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Washington, D. C.; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

---

\*New member this year.

Committee on Honorary Members.--Charles Morley, Ohio State University, chairman; John K. Fairbank, Harvard University; Howard Cline, Library of Congress;\* Oscar Handlin, Harvard University; George Mosse, University of Wisconsin; Franklin Scott, Northwestern University;\* Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on International Historical Activities.--Arthur Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Waldo Leland, Washington, D. C.; John Curtiss, Duke University; Martin McGuire, Catholic University of America; John Rath, University of Texas; Caroline Robbins, Bryn Mawr College; Eugen Weber, University of California (Los Angeles); Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund.--Edward Dumbauld, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, chairman; John J. Biggs, Jr., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; William B. Hamilton, Duke University; George L. Haskins, University of Pennsylvania; Alfred Kelly, Wayne State University; Leonard W. Labaree, Yale University; David J. Mays, Richmond, Virginia; Paul Murphy, University of Minnesota;\* Joseph H. Smith, New York City; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on Maritime History.--Frederic C. Lane, Johns Hopkins University, chairman; Melvin Jackson, Smithsonian Institution;\* Waldo Leland, Washington, D. C.; Vernon Tate, United States Naval Academy; Walter M. Whitehill, Boston Athenaeum.

Committee on the Professional Register.--Walter Rundell, Jr., American Historical Association, chairman; Dean Albertson, Brooklyn College; Harold Davis, American University; Elmer Louis Kayser, George Washington University; Rayford Logan, Howard University; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on Research Needs.--Roderic Davison, George Washington University, chairman; David Donald, Johns Hopkins University; Hunter Dupree, University of California (Berkeley); John Higham, University of Michigan;\* Leonard Krieger, Yale University;\* Charles Gibson, State University of Iowa; Earl Pritchard, University of Arizona; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on Scholarly Historical Resources.\*\*--Robert F. Byrnes, Indiana University, chairman; Lester Born, Library of Congress; David Dowd, University of Florida; Dewey Grantham, Vanderbilt University; Burton Stein, University of Minnesota; Walter Johnson, University of Chicago; John Snell, Tulane University; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on South Asian History.--Holden Furber, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Robert I. Crane, Duke University; Earl Pritchard, University of Arizona; David Owen, Harvard University; Burton Stein, University of Minnesota; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on Teaching (Service Center for Teachers of History).--Joseph R. Strayer, Princeton University, chairman; Robert Coon,

---

\*New member this year.

\*\*New committee this year.

Lakewood, Colorado;\* William Cartwright, Duke University; Margareta Faissler, Baltimore, Maryland; Frank Freidel, Harvard University;\* Stanley Idzerda, Michigan State University; Agnes Meyer, Washington, D. C.; Jim Pearson, University of Texas;\* Walker Wyman, Wisconsin State College (Whitewater); Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.--William Shanahan, University of Oregon, chairman; Theodore Hamerow, University of Wisconsin; Arthur Wilson, Dartmouth College.\*

Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize.--John Snell, Tulane University, chairman; Victor Mamatey, Florida State University; Charles Delzell, Vanderbilt University.\*

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Award.--Hugh Aitken, University of California (Riverside), chairman; John Higham, University of Michigan; Richard Morse, Yale University;\* David Shannon, University of Wisconsin; James Smith, College of William and Mary.

Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize.--Thomas Cochran, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Don Fehrenbacher, Stanford University; Wesley Craven, Princeton University.\*

Committee on the Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize.--Robert J. Walcott, College of Wooster, chairman; Jack Hexter, Washington University (St. Louis); Wallace MacCaffrey, Haverford College; R. K. Webb, Columbia University; David Willson, University of Minnesota.

Committee on the Watumull Prize.--Robert I. Crane, Duke University, chairman; Burton Stein, University of Minnesota;\* Stephen Hay, University of Chicago.

Three committees appointed jointly by other historical associations and the American Historical Association are:

Canadian-United States Committee for Co-operation.--Albert Corey, Albany, New York, chairman;\* W. K. Ferguson, University of Western Ontario; T. M. Hunter, Ottawa, Canada; C. P. Stacey, University of Toronto; Samuel Flagg Bemis, Yale University; John Galbraith, University of California (Los Angeles).

The Historical Association (Britain) and American Historical Association Committee on National Bias in Textbooks.--E. H. Dance, B. R. Potter, Reginald F. Treharne (British members), and Ray Billington, Richard McCormick, Caroline Robbins (United States members).

Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the American Historical Association Committee on Censorship in Textbooks.--Vernon Carstensen, University of Wisconsin, chairman; W. D. Aeschbacher, Mississippi Valley Historical Association; John Caughey, University of California (Los Angeles); John F. Dickey, Chicago, Illinois; John Hope Franklin, Brooklyn College; Joe Frantz, University of Texas; Erling M. Hunt, Columbia University; R. W. Patrick, University of Florida; Boyd C. Shafer, American Historical Association (ex officio).

---

\*New member this year.



Delegates of the American Historical Association--American Council of Learned Societies: George Pierson, Yale University--term expires 1965. International Committee of Historical Sciences: Boyd C. Shafer, Washington, D. C. (Bureau)--term expires 1965; Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania (Assembly)--term expires 1965. Joint Anglo-American Committee on British Bibliographies: Stanley Pargellis; National Historical Publications Commission: Julian P. Boyd, Princeton University--term expires 1964; Boyd C. Shafer, Washington, D. C.--term expires 1965. Social Education: Walter Rundell, Jr., Washington, D. C.--term expires 1964; Thomas C. Mendenhall, Smith College--term expires 1965. Social Science Research Council: Thomas Cochran, University of Pennsylvania--term expires 1964; Louis R. Gottschalk, University of Chicago--term expires 1963; Louis Morton, Dartmouth College--term expires 1965.

The following ad interim appointments as representatives of the American Historical Association were made in 1962: Waldemar Westergaard of the University of California, Los Angeles, at the inauguration of Buell Gordon Gallagher as first chancellor of the California State Colleges on April 2; John Snell of Tulane University at the inauguration of John Anderson Hunter as president of Louisiana State University on April 7; Festus Summers of West Virginia University at the inauguration of Paul Ausborn Miller as president of West Virginia University on April 11; L. E. Bumgartner of Birmingham-Southern College at the inauguration of Lucius Holsey Pitts as president of Miles College in Birmingham on April 13; Jeannette P. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania at the sixty-sixth annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science on April 13-14; Ollinger Crenshaw of Washington and Lee University at the inauguration of John Arthur Logan, Jr., as president of Hollins College on April 14; Robert L. Bloom of Gettysburg College at the inauguration of Carl Arnold Hanson as president of Gettysburg College on April 28; Thomas M. Jones of Lincoln University at the inauguration of Marvin Wachman as president of Lincoln University on April 29; James Rodabaugh of the Ohio Historical Society at the Fifth National Assembly of the Civil War Centennial Commission on May 4-5; Jacques Downs of St. Francis College at the Fiftieth Anniversary Convocation of Nasson College on May 5; Wilbur R. Jacobs of the University of California, Santa Barbara, at the inauguration of Chancellor Vernon I. Cheadle on September 21; Ernest B. Bader of Washburn University of Topeka at the inauguration of Harold E. Sponberg as president of Washburn University of Topeka on October 7; Barnes Lathrop of the University of Texas at the inauguration of Kenneth S. Pitzer as president of William Marsh Rice University on October 10-12; Vernon Carstensen of the University of Wisconsin at the inauguration of Walker D. Wyman as president of Wisconsin State College, Whitewater, on October 18; George Haines IV of Connecticut College at the inauguration of Charles E. Shain as president of Connecticut College on October 19; Reinhold A. Dorwart of the University of Connecticut at the inauguration of Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., as president of the University of Connecticut on October 20;

John H. Wuorinen of Columbia University at the inauguration of James M. Hester as president of New York University on October 26; Robert L. Bloom of Gettysburg College at the inauguration of Donald Heiges as president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary on October 31; Harold W. Currie of Muskingum College at the inauguration of Glenn L. McConagha as president and the installation of First Chancellor Robert Montgomery of Muskingum College on November 2; A. John Dodds of Aurora College at the inauguration of James E. Crimi as president of Aurora College on November 3; Elvin Martin Akre of the Pacific Lutheran University at the inauguration of Robert A. L. Mortvedt as president of the Pacific Lutheran University on November 8; Erling M. Hunt of Columbia University at the inauguration of John H. Fischer as president of the Teachers College at Columbia University on November 13; O. Fritiof Ander of Augustana College at the inauguration of Clarence W. Sorensen as president of Augustana College on November 17; Robert Byrnes of Indiana University at the inauguration of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., as president of Indiana University on November 19; Milton M. Klein of Long Island University at the inauguration of Ralph Gordon Hoxie as president of C. W. Post College on December 16.

## PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OFFICERS FOR 1963

### PRESIDENT

RICHARD W. VAN ALSTYNE  
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

### VICE PRESIDENT

ABRAHAM P. NASATIR  
San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.

### SECRETARY-TREASURER

JOHN A. SCHUTZ  
Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.

### COUNCIL

The above officers and the following elected members:

CHARLES GATES  
University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. (term expires 1963)

DOROTHY O. JOHANSEN  
Reed College, Portland, Ore. (term expires 1965)

HENRY C. MEYER  
Pomona College, Claremont, Calif. (term expires 1963)

ARMIN RAPPAPORT  
University of California, Berkeley, Calif. (term expires 1963)

THEODORE SALOUTOS  
University of California, Los Angeles, Calif. (term expires 1964)

ROBERT WAYNE SMITH  
Oregon State University, Corvallis, Ore. (term expires 1964)

REYNOLD M. WIK  
Mills College, Oakland, Calif. (term expires 1964)

GORDON WRIGHT  
Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (term expires 1965)

---

---

PROCEEDINGS  
of the  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION  
for  
1962

---

---

## THE CHICAGO MEETING, 1962

As readers of the April Review are already aware, over twenty-nine hundred registered historians and an undetermined number of visitors-without-badge attended the seventy-seventh Annual Meeting of the Association at the Conrad Hilton in Chicago, December 28--30, 1962. For three days they listened to a variety of papers which dealt with the meeting's theme of "Change and History." Readers are again referred to the Program Chairman's earlier report, in the pages of the April Review, which described the composition of the Program Committee and how it went about the task of selecting this theme and gathering papers relevant to it. The present report will attempt to give some sense of the content of the forty-eight sessions, as reported by their chairmen. In those cases when reports are lacking, this report can only state what was scheduled to take place, and assume that it did.

Four sessions were devoted to examining problem areas in the writing and teaching of history. Herman H. Fussler, University of Chicago, was in the chair at a gathering devoted to consideration of "The Historian and Changing Techniques of Research." Verner Clapp, of the Council on Library Resources, considered problems connected with the institutional assemblage of historical material, emphasizing the valuable contributions that have been made by various microcopying techniques and the variety of unresolved problems that still limit the potential benefits of these media. He dealt with intellectual, economic, and other factors influencing the suitability of computers and similar devices in the compilation of indexes and other bibliographical tools, and pointed out the bearing of the use of such expensive devices on the question of local self-sufficiency versus co-operative access to source materials. As an example of the kind of problem presented, he noted that the potential of microfilm is still limited because there has been, as yet, no reading device of a size and price that the individual scholar could easily manage. Lawrence Harper, University of California (Berkeley), in "The Challenge to the Historian," strongly urged that historians deposit their working notes in suitably co-ordinated pools from which the notes would be organized and made available by microcopy or in some other form to any other historian, thus avoiding needless repetition in gathering data. Such procedures might make historical research a more cumulative discipline than it now is and would provide a suitable basis for comparative studies. Mechanization in the indexing and preliminary organization of much historical data should free a great deal of scholarly time for the essential role of interpretation. Herman Henkle, of the John Crerar Library, commented that the prime virtue of technological aids is the time they save for intellectual tasks not susceptible to technical aid. He also argued that the current conspicuous drive toward local institutional self-sufficiency would always be doomed to partial failure. Edgar L. Erickson, University of Illinois, commented that adequate bibliographical control of master negatives of all forms of microtext is an urgent necessity if serious waste is to be avoided. With regard to the proposed note bank, he expressed doubt that scholars could be brought to such a degree of disciplined efficiency that notes extracted by hand would be of much use to someone other than the extracting party. Facsimile copies of source materials, on the other hand, might be useful if sufficiently complete.

A session devoted to another kind of historiographical problem was entitled "What Happened to the Great Generalizations?" and was presided over by Louis Gottschalk, University of Chicago. A single paper was presented by Herbert J. Muller, Professor of English and Government, Indiana University. Entitled "One Cheer for the Great Generalizations," it dealt primarily with one--that of progress as an enduring theme in history. Muller thought that it still had meaning and validity as a dominant frame of reference. Bruce Mazlish, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in his comment felt that his own enthusiasm for generalizations was limited to those of what he called "an

empirical nature"--i.e., based more thoroughly on accumulated evidence than on intuition or insight. Stephen Tonsor, University of Michigan, committed himself to a defense of the unique in history, and hence to a position of skepticism regarding the validity of generalizations. In a closing summation, Professor Gottschalk suggested that the differences of opinion might be attributable more to semantics (what was meant by generalization) than to historiographical principles or methods, and he urged more study of the problems of generalization in the training of historians.

A full session was devoted to "The Education of Historians in the United States." John Snell, Tulane University, delivered a paper in which he reiterated and emphasized certain points made in the well-known report on graduate historical training today which he had undertaken with Dexter Perkins and others under the auspices of the American Historical Association. (Professor Perkins, himself, occupied the chair at this session.) Another paper was read by Jacques Barzun, Columbia University, entitled "Money and the Man," in which it was suggested that the gathering and allocation of funds to support graduate study of history was less important than intelligent objectives and methods. Money, in short, would not supply the place of quality in education at any level. W. Stull Holt, University of Washington, delivered a commentary on both the Snell and Barzun papers, in which he expressed the belief that the proliferation of doctoral programs in history would continue, even at institutions not properly endowed with personnel and facilities for such efforts. He felt that in self-defense, the profession would eventually have to resort to some kind of accreditation procedure. A lively discussion marked the conclusion of this session.

Another aspect of the teaching of history was considered in a session on "Bridging the University-High School Gap," with Paul L. Ward, Sarah Lawrence College, in the chair and Martin Mayer, consultant to the American Council of Learned Societies Social Studies Project as the principal speaker. Mayer's paper was sharply critical of university-based historians for an alleged lack of concern with the way in which their findings are communicated to secondary-school students. Edwin Fenton, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Alan Griffin, Ohio State University, both delivered comments which, without endorsing or rejecting Mr. Mayer's charges, discussed various programs for bringing high school teachers into closer touch with current professional historical trends. Peter Riesenbergh, Washington University, felt that Mayer's strictures were based on inadequate evidence, and that the problems of communication between those in research and those engaged in teaching at the pre-college level were unlikely to be well described or solved by a hasty, journalistic investigation.

Two luncheon programs featured papers that fell under the general heading of historiography. At a luncheon conference of the American Studies Association, sixty-one persons heard William E. Woolfenden, assistant director of the Archives of American Art in Detroit, speak on "Documentation in Depth: Source Materials for the Historian in the Domain of the Arts." Woolfenden described the work of the Archives, stating that its aim was to assemble in one central place the documentary sources required for the scholarly (as distinguished from the merely impressionistic) study of the history of American art in all its phases. Leaving to established museums the collection and display of works of art themselves, this agency concentrates its effort upon the preservation and the effective arrangement of such essential primary sources as the correspondence, diaries, ledgers, and recollections not only of artists but also of patrons, dealers, and critics. Arthur Bestor, University of Washington, presided over this gathering. On December 29 another luncheon, sponsored by the Society of American Archivists, was under the chairmanship of the Society's president, Leon de Valinger, Jr. The speaker was John A. Munroe, University of Delaware, whose subject was "A Brave Man--or a Foolish One." The one adjective or the other was applicable to himself, Munroe suggested, because he began to speak in rebuttal against, but not in wholesale disagreement with, three accusations against historians made by W. Kaye Lamb, the Dominion Archivist of Canada, upon the corresponding occasion one year earlier. Munroe rejected the implication by Lamb and assertions by Hilary Jenkinson and Albert R. Newsome that historians and archivists should be separated by a deep and wide gulf. He proceeded to propose several ways in which historians who are in charge of archives can smooth the

pathways of historians who visit archives for research. The discussion may be pursued in greater depth by interested readers, since Dr. Lamb's paper appeared in the January 1963 issue of the American Historical Review, and Munroe's is expected, as of this writing, to be published in the April 1963 issue of the American Archivist.

Four sessions and a luncheon were planned for those interested in the history of Russia and the Slavic and East European worlds, but unfortunately a detailed report is available for only one of these. A joint session with the Conference on Slavic and East European Studies was scheduled on the theme of "The Changing Soviet View of Russian History." Alexander V. Riasanovsky, University of Pennsylvania, was to read a paper on "The Trend toward 'Nationalism' in Soviet Medieval Studies," Raymond T. McNally, Boston College, was scheduled for a paper on "Views of Early Nineteenth-Century Intellectual History," and Michael Luther, Hunter College, was slated to read a paper titled "Self-Portraiture: The Early Soviet Era." If all went as planned, Jesse D. Clarkson, Brooklyn College, commented, and the chairman, Philip M. Rice, Kansas State University, occupied the chair. The Conference on Slavic and East European Studies also sponsored a luncheon at which S. Harrison Thomson, University of Colorado, introduced the principal speaker, Francis Dvornik, Dumbarton Oaks. His topic was "The Slavs between the East and West."

Dvornik himself was the presiding officer at a session on "Western Influences on Russian Religious and Cultural History: Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." William K. Medlin, University of Michigan, read a paper on "The Intellectual and Scholastic Movements in Rus'." The Orthodox communities in the Polish-Lithuanian kingdom, under social and cultural pressure generated by Roman Catholic, Protestant, and humanistic interests, realized their need of an intellectual revival. This was begun by the Orthodox Church in printing and publishing its own services. The initiator of this activity was Skorina, who printed a Slavonic Bible for the first time. Brotherhoods (Bratstva) were founded in all the major cities and became the most important factor in the cultural revival, as they founded printing houses, initiated translations from the Greek, Latin, and Polish, and organized schools on the pattern of Jesuit schools in Poland. The main driving force of this intellectual renaissance of the Western Rus' was the Metropolitan, Peter Mohyla, founder of the Academy in Kiev. The professors of this Academy were trained in Western methods and developed intellectually. Their influence reached the Muscovite Rus'. James Billington, Princeton University, spoke on "The Schism of the Russian Church," which was provoked by the rejection by the Old Believers of the reforms imposed by the Patriarch Nikon. Billington contended that this crisis resulted in large part from Russian involvement in general European conflicts, and that this schism was broadly similar in outline and outcome to the schism which rent western Christendom in the seventeenth century. He characterized the Russian break as Byzantine in form, but Western in content. Georges Florovsky, Harvard University, sharply criticized Billington's attempt to explain the Russian schism by comparing it with the Western Reformation. He stressed the basic differences between the origins of both schisms. The comments of Oswald P. Backus, University of Kansas, were read for him by a colleague. They augmented certain aspects of Medlin's paper, by dealing with omitted aspects of the intellectual movement in Rus'.

It can only be noted that a session was held on "Russian Industrialization in the 1890's," Theodore H. Von Laue, University of California, Riverside, presumably delivered his planned paper on "Witte's Point of View" and Francis B. Randall, Sarah Lawrence College, gave his on "The Narodniks' Point of View," with Peter Wiles, Brandeis University, commenting, and Leopold H. Haimson, University of Chicago, directing discussion from the chair.

Some 250 people attended a discussion of "Change and Continuity in the Danubian World," which took place under the leadership of Otakar Odlozilik, University of Pennsylvania. Andrew G. Whiteside, Queens College, discussed the early period, 1867-1914, limiting his observations to the Western half of the Habsburg monarchy. He emphasized the distinctly revolutionary character of events that occurred in that area after the establishment in 1867 of the dual system. After a brief description of Austrian liberalism and of the role of the Austrian Jewry, he pointed out the great unresolved

issues which hindered the development in Austria of true parliamentarism after the electoral reform of 1907. Passing from political events to economics, he presented the industrial transformation of Austria as an overpowering experience for nearly everyone in that area prior to 1914. The second paper, by Robert A. Kann, Rutgers University, was devoted to the changing pattern of Central European life after the first World War. His brief comment on the extent and depth of change in the "Succession" states was followed by an analysis of the more general problems of change, tradition, and continuity affecting the entire area. Accepting the view that the state is composed of three essential elements, territory, people, and sovereign power, the speaker dealt with each of them, confronting the theory with specific features of public life in the Danubian world. He paid equal attention to the inter-war period and to the socio-political upheavals after 1945. Traian Stoianovich, Rutgers University, commented on Whiteside's paper. While praising its treatment of economic change, of the Jews, and of the triumph of bourgeois law and state reason in Austria, he criticized the paper for failing to encompass the entire Danubian basin and neglecting the role of nature and geography. He also stressed the ambivalence of the Austrian middle class, bourgeois in politics but yearning for an aristocratic style of life. Elinor Murray Despalatovic, University of Michigan, made her commentary (principally on Kann) an analysis of intellectual processes by which we try to locate continuity within the period of radical change. A lively floor discussion followed.

Historical problems of the western hemisphere also received a due share of attention. A joint session with the Canadian Historical Association, sponsored by the Joint American Historical Association-Canadian Historical Association Committee, met with Wallace K. Ferguson, University of Western Ontario, as chairman. The theme of the session was "Canada Since the Second World War." Both the papers delivered were concerned, however, primarily with Canadian foreign policy. Ernest R. May, Harvard University, read a paper on "Canada, the United States, and Hemispheric Security," in which he presented an illuminating account of the shifting attitudes of both Canada and the United States toward Canadian membership in the Organization of American States. This theme was also touched on in passing by John Holmes of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, but his paper on "Canadian External Policies Since 1945" was devoted principally to an analysis of Canada's role as an independent middle power, stressing the disproportionate importance of Canada's activity in world affairs in the years following the end of the war, and accounting for its more recent relative decline as a force in international relations. Ramsay Cook, University of Toronto, made some pointed criticisms of both Canadian and American policy. Gaddis Smith, Yale University, commented on the changing symbols representing popular conceptions of the relation of Canada to Britain and the United States. At the conclusion of a lively discussion Samuel Flagg Bemis, who was largely instrumental in founding the now functioning joint American Historical Association-Canadian Historical Association Committee, expressed gratification at the success of the joint session and the hope that it will become an annual event.

The Program Committee also scheduled a joint session with the Conference on Latin-American History on "Significant Trends in Postwar Brazil," with Stanley J. Stein, Princeton University, in the chair. Ronald Schneider, Department of State, in a paper on "Major Political Trends and Developments in Postwar Brazil" argued that the Vargas administration (1930-45) shattered the political influence of pre-1930 elite groups and used the government's resources to stimulate economic development. Since 1945 succeeding governments have expanded the government's role in the national economy. Schneider indicated that Brazil's political life is characterized by a multiplicity of parties, by the absence of sharp ideological differences, and by a high degree of personalism. He pointed to the new political elite of urban, financial, and industrial groups which dominate both the executive and congressional positions and rule by "courting the middle and working class electorates." He ended on a note of guarded optimism, stressing the role of "accommodation" in British history. Rollie Poppino, University of California, Davis, in "Communism in Postwar Brazil" concentrated on the Communist Party's appeal and vicissitudes. The ground swell of communism,



1945-47, he attributed to its then moderate reform program and its status of legality. Its subsequent decline was caused by the withdrawal of legality (1947), the onset of the cold war, and--for a time--the radical and uncompromising platform espoused from 1950 to 1954. The apparent loss of appeal in recent years, Poppino argued, is due principally to the "attractive alternatives" of competing parties that also espouse nationalism, social reform and governmental support for economic development. In his commentary, John J. Johnson, Stanford University, took issue with the optimism of both papers on two grounds: first, the proliferation of highly articulate interest groups, and secondly, growing disunity among the military.

James F. King, University of California, Berkeley, presided over the Conference on Latin American History luncheon. Charles Gibson, State University of Iowa, read an address by Harry Bernstein, Brooklyn College, which considered how "The Historian Views the Alliance for Progress." Bernstein suggested that the Alliance for Progress, to succeed, requires an "alliance for understanding" in the United States. The traditional United States view centers on Europe, not on Latin America, and a reorientation of attitude and education is needed. Scholars can effect this reorientation better than bureaucrats. The universities, however, have neglected their obligations to the study of Latin America, the corps of Latin American scholars has remained thin, and there is much work to be done. Emphasis on the history of individual nations is long overdue. In most Latin American countries the primary experience is nationality. Industrialization is second. Bernstein maintained further that a loose survey of the general ills of Latin America allows the Alliance for Progress to be identified with a simple alliance for change, based too much on projection from the present, not enough on experience and traditional frames of reference. A session on "Colonial Institutions and Contemporary Latin America," with John L. Phelan, University of Wisconsin, presiding, was slated to hear a paper on "Political and Economic Life" by Woodrow Borah, University of California, Berkeley, another on "Social and Cultural Life" by Charles Gibson, State University of Iowa, and a comment by Robert Potash, University of Massachusetts.

Two sessions dealt with aspects of Asian history. A pair of papers dealt with "Warlordism in a Changing China." James E. Sheridan, Northwestern University, was listed in the program as the author of "Feng Yü-hsiang and the New Culture Movement," and Akira Iriye, Harvard University, was to speak on "Chang Tso-lin and the Chinese Revolution," with comments being furnished by Howard L. Boorman, Columbia University, and James R. Shirley, Northern Illinois University.

Stephen N. Hay, University of Chicago, was in the chair at a meeting devoted to "The Evolution of British Land Policy in India." Thomas R. Metcalf, University of California, Berkeley, outlined the two conflicting British views toward tenant right in the mid-nineteenth century: the laissez-faire view, (more popular in Bengal), which in practice favored the landlord, and the opposing view (prevalent in the Punjab), which favored the tenant. The legislation adopted by the Government of India between 1859 and 1885 represented a compromise between these positions, and "undertook simultaneously to conciliate the landlords and to protect the peasantry. John R. McLane, Northwestern University, gave a synopsis of the situation at the turn of the century in which he noted that both government, personified by Lord Curzon, and the Indian National Congress claimed to be defending the real interests of the peasantry. Curzon unfairly accused R. C. Dutt of favoring the landlords when the latter recommended the extension of the principles of the permanent settlement, and in the single instance in which such class bias seemed to be present--in the Punjab Land Alienation Act of 1900--the Congress leaders quickly yielded to Muslim peasant protests in the interest of preserving a united nationalist movement. Walter Hauser, University of Virginia, carried the land policy story down to the 1930's, by which time the Congress leadership had divided into pro-landlord and pro-peasant wings. In Bihar, where peasant agitation was quite active, the Congress ministry in 1938 enacted legislation which a leading landlord politician acknowledged was "in the interests of the zamindar community." Hauser concluded that in his period "there was relatively little change on the land, that rural society was still dominated by its 'feudal barons'... and that all the devices of the nineteenth century were employed with equal effectiveness in protecting privilege and depressing the peasantry."

In his comment, Bernard S. Cohn, University of Rochester, drew the attention of the panel to the great complexity of rural society in India, and suggested that historians conduct more detailed investigations at the local level to determine the extent to which classificatory terms such as landlord, tenant, and peasant tended to create distinctions which had not previously existed in Indian society. In the concluding question period, several speakers noted that the situation of the landless laborers, economically the poorest group on the land, had not been dealt with by the panelists.

Emergent Africa received attention in three meetings. A joint session with the American Catholic Historical Association took up the question of "Christianity in Tropical Africa in the Nineteenth Century." Dorothy O. Helly, Hunter College, described British attitudes towards Christianity and Islam, 1860-1890. Whereas in the earlier period of the opening of central Africa sentiment was shaped by the humanitarian crusade against the slave trade and by Protestant missions, a change of attitude appeared in the sixties. Such men as James Hunt, Richard Burton, Winwood Reade and F. W. Farrar revolted against the concept of monogenism, rated the Negro low in the human order, and questioned the capacity of the African to adopt European civilization and Christianity. These spokesmen for the "new anthropology" were of divided mind about the spread of Islam in Africa, some claiming that it would forever retard the progress of the African towards "higher" levels of life, and others holding that it would either serve as a stepping stone to Christianity and European civilization, or was in itself an effective agent for humanizing and civilizing the African, who perhaps could do no better in view of his "low moral and cerebral development." The debate stimulated British public opinion to believe that there would inevitably be a conflict between crescent and cross in Africa, with European or Arab influence eventually triumphant. Catherine Ann Cline, Notre Dame College of Staten Island, read a paper on the Belgian Catholic hierarchy's reaction to the movement for reform in the Congo. The Church defended the Belgian government from charges of brutality in the Congo Free State, in part because of sectarian interests (since it identified the movement for reform with the Protestant missions), because of national loyalty, and from an overwhelming faith in the benefits of Europeanization. When documented revelations of actual atrocities came to light in 1904 and 1905, Catholic apologists pleaded ignorance, but the Jesuit Father Arthur Vermeersch led an attack on the regime. Ultimately, annexation by Belgium led to the restoration of the earlier harmonious relations between the Church and the government. Circumstances kept the scheduled commentator on Miss Cline's paper from appearing, but William H. Lewis, Georgetown University and the Department of State, made some observations on both papers. He noted the persistence of some of the chief errors of the past: the European assumption of racial superiority; the tendency to look at sub-Saharan Africa in terms of "levels" of cultural development; a derogatory stereotype of Africans; and a tendency to speak of Africa in terms of Western interests without a counterbalancing appreciation of how Africans may view their own situation. The argument over Christianity or Islam, Lewis held, is unreal now, because the African will make an independent decision, with the result an African Christianity, an African Islam, or an African synthesis. R. Pierce Beaver, University of Chicago, presided.

Certainly the "youngest field" to be explored in recent meetings was covered in "New Trends in African Historiography," a session under the chairmanship of Franklin D. Scott, temporarily of Stanford University. Daniel F. McCall, Boston University, went directly to the meeting's theme in his paper on "Changes in the Writing of African History." He held that from the time of Herodotus until recently, historians have written of the African continent in terms of the external impact of other peoples rather than the internal development within the continent itself. Now attention is turning to autochthonous changes among the increasingly self-conscious African nations. To study such changes--as well as the activities of Europeans and Asians in Africa--all available materials must be used: archives, linguistics, archaeology and oral tradition. McCall demanded the training of historians in anthropological as well as historical method, and pointed to the opportunities of a frontier field. Prosser Gifford, Yale University, discussing "The Historian and Social Change in Southern Africa" agreed that only co-operation

among the disciplines of the social sciences will yield a whole and satisfying truth. The common historical practice of analogy is of questionable validity in dealing with developments in an African culture which appear on the surface to resemble developments in European life. Historians must, in assessing African developments, use data gathered by other social scientists, and perhaps subject the evidence to a dual examination--once analytically and once historically. An enlivening comment was furnished by Jan Vansina, University of Wisconsin and Northwestern University, himself a historian with an interdisciplinary background and a strong advocate of the value of oral tradition.

Philip J. Foster, University of Chicago, was chairman of a session which addressed itself to "Labor in Changing West Africa." Elliot P. Skinner, New York University, described the traditional labor regimes of black Africa, and gave a clear indication of their considerable range in structural and functional complexity. At one extreme were voluntary or compulsory work groups based upon extended family organization and associated with agricultural activities. Even in the agricultural sphere, however, it was possible to indicate the existence of much more complex organization producing specialized crops for exchange. Such complexity, generally speaking, was more apparent in West than in East Africa, as was true of craft specialization. Certain elaborate specialist organizations were even discernible, having some, if not all of the characteristics of western medieval guilds, and depending on the existence of a developed exchange economy. Hans Panovsky, Northwestern University, discussed the impact of European penetration on labor in Africa. One of its main consequences was the incidence of migratory labor patterns in West Africa. Such labor is not associated only with the demands of European employers, but makes a significant contribution to the African controlled cocoa farms of Ghana and the Ivory Coast. Moreover, these West African migrations have not, for the most part, been associated with formally organized employer associations. An attempt was made to analyze the consequence of such migrations for local agricultural activities and for other economic and social activities. Jean Kopytoff, Swarthmore College, and John Peterson, Kalamazoo College, both delivered comments which stressed the need for understanding traditional African work attitudes in analyzing migration problems.

Ancient and medieval history, too, had their deserved place in the general scheme of the meeting. The first session devoted to ancient history took up the matter of "Explanations of Change in Classical Historians." Mortimer Chambers, University of California, Los Angeles, examined the writings of Herodotus and Thucydides with respect to this problem. Thomas Africa, University of Southern California, spoke to the same theme as it revealed itself in the works of several Hellenistic historians, culminating with Polybius and the geographer Strabo. Richard Anderson, Brigham Young University, discussed the writings of Tacitus and Ammianus, so that the papers made a connected session, lacking only something on Sallust and Livy to bridge the gap from Polybius to Tacitus. Mason Hammond, Harvard University, presided. A second session on ancient history dealt with a most interesting subject, "Changing Skills in Ancient History." Sterling Dow, Harvard University, spoke on Greek epigraphy. He first described the mechanics of producing good epigraphical texts, chiefly by means of squeezes, then discussed recent trends with regard to the restoration of inscriptions, and outlined the general character of present-day epigraphical trends and interests. On this last point he stressed the importance of studying each class of texts (euphobic inscriptions and the like) in the fullest possible manner by treating all the material relating to a specific subject as a whole, particularly as an aid to the restoration of individual texts, and he illustrated his general statements with examples drawn from his own work on the Law Code of Nicomachus. William Donovan, University of Illinois, presented a paper on Greek archaeology which dwelt upon the changing relationships between history and archaeology and the technological improvements and scientific apparatus which have been turned to the advantage of modern archaeological research. He also illustrated his observations with specific instances derived from current excavation projects. A general discussion followed, moderated by the chairman, Tom B. Jones, University of Minnesota, who felt that the many favorable comments made by members of the audience at the conclusion of the meeting indicated that this was one of the most successful sessions of the ancient history group in recent years.

"Medieval Revolutions" were the subject matter of a session held on the first day of the meeting, with Frederic C. Lane, Johns Hopkins University, presiding. Eric E. Hirshler, Denison University, presented "German Towns in the Fourteenth Century," describing the diversity from one place to another in the outcome of the struggle by the guildsmen and patricians. Harry Miskimin, Yale University, in "The Last Act of Charles V: Political and Economic Backgrounds of the Revolt of 1382" showed that the king's "last act" was not a gesture of deathbed piety but a rational response to the economic and political circumstances of the time and the surplus in the royal treasury. Howard Kaminsky, University of Washington, explained "Wyclifism as Ideology of Revolution" by showing how Wyclif moved the "ideal of evangelical perfection, . . . into the political stage and thus . . . made every reformation a revolution." Like the papers, the discussion ranged over three different regions in Europe and three causes of revolution, namely urban conflicts, royal taxes, and religious ideas.

A session entitled "Shifting Interpretations of Medieval History" found Norman F. Cantor, Columbia University, delivering a historiographical and critical assessment of the literature on change in medieval Europe, with two commentators replying to him. Cantor critically appraised five schools or approaches: a) the dialectical-spiritual approach, characteristically German whether in the homeland or among emigrés; b) the devotional-personal approach among English scholars; c) an American school concerned chiefly with political and economic institutions; d) economic and technological determinism, and e) the prolific school in France of Marc Bloch's disciples, quasi-sociological in approach. Cantor advocated greater reliance on the comparative method, more often praised than used, illustrating this point by reference to the period 600-900 A.D. when Europe had its true origins, partly under the influence of "colonials" from Ireland and England. Valuable too is the use of the generation as a unit of time, as suggested by Bloch. By 1050 enough data about individual clergy are available to make this method practicable for ecclesiastical history, as for example in a study of the "generation" of persons responsible for the Gregorian reform. And for the debacle of 1270-1325, which saw the rapid disintegration of medieval civilization, Cantor suggested an explanation derived from Freud and Norman Brown, namely that an era may become neurotic under the pressure of civilizing trends and that medieval civilization here showed a will to self-destruction. Archibald R. Lewis, University of Texas, the first commentator, criticized Cantor's view of what constituted the Middle Ages as unduly narrow and held further that Cantor was wrong in implying that all American medievalists were institutional historians. He cited instances to show frequent use of the comparative method and argued that Bloch's concept of the generation must be carefully used. In addition, he objected to any use of social psychology that gives to medieval civilization an organic personality, neurotic at that. Sylvia Thrupp, University of Michigan, also deplored what she considered the misuse of genetic psychology as applied to groups. She objected to Cantor's reference to respected non-Marxist historians as economic determinists, and suggested that he failed to understand wholly the nature of economic history. A lively discussion among the panelists and members of the audience followed, and was still in progress when time was called by the chairman, James L. Cate, University of Chicago.

"Canon Law and Social Change in Medieval Europe" was the title of a session whose chairman was Stephen Kuttner, Catholic University of America. Michael Sheehan, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto, discussed the influence of the canon law on the property rights of married women in England, Canonical rules of property settlement at the dissolution of marriage and on widow's rights, wills, and legacies, were limited by some principles of the common law because of the exclusive jurisdiction of lay courts in pleas touching land, and because of certain other developing rules of lay jurisprudence. While the wife's freedom to bequeath became progressively restricted, the husband's freedom to dispose of "his" chattels (which came to include those things in his wife's dowry, as well as any later acquisitions of hers) was increasingly extended. Ultimately there was a rejection in English rules of chattel ownership of the canon law's dotal and testamentary systems, to the detriment of women's rights. Gerhard B. Ladner, University of California, Los Angeles, in commenting on this paper, noted that the chief purpose of the canonical rules was the protection of miserables

personae and pious bequests, rather than the harmonizing of the individual rights of husband and wife within the marital community. Nevertheless, if the English Church succeeded in upholding even in part women's testamentary capacity (in practice if not at law), this shows the respect which almsgiving, as a spiritual motive, commanded in society and should not be laid to the force of clerical self-interest. A second paper by Frederic Cheyette, Oberlin College, dealt with "Canon Law in the Parlement of Paris." He explained how certain cases brought before this parlement illustrate the extent to which medieval canonical concepts were shaped by feudal elements ("feudal" taken in its broader connotation), especially as concerned the "property" and "possession" of incorporeal rights. In certain instances, "custom," besides being a source of rights, often becomes itself a "right" which can be possessed and acquired by prescription. After discussing the doctrine of Boniface VIII and of Antonio de Butrio on custom and law, the speaker pointed to "feudal" elements in some medieval notions of papal power, in contrast with the analysis of papal authority in the discourses of the conciliarists. Robert L. Benson, Wesleyan University, in his comment questioned the description of pleas en novellete, exemption privileges, and prescription of customs as "feudal." The floor discussion elicited comments on the uses and perils of emphasizing the contrasts between medieval institutions and Roman law.

Medievalists had one other program in store for them, according to the schedule. The annual dinner of the Medieval Academy of America was held on December 28, and Peter Charanis, Rutgers University, was announced as the speaker, with the topic to be "How Greek Was the Byzantine Empire?" Bertie Wilkinson, University of Toronto, was presumed to be the chairman of the occasion.

The British Isles and Europe also yielded material for speculation on the interrelations of "Change and History." A joint session with the Conference on British Studies dealt with "Changing Patterns in English Administrative History." If it went as planned, there were papers by Charles R. Young, Duke University, on "Hubert Walter, A Great Medieval Administrator;" by Frank Pegues, Ohio State University, on "The New Monarchy and Administrative Change;" and by George B. Cooper, Trinity College, on "The Home Office in Late Georgian England." William H. Dunham, Yale University, was scheduled to deliver a comment, and George Cuttino, Emory University, to preside.

Moving into the area of nineteenth-century Britain, a session on "Social Change in Britain During the Industrial Revolution" found Charles F. Mullett, University of Missouri, as chairman. Raymond Cowherd, Lehigh University, dealt with social welfare during the French wars, summarizing humanitarian ideas and policies as revealed in legislation and the activities of such men as Jonas Hanway, Thomas Gilbert, and George Rose. Cowherd distinguished between those men who accepted the necessity of poverty on the one hand and the humanitarians on the other. Peter T. Cominos, Washington University, considered "Lower-Class Education and Social Mobility in Early and Mid-Victorian England." He contrasted the aims of public lower-class education under the Shuttleworth system (1846) with those of the Revised Code (1862). The proponents of the first system stressed the need to improve the whole standard of civilized living, and in defense of their proposals pointed to the higher moral tone after education had been provided. Their opponents quickly emphasized the incompatibility of popular education and "social equilibrium," and sought through the Revised Code merely to prepare lower-class children for that "proper" station to which the aristocracy had called them. Throughout, the speaker alluded to administrative problems as well as ideals and objectives. The two commentators, John F. C. Harrison, University of Wisconsin, and R. K. Webb, Columbia University, analyzed the papers sharply. Both found anachronism and superficiality in the first one; both found serious gaps in the second, but whereas Harrison accounted for these in part by limitations in the materials available, Webb felt that Cominos had misconstrued the evidence at his disposal by undue dependence on great names and Whiggish interpretations.

The significant field of demography made a contribution to the meeting, when John T. Krause, Rutgers University, and H. J. Habakkuk, Oxford University (currently visiting professor, University of California, Berkeley), read papers relating to "Demographic Change in Britain and Europe, 1700-1900." Krause, discussing population change in

England as an economic variable, argued persuasively that, responding to economic stimuli, fertility, not mortality, was the major variable in population growth in England and Wales in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth century, and that in these respects Young, Smith, and Malthus were, contrary to some more recent writers, quite sound. Correlations with evidence he collected from two hundred parishes indicated that high demand for labor prompted earlier marriage and higher birth rates. Habakkuk, discussing the causes and consequences of declining fertility in Britain and Europe from 1850 to 1914, explained the remarkable decline in fertility and family size at the end of the period--a widespread European trend--as adjustment of family size to the fall in death rates. Life expectancy started to rise notably in the 1870's, and after 1900 it rose very rapidly with a decisive fall in infant mortality. Control of birth rate within marriage became accepted among professional and middle classes by 1900, and among the working class thereafter. That it was slower to reach the working classes and reduce the pressure on family income in the years of rising prices before 1914 is one explanation of the stormy social history of these years. Jacob M. Price, University of Michigan, and Morris D. Morris, University of Washington, expressed substantial agreement in their comments with the main lines of these theses. The session was presided over by Albert H. Immler, Tufts University.

The early modern period of European history is sometimes dated from the Renaissance in Italy, so it is perhaps appropriate to begin consideration of the meeting's coverage of this period with the report of a session on "The Tuscan City-State in the Early Renaissance." Three papers were presented, with the speakers introduced by S. William Halperin, University of Chicago, Gene A. Brucker, University of California, Berkeley, dealt with the individual and the social order in early Renaissance Florence. His main thesis was that by 1400 the old corporate structure of Florentine society had in large measure been replaced by a complicated system of patron-client relationships that significantly altered the political and social milieu and laid the foundations for the Medici regime. Marvin Becker, Western Reserve University, noted the significance of changing patterns of public finance in various Florentine regimes. The Signoria's desperate financial needs weakened the private system of multiple economies, both lay and ecclesiastical, and promoted the formation of a unitary public fiscal structure in Florence. William Bowsky, University of Nebraska, chose to examine the impact of the Black Death upon Sienese government and society. He held that the plague of 1348 was instrumental in bringing about social and economic conditions in Siena that greatly augmented the opposition to the ruling hierarchy and thus contributed to the success of the subsequent revolution in that city. David Herlihy, Bryn Mawr College, in commenting on these three papers, noted that they emphasized the role of wars, plagues, and famines in breaking down old patterns and clearing the way for new departures. Although agreeing that this was an accurate and useful approach, he maintained nevertheless that by and large the nature of the period's crises was still but dimly understood.

A joint session with the American Society for Reformation Research asked the question "How Much Change in the Reformation?" George H. Williams, Harvard University, spoke on what he described as the Reformation's "left wing," stressing the abrupt break which the radicals made from established Christianity while keeping a unity intact. The civic oath was transferred into an allegiance to a common community of the spirit. Williams concentrated upon theories of baptism, which, for the Anabaptists, were not an escape from the world but the beginning of election. He also stressed the regional aspect of the radical movement which stretched from Sicily to Poland. George W. Forell, State University of Iowa, read a paper on "Thomas Müntzer--Symbol and Reality." He dealt with three myths which grew up after Müntzer's death: the Lutheran, the Catholic, and the Marxist. For Lutherans, he became a justification for the suppression of the Anabaptists, for Catholics the logical result of Luther's revolt against the Church, and for the Marxists, the only true reformer. Forell, analyzing Müntzer's supposed communism, found no documentary evidence of this, and indeed felt that the reformer would have been willing to establish a theocratic monarchy. The commentator, Perez Zagorin, McGill University, warned of the hazards of theological typology which stood in danger of overlooking agreements between Müntzer and the other Anabaptists as well as the

importance of secular elements of his thought. These elements tended to be directed towards change once the theological side of his thought had been dropped. A lively discussion, presided over by chairman George L. Mosse, University of Wisconsin, pointed out the affinities of Müntzer with the Czech reformers and criticized a lack of emphasis on the element of change among the radicals, though Williams had emphasized that, unlike the magisterial reformers, the radicals had no clear continuity with the later middle ages.

Another joint meeting was with the American Committee of the International Commission for the Study of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions. Caroline Robbins, Bryn Mawr College, was the presiding officer. Gordon Griffiths, University of Washington, addressed himself to the theme of the session ("Changing Concepts of the History of Representative Institutions in the Early Modern Period") with a paper on tradition and reform in the estates of France and the Low Countries in the sixteenth century. In both areas, Calvinism was influential, but modern research emphasizes the importance of other considerations affecting the decline of the estates in France and their growing power in the Dutch Netherlands. But in both, traditional methods of opposition to monarchy through the estates were the resort of the discontented. The renewed vigor undoubtedly infused by Calvinists into representative institutions stemmed, not from any principle inherent in their religion, but from a desire for political power. To achieve such they naturally turned to traditional institutions. Anthony Forbes, editor of the "Commons Debates Project" at the University of California, Los Angeles, described the difficulties of his editorial task, particularly in regard to securing money and competent assistance. Yet, he observed, without the material he was attempting to assemble, any Namieresque analysis of the parliaments of the early Stuarts would be impossible. Dietrich Gerhard, Washington University, talked on nobility and representation in the eighteenth century as a part of a revisionist interpretation of absolutism. He confined himself to continental Europe before the Enlightenment and before the resurgence of the aristocracy in the middle and later portions of the century. Within the area and time period he defined, it appears that the role of the nobility differed in different places. In some countries they formed whole "nations," in others they were only one of several "estates." They were rivalled by the new officialdom commissioned by the crown. They wished to guard their privileges, but were uncertain whether to restrict membership in their class or whether to recruit. Where they did share in representative institutions, these institutions rarely shared in the conduct of decisive affairs. Where the nobles successfully achieved any such power as in Poland and in Sweden, they failed utterly or in large part to use it to advantage.

Three sessions on successive days also took up the question of political power in the emergent states of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, but only the last of these was reported in detail by its chairman. It can therefore only be assumed that the other two were given as planned. The first was entitled "The Crown and the New Aristocracy in the Renaissance," J. H. Hexter, Washington University, presided; papers were offered on the title theme as it applied to England (by Wallace MacCaffrey, Haverford College) and France (by Russell Major, Emory University.) Comments were to be delivered by Paul Rosenfeld, Rutgers University, Newark, and Maurice Lee, Jr., University of Illinois. On the meeting's second afternoon, a session on "Absolutism and Opposition in the Reign of Louis XIV" was scheduled under the chairmanship of John B. Wolf, University of Minnesota. Papers were to be presented by Herbert H. Rowen, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and by Lionel N. Rothkrug, University of Pittsburgh, and comments were to be made by John C. Rule, Ohio State University, and Andrew Lossky, University of California, Los Angeles.

The last of the three planned sessions on the evolution of modern European political institutions was entitled "From the Old Regime to the New Order: The Case of the Corporation," Robert R. Palmer, Princeton University, introduced the speakers, the first of whom, Rudolf Vierhaus, University of Münster, read a paper on "Corporate Tradition and Civil Service in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany." He paid particular attention to the relation of the diets and the civil service to governments and social classes, and argued that, as absolutist institutions were superimposed on the old

corporate bodies, these bodies came to be seen less as public institutions and more as private interests, with their members converted into social classes. The growth of a professional civil service offered a means by which middle-class persons could be brought into government and a phenomenon which enabled the older nobility to survive and prosper in a new role. The merger of the two produced a new class of governing personnel with an "exaggerated" sense of its own importance. Paul Lucas, Washington University, gave a case history of "Continuity and Change in a Corporate Institution: the French Commercial Courts, 1760-1830." He showed that, alone among such bodies of the Old Regime, special courts for business men (made up of business men) survived the Napoleonic codification. He thought the reason lay in the desire of lawyers to protect society--in particular the agrarian interests both of peasants and of wealthy landowners with capital to invest--from losses due to business insolvencies. Special regulations regarding matters of business debt were a significant departure from the new principle of legal equality or uniformity, and Lucas questioned the view that the Revolution was primarily a movement serving "bourgeois" interests. Walter Simon, Cornell University, commented on the two papers, related only at a high level of general ideas. He noted that since Vierhaus had found for Germany as a whole much the same development that others had found for Prussia, explanations emphasizing the peculiarities of the Prussian state seemed to be inadequate. The two papers confirmed the belief that the Revolutionary-Napoleonic era made Germany, with its aristocratic bureaucracy, more different from France than it had been before.

The Napoleonic era was the subject of another presentation at noon on December 29th, when the Modern European History Section of the American Historical Association held a luncheon meeting, with Gordon Wright, Stanford University, in the chair. Franklin L. Ford, Harvard University, spoke on "The Revolutionary-Napoleonic Era: How Much of a Watershed?" He examined the tendency of many recent scholars to reduce the significance of the Revolutionary era by emphasizing the lines of continuity that mark the last three centuries. After recognizing the validity of many of the arguments for continuity, he forcefully reasserted the view that the Revolutionary era constituted "a massive historical divide" in realms ranging from the sociology of war to the "temperature" of European culture.

The session of "Realpolitik and Romanticism," under the chairmanship of Gordon A. Craig, Stanford University, dealt with the problem of adjustment to revolutionary change in an age not dissimilar to our own. Stephen Graubard, Harvard University, in a paper on Castlereagh and the peace of Europe, emphasized the necessity of revising conventional interpretations of the nature of Castlereagh's accomplishment (particularly those based upon the work of Sir Charles Webster) and of seeing it in the context of the Napoleonic, rather than in that of the post-Versailles period. He suggested that Castlereagh's response to the problems of his time was guided by diplomatic traditions inherited from the past which the British statesman refused to believe were invalidated by the Napoleonic era. Peter Paret, University of California, Davis, discussed some little known aspects of Clausewitz's thinking upon which new light has been thrown by documentary discoveries in Germany. Paret traced the Prussian soldier's evolution from the romantic prejudices of his youth to a sophisticated appraisal of the political realities of his time. In a third paper, Daniel P. Resnick, Sarah Lawrence College, analyzed the influence of Napoleon upon the political ideas of Chateaubriand. He pointed out that this self-styled "last surviving witness of feudal life" never allowed himself to think that the past could be restored, and that Chateaubriand's response to the challenge of his time was to seek to make constitutional monarchy a viable political form. In the floor discussion it was agreed that all three figures discussed, at least in their recognition of the new facts of power in their age and of the potential of the masses, had some right to be considered Realpolitiker.

A joint meeting of the American Historical Association and the Society for Italian Historical Studies looked at the evolution of "City and Countryside in Modern Italian History" from the Napoleonic era to the present. R. John Rath, University of Texas, read a paper on the effect on public opinion of economic conditions in Lombardy and Venetia, 1813-1815. Though economic conditions were much worse in the latter area than



in the former, the Venetians nevertheless remained more pro-Habsburg than the Lombards, probably because the French had favored the Lombards over the Venetians and because the bourgeoisie, which had suddenly risen to power and affluence during the Napoleonic era, was considerably more numerous and prosperous in Lombardy than in Venetia. George A. Carbone, Portland (Oregon) State College, reported on his study of rural migrations and urbanization in northern Italy after unification. He limited his observations to Liguria and noted how in the course of fifty years--1860 to 1910--the urbanization of the Genoese coastline and the movements of Ligurians thither transformed a heavily overpopulated area, surviving on a critical agricultural economy, into a predominantly industrial area with a chronic labor shortage. Robert Fried, Connecticut College, discussed "The Role of Cities in the Political Modernization of Italy after World War II." After referring to the Fascist laws forbidding internal migrations, he discussed the vast exodus from the land since 1945. The economic boom has had political consequences, changing the expectations of peasants and the consequent fortunes of political parties. The changing allegiances of migrants were examined, and the low morale of those remaining in agriculture noted. Norman Kogan, University of Connecticut, wielded the gavel at this session.

"Social Change in Nineteenth Century Germany" provided rich fare for the joint session with the Conference Group for Central European History. Paul H. Noyes, Columbia University, emphasized the position of the artisans in the mid-century crises and sketched the role of this element in society and politics earlier and later in the century. Despite dire prophecies, the handicraftsmen flourished under broader economic freedom and were eagerly courted by emerging political parties. Since Eugene N. Anderson, University of California, Los Angeles, was prevented by illness from attending, his exposition of the changing position of the bourgeoisie was read by Donald Ziegler, Carroll College. Anderson's paper surveyed the progress toward material affluence and social power of various levels of industrial bourgeoisie in the new age of machinofecture. Though stiffly resisted by the nobility, many a bourgeois magnate pushed into the aristocratic caste, while displaying disdainful indifference to wage-workers. Werner T. Angress, University of California, Berkeley, the commentator, took Anderson to task in absentia for a too narrow conception of the multifaceted bourgeoisie and for his depreciation of their awareness of the things of the mind and spirit. Echoing a decade-old plea, he called for more scholarly investigations of German social classes. Arthur J. May, University of Rochester, presided.

John Bowditch, University of Michigan, was chairman of the session on "Revolution and Morale in Modern French Thought." Its first paper, by Alan Spitzer, State University of Iowa, was on the anarcho-syndicalist, Fernand Pelloutier, whom Spitzer described as a moralist whose efforts to create through the Bourses du Travail the basis for a new social order foundered on the evident gap that existed between the aspirations of the French workers and those of their leader. In the second paper, "Sorel and the Sorelians," Jack Roth, Roosevelt University, followed Albert Sorel on the tortured path that led him from his syndicalist phase, when he hoped to find the mechanism for social regeneration in proletarian violence, to his endorsement of Mussolini's Fascism. Roth then traced the equally variegated and self-defeating nostrums of Sorel's disciples, concluding that their "faith in the virtues of apocalyptic political conceptions has all but disappeared since the war." Edward Gargan, Loyola University, in a third paper offered an analysis of the changing ideas of Albert Camus from 1939 to the publication of L'homme revolté in 1950. Until the end of the Resistance experience, according to Gargan, Camus maintained some hope in the renovation of society through revolution, but L'homme revolté offers "the darkest picture of modern man and history in all of France's literature." In his comment, Hans Schmitt, Tulane University, highlighted the major themes of the session. His one point of serious criticism lay in his insistence that to Camus' pessimism, as depicted by Gargan, there should be added the affirmation that Camus "called us back from the impasse into which false prophets like Pelloutier and Sorel had led us" and that in Camus "after a brief eclipse, humanism was reborn."

"Totalitarianism and Foreign Policy: The Dictators and the United States" was the most "recent" subject in the list covered by sessions in European history. Under the

chairmanship of Harold C. Deutsch, University of Minnesota, William C. Askew, Colgate University, Gerhard Weinberg, University of Michigan, and Robert H. McNeal, McMaster University, examined respectively the "image" of the United States held by Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin. Askew said that Mussolini's early admiration for President Wilson and America's World War I effort rapidly evaporated, and from the time of the Ethiopian War, the Duce increasingly resented the critical American attitude towards him. American efforts to keep Mussolini out of Hitler's war were doomed in the face of the spectacular manifestations of German power. Weinberg noted that Hitler's image of America changed drastically in the decade before World War II. While in the late twenties he considered Americans as a racial elite drawn from the "Nordic" elements of Europe, our economic troubles and critical views of Nazism soon convinced him that we were really a mixture of inferior exiles. Thereafter he felt little concern about what Americans might do, and as late as the Battle of the Bulge was underestimating our military capacities. McNeal stressed that Stalin shared the Bolshevik antipathy towards liberal reformers and regarded Roosevelt's conciliatory gestures suspiciously, considering the wartime President even more of an arch-imperialist than Churchill. In his comment, Herbert Fels agreed that the Italo-Ethiopian episode marked a turning point in Italian-American relations, suggested that Hitler could never quite convince himself of American weakness, and noted finally that the conceptions of all three dictators were molded by their compulsions.

The range of subjects covered by the sessions in United States history was wide indeed. It may be well at the outset to indicate which programs did not yield chairmen's reports. With regard to them, the editor of this summary can only note what was planned, leaving the question of what actually took place in the realm of highly probable but undocumented conjecture. An excursion into very recent history was the session on "Historical Aspects of the Problem of Disarmament," in which papers were read on the role of American scientists in relation to early proposals for international control of atomic energy and on the problem of feasibility in such proposals. These papers were to be given respectively by Alice Kimball Smith, Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study, and Robert Gard, Jr., United States Army, with comments furnished by Merze Tate, Howard University, and Louis Morton, Dartmouth College, and with Hans J. Morgenthau, University of Chicago, as presiding officer. At the other end of the timeline was a scheduled meeting on "The Function of the English Colonial Executive in Eighteenth-Century America," under Max Savelle's chairmanship. Papers were scheduled on Pennsylvania (by William S. Hanna, University of Michigan), Massachusetts (by John A. Schutz, Whittier College) and South Carolina (by M. Eugene Sirmans, Emory University), with a comment by William W. Abbott, Rice University. Finally, returning to relatively modern times, Thomas C. Cochran, University of Pennsylvania, was listed as chairman of a meeting to consider "Changes in Economic Opportunity in the United States." Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was to present a paper on the nineteenth century, Mabel Newcomer, Vassar College, on the twentieth, and William Parker, Yale University, and James Soltow, Michigan State University, were slated to comment. One dinner session featured an excursion into the nineteenth-century United States political past. This was the annual dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and if, as most reliably reported, nothing went awry, then Avery Craven, University of Chicago, introduced Albert D. Kirwan, University of Kentucky, who read a paper entitled: "Nativism: Mid-Century Way Station for Whigs." The University of Kentucky also furnished the speaker at the annual Phi Alpha Theta luncheon. This was Thomas D. Clark, whose paper was entitled "American Indians and Pioneers Before and After James Fenimore Cooper." Professor Clark was to be introduced by Donald E. Worcester, University of Florida.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Association, in joint session with the American Historical Association, provided the meeting with some "Reappraisals of Historical Portraits by Henry Adams." Three speakers, introduced by Marshall Smelser, University of Notre Dame, assayed the intrinsic merits of Adams' treatment of Jefferson, Gallatin, and Madison. Merrill D. Peterson, of Brandeis University, said that Adams fitted Jefferson into an imaginary and contrived doctrinaire system, and then regarded each

of Jefferson's departures from the principles of this artificial system as a failure or a disgrace. Alexander Balinký, an economist of Rutgers University, resisted the temptation to evaluate Gallatin's theories of public finance by the standards of today, and concluded that Adams overrated Gallatin, who was a resounding success only from 1802 to 1808, a period in which he relied on revenue from foreign trade, which grew enormously only because of the accidental co-incidence of world war, and not for any reason attributable to Gallatin's policy. Irving Brant presented a detailed case against Adams' use of documents, claiming that Adams, by selection and omission, heavily under-evaluated Madison's leadership as Commander-in-Chief during the war of 1812. Adrienne Koch, University of California, Berkeley, was the commentator, and expressed reservations about each paper. In her view, Adams' work was perhaps the best history ever written by an American, but she admitted that despite its perspicacity, eloquence, and beauty, it was in some instances false. This led her to the unanswered question of whether history was art or knowledge. In any case, she felt, our understanding of the Jefferson and Madison administrations must remain clouded until further digestion of the mass of sources takes place.

For "Trends in Living Standards in the United States before the Civil War: A Re-Examination," Ralph W. Hidy, Harvard University, was in the chair and there were two papers. Ralph L. Andreano, Harvard University, described trends and variations in the economic welfare of the American population to 1860. He emphasized that making comparisons in the level of living requires a judicious fusion of purely descriptive economic data with the analytical framework of economics. He himself employed as indices of economic welfare both the index of real per capita income and the less easily defined and measured threefold index of trends in social asset formation, personal asset formation, and personal consumption of perishable goods and services. His findings strongly support the view that the trend was rising between 1800 and 1840, and that between 1840 and 1860 the level of living in the United States rose so as to make its people the richest in the world by the eve of the Civil War. In specific support of this last-named general proposition, Arnold Daum, Loyola University, Chicago, focused on "The Ante-Bellum Revolution in Illumination: A Neglected Consumer Goods Industry." He found that the major change came before the age of petroleum, not after 1859. Five major developments forced the pre-petroleum democratization of illumination: the upgrading of lard oil, the use of camphene (spirits of turpentine), the mass manufacture of cheap striking matches, and the emergence of manufactured gas as well as its off-shoot, coal oil. An over-all factor was improved processes in the manufacture and distribution of glassware and lamps, of which 1,800,000 were in use by 1860.

The Southern Historical Association combined with the American Historical Association to present "Historical Change in the Middle Period," a lively session which saw Thomas P. Govan, New York University, open the proceedings by considering changes in the financial and political views of Nicholas Biddle. Govan held that Biddle, an American nationalist, viewed the affirmations in the Declaration of Independence and the preamble to the Constitution as principles of judgment of policies, not as policies themselves. In Biddle's view, the Bank and its policies were to be judged by whether or not they contributed to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, . . . and secure the blessings of liberty." Thus he was able to argue that economic crises, such as those of 1837, could be met by changing policies to meet changing economic conditions. But those who made policy itself a matter of principle refused to alter their concepts; this rigidity, in men like Van Buren and Albert Gallatin, thwarted Biddle's efforts to counter-act the depression of 1837 and worsened it by 1839. W. Edwin Hemphill, of The Papers of John C. Calhoun, discussed "Change in the Career of John C. Calhoun." He portrayed the Carolinian as a nationalist before about 1830, a sectionalist thereafter. These two Calhouns had the same heredity, but differed because they did not live in identical environments. Eight changes in the environment inhabited by Calhoun were isolated: the Union's growing strength in the family of nations after 1823, the depression in the South through most of the 1820's and 1830's, the South's loss of equality in the Union, John Marshall's weakening of state's rights, the Industrial Revolution, Calhoun's change from an "in" to an "out" status as a party leader, the South's isolation, and abolitionism.

In his comment, Thomas B. Alexander, University of Alabama, suggested that Biddle may have accurately appraised the national need for central banking, but inadequately understood the force of democracy. Calhoun, with his inability to adjust to the confluence of democracy and nationalism in the United States, failed to face the fact that such a confluence meant the inevitable end of slavery, and so failed to make a statesman-like contribution to Southerners' readiness to face the changing circumstances. James W. Silver, University of Mississippi, presided over the exchange of views.

The ending of slavery, whether anticipated by John C. Calhoun or not, was certainly a major development in American history, as the participants in a session entitled "The Emancipation Proclamation As Historical Turning Point" agreed. Roland C. McConnell, Morgan State College, presented a paper on national reactions during the hundred days between the preliminary and final emancipation proclamations. He noted that in the North, public opinion was divided upon the matter by party factionalism, but in the South, the impact on the popular mind was tremendous, and the Confederate press was unanimous in condemning it as a gross violation of the law of nations and the rights of private property. The hundred day period between preliminary and final versions, he felt, afforded time for the country and the world to learn the meaning of the words and gain insight into the problems of preparing the public for their reception. Mark Krug, University of Chicago, delivered "The Republican Party and the Emancipation Proclamation." His central findings were that the Proclamation represented a turning point in the war because it made the issue of slavery a central theme of the Civil War; that it "met with the approval of all the factions in the Republican party and not simply of the radical wing"; that its effects on the fall elections were varied and not widely unfavorable to the Republican Party; and that the final document was hailed as a clarion call for human freedom. With the years, however, Krug declared, historians "became, in increasing measure, disenchanted with it," and often assert that it was "nothing of the sort." Nevertheless, in Krug's view, the document was still a call to freedom, issued by a Lincoln who moved from personal conviction and deserved to be considered the Great Emancipator. Jerome W. Jones, Central State College, presented an approving commentary, and the discussion period was managed by the session chairman, Charles H. Wesley, President of Central State University and of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History.

A comparison of "Patterns of American Intolerance in Two Centuries" was the business of a session presided over by John Higham, University of Michigan. The first speaker, David B. Davis, Cornell University, discussed the psychological meaning of ante-bellum intolerance. Noting the close ideological association between nativism and reform, he suggested that the nativist impulse was not entirely negative. It engendered a sense of identity and contributed to the integration of a fluid and amorphous society. Paul L. Murphy, University of Minnesota, analyzed the intolerance of the 1920's with an emphasis on the political and economic exploitation of hysteria by special interests. He stressed the manipulative role of various business groups, bureaucrats, and professional patriots who preached anti-radicalism and anti-pacifism. The commentators were politely skeptical. Ernest G. Muntz, University of Cincinnati, denying that the ante-bellum nativists accomplished anything for the nation or for themselves, thought Davis proved only that they felt great tension and anxiety. David Chalmers, University of Florida, chided Murphy for neglecting ethnic prejudice and for hewing to a traditional interpretation of the 1920's as a period dominated by a reactionary business community.

A joint session with the Agricultural History Society on "Continuity and Change in Agrarian Ideology" began with a paper by Richard S. Kirkendall, University of Missouri, on "L. C. Gray and the Supply of Agricultural Land." In Kirkendall's absence, the session chairman, Weymouth T. Jordan, Florida State University, read his paper, which traced the role of Gray and his supporters in the Department of Agriculture, shortly before 1933, in trying to hold back submarginal lands from cultivation. Paul W. Gates, Cornell University, the commentator on this paper, complimented Kirkendall for his intensive research. In the second paper, "Space, Time, Culture, and the New Frontier," Robert F. Berkhofer, University of Minnesota, dealt with some aspects of Frederick Jackson Turner's dependence on the social history of his time in conceiving

of social evolution as a history of adaptation to changed environment. Berkhofer felt that the American frontier should be viewed today in the new perspective afforded by modern social theory. He said, following in part Herbert Baxter Adams and others, that the institutions which sprang up depended more on the migrants' cultural baggage than on the influence of the frontier, considered either as geographical setting or unpopulated space. Earl Pomeroy, University of Oregon, in discussing Berkhofer's paper, agreed on the useful stimulus that might come from new social theory, but emphasized that Turner did not confine himself to an environmental interpretation.

Government and the consuming public were studied in their relation to each other at the session entitled "The Government and the Consumer: Evolution of Food and Drug Laws." Oscar E. Anderson, Jr., of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, discussed the 1906 pure food and drug act as a "pioneer statute." He concluded that weaknesses in that act were primarily a result of "attrition in the legislative battle" rather than defects of conception. Effective regulation, he held, requires education of producer and consumer, public support, and the efforts of public servants of "integrity and imagination." J. Harvey Young, Emory University, in a similar examination of the 1938 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, noted the changes in climate which made the legislative history of that act differ from that of its 1906 predecessor. In a third paper Wallace F. Janssen, of the Food and Drug Administration, spoke of "Recent Laws and Current Needs." He stressed the tremendous changes since 1938 and the trend to preventive law, as evidenced in various amendments requiring "safety clearing" before marketing. A. Hunter Dupree, University of California, Berkeley, gave a comment, which, in stressing the "implied significance" of the session at hand, appealed for other such sessions devoted to the "role of science and technology." The discussion produced general agreement that the impact of science and technology upon government has been slighted by the historical fraternity. J. Leonard Bates, University of Illinois, presided.

Raymond C. Miller, Wayne State University, was in charge of a session which raised the provocative question, "Was There A Definable Progressive Era?" Morton Keller, University of Pennsylvania, in his paper, "The Progressive Generation," suggested that in the two decades from 1898 to 1918 there was a dominant social view. The characteristic words of this America, thrust so suddenly into an active world, were the progressive words--stability, efficiency, order, control. The spirit of the progressive generation thus ran far beyond the reformers, who were only one case. The World War was in a sense the climax of a movement toward giantism and social purpose, and 1920 was hence more important than the election of Harding alone could make it. J. Joseph Huthmacher, Georgetown University, suggested that if Charles Evans Hughes, of New York, is listed as a progressive, then Charles F. Murphy, Tammany boss, who did much more in the way of "progressive" lawmaking than Hughes, should also be included. Huthmacher protested against the association of Progressivism only with rural virtue, and the consequent ignoring of urban reform activities in the movement. Comments were by Arthur Mann, Smith College, and Daniel Levine, Earlham College. The floor discussion which followed papers and comments indicated a high degree of interest and enthusiasm.

A joint session with the Urban History Group and the Social Welfare History Group presented papers by Allen F. Davis, University of Missouri, on "Settlement Workers and Politics, 1890-1914" and by James Leiby, University of California School of Social Welfare, on "A Non-Political State Welfare Department: New Jersey, 1918-1945." These papers together constituted an examination of "Changing Views of the Relation Between Social Welfare and Politics," the title of the session presided over by Ralph Pumphrey, Washington University. Davis pointed out that settlement workers in the period of his paper had a continuing and widespread commitment to political action, particularly on the ward and local level. While they experienced only partial success in controlling elections at the aldermanic level, they added greatly to the knowledge and understanding of local politics, and also were effective in influencing legislation at local and state levels. Professor Leiby contrasted the limited success of a self-consciously non-political but aggressive and gaudy reform administration, 1918-1925, with the substantial progress made under a quiet, unpretentious administration, 1925-1945, in which

public relations efforts were directed towards building understanding in all political factions, rather than towards a massive change in public opinion. In his comment, Clarke Chambers, University of Minnesota, emphasized the pragmatic role of the settlement workers in influencing the reform movement of the Progressive Era and also pointed to their continuing efforts and leadership in this direction during the twenties. Miss Frances Perkins was unable to be present as a commentator, as scheduled. Her remarks were read by the Chairman. She stressed that she and other early settlement workers lacked formal training for political reform and learned much by experience. Only rarely did they attempt to use their influence outside the city or the state, and more recognition should be given to the work of the national reform organizations (such as the National Child Labor Committee) to which the settlements looked for the expression of their national aspirations.

The final joint session in this report was held with the American Society of Church History, under the title "Changes in the Protestant View of Progress," with Lefferts A. Loetscher, Princeton Theological Seminary, in the chair. The two major papers dealt with the idea of progress and its critics from 1900 to 1930, and from 1930 to 1960. The chairman, in introducing the theme, pointed out that 1930 has often been regarded as a "watershed," that after that date American Protestant liberalism was supposed to have become more self-critical and less optimistic. The two speakers tended to modify this idea. The first, William R. Hutchison, American University, pointed out that from 1900 to 1930 there was much self-criticism among liberals, though he did acknowledge that there was an important change of climate at the end of that time, when early translations of Karl Barth's work and the prophetic writings of Reinhold Niebuhr stimulated Americans to theological reconstruction in the face of international and economic upheaval. In the second paper, Paul A. Carter, Smith College, while even readier than Hutchison to accept 1930 as a "watershed," stressed evidences that many liberals after 1930, though "chastened," still retained much of their optimism. In his comment on Hutchison's paper Robert T. Handy, Union Theological Seminary, agreed that stereotyped ideas of a "watershed" at 1930 were too extreme, but thought that the paper tended to emphasize too little the discontinuities which emerged around that year. Georg G. Iggers, Dillard University, in dealing with Carter's paper, noted that American historians, who had previously said much about "progress," became comparatively silent on this subject after 1932. Floor discussion raised the questions of whether or not "watersheds" occurred at different times in different areas of culture, and whether there had not periodically been a note of pessimism throughout the history of American thought.

The outgoing Chairman of the Program Committee reminds readers that he has once already expressed his gratitude to his committee co-workers, to the Local Arrangements Committee, to the Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association, to all participants in the 1962 meeting, and to all those in the profession whose ideas and suggestions were of so much value. The repetition of these feelings at this point may lessen their impact in print, but in no way detracts from the sincerity with which they are felt.

University of Chicago.

BERNARD A. WEISBERGER.

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION THE CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS DECEMBER 27, 1962, 10:00 A.M.

Present at the meeting were Carl Bridenbaugh, President; Crane Brinton, Vice-President; Elmer Louis Kayser, Treasurer; Boyd C. Shafer, Executive Secretary; Councilors John Caughy, Walter Johnson, Frederic C. Lane, Charles Mullett, Gaines Post, Gordon Wright; and former Presidents Samuel Flagg Bemis and Bernadotte Schmitt. John A. Schutz, Secretary-Treasurer of the Pacific Coast Branch, and Walter

Rundell, Jr., Assistant Executive Secretary, were also present. Past Presidents Louis Gottschalk, Dexter Perkins, and Walter Prescott Webb attended at varying times.

The minutes of the 1961 meeting of the Council were approved as they had been published in the April 1962 issue of the Review (pages 881-88).

The President asked the Executive Secretary to send greetings from the Council to John Hope Franklin who is presently Pitt Professor of American History at Cambridge University and a member of the Council of the Association.

On behalf of the Council, the Executive Secretary was asked to send a telegram to Guy Stanton Ford, long Executive Secretary of the Association and Managing Editor of the Review and now in his ninetieth year.

Because it has been sent to the Council, the report of the Executive Secretary and Managing Editor of the Review was not read. The Executive Secretary spoke of the increase in membership (approximately 10,500 active members, 11,500 constitutional members). He reported that the Professional Register now had over 700 registrants and that the Association was being notified of numerous positions.

Carl Bridenbaugh, President of the Association, appointed a committee of the three immediate past Presidents, Samuel Flagg Bemis, Bernadotte Schmitt, and himself, with Councilor Gordon Wright as Chairman and Julian Boyd as an additional member, to study and define the duties of the President, Vice-President, the Executive Committee, and Finance Committee, and to report to the Council at the meeting in 1963 for the Council's consideration.

The Treasurer of the Association, Elmer Louis Kayser, gave a brief summary of his report which the Council had received earlier. He indicated that certain changes in the values of the funds of the Association resulted from changes in the market values of the securities held by the Fiduciary Trust Company, New York City, and in the investment in property for the enlargement of the Association headquarters. The Council seriously considered plans for further use of Association funds on the motion of Councilor Walter Johnson. It approved in principle funds for the addition of staff to assist the Executive Secretary, and asked that the details be worked out by the Executive Committee.

The Treasurer and Executive Secretary discussed proposed budgets for 1962-1963 and 1963-1964. The Council approved these budgets with minor changes. The Service Center should be, the Council decided, allotted up to \$5,000 a year for 1962-1963 and 1963-1964 for conferences of teachers in the schools and professional historians; up to \$3,000 is to be taken from the revolving fund of the Service Center, while the originally budgeted \$2,000 contributions by the Association remain constant. The Council authorized additional expenditure of up to \$2,500 for the remodeling of the new offices at 402 A Street. The Council approved slight overages in budgeted expenditures for 1961-1962 and an increase in the budget of the Program Committee for 1963-1964 to \$1,000.

The Executive Secretary spoke of the new provision for the printing and distribution of the Service Center pamphlets by the Macmillan Company and of the difficulties arising out of the transition to the new plan.

Upon the nomination of the Managing Editor, the Council confirmed the appointment of Professor C. Bradford Welles as a new member of the Board of Editors to replace Professor Mason Hammond whose term expires in 1962.

For the new delegates to scholarly groups, the Council elected Professor Louis Morton to the Social Science Research Council, re-elected President Thomas C. Mendenhall to the Board of Editors of Social Education, and elected Professor George Pierson to the American Council of Learned Societies.

The Executive Secretary announced that the Executive Committee of the Council had selected as Program Chairman for 1963 Professor Hilary Conroy of the University of Pennsylvania and as Local Arrangements Chairman, Professor Clement Motten of Temple University.

The Executive Secretary gave the places of the Annual Meetings for the next four years: the Sheraton and other hotels in Philadelphia, 1963; the Sheraton Park and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C., 1964; the San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco, California, 1965; and the New York Hilton, New York City, 1966.

Professor Bemis presented a full account of the discussions of the Joint Canadian-United States Committee for Co-operation. He mentioned the joint scholarly meetings that had been held or are being held and the contribution of \$1,000 by an anonymous donor toward a prize on the history of Canadian-United States relations. He gave particular attention to the possibility of a joint meeting of the Canadian Historical Association and the American Historical Association in 1967. After considerable discussion, the Council approved the following resolution:

The Council of the American Historical Association, having at hand the letter of Lieutenant Colonel T. M. Hunter, English Language Secretary of the Canadian Historical Association, of November 14, 1962, to Dr. Boyd C. Shafer, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association, in which the Canadian Historical Association states that it would be delighted if the American Historical Association would hold its 1967 meeting in Canada and thereby assist the Canadian Historical Association in celebrating the centenary of Canadian Confederation, expresses its appreciation of the sentiments conveyed and resolves to have its 1967 meeting in Toronto and to proceed with a joint program in consultation with the Committee established by the two Associations.

The Executive Secretary then discussed various special projects. The Historical Association (Britain) and the American Historical Association have appointed committees to provide a plan for the study of bias in the textbooks of Great Britain and the United States. Professor Richard McCormick, chairman of the American Committee, and the Executive Secretary have met with their colleagues of the British Committee, and working parties are being appointed. This study is supported by funds provided by the Nuffield Trust and the Ford Foundation.

The Council approved a reduction in size of the Committee on Research Needs and the continuation on the Committee of the following historians: Professor Roderic H. Davison, chairman, David Donald, Charles Gibson, Earl Pritchard, John Higham and Leonard Krieger (newly elected), Hunter Dupree, and Boyd C. Shafer (ex officio). The Council understands that the committee will reshape its proposals and present a new plan to foundations.

A proposal from the Macmillan Company for an "Encyclopedia of American History" was tabled without prejudice.

The Assistant Executive Secretary and the Executive Secretary discussed the work of the Service Center. The pamphlets, now being distributed by the Macmillan Company, are in wide demand as are the conferences between professional historians and teachers in the schools. The Council, having approved additional funds for conferences, took no further action, but expressed its approval of what was being done.

For the regular and special committees of the Association the Council approved the nominations of the Committee on Committees (See pp. XXIII-XXV for these committees). It also elected or re-elected delegates and representatives to other scholarly groups (See p. XXVI).

The Council approved the appointment of a new Committee on Scholarly Historical Resources, which is to be composed of: Robert F. Byrnes, chairman; Lester Born, David Dowd, Dewey Grantham, Burton Stein, Walter Johnson, John Snell, and Boyd C. Shafer (ex officio).

After considerable discussion, the Council decided to table the report of the Committee on Honorary Members and ask this Committee for additional nominations, which the Council may consider at its next meeting. The Council took this action hoping to widen the choice. Members of the Council were asked to correspond with members of this Committee if they had suggestions.

For the Pacific Coast Branch, Professor John A. Schutz, Secretary-Treasurer, reported that both the activities of the Branch and attendance at its meetings were increasing. A complete report of the Branch will be found in the Annual Report of the Association, Proceedings for 1962. For the national meeting in 1965, the Executive Secretary will consult with the members of the Branch.



The Executive Secretary spoke of the plans for the Newsletter, which began to appear in December 1962, and mentioned the wide favorable response. These plans had been previously approved by the Executive Committee. The Executive Secretary mentioned the possibility that the Newsletter, in response to demand, might be expanded.

After considerable discussion in which members of the Council took differing views, the proposal of the Macmillan Company to publish the presidential addresses of the last twenty-five years was approved.

The Conference on Latin American History proposed to present funds to the Association for a Clarence Haring Prize in Latin American History of five hundred dollars to be awarded every five years. The Council accepted the proposal, with the provision that the Conference be asked to increase the capital fund to three thousand dollars, and with the understanding that the customary rules and regulations of the Association, as they have outlined to the Conference on Latin American History, would be followed. In addition, the Council provided that in the future no prize would be accepted by the Association unless a capital sum of at least five thousand dollars be made available to the Association.

A proposal favoring a multivolume work on the Habsburg monarchy was tabled without an expression of views on the part of the Association.

The Council expressed regret that adequate attention was not given to history in the new Encyclopedia of Social Sciences and believed that historians would not regard the new encyclopedia with favor.

Vice-President Brinton was appointed chairman of the Executive Committee and the Finance Committee, replacing Professor Frederic C. Lane who retires from the Council. Others members of the two Committees will be the same as those for 1962. The Executive Committee consists of Professors Samuel Flagg Bemis, Carl Bridenbaugh, Elmer Louis Kayser, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, and Dr. Boyd C. Shafer. Elmer Louis Kayser and Boyd C. Shafer make up the Finance Committee. The Council then provided that in the future the President of the Association should, as a rule, act as chairman of these two committees.

For the Committee on Resolutions, Councilors Walter Johnson and Charles Mullett were selected.

Two proposals for a "Guide to Historical Periodical Literature" and for a new Committee on Historical Sites were tabled. The Council believed that a "Guide to Historical Periodical Literature" was too large a task to undertake at this time and that other groups which the Association supports could provide for the preservation of historical sites.

A committee composed of Professors Caughey, Lane, and Post reported on a retirement plan for employees of the Association. The Council asked that the Association provide fully adequate retirement funds and recommended a retirement age of sixty-five with yearly appointments to age seventy. The Council accepted this plan with the provision that details be worked out by the Finance Committee.

The Council adjourned at approximately 4:45 p.m.

BOYD C. SHAFER, Executive Secretary.

## MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION THE CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS DECEMBER 29, 1962, 4:30 P.M.

President Carl Bridenbaugh called the meeting to order with approximately one hundred members present (about sixty additional members came later). The minutes of the last meeting (AHR, LXVII [Apr. 1962], 888-890) were approved.

The Executive Secretary and Managing Editor of the Review, Boyd C. Shafer, gave his annual report (see pages 25-29).

The Treasurer, Elmer Louis Kayser, presented his report for 1961-1962. On August 31, 1962, the Association had \$88,137.67 cash on hand for general purposes, a decrease of \$14,080.15 from the preceding year. Unrestricted funds, in the custody of the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York and under the direction of the Board of Trustees, amounted to \$286,029.05. The Association headquarters and equipment were valued at \$78,798.66. The total assets available for general purposes, therefore, totaled \$452,965.38. The Treasurer also reported that various restricted funds totaled \$432,053.12; hence the total assets of the Association, if the book value of the permanent investments is used, amounted to \$885,018.50. If, however, the market value of the permanent investments is noted, the total assets amounted to \$1,112,030.00. The Treasurer pointed out that because of the changing portfolio of the Association, the book value of the investments had increased \$54,701.42 but that because of the declining market value of the investments and of other factors, the total assets of the Association had declined \$23,795.17 in market value.

The present favorable financial condition of the Association, the Treasurer stated, was principally the result of the increasing number of members, but he noted that costs were mounting rapidly.

The report, which was distributed at the meeting and may be examined the Association's headquarters, was accepted without dissent. The report will be published in the Annual Report of the American Historical Association, Volume I, Proceedings, 1962.

Professor Stow Persons of the State University of Iowa, chairman of the Nominating Committee, reported for the committee. For the officers of the Association the following were nominated for 1963: President, Crane Brinton, Harvard University; Vice-President, Julian Boyd, Princeton University; Treasurer, Elmer Louis Kayser, George Washington University. Upon instruction, the Executive Secretary cast one ballot for these nominees, and they were unanimously elected. Reporting on the mail ballot, Professor Persons announced that Professor Robert Byrnes of Indiana University and Dr. Louis Wright of the Folger Library were elected to the Council of the Association, and that Professors David Donald of Johns Hopkins University, John Tate Lanning of Duke University, and John Snell of Tulane University were elected to the Nominating Committee. Professor Persons' report was unanimously accepted.

The Executive Secretary reported upon actions taken by the Council at its meeting on December 27 (see pages 20-23). He announced places of meeting through 1967; the 1963 Program Chairman, Professor Hilary Conroy of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Local Arrangements Chairman, Professor Clement Motten of Temple University; the new appointments to various Association committees; the selection of delegates to several scholarly groups; and the appointment of Professor C. Bradford Welles of Yale University to the Board of Editors, replacing Professor Mason Hammond of Harvard University, whose term had expired. The Executive Secretary noted particularly that the Association, responding to a communication from the Canadian Historical Association that it would be delighted to have the American Historical Association meet in Canada to assist the Canadian Historical Association in the celebration of the centenary of Canadian Confederation, planned to meet in Toronto in 1967.

Professor John Schutz of Whittier College gave the report of the Pacific Coast Branch of the Association and revealed its thriving state.

For the Committee on Resolutions, Professor Charles Mullett proposed the following:

With enthusiasm the new members of the Council applaud the wisdom of their seniors in choosing a hotel admirably equipped to handle a meeting. For the whole Association we extend our deep thanks to Bernard Weisberger and the members of his Program Committee and to Martin Lowery and the members of the Local Arrangements Committee for their efforts in making this meeting both enlightening and bearable.

The resolution was approved with acclamation.

As no other business was proposed, President Bridenbaugh, on the motion of Professor Lawrence Gipson, one of the oldest members of the profession and the Association, adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

BOYD C. SHAFER, Executive Secretary.

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR FOR 1962

This is my tenth report as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor. This report will, as my previous reports have done, describe activities of the Association during the year. It will also stress certain problems facing historians as they try to recapture historical experience to enrich the understanding of present men.

The paid membership of the Association is now over 11,000, compared to 6,000 in 1953; at our meetings about 3,000 historians now register, double the number (1,292) registering at Chicago in 1953. As the Association has steadily gone about its usual work, it has also steadily taken on new activities, rendered new services. In past reports I have, for example, spoken often of the microfilming and indexing of German war documents, of the Guide to Historical Literature (now in its second printing), of the Guide to Photocopied Materials, and of The Education of Historians in the United States. These projects are now completed.

Our Service Center for Teachers of History, designed "to bridge the gap between the teacher and the professional historian," continues to bridge this gap with the counsel of the Committee on Teaching (Joseph Strayer, chairman). In September we turned over the printing and distribution but not the editing of the pamphlets (now forty-seven with six more to be published this year) to the Macmillan Company. This action relieved our office of a burden it could no longer support and may bring the pamphlets to the attention of more teachers. During the six years we distributed the pamphlets their circulation exceeded 600,000. Out of monies set aside from the sale of pamphlets as well as Association funds, we still support, though on a reduced scale, conferences of high school teachers and academic historians, and we plan to expand this service which teachers both want and need. One Service Center pamphlet outside the regular series, the Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers, has just been sent to all members and will be given to many students, teachers, and educators. Dozens of requests for it have come in. If it helps in the improvement of standards, our objectives will be realized.

Our attempt to strengthen the study of South Asian history in the United States has, according to the universities to which we have sent eleven professors, met with success. This coming year, the last year of the supporting Rockefeller Foundation grant, our Committee on South Asian History (Earl Pritchard, acting chairman) will invite two additional historians from India and Pakistan. Of our five planned bibliographies on British history only one volume, that by Conyers Read, has appeared, but Stanley Pargellis, who has acted as leader of the joint British-American advisory group, believes that two more volumes will appear within a year.

During the year we have established two new Association committees, on Ancient History (Chester Starr, chairman) and on Maritime History (Frederic Lane, chairman). We have also appointed the United States members of two new joint committees, the Canadian-United States Committee for Co-operation (Samuel Flagg Bemis, chairman of the American contingent), and the Historical Association (Britain) and the American Historical Association Committee on National Bias in Textbooks (Richard McCormick, United States chairman). We may expect recommendations from all four of these committees during the next two or three years.

We continue to be represented on the Social Science Research Council (Louis Gottschalk, David Potter, and Thomas Cochran), and on the American Council of Learned Societies (Robert Palmer). Arthur Whitaker is the Association and United States delegate in the Assembly of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, and Boyd Shafer is an elected member of the Bureau (or Council) of the International Committee. Thomas Mendenhall and Walter Rundell, Jr., are the Association's representatives on the editorial board of Social Education, the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, and Julian Boyd and Boyd Shafer are the Association's representatives on the National Historical Publications Commission, which has been primarily concerned with the preparation of scholarly editions of the papers of famous Americans. Boyd Shafer also serves on the Board of Directors of the Harry S. Truman Library Institute for National and International Affairs.

The prize committees of the Association, inundated as usual with books but not manuscripts, have again made wise choices which, as is the custom, are announced on December 29. Though the monetary value of the prizes, with the exception of the Beveridge Award, is too small, scholars still eagerly contend. The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize in European History (Richard Brace, chairman), the George Louis Beer Prize in European International History (Henry Cord Meyer, chairman), the Beveridge Award in the History of the Western Hemisphere (Charles Gibson, chairman), the John H. Dunning Prize in American History (Edmund Morgan, chairman), and the Watumull Prize (Robert L. Crane, chairman) will all be awarded this year.

Though most college and university faculty members seem to abhor committee work in their own institutions, dozens of members of the Association gave long hours and hard toil to the widely varied work of the Association and the profession. The Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government (Charles Barker, chairman) has considered many problems, including governmental historical publications, scholarly use of the Library of Congress, and the nature of governmental employment of historians. For the Committee on International Historical Activities (headed by Arthur Whitaker) this has been a year of preparation for American participation in the International Congress to be held in Vienna in 1965. Hoping to provide outstanding papers and to meet the difficulties of international cooperation in a world split by ideology, this committee has most difficult and important tasks.

For two much-needed studies we have not been able as yet to obtain funds. With an imaginative group headed by Roderic Davison we plan to do what could be a truly creative series of experimental historical papers based on concepts and methods adapted from other disciplines in the social sciences and the humanities, one on areas outside Europe and the United States, and one on the history of science. These papers would not stop at exhortation, as has too often been the case in the past, but actually reveal insights that may develop when the tools of inquiry are sharp. We also had hoped to begin a major study of world history in the schools, but, unfortunately, we may not be able to do so until other major surveys of all school offerings in the so-called social sciences, from kindergarten through grade twelve, are under way.

Fortunately positions in history do not have to await surveys. The Professional (formerly Job) Register has been informed of about 250 positions in the last 11 months and brought these to the attention of the over 500 registrants.

The editing of the Review is probably our most important task. Our Review is the most comprehensive (1,230 pages in 1961-1962) and universal scholarly journal in history. In Volume LXVII the Review published 16 (14 last year) articles and 4 "Notes and Suggestions" (8 the previous year). Because more scholarly historical volumes were published, but also because the editor strenuously has sought to obtain such books everywhere, the number of books reviewed and noticed has mounted every year. Last year the total soared to 720 (692 in 1960-1961); this is almost double the number of 1953. If we may judge by letters and comments, the Board of Editors' policy of seeking broad, new, interpretive, and well-written papers should be emphasized even more than it has, but the difficulty is that American historians do not often prepare this kind of essay. The Review now goes to over 13,000 (7,000 in 1953) individuals and institutions. To facilitate scholarly use of the Review, a huge new Index covering the years 1935-1955 has been prepared and published. One major problem of the Review, that of space, is being alleviated though not solved.

In early December the Association mailed to members the first issue of the Newsletter, which will be published five times a year. This Newsletter, edited by the Assistant Executive Secretary, Walter Rundell, Jr., carries "personals," long a section of the Review, notices of the Professional Register, and other items of Association and professional interest.

As the Association and its activities have grown and the Review has become larger, our office became too small. We have been forced, therefore, to expand our office space by the acquisition and remodeling of an adjoining building. The new space should be ready for occupancy by the time the staff returns from the Chicago meeting.

All that we do is based on the premise that the study of history, our teaching and our research, will deepen human understanding of the present and thus enhance the possibility of intelligent action. As it was in 1890 and again in 1910, historical study is deep in a period of major questioning and transition. For historians, as for all mankind, this is a period, in the words of President Carl Bridenbaugh, of the "Great Mutation." As never before, American historians are questioning their basic assumptions, their methods, their purposes. Practitioners of other scholarly disciplines in the United States are challenging our discipline with increasing vigor. And Marxist historians are sharply attacking the whole structure of historical study as it has developed in Western civilization since Ranke.

Questioning of the ways history is studied, written, and taught in the United States is not new, nor are attacks on American historical study and historians. Theodore Roosevelt called our predecessors "conscientious, industrious, painstaking little pedants" who might have been useful had they understood their limitations. James Harvey Robinson exhorted his progressive generation to give up antiquated ideas and adopt a broadened "new history," based on the social sciences, a history expressly written to explain the making of the modern mind. Charles Beard told the same generation that it had failed to understand the economic interpretation of *The Federalist*, Number 10, and had therefore not understood the Constitution of the United States; he told a later generation that they ought to read Croce and the recent German philosophers of history, re-examine out-of-date postulates, and achieve more useful and therefore truer understandings. Allan Nevins in 1940 and since has told American historians again and again that they were failing to communicate, that they ought to think and write with the public always in mind. In Europe from the 1870's the same questions were being asked, the same attacks were being delivered as the essays and books of Nietzsche, Droysen, Dilthey, Lamprecht, Croce, Lacombe, Berr, Febvre, and Bloch abundantly witness.

What seems new today is the intensity of the questioning of Western historical work as a useful contribution to the study of men and societies.

Marxist historians following the Stalin or Khrushchev line have attacked American historians (see *AHR*, LXI [Oct. 1955], 252-56; LXVIII [Oct. 1962], 304-308) as bourgeois agents of the "ruling circles" of the United States. They assert that we follow the "reactionary line" of monopolistic and imperialistic capitalism. Last summer at a conference in Dedham, Massachusetts, sponsored by Educational Services Incorporated and the American Council of Learned Societies, a sociologist from Brandeis University called history "the Sacred Cow" that ought to be slaughtered. Most "behavioral" scientists, of course, are not so violent, but some do ask a pointed question: "What does the study of history contribute to the human sciences?" Sometimes they answer, "Not much."

Serious historians have often asked themselves the same question, and a few of them, as James Harvey Robinson who was thinking of history before his new history, have been inclined to give the same answer. Usually, however, historians have not delivered frontal attacks or indulged in sweeping generalizations; rather they have asked searching and critical questions of their discipline. Recently J. H. Hexter, re-examining a myth of Tudor and Stuart history, has asked us to test the validity of many of our concepts, as "trends," and to rethink our basic assumptions. This fall members of a group of historians meeting at the Winterthur Museum warned us that historians have withdrawn from the contemporary world, that they have failed to catch the public imagination, and that their books "encrusted in graduate school pedantry often go down like old-fashioned castor oil." They called for new theories rather than the new testing of old hypotheses. Our own President Bridenbaugh asks whether, unless we become more imaginative than we are, society will continue to support history as a useful branch of knowledge.

For the past ten years, in Washington and during occasional trips about the country and to Europe, I have systematically investigated fundamental questionings concerning the nature and practice of historical study in the United States. It has been not only part of my job but part of my personal quest as a historian to know the issues and to take

part in the never-ceasing debate. Here I simply try to summarize certain critical opinions that I have encountered.

American historians, unlike German and some French historians, have disliked and disparaged theoretical discussions (philosophy, epistemology) and have seldom examined the fundamental assumptions upon which their work is based. They have proceeded in pragmatic and empirical fashion, saying, "Let's get on with our real work of research and teaching." But, it is reiterated, the assumptions can no longer be taken for granted. Progress (or evolution of any kind) is not inevitable. Being human, historians cannot be objective; the documents themselves, being of man, are subjective: wie es eigentlich gewesen is an illusion. Because truth itself is relative, historians cannot arrive at scientific conclusions or definitive interpretations. Even their choice of facts changes with time and circumstance. Unless they wish, for example, to stand Hegel on his head and use the materialist dialectic, they now, or so it is said, have no solid scheme of reference, no sturdy framework on which to hang facts and base understanding.

Even if historical study has been of great value in the past, it cannot be so in the contemporary world, it is asserted, because of the speed of events or because of the discontinuity brought by science and invention, war and revolution. Buried in the mass of documents, present historians are always hopelessly behind, can never catch up. If they could catch up, they would be faced with a world that no longer needs history. In any case, historians, involved in the past, cannot and do not contribute much to the only time that counts, the present and future.

Even if, another argument runs, historians do learn to work with the mass of documents, their tools of analysis, their powers of synthesis are too blunt. The "behavioral" sciences, employing testable hypotheses and precise language (or jargon), can and do make more useful discoveries.

Even if, critics tell us, historians do socially useful work, they write so badly, teach so poorly, and are so undramatic that they fail to reach people or enough people. It is true that their classes are filled and overflowing and that they publish many books and articles. But they cannot effectively use the English (or any other) language; they want to be in ivy-covered libraries and teach as little as possible; and their books do not sell. High school teachers of history, moreover, are not well trained, and the professional college and university teachers are too often dull pedants. The world history course in the high schools is a "mess," and college courses are either too general or over-specialized. Because historians are too timid, they tend to ignore the "real" world of conflict and creation, and they concentrate too often on subjects of antiquarian interest. Because they are too unimaginative, they write on any topic, no matter how insignificant, on which they can find documents. In sum, the argument runs, they fail to relate the past to the present in meaningful ways, and they have lost touch with their fellows and their communities.

I suppose that the critical faculty can be overdone. I am certain that the above indictments are overdrawn. I am aware that some of the criticisms arise out of a power struggle in the academic world for status, for students, and for foundation grants. Yet some of the criticisms are based on keen observation and solid evaluation. It is certainly true that we have in part, and I emphasize in part, failed to answer needs of our age for that kind of reflective historical work which will so enrich the lives of our students and readers and so attract them that they will demand historical knowledge before acting.

Some historians may say that this view reveals a naïve kind of eighteenth-century optimism, that we can never hope to enlighten our fellows more than we are doing. Others may argue that it indicates an unfounded pessimism, that all historians need is the "wherewithal," that is, money, and if the Association, or someone, would get it and provide historians with all the grants and fellowships that scientists have, there would not be a problem. To hope may be naïve, but it is a characteristic of the genus American. To wish for material resources, in this case for research and teaching, is also a characteristic of American scholars but, as the cliché goes, money is not enough, for the real answers to questions of the mind cannot be bought.

In the Western world there are thousands of historians. Few generalizations will cover all their views and work. Everywhere, however, some of them are asking how

they may improve their discipline and arrive at new or deeper insights. This may not be the century of history as Augustin Thierry thought the nineteenth century was, but it is a century in which there is intense interest in history, and fine minds are studying it, both in traditional and in daring, unorthodox ways. In Britain, France, and the United States, historians for the most part are intelligently adding to knowledge as they test old hypotheses and deepen or widen well-worn channels. In Britain, at the same time, the "degeneralizing" and "demythologizing" inspired by Namier's basically statistical analysis of small subjects have shattered old beliefs about late eighteenth-century and Victorian England. Only now are new syntheses ever so tentatively being suggested. In France, the great work of synthesis exhorted by Berr and Febvre and perhaps achieved by Bloch and Braudel is leading to new understanding of the Middle Ages and the Mediterranean world of the sixteenth century, and the brilliant economic analyses of Labrousse and his *équipe* have revolutionized interpretations of eighteenth-century France and its Revolution. In the United States, Curti, Potter, Palmer, Woodward, Hofstadter, Bailyn, Boorstin, Donald, and a good many others are daring to try new hypotheses and methods. Louis Gottschalk, with his Committee of the Social Science Research Council, is about to publish an important study on "generalizations," and the book on Reconstruction of American History, edited by John Higham, and our own Service Center pamphlets reveal how many of our old interpretations have been modified by later research.

Still there is much to be done, much rethinking to do. And there always will be. Possibly, probably, we should at this point ask some fundamentally theoretical questions once more, however we may dislike doing so and though it is clear that we can find no certain final answers.

What are major valid unities for study? Only individuals in biography, as Dilthey declared? Nations in national histories, as most of us have thought? Or world history, as Barraclough hopes?

What time divisions should be used for study? We know that the Middle Ages were not "middle"; we are not certain there was a "Renaissance." When does modern history begin? Since history is a flowing stream, perhaps it does not matter, but the Marxists think so, and the periodization we choose does influence interpretation.

By what criteria shall we judge what is significant and therefore select the facts on which to base interpretation? Shall we try to re-create the past in terms of the past, the present, or (as E. H. Carr would have it) the future?

Most of us believe that to write history wie es eigentlich gewesen is not possible, an ideal that even Ranke could not realize. But if we cannot re-create the past as it happened, what can or do we re-create?

If, as most of us think, definitive history (in the sense of Langlois and Seignobos) can no longer be written because each age will ask new questions of the past which contains everything, are there any universal questions or answers? Because of the nature of history and ourselves, we probably cannot avoid being relativists, but does this mean that there are no eternal questions that the historian can ask and no long-range, if pluralistic, interpretations he can offer?

No one believes that we can attain complete objectivity, but how can we restrain and control subjectivity? Should we "empty out" our prejudices as Butterfield advocates, become sympathetically but passionately involved with our subjects as Marrou pleads, or become "hanging judges" as Acton believed?

What new hypotheses or concepts ought we to propose and to test? It seems certain that "Quand on ne sait pas ce qu'on cherche, on ne sait pas ce qu'on trouve."

I shall not prolong these questions to which there are no certain or final answers, but we must continue the dialogue, for the history we write and teach will depend upon the tentative and halting positions we have taken, do take, and will take. Nothing human, Bloch told us, can be alien to us, and, Marrou adds, we must open ourselves to all that is human. It well may be, as the Strasbourg philosopher Georges Gusdorf remarks, that the goals of understanding will always recede as we think we approach them and that we may be like children running after their shadows. Still there is knowledge to be gained and enjoyment to be won in the running.

BOYD C. SHAFER, Executive Secretary and Managing Editor.

## ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER FOR THE FISCAL YEAR, 1961-62

The American Historical Association headquarters and its equipment are valued at \$78,798.66. The Association on August 31, 1962 had cash on hand for general purposes amounting to \$88,137.67, a decrease of \$14,080.15 from the preceding year. Funds, unrestricted as to use of income, in the custody of the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York under the direction of the Board of Trustees, amount to \$286,029.05. These three items (headquarters building and equipment, cash, and invested funds) constitute the total assets of \$452,965.38, available for the general purposes of the Association.

Securities in the portfolio of the Matteson Fund amount to \$94,202.20 and those in the other special funds of the Association, restricted in purpose, amount to \$167,303.14. Unexpended portions of grants made by foundations and others for specified purposes amount to \$170,547.78. These various restricted funds total \$432,053.12.

Funds, restricted and unrestricted, composing the total assets of the Association amount to \$885,018.50 if the book value of permanent investments is used. If market values, according to the August 31, 1962 appraisal, are used, the total assets of the Association amount to \$1,112,030.00. There is an increase of \$54,701.42 over the preceding year if the book value of permanent investments is used. A decrease of \$23,795.17 from the preceding year is shown, if market values are used; this is the result of the decrease in value of the securities in permanent investments.

The tables on the pages which follow give a condensed account of the Association's financial operations during the past fiscal year. All financial accounts have been audited by F. W. Lafrentz and Company, certified public accountants, whose report is on file at the Association's headquarters where it is available for inspection by interested members. Filed also at headquarters and available for examination is the report of the Fiduciary Trust Company, approved by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, on the securities held in its custody.

December 1962.

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER, Treasurer.



# PROCEEDINGS--1962

31

## GENERAL ACCOUNT

### Comparative Statement for 1960/61 and 1961/62 of Receipts and Disbursements of Unrestricted Funds

	1960/61	1961/62
<u>Receipts</u>		
Cash on hand Sept. 1.....	\$78,914.67	\$102,173.18
Annual Dues.....	69,889.12	86,990.10
Registration Fees.....	4,518.22	4,166.70
Interest.....	24,163.61	21,048.50
<u>American Historical Review</u> .....	9,415.71	2,400.00
Royalties.....	299.25	709.60
Advertising.....	9,633.80	11,014.76
Miscellaneous.....	954.82	944.87
Foundation Grants (portions allocated to administration).....	13,850.00	8,635.61
	<u>\$211,639.20</u>	<u>\$238,083.32</u>
<u>Disbursements</u>		
General Administration.....	\$61,640.47	\$66,017.12
Council and Committees.....	2,122.12	3,416.61
Annual meetings.....	6,169.01	6,020.89
Review--copies for members.....	28,273.60	38,827.00
A.C.L.S. dues.....	100.00	100.00
Pacific Coast Branch.....	300.00	300.00
International Com. of Hist. Sciences.....	134.88	116.30
National Trust for Historic Preservation.....	100.00	100.00
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize award.....	300.00	-0-
Investments.....	7,500.00	-0-
Special Projects Committees.....	2,602.34	2,167.95
Doctoral Dissertations Lists.....	174.65	77.12
Employees' taxes withheld from Salaries.....	48.95	(21.48)
Land and Building.....	-0-	32,754.32
Furniture and equipment.....	-0-	69.82
	<u>\$109,466.02</u>	<u>\$149,945.65</u>
Balance, Aug. 31.....	<u>102,173.18</u>	<u>88,137.67</u>
	<u>\$211,639.20</u>	<u>\$238,083.32</u>

### Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1961/62 of Special Funds and Grants included in the General Account

	Receipts	Disbursements
<u>Endowment Fund</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$4,252.00	
Contributions.....	314.50	
Life Membership dues.....	2,600.00	
Balance, August 31, 1962.....		<u>\$7,166.50</u>
	<u>\$7,166.50</u>	<u>\$7,166.50</u>
<u>Andrew D. White Fund</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$372.34	
Interest on Investments.....	42.00	
Balance, August 31, 1962.....		<u>\$414.34</u>
	<u>\$414.34</u>	<u>\$414.34</u>
<u>George Louis Beer Prize</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$678.25	
Interest on Investments.....	294.00	
Contribution.....	20.00	
Prize of 1961.....		\$300.00
Balance, August 31, 1962.....		<u>692.25</u>
	<u>\$992.25</u>	<u>\$992.25</u>
<u>John H. Dunning Prize Fund</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$2,605.92	
Interest on Investments.....	73.50	
Royalties.....	438.41	
Reimbursement of subsidies.....	555.74	
Balance, August 31, 1962.....		<u>\$3,673.57</u>
	<u>\$3,673.57</u>	<u>\$3,673.57</u>

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

## GENERAL ACCOUNT--Continued

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1961/62 of  
Special Funds and Grants included in the General Account--Continued

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
<b>Robert L. Schuyler Prize Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$479.08	
Interest on Investments.....	16.73	
Prize awarded.....		\$100.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>495.81</u>	<u>395.81</u>
	<u>\$495.81</u>	<u>\$495.81</u>
<b>J. Franklin Jameson Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$983.65	
Interest on Investments.....	154.70	
From sale of "List of Doctoral Dissertations".....	643.69	
Expense on account of "List of Doctoral Dissertations".....		\$1,162.08
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>1,782.04</u>	<u>619.96</u>
	<u>\$1,782.04</u>	<u>\$1,782.04</u>
<b>David M. Matteson Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$24,604.01	
Interest on Investments.....	4,044.10	
Sale of <u>Index and Guide</u> .....	691.50	
Preparation of indexes and international bibliographies.....		\$1,236.48
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>\$29,339.61</u>	<u>28,103.13</u>
	<u>\$29,339.61</u>	<u>\$29,339.61</u>
<b>Professional Register Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$804.76	
Annual Fees.....	1,448.00	
Office Expenses.....		\$950.15
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>\$2,252.76</u>	<u>1,302.61</u>
	<u>\$2,252.76</u>	<u>\$2,252.76</u>
<b>Reserve Fund (for house repairs and renovations)</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$1,456.05	
Addition to reserve.....	600.00	
Repairs.....		\$264.33
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>\$2,056.05</u>	<u>1,791.72</u>
	<u>\$2,056.05</u>	<u>\$2,056.05</u>
<b>Revolving Fund for Service Center for Teachers of History</b>		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$40,865.76	
Sale of Publications.....	32,019.40	
Disbursements.....		\$17,191.52
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>\$72,885.16</u>	<u>55,693.64</u>
	<u>\$72,885.16</u>	<u>\$72,885.16</u>
<b><u>Ford Foundation Grants:</u></b>		
<b>Bibliographies of British History</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$11,001.11	
Disbursements.....		\$1,877.99
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....	<u>\$11,001.11</u>	<u>9,123.12</u>
	<u>\$11,001.11</u>	<u>\$11,001.11</u>
<b>Service Center for Teachers of History</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$34,724.75	
Permission to reprint.....	34.00	
Disbursements.....		\$36,089.45
Transferred from Revolving Fund for Service Center for Teachers of History.....	1,330.70	
Balance, August 31, 1962.....	<u>\$36,089.45</u>	<u>-0-</u>
	<u>\$36,089.45</u>	<u>\$36,089.45</u>

## GENERAL ACCOUNT--Continued

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1961/62 of  
Special Funds and Grants included in the General Account--Continued

	Receipts	Disbursements
<u>Ford Foundation Grants--Continued:</u>		
Microfilming of War Documents		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$2,340.76	
Disbursements.....		\$533.25
Refunded to Ford Foundation.....		<u>1,807.51</u>
	<u>\$2,340.76</u>	<u>\$2,340.76</u>
<u>Rockefeller Foundation Grants:</u>		
Assistance for Professors of South Asian History		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$2,750.37	
Grant.....	11,500.00	
Disbursements.....		\$2,337.38
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>11,912.99</u>
	<u>\$14,250.37</u>	<u>\$14,250.37</u>
<u>Carnegie Corporation of New York Grants:</u>		
Travel Expenses of Delegates to International Meetings		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$4,642.88	
Disbursements.....		\$1,066.46
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>3,576.42</u>
	<u>\$4,642.88</u>	<u>\$4,642.88</u>
Committee on Study of Graduate Education in History		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$9,428.20	
Disbursements.....		\$5,075.90
Transfer to History as a Career.....		2,200.00
Refunded to Carnegie Corporation.....		2,152.30
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>-0-</u>
	<u>\$9,428.20</u>	<u>\$9,428.20</u>
<u>Council on Library Resources Inc. Grant:</u>		
Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$3,407.73	
Disbursements.....		\$24.84
Refunded to Council on Library Resources Inc.....		3,382.89
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>-0-</u>
	<u>\$3,407.73</u>	<u>\$3,407.73</u>
<u>The Fund for the Advancement of Education Grant:</u>		
Conference on Television History Courses		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$430.80	
Refunded to Ford Foundation.....		\$430.80
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>-0-</u>
	<u>\$430.80</u>	<u>\$430.80</u>
<u>Asia Foundation Grant:</u>		
Travel Expenses and membership dues for Asian Historians		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$2,297.78	
Grant.....	1,390.00	
Disbursements.....		\$1,176.20
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>2,511.58</u>
	<u>\$3,687.78</u>	<u>\$3,687.78</u>
<u>American Council of Learned Societies</u>		
Conference on Research needs		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$1,184.03	
Disbursements.....		\$359.07
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>824.96</u>
	<u>\$1,184.03</u>	<u>\$1,184.03</u>
<u>History as a Career</u>		
Transfer from Carnegie-Projected Study of Graduation Education		
in History.....	\$2,200.00	
Sale of Publications.....	386.48	
Disbursements.....		\$1,127.83
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>1,458.65</u>
	<u>\$2,586.48</u>	<u>\$2,586.48</u>

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

## GENERAL ACCOUNT--Continued

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1961/62 of  
Special Funds and Grants included in the General Account--Continued

	Receipts	Disbursements
<u>Canadian-American History Prize Fund</u>		
Receipts:		
Contribution.....	\$1,000.00	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>\$1,000.00</u>
	<u>\$1,000.00</u>	<u>\$1,000.00</u>
<u>National Bias in British-American Textbooks</u>		
Grant.....	\$17,000.00	
Disbursements.....		\$833.33
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>16,166.67</u>
	<u>\$17,000.00</u>	<u>\$17,000.00</u>

## SPECIAL ACCOUNTS

Statement for 1961/62 of Receipts and Disbursements

	Receipts	Disbursements
<u>A.H.A. Revolving Fund for Publications</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$3,386.04	
Interest (Savings account).....	113.71	
Royalties.....	37.25	
Reimbursement of Printing Costs.....	100.00	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>\$3,637.00</u>
	<u>\$3,637.00</u>	<u>\$3,637.00</u>
<u>Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$10,897.31	
Interest (from Investments and Savings Account).....	3,802.08	
Royalties.....	4,803.59	
Disbursements.....		\$11,408.59
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>8,094.39</u>
	<u>\$19,502.98</u>	<u>\$19,502.98</u>
<u>Littleton-Griswold Fund</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$11,692.82	
Interest (from Investments and Savings Account).....	1,613.17	
Sale of Publications.....	403.00	
Disbursements.....		\$495.56
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>13,213.43</u>
	<u>\$13,708.99</u>	<u>\$13,708.99</u>

## FINANCIAL ASSETS

Securities (book value) Aug. 31, 1962.....		\$547,534.39
Credited to		
Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.....	\$105,000.00	
Littleton-Griswold Fund.....	35,000.00	
Andrew D. White Fund.....	1,200.00	
George Louis Beer Fund.....	8,400.00	
John H. Dunning Fund.....	2,100.00	
J. Franklin Jameson Fund.....	4,420.00	
Endowment Fund.....	<u>11,183.14</u>	167,303.14
David M. Matteson Fund (Special portfolio).....		94,202.20
Unrestricted.....		<u>\$286,029.05</u>
Cash in checking, savings accounts, U.S. Treasury bills and certificates of indebtedness, and petty cash.....		\$258,685.45
Credited to		
Special accounts.....	\$24,944.82	
Special funds and grants.....	<u>145,602.96</u>	<u>170,547.78</u>
Unrestricted.....		<u>\$88,137.67</u>

## FINANCIAL ASSETS--Continued

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
<b>Fixed Assets</b>		
Real Estate.....	\$72,336.78	
Furniture and equipment.....	<u>6,461.88</u>	<u>\$78,798.66</u>
<b>SUBMARY</b>		
<b>Unrestricted Funds</b>		
Securities.....	\$286,029.05	
Cash in custody of Treasurer.....	<u>88,137.67</u>	\$374,166.72
<b>Fixed Assets.....</b>		78,798.66
<b>Restricted Funds</b>		
Securities.....	\$261,505.34	
Cash in custody of Treasurer.....	<u>170,547.78</u>	<u>432,053.12</u>
<b>Total.....</b>		<u>\$885,018.50</u>

## REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

October 25, 1962

American Historical Association  
400 A Street, S.E.  
Washington 3, D.C.

Gentlemen:

We have examined the entries for the recorded cash receipts and disbursements of the general and special accounts of your Association for the fiscal year September 1, 1961 to August 31, 1962, have verified all cash balances, have confirmed all investments and performed such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances, in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. We did not correspond with members in verification of dues paid to the Association, but used other means to reasonably satisfy ourselves as to the accuracy of the recorded amounts.

In addition to the statements of receipts and disbursements, we present in this report, a statement of assets of the Association as of August 31, 1962. The assets included are cash, accounts receivable, investments and fixed property. Dues receivable, salable books, library books and deferred charges are not included, nor are any liabilities reflected therein. We are advised that contractual obligations of approximately 15,000.00 had been signed during the period ended August 31, 1962 for renovation of a building purchased and that there were liabilities for current monthly bills and payroll taxes.

In our opinion, the accompanying exhibits and supporting schedules present fairly the assets of the American Historical Association on August 31, 1962 and the recorded cash transactions for the year then ended, and have been prepared on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year. The financial statements are presented herewith.

In the paragraphs to follow we shall submit comments and additional information as to the scope of our examination and the accounts presented.

## CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

A combined summary of all receipts, disbursements and transfers for the year under review is as follows:

	Combined Total	Exhibit B-1 Special Funds and Grants	Exhibit B-2 Operating Fund	Exhibit C Special Accounts
Cash and temporary investments balance, September 1, 1961.....	277,459.58	149,310.23	102,173.18	25,976.17
Receipts and transfers.....	224,585.10	77,802.16	135,910.14	10,872.80
	502,044.68	227,112.39	238,083.32	36,848.97
Disbursements and transfers.....	243,359.23	81,509.43	149,945.65	11,904.15
Cash and temporary investments balance, August 31, 1962.....	258,685.45	145,602.96	88,137.67	24,944.82

Recorded cash receipts were traced to bank deposits and cash disbursements were supported by canceled checks and properly approved vouchers or authorizations. The grants recorded during the year under review were confirmed by direct correspondence with the grantors.

Income earned on investments during the year under review was checked for accuracy and properly accounted for on the books of the Association. Amortization of premiums paid on bonds owned was provided in accordance with the amounts determined by the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York.

Payments to the Association during the year under review by the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York totaled 24,765.22.

Dues received during the year are reflected on Exhibit B-2 in the total amount of 86,990.11, in accordance with the cash receipts records. Verification by us was limited to a test check of the names on the members' account cards to the dues book. Your records indicate that the total dues received are applicable to the following years:

<u>Dues Year Ending in</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1965 .....	10.00
1964 .....	220.00
1963 .....	54,030.00
1962 .....	32,685.10
Prior years .....	45.00
Total.....	<u>86,990.10</u>

Total dues collected in the preceding year amounted to 69,889.12. A distribution of the dues between regular and student members is as follows:

7,913 members paid regular dues of.....	78,760.10
1,655 members paid student dues of .....	<u>8,230.00</u>
Total.....	<u>86,990.10</u>

The membership dues were increased during the previous fiscal year, effective September 1, 1961, and are now established at 10.00 regular, 5.00 student, and 200.00 life. The dues income increased 17,100.98 over that for the prior year.

F. W. LAFRENTZ & CO.  
Certified Public Accountants

## REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES

December 1, 1962

TO THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION:

Sir: I submit herewith a report of the Board of Trustees of the American Historical Association for the financial year ended August 31, 1962.

The securities held in trust for the Association on that date were as follows:

## REGULAR SECTION

## VALUE OF ORIGINAL AND PRESENT HOLDINGS

Original Value.....	\$268,742.00
Present Value.....	654,324.00
Estimated Annual Income.....	22,026.00
Return on Current Market Value.....	3.4%
Return on Original Value.....	8.2%
Bond Premiums are Amortized.....	

## ANALYSIS OF INVESTMENTS

	Amount	Percent
Cash and Bonds:		
Cash.....	\$254	
U.S. Government.....	142,400	21.8
Railroad.....	7,300	1.1
Public Utility.....	25,500	3.9
Industrial.....	52,250	8.0
Other Bonds.....	18,600	2.8
Total Cash and Bonds.....	\$246,304	37.6
Preferred Stocks:		
Public Utility.....	10,500	1.6
Industrial.....	35,860	5.5
Total Preferred Stocks.....	\$46,360	7.1
Common Stocks		
Financial:		
Insurance.....	42,060	6.5
Public Utility:		
Electric Utilities.....	60,270	9.2
Natural Gas.....	20,520	3.1
Consumer Goods:		
Photographic.....	20,400	3.1
Container.....	13,200	2.0
Other Consumer.....	16,300	2.5
Semi-Capital Goods:		
Chemical.....	46,800	7.2
Oil.....	71,860	11.0
Automotive.....	2,650	0.4
Capital Goods:		
Elec & Electronic Equip.....	58,400	8.9
Non-Ferrous Metal.....	9,200	1.4
Total Common Stocks.....	\$361,660	55.3
Total Account.....	\$654,324	100.0

	Approximate		Estimated annual income	
	Price	Value	Rate	Amount
Bonds:				
80,000. U.S.A. Treasury Bonds 1967-72 2 1/2% 12/15/72.....	\$88	70,400		2,000
80,000. U.S.A. Treasury Bonds 1978-83 3 1/4% 6/15/83.....	90	72,000		2,600
10,000. Virginian Ry. 1st Lien & Ref. B 3% 5/1/95.....	73	7,300		300
25,000. American Tel. & Tel. Deb. 4 3/8% 4/1/85.....	102	25,500		1,094
15,000. Aluminum Co. of America Deb. 3 1/8% 2/1/64.....	100	15,000		469
10,000. Scott Paper Co. Deb. 3% 3/1/71.....	120	12,000		300
25,000. Standard Oil California Deb. 4 3/8% 7/1/83.....	101	25,250		1,094
20,000. General Motors Acceptance Deb. 3 1/2% 3/15/72.....	93	18,600		700
Total Bonds.....		\$246,050		\$8,557

## REGULAR SECTION--Continued

	Approximate		Estimated annual income	
	Price	Value	Rate	Amount
<b>Preferred Stocks:</b>				
100 Cons. Edison of New York \$5 Pfd.....	105	\$10,500	5.00	\$500
100 E.I. du Pont de Nemours \$4.50 Pfd.....	105	10,500	4.50	450
70 U.S. Rubber 8% N-OM 1st Pfd.....	158	11,060	8.00	560
100 U.S. Steel 7% Pfd.....	143	14,300	7.00	700
Total Preferred Stocks.....		\$46,360		\$2,210
<b>Common Stocks:</b>				
180 Connecticut General Life Ins.....	123	22,140	.80	144
240 Insurance Co. of North America.....	83	19,920	1.80	432
545 Cincinnati Gas & Electric.....	46	25,070	1.50	818
400 Texas Utilities.....	46	18,400	1.12	448
300 Virginia Electric & Power.....	56	16,800	1.40	420
586 Oklahoma Natural Gas.....	35	20,510	1.40	820
3 10th Oklahoma Natural Gas Ord. Pm. Vd. for Consolidation 10/1/62.....	3.538	10		
200 Eastman Kodak.....	102	20,400	2.45	490
300 American Can.....	44	13,200	2.00	600
100 Corning Glass Works.....	163	16,300	2.00	200
200 American Cyanamid.....	42	8,400	1.80	360
100 E.I. du Pont de Nemours.....	202	20,200	6.35	635
200 Union Carbide.....	91	18,200	3.60	720
400 Continental Oil.....	50	20,000	1.70	680
600 Shamrock Oil & Gas.....	34	20,400	1.50	900
605 Standard Oil of New Jersey.....	52	31,460	2.40	1,452
50 General Motors.....	53	2,650	2.00	100
400 General Electric.....	68	27,200	2.00	800
400 International Tel. & Tel.....	43	17,200	1.00	400
500 Westinghouse Electric.....	28	14,000	1.20	600
400 Aluminum Ltd.....	23	9,200	.60	240
Total Common Stocks.....		\$361,660		\$11,259
Securities Value.....		\$654,070		
Principal Cash.....		\$254		
Total Account.....		\$654,324		
Estimated Annual Income.....				\$22,026

## Statement of Transactions During the Period From September 1, 1961 Through August 31, 1962

Date	Redemption	Price	Principal
2/1/62.....	\$5,000. Aluminum Co. of America Deb. 3 1/8% 2/1/64 (Called).....	\$100	\$5,000.00
<b>Purchases</b>			
2/6/62.....	\$25,000. American Tel. & Tel. Deb. 4 3/8% 4/1/85.....	99 5/8 net	\$24,906.25
2/6/62.....	\$20,000. General Motors Accept. Corp. Deb. 3 1/2% 3/15/72.....	92 net	18,400.00
2/6/62.....	\$25,000. Standard Oil of Calif. Deb. 4 3/8% 7/1/83.....	100 1/8 net	25,031.25
<b>Sales</b>			
2/6/62.....	100 Shs. E. I. du Pont de Nemours.....	236 1/2	\$23,574.87
2/6/62.....	100 Shs. Eastman Kodak.....	103 5/8	10,304.77
2/6/62.....	200 Shs. Texas Utilities.....	104 1/4	20,734.40
2/6/62.....	200 Shs. Virginia Electric & Power.....	60	11,896.96
			\$68,337.50
			\$66,511.00

## Security Received by Exchange

2/19/62.....	180 Shs. Connecticut General Life Ins. Co. Received in Exchange for 150 Shares Aetna Insurance Co.
--------------	---



REGULAR SECTION--Continued

Securities Distributions Received

Date		
6/7/62.....	200 Shs.	Texas Utilities Representing a 100% Stock Distribution on 200 Shares Payable 6/5/62 to Holders of Record 5/18/62
7/10/62.....	50 Shs.	General Motors Representing a Distribution on 100 Shares E. I. du Pont de Nemours Payable 7/9/62 to Holders of Record 6/8/62
8/31/62.....	53 3/10 Shs.	Oklahoma Natural Gas Representing a 10% Stock Distribution on 533 Shares Payable 8/31/62 to Holders of Record 8/10/62

MATTESON FUND

VALUE OF ORIGINAL AND PRESENT HOLDINGS

Original Value.....	\$73,501.00
Present Value.....	118,430.00
Estimated Annual Income.....	4,115.00
Return on Current Market Value.....	3.5%
Return on Original Value.....	5.6%

Bond Premiums are Amortized.....

ANALYSIS OF INVESTMENTS

	Amount	Percent
Cash and Bonds:		
Cash.....	\$1,536	1.3
U.S. Government.....	25,000	21.1
Railroad.....	8,700	7.4
Public Utility.....	14,100	11.9
Industrial.....	14,600	12.3
Total Cash and Bonds.....	\$63,936	54.0
Common Stocks:		
Public Utility		
Electric Utilities.....	6,528	5.5
Communication.....	23,730	20.0
Semi-Capital Goods:		
Oil.....	19,936	16.9
Capital Goods:		
Elec. & Electronic Equip.....	4,300	3.6
Total Common Stocks.....	\$54,494	46.0
Total Account.....	\$118,430	100.0

	Approximate		Estimated annual income	
	Price	Value	Rate	Amount
Bonds:				
25,000. U.S.A. Treasury Notes D-1963 3 1/4% 5/15/63.....	\$100	\$25,000		\$813
10,000. Union Pacific RR. Deb. 2 7/8% 2/ 1/76.....	87	8,700		288
15,000. Cons. Edison of N.Y. 1st Ref. O 4% 6/ 1/88.....	94	14,100		600
5,000. Scott Paper Co. Deb. 3% 3/ 1/71.....	120	6,000		150
10,000. Standard Oil N.J. Deb. 2 3/4% 7/15/74.....	86	8,600		275
Total Bonds.....		\$62,400		\$2,126
Common Stocks:				
102 American Electric Power.....	64	6,528	2.16	220
210 American Telephone & Telegraph.....	113	23,730	3.60	756
100 Shamrock Oil & Gas.....	34	3,400	1.50	150
318 Standard Oil of New Jersey.....	52	16,536	2.40	763
100 International Tel. & Tel.....	43	4,300	1.00	100
Total Common Stocks.....		\$54,494		\$1,989
Securities Value.....		\$116,894		
Principal Cash.....		\$1,536		
Total Account.....		\$118,430		
Estimated Annual Income.....				\$4,115

MATTESSON FUND--Continued

Statement of Transactions During the Period From September 1, 1961 Through August 31, 1962

None

The holdings of the American Historical Association as of Aug. 31, 1962, compare with its holdings of Aug. 31, 1961, as follows:

REGULAR SECTION	Value of principal	Estimated income	MATTESSON FUND	Value of principal	Estimated income
Aug. 31, 1961.....	\$688,349.00	\$20,804.00	Aug. 31, 1961.....	\$122,072.00	\$4,040.00
Aug. 31, 1962.....	654,324.00	22,026.00	Aug. 31, 1962.....	118,430.00	4,115.00

Charges made by the Fiduciary Trust Co. for management of securities as well as brokerage charges on purchases and sales amounted to \$2,781.00 for the Regular Section and \$495.00 for the Matteson Fund. The Board of Trustees incurred no other expenses.

FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

W. A. W. STEWART, Jr., Chairman.

## DRAFT BUDGETS, 1962-63, 1963-64

## UNRESTRICTED FUNDS

(Submitted to the Finance Committee and the Council, December 1962)

Approved by Council, December 27, 1962

	Actual income and expenditure 1961/62	Original proposed budget 1962/63	Proposed revised budget 1962/63	Proposed tentative budget 1963/64
<u>Receipts</u>				
Annual dues.....	\$86,990.10	\$80,000	\$90,000	\$90,000
Registration fees.....	4,166.70	4,200	4,200	4,200
Interest.....	21,048.50	16,000	18,000	18,000
Advertising and exhibit space.....	11,014.76	9,500	13,000	13,000
(Annual meeting)				
Royalties, publications and miscellaneous.	1,579.47	600	1,200	1,200
<u>American Historical Review</u>				
Macmillan, editorial expense.....	2,400.00	2,400	2,400	2,400
Share of receipts.....		9,000	16,000	10,000
Administration of, services to, and housing of special grant projects.....	8,635.61	500	1,530	500
	<u>\$135,835.14</u>	<u>\$122,200</u>	<u>\$146,330</u>	<u>\$139,300</u>
<u>Disbursements</u>				
Payments to the Macmillan Co. for copies of the <u>Review</u> supplied to members.....	\$38,827.00	\$39,500	\$43,000	\$44,000

	Actual income and expenditure 1961/62	Original proposed budget 1962/63	Proposed revised budget 1962/63	Proposed tentative budget 1963/64
<u>Disbursements--continued</u>				
General Administration				
Salaries				
Exec. Secy. & Editor.....	\$15,999.96	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,000
Asst. Exec. Sec. (part time).....	2,885.00	2,000	2,000	2,000
Asst. Exec. Sec.....	833.32	5,200	5,200	5,450
Asst. Editor.....	5,600.00	5,900	5,900	6,200
Bookkeeper.....	4,900.00	5,200	5,200	5,500
Editorial Asst.....	4,200.00	4,500	4,500	4,800
Secy. to Exec. Secy.....	4,919.95	5,000	5,100	5,200
Clerical Asst.....	4,000.00	4,100	4,100	4,300
Membership Secy.....	4,300.00	4,700	4,700	5,100
Janitor (part time).....	975.00	1,050	2,055	2,400
Annuity for Exec. Secy.....	1,280.04	1,440	1,440	1,440
Retirement Pay - Miss Washington.....	666.68	700	700	700
Bonding Staff.....	100.00	110	200	200
Auditing.....	1,512.50	1,500	1,700	1,700
Travel.....	412.97	1,500	1,500	1,500
TIAA & CREF for staff.....	1,144.35	1,400	1,500	1,600
Social Security for Office Staff.....	1,101.49	1,300	1,410	1,474
Life Insurance.....	118.50	280	280	280
Contribution toward hospitalization				
Insurance of staff.....	170.23	200	265	275
Unemployment Insurance Tax.....	298.45	.....	740	800
Contingent & Miscellaneous.....	335.00	2,500	2,500	2,500
Legal Counsel.....	.....	100	100	100
Office Expense:				
(Stationery, supplies, printing, postage, telephone & telegraph).....	6,027.20	7,500	8,500	8,500
Housing operating expense:				
(Gas, water, trash, electricity, insurance, supplies & minor replacements, etc.).....	1,775.98	2,000	3,500	3,500
Office furniture & equipment.....	69.82	1,000	2,500	1,500
Transfer to Service Center for conferences.....	.....	2,000	2,000	2,000
Notes contributed to the Review.....	885.50	950	1,000	1,000
Newsletter.....	.....	.....	3,500	3,500
Payment Review articles.....	1,575.00	2,100	2,500	2,500
Doctoral Dissertation Lists.....	77.12	150	200	.....
House Sinking Fund.....	.....	600	1,000	1,000
	\$66,164.06	\$82,980	\$93,790	\$95,019
Historical Activities				
Pacific Coast Branch.....	\$300.00	\$300	\$300	\$300
Council and Committees.....	3,416.61	5,000	5,000	5,000
Special Project Committees.....	2,167.95	2,000	3,000	3,000
Annual meeting:				
Program Printing & Mailing.....	4,568.22	5,000	5,500	6,000
Program Committee				
1961.....	530.79	.....	.....	.....
1962.....	.....	500	500	.....
1963.....	.....	.....	.....	750
Local Arrangements Committee.....	605.41	1,500	1,500	1,500
Ballot (printing).....	316.47	350	350	400
Dues to ACLS.....	100.00	100	100	100
Intl. Comm. of Hist. Sciences (membership dues).....	116.30	275	135	135
National Trust for Historical Preservation.....	100.00	100	100	100
American Council on Education.....	.....	.....	300	300
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.....	.....	325	325	.....
	\$12,221.75	\$15,450	\$17,110	\$17,585
Investments, unrestricted funds.....	.....	.....	\$10,000	.....
Summary of Disbursements				
Macmillan Co. for copies of				
Review to members.....	\$38,827.00	\$39,500	\$43,000	\$44,000
General Administration.....	66,164.06	82,985	93,790	95,019
Historical Activities.....	12,221.75	15,450	17,110	17,585
Investments.....	.....	.....	10,000	.....
	\$117,212.81	\$137,935	\$163,900	\$156,604

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

## MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS

December 14, 1962

## I. GENERAL

## Total Membership:

Individuals - Honorary.....	17	
Life.....	412	
Annual.....	9,702	
Trustees.....	5	
Fifty years and over... ..	24	10,160
Total paid membership, including life members.....		10,114
Delinquent.....		1,032
Total membership.....		11,146

## Gains:

Life members.....	9	
Annual members.....	1,555	1,564

## Losses:

Deaths - Honorary.....	2	
Life.....	5	
Fifty years and over.....	2	
Annual.....	26	35
Resignations.....	90	
Drops.....	699	824

Net Gain..... 740

Total membership, December 15, 1961..... 10,406

Total membership, December 14, 1962..... 11,146

## II. BY REGIONS

New England:	Me., N.H., Vt., Mass., R.I., Conn.....	1,004
North Atlantic:	N.Y., N.J., Pa., Md., Del., D.C.....	3,329
South Atlantic:	Va., N.C., S.C., Ga., Fla.....	759
North Central:	Ohio, Ind., Ill., Mich., Wisc.....	1,718
South Central:	Ala., Miss., Tenn., Ky., W. Va.....	324
West Central:	Miss., Iowa, Mo., Ark., La., N. Dak., S. Dak., Nebr., Kans., Okla., Texas.....	998
Pacific Coast:	Mont., Wyo., Colo., N. Mex., Idaho, Nev., Utah, Ariz., Wash., Ore., Calif., Hawaii, Alaska.....	1,366
Territories and Dependencies:	Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands.....	14
Canada.....		144
Other Countries.....		331
Address Unknown.....		173
Total Active Membership.....		10,160

## III. BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

	Total Membership			Total Membership	
	Dec. 15, 1961	Dec. 14, 1962		Dec. 15, 1961	Dec. 14, 1962
Alabama.....	68	64	New Hampshire.....	56	60
Alaska.....	6	6	New Jersey.....	373	392
Arizona.....	39	46	New Mexico.....	44	39
Arkansas.....	28	22	New York.....	1,450	1,621
California.....	794	866	North Carolina.....	172	207
Canal Zone.....	1		North Dakota.....	15	22
Colorado.....	108	110	Ohio.....	400	432
Connecticut.....	250	239	Oklahoma.....	50	49
Delaware.....	36	42	Oregon.....	85	100
District of Columbia...	344	355	Pennsylvania.....	541	574
Florida.....	101	107	Puerto Rico.....	8	12
Georgia.....	76	84	Rhode Island.....	60	64
Hawaii.....	22	21	South Carolina.....	60	62
Idaho.....	19	17	South Dakota.....	20	21
Illinois.....	501	462	Tennessee.....	89	92
Indiana.....	215	229	Texas.....	221	244
Iowa.....	99	114	Utah.....	17	20
Kansas.....	88	92	Vermont.....	38	46
Kentucky.....	83	93	Virgin Islands.....	2	2
Louisiana.....	52	62	Virginia.....	283	299
Maine.....	32	41	Washington.....	104	108
Maryland.....	307	345	West Virginia.....	45	45
Massachusetts.....	523	554	Wisconsin.....	203	248
Michigan.....	319	347	Wyoming.....	12	7
Minnesota.....	147	155	Canada*.....		144
Mississippi.....	34	30	Other Countries*.....	446	331
Missouri.....	140	148		9,363	9,987
Montana.....	18	20	Address Unknown.....	76	173
Nebraska.....	117	69		9,439	10,160
Nevada.....	2	6			

\*Canada is shown in Other Countries in 1961.

Honorary members:		Date of Death
Hu Shih, New York, N.Y.....		Feb. 26, 1962
George Macaulay Trevelyan, Cambridge, England.....		July 21, 1962
Life members:		
Solomon F. Bloom, New York, N.Y.....	Aug.	14, 1962
Solon Justus Buck, Washington, D.C.....	May	25, 1962
Ralph Budd, Santa Barbara, Calif.....	May	11, 1962
William E. Lingelbach, Philadelphia, Pa.....	Nov.	24, 1962
Ella Lonn, St. Petersburg, Fla.....	Nov.	19, 1962
Fifty year members:		
Walter P. Hall, Princeton, N.J.....	May	3, 1962
George Clarke Sellery, Madison, Wisc.....	Jan.	21, 1962
Annual members:		
John J. Ambler, Bronx, N.Y.....		1962
Carroll J. Amundson, Pittsburgh, Pa.....		1962
Nathaniel E. Ashby, Huntsville, Ala.....		1962
Samuel E. Asbury, College Station, Tex.....		1962
David K. Bjork, Los Angeles, Calif.....		1962
Hon. Robert Woods Bliss, Washington, D.C.....		1962
Rev. Joseph H. Brady, Ramsey P.O., N.J.....		1962
Albert Deutsch, Berkeley, Calif.....		1962
James W. Foster, Baltimore, Md.....	May	12, 1962
Cmdr. Theodore Gatchel, Norman, Okla.....	May	2, 1962
Allen Hamilton, La Jolla, Calif.....	Dec.	18, 1962
Frederic Walbridge Hoeing, New York, N.Y.....	Aug.	25, 1962
Kenneth Allen Hoffman, Roselle, N.J.....	Aug.	24, 1962
Roland Mather Hooker, Miami Beach, Fla.....		1962
William A. Itter, Kingston, R.I.....		1962
Allen Conn Klinger, Agoura, Calif.....		1962
Stewart Lea Mims, Greenwich, Conn.....	Sept.	22, 1962
Sigmund Neumann, Middletown, Conn.....		1962
Edward Alexander Parsons, New Orleans, La.....	Feb.	19, 1962
Ernest Donald Ramstatter, Golden, Colo.....	July	1961
Rev. Joseph Roubik, Chicago, Ill.....	Mar.	22, 1962
Joseph Everett Sams, Middletown, Ohio.....	Apr.	18, 1962
Sister Mary Claver, Pine Lake, Isequeah, Wash.....	Mar.	14, 1961
Henry Francis Sturdy, Annapolis, Md.....		1962
William Waring Tinsley, Flagstaff, Ariz.....	Apr.	6, 1962
James O. Wettereau, New York, N.Y.....	Nov.	8, 1962

## THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

For President..... Crane Brinton  
For Vice President ..... Julian P. Boyd  
For Treasurer ..... Elmer Louis Kayser

First vacancy . . . . . John K. Fairbank of Harvard University  
Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana University  
Second vacancy . . . . . Louis B. Wright of Folger Library  
Sylvia Thrupp of the University of Michigan

First vacancy . . . . David L. Dowd of the University of Florida  
John Snell of Tulane University

Second vacancy . . . . . John Tate Lanning of Duke University  
Henry L. Roberts of Columbia University

Third vacancy . . . . . David Donald of Johns Hopkins University  
Sidney Fine of the University of Michigan

For Chairman of the Nominating Committee: Franklin D. Scott of Northwestern University

As a result of the mail ballot, the following have been elected as members of the Council: Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana University and Louis B. Wright of Folger Shakespeare Library; as members of the Nominating Committee: John Snell of Tulane University, John Tate Lanning of Duke University, and David Donald of Johns Hopkins University.

December 29, 1962.

STOW PERSONS, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON ANCIENT HISTORY

The Committee on Ancient History, appointed December 1961, established an agenda by correspondence and met at Association headquarters in Washington on April 7, 1962.

The dimensions of the present problem were first canvassed. It is agreed that enrollments in ancient history are rising and that the demand for ancient historians is growing. New schools are appearing; smaller ones are expanding; some better schools are adding ancient history to improve their graduate offerings. Yet the supply is little more than static. In high schools, preparation in ancient history and in Latin is diminishing; in universities there are problems in the relations between classics and history. The extensive linguistic preparation required is a serious difficulty.

The Committee agreed upon a sequence of steps, the first two of which are:

a) to approach American Council of Learned Societies for a modest grant to permit the convocation of a group of interested men from classics and history to explore possible means of improvement. Unfortunately the ACLS has just reported its inability to make this grant.

b) to request the American Philological Association to appoint two members of our committee to represent the philological side. Professors Mason Hammond (Harvard) and James Oliver (Johns Hopkins) have been so appointed, and the American Philological Association has expressed its great interest in our study.

By correspondence the Committee is now determining its future course of action to publicize the problems and possibilities of the field and to gain general counsel on means of ameliorating the problems. In view of the interest displayed, the Committee feels that methodical progress can be definitely achieved. Financial support is a critical prerequisite, achievement of which requires careful demonstration of the importance of the ancient background of Western civilization and a clear course of possible action.

October 16, 1962.

CHESTER G. STARR, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE HARMSWORTH PROFESSORSHIP

The Committee on the Harmsworth Professorship was not, in view of the election of Professor Allan Nevins to the Chair for the two-year term 1963-65, asked to recommend names to the Oxford University Electors or to give judgment on the scholarly qualifications of men suggested by the Oxford Electors as possibilities for the Chair.

October 15, 1962.

ARTHUR S. LINK, Chairman.

## THE COMMITTEE ON THE HISTORIAN AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

During the past few years the Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government has with little exception done two kinds of business. First, it has surveyed the work of the national government in publishing and preserving historical documents; in doing this the diplomatic historians who are members of the Committee are especially active. Second, it has concerned itself with a wide variety of matters appropriate to its title: the terms and conditions on which the government employs historians, and on which it sends historians abroad as lecturers and researchers, how it treats the work of employee-historians, and the like. During 1962 the Committee continued in this pattern. It had an uncommon variety of matters to consider, but none proved to be as acute as some it has had in the past.

The Committee held its annual meeting on September 29, 1962, the morning session at the American Historical Association headquarters, lunch and the afternoon session at the Cosmos Club.

In respect to government publications interesting to the American Historical Association, one action was taken. The Committee requested the Executive Secretary to write to the Secretary of State applauding the plan of his Department to print the English text of all treaties of the United States not covered by the Hunter Miller series, through 1949. It asked that the texts be based on original and authentic documents, according to Miller's criteria, and not be a reprinting of texts already published. The Committee heard from the Executive Secretary that Professor Harlan of the University of Southern California is now at work on a volume to cover the gap for 1904-1905 in the Writings on American History; it heard also that there is some hope of finding the right editor, and some doubt about finding the necessary funds, to fill the gap for 1940-1947 in the same series. The Committee was shown the newly published volume one of the National Union Catalog of Manuscripts compiled by the Library of Congress. The Committee asked Professor Samuel Flagg Bemis at his discretion to urge the Yale University Library to co-operate in producing this catalog. After some discussion of the work of the National Historical Publications Committee, Professor Arthur Bestor suggested that our Committee favor the publishing of certain old government documents (such as the record of the first Congress) at federal expense; he agreed to present a written proposal on this subject at the next meeting of the Committee.

Following up a matter discussed in 1961, Dr. Maurice Matloff (who was prevented from attending the meeting) suggested in writing that the Committee ask the Civil Service Commission to allow government historians to have leave of absence up to a calendar year in order to accept occasional academic appointments. The Committee asked the Executive Secretary to make this request, and (on Professor Bemis' motion) to request the Commission also to reopen the register for historians, which had been closed about three months. Dr. Matloff made a second proposal, that the American Historical Association seek to have established a "Co-ordinating Advisory Committee on History, for all governmental historical activities." The Committee referred this to a sub-committee, to consist of Messrs. Matloff, Gray, and Rundell, to report at the next meeting.

The chairman presented a letter from Arthur Waskow of the Peace Research Institute, which urged the American Historical Association to establish a committee on research on problems of maintaining international peace. While the Committee decided against making such a recommendation, it asked the Executive Secretary to inform the membership of the American Historical Association of the work of the Peace Research Institute and to write Mr. Waskow of this action.

On the initiative of the Executive Secretary, the Committee discussed at length the need historians feel that the Library of Congress concern itself more amply with its acquired function as a national library, in addition to its functions as a governmental one. Discussion turned on a report prepared by Douglas Bryant, associate director of the Harvard University Libraries, printed in the Congressional Record. The Committee approved the Bryant report in principle, and asked the Executive Secretary at his discretion to write a letter to the President, with a copy to Senator Pell, stating

the wish of historians to have the Library of Congress serve historical research by independent scholars more generously than in the recent past.

On being informed of a complaint by a member of the American Historical Association concerning Department of Defense security regulations requiring fingerprints as a condition for using certain archives, the Committee decided that it should take no action regarding this or other security measures unless they proved to be discriminatory against historians, as in this case they did not.

The Committee fixed September 28, 1963, as the date of its next meeting, and agreed that the last Saturday in September will be its regular meeting day.

November 5, 1962.

CHARLES A. BARKER, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON HONORARY MEMBERS

The Committee on Honorary Members has reached a consensus as a result of correspondence. We suggest four historians for consideration of the Council.

May I say that the entire Committee was quite cooperative. I have elsewhere made suggestions for membership on the Committee.

October 24, 1962.

JOHN WOLF, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

The Committee held two meetings in the course of this year, both at the American Historical Association headquarters in Washington, D.C. The first meeting, on February 17, was devoted mainly to formulating proposals for the program of the International Congress of Historical Sciences to be held at Vienna in 1965. These were drawn up at the request of the Bureau of the International Committee of Historical Sciences and were forwarded to its Secretary General for consideration by the Bureau at its meeting in London in May-June 1962. The Committee also considered certain questions relating to Inter-American historical activities submitted to it by Robert N. Burr, United States member of the Commission on History, Pan American Institute of Geography and History. The Committee agreed on replies to these questions to be transmitted to Mr. Burr by the Chairman.

At its second meeting, on October 20, the Committee gave further consideration to planning for the program of the 1965 Vienna Congress, in the light of decisions on this subject taken by the Bureau and General Assembly of the International Committee at London in June, as reported to it by Boyd C. Shafer, a member of the Bureau, and A. P. Whitaker, the United States member of the Assembly. The Committee's main task was to select four American scholars (with an alternate in each case) for the preparation of reports on the four principal topics in the program assigned to the United States. The selections were made and the Chairman was instructed to make tentative approaches to the persons in question, subject to final approval by the Bureau. Attention was also given to a proposal received from the French National Committee and to questions relating to the role of the Assembly in the ICHS.

November 8, 1962.

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE LITTLETON-GRISWOLD FUND

The Committee met at Washington, D.C., on May 12, 1962, and authorized printing and publication of the Prince George's County, Maryland, records, edited by Professor Joseph Smith. It is hoped that publication of this work can be announced in the near future.



Upon learning that the North Carolina Department of Archives and History plans to include the North Carolina General Court records in the tercentenary edition of Colonial Records of North Carolina, the Committee approved that mode of publication. Plans for further volumes in the American Legal Records series were reviewed.

Appended is a financial report showing the status of the fund.

November 1, 1962.

EDWARD DUMBAULD, Chairman.

LITTLETON-GRISWOLD FUND

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements, Sept. 1, 1961, to Aug. 31, 1962

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$11,692.82	
Interest - Investments.....	\$1,225.00	
Savings Account.....	<u>388.17</u>	1,613.17
Proceeds on Sales of American Legal Records:		
Vol. I, <u>Maryland Court of Appeals</u> 1695-1729.....	93.00	
Vol. II, <u>Select Cases of the Mayor's</u> <u>Court of New York City</u> .....	87.00	
Vol. VII, <u>Court Records of Virginia</u> .....	100.00	
Vol. VIII, <u>Court Records of Kent County,</u> <u>Delaware</u> .....	<u>123.00</u>	403.00
Postage, handling charges, and storage.....		\$169.07
Membership dues of contributor.....		10.00
Committee meetings.....		292.59
Expenses preparing Volume IX, <u>Smith,</u> <u>Prince George's County Court Records</u> .....		<u>23.90</u>
	<u>\$13,708.99</u>	<u>\$495.56</u>
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		<u>13,213.43</u>
	<u>\$13,708.99</u>	<u>\$13,708.99</u>

THE COMMITTEE ON MARITIME HISTORY

The Chairman attended the session at Venice of the Sixth International Congress on Maritime History. The report made there by Professor Verlinden concerning the plans of a committee of which he is chairman for the preparation of a new International Bibliography of Oceanic Discoveries makes more urgent than ever some activity in this country to collaborate with the projects of the International Commission on Maritime History.

November 7, 1962.

FREDERIC C. LANE, Chairman.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE PROFESSIONAL REGISTER

Professional Register operations expanded in 1962, with a record number of vacancies posted at the annual meeting and with more members of the Association using the Register. At irregular intervals during the year, the Register informed members of vacancies. Including the 188 vacancies listed at the annual meeting, the number of positions circularized by the Register amounted to approximately 300. In special instances when institutions requested, the Register made individual searches for qualified applicants. By the close of the year, membership in the Register was 900.

A significant change occurred in the method of notifying members of vacancies when the AHA Newsletter began carrying all information related to the Professional Register. Each of the five issues during the year (October, December, February, April, and June) carries vacancy notices.

January 15, 1963.

WALTER RUNDELL, JR., Assistant Executive Secretary.

## THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH NEEDS

On November 11, 1961, and after our last report to the Council was drawn up, a sub-committee of five members (Bernard Bailyn, David Donald, Earl Pritchard, Boyd Shafer, Roderic Davison) met to work out a concrete proposal. This was done early in 1962, with the aid of further correspondence among the members to put the draft proposal into shape. A copy of the proposal appears below.

During 1962 approaches were made to two foundations for financial support for the project, with negative results. The committee has not been able to meet since these results became known, but intends to seek further for support, perhaps after reconsideration of the proposal or some of its elements.

PROPOSAL OF A STUDY BY THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION ON  
THE RESEARCH NEEDS OF THE PROFESSIONShort Statement of Proposal

The American Historical Association wishes to propose a study of the research needs of the profession. The proposal here presented is the work of the Committee on Research of the Association, composed of a dozen historians in different fields of history who are actively engaged in research.

The Committee desires to investigate new approaches, new concepts, new techniques, and new broad fields or areas of research. As a result of the investigation the Committee hopes to see a volume of essays which would reveal the best thinking of historians and illustrate fruitful methods of research to be pursued.

This venture is frankly an imaginative attempt to enrich the study of history. There is no guarantee of success. Risk is involved. The result could be of immense value for historians, their readers, and their students.

Background

Thirty years ago the American Historical Association sponsored a study of research. After a series of regional conferences among representative historians, A. M. Schlesinger and W. L. Langer published Historical Scholarship in America, incorporating the results of the discussions. The volume was principally a statement, in some cases an itemization, of areas to which scholars in history should give greater attention. Since that time, much has been done along the lines suggested. Meanwhile, research techniques, area interests, and the world in which historians live have changed.

In December 1958, the Council of the American Historical Association recommended another study of research needs in history. A sampling by letter of the opinion of over fifty historians in various fields backed the proposal. With a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies, a committee of 12 representative historians was enabled to meet in 1961. A follow-up meeting by a smaller group drafted specific proposals. The whole committee, and the Council of the American Historical Association, have given general approval to the proposals.

Proposed Area of Inquiry

The Committee has concluded that there is no purpose to be served by compiling bibliographies of work done since the Schlesinger-Langer report; this information is available in print. It believes also that there is little virtue now in identifying particular subjects that need investigation, for these are known to many specialists, and to their graduate students. The profession would best be served by an investigation of new approaches to research, new concepts of historical inquiry, new techniques that the

historian can use, new broad fields of research to be opened up or pursued further. To be specific, the Committee envisions a study embracing most or all of the following:

1. The historian and the quantitative method--how statistical data, IBM machines, samplings, multiple biographical surveys, business records, etc., are being or may be used in political, social, and economic history.
2. The historian and the history of society--how society, human institutions, or social groupings, may be studied organically, and not simply by the enumeration of disparate social data; effect of social position on political behavior.
3. The historian and the arts--the uses of literature, art, architecture, etc., not simply to produce histories of art or literature, but as revealing sources for the development of society and thought.
4. The historian and economic theory--how economic theory can contribute not only to economic, but to social and political history. How it can corrupt: Marxist theory.
5. The historian and psychology--the application of systematic psychology to explain individuals and individual relationships, mass behavior, the use of comparative biography, etc.
6. The historian and new areas--the identification and study of problems peculiar to, or important in, the newer non-Western fields: Far East, Southeast Asia, Middle East, Africa, Latin America, etc.
7. Comparative history--studies of the techniques, possibilities, and pitfalls in comparing different societies, civilizations, eras, to illuminate one by the other.
8. The historian and institutional research--the effects on research of independent research centers, philanthropic foundations, government-sponsored research, university research centers.

#### Method of Procedure

On each topic, the committee agreed to seek three (at most five) papers from historians who would be asked not to summarize the literature, or to exhort, but to use their own experience to illuminate the new approaches, the problems and benefits inherent therein, as well as possible projections of such new approaches and techniques. Tools and materials would be discussed in these papers whenever appropriate: computers, microfilming, existing or needed collection of data, etc. Scholars from other related disciplines should take part in the contemplated short conferences and foundation personnel should participate in at least topic number eight.

It was further envisioned that for each topic finally selected, the three to five authors of papers should have the benefit of a small conference of colleagues from history and related disciplines, to discuss their experience and approaches and further projections. Each conference might produce one additional paper, of a more summary and general nature, to be added to those based on individual research experience. Authors of papers should be paid, and expenses of conferences should also be paid.

Possibly some of the papers might be arranged to fit sessions of the American Historical Association Annual Meetings, or to appear in the American Historical Review. The end product should be a well-edited volume of essays which would act as stimulants to new approaches to research.

The project should be directed by a scholar-historian, employed full time for one year, and part time for two years thereafter. His job would be more particular planning of papers and conferences, under general direction of the committee and in consultation with other members of the profession; preparation of lists of pertinent articles and materials, both for information of participants and to see that previous work is not duplicated; editing of the final volume. He should have secretarial help and an administrative budget as well as an adequate salary.

October 26, 1962.

RODERIC H. DAVISON, Chairman.

## THE COMMITTEE ON SOUTH ASIAN HISTORY

The Committee encountered various difficulties during 1962 in its program of bringing distinguished foreign scholars in the field of South Asian history to the United States. Its request through the Council to the Rockefeller Foundation for a new grant to continue the program was unsuccessful, the Foundation apparently feeling that further "pump-priming" in this area was unnecessary. Under the circumstances, the Committee had planned to bring its activities to a close during the year 1962-63 with two appointments. Dr. S. Gopal, Historical Adviser to the Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was to be at the University of Chicago during the summer and autumn quarters of 1962 and at Duke University during the winter-spring semester of 1963; and the Ceylonese Professor S. Arasaratnam, formerly of the University of Ceylon and now of the University of Malaya, was to be at the University of Pennsylvania during the winter-spring semester of 1963 and at the University of Chicago during the summer of 1963 for the summer session on South Asia sponsored by the Universities of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, California, and Chicago.

In May 1962, less than two months before he was to take up his duties at the University of Chicago, Dr. Gopal informed us that he would be unable to carry out his commitment. Shortly after this Dr. Arasaratnam advised us that, contrary to his previous belief, he would be unable to accept our proposal, because his Vice-Chancellor felt that he could not be given leave so soon after his appointment at Malaya.

Faced with this situation and with the fact that its grant from the Rockefeller Foundation was to expire as of September 30, 1963, the Committee endeavored to find replacements and the Executive Secretary of the Association requested the Foundation for a year's extension of its grant. The Rockefeller Foundation graciously extended the grant to September 30, 1964. Although no replacement for the summer and autumn of 1962 could be found on such short notice, the Committee was able, through the help of Professor Mallick, a former appointee of the Committee, to obtain the services of Dr. A. F. S. Ahmed, Reader in History at Rajshahi University, East Pakistan, who will be at the University of Pennsylvania during the winter-spring semester of 1963 and at the University of Chicago for the joint summer session on South Asia in 1963. Dr. Ahmed is an able young scholar of modern South Asia, having received his doctorate at London with a study on The Development of Public Opinion in Bengal, 1818-1833, and having been a UNESCO Fellow in Japan.

The Committee expects to arrange one further appointment, probably for the winter-spring semester and the summer of 1964. The summer appointment will probably be at the University of California, since the joint-summer session on South Asia of the Universities of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Chicago, and California will be at Berkeley in 1964. Several capable persons are in prospect and the Committee is now in the process of deciding who shall be approached and which school shall receive the winter-spring semester appointment.

The two scholars sponsored by the Committee during 1961-62, Professors Niharkana Majumdar (Minnesota) and A. R. Mallick (Pennsylvania) completed successful years at the respective schools.

The Committee hopes that the Asia Foundation will continue the annual grant of \$2,500 to the Association which is making it possible for over a hundred historians in Asia to receive the American Historical Review and for those who are temporarily in this country to travel to the Association meeting.

No changes in Committee membership are recommended.

November 5, 1962.

EARL PRITCHARD, Acting Chairman.

## THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

The Committee on Teaching met in the spring and in the fall of 1962. At each meeting it discussed three problems--the pamphlet series, conferences with teachers of history, and proposals for improving school courses in history.

On the question of the pamphlets, it endorsed strongly the proposal of the Macmillan Company to take over sales and distribution. The Committee is happy to learn that the Council has accepted this proposal. It believes that this will increase circulation of the pamphlets, add to funds which can be used to support the Service Center, and reduce the burden of routine work in the executive offices.

The Committee believes that by aiding conferences of social studies teachers to secure first-class speakers, it can improve relations between colleges and schools and have a significant impact on school programs. It is grateful to the Council for appropriating \$2,000 for this work. It recommends that \$5,000 from Service Center funds be allotted for this program next year.

On the Committee's recommendation, the Executive Secretary made valiant efforts to secure a foundation grant for an investigation of the world history course. These efforts were unsuccessful, largely because various organizations have proposed sweeping investigations covering the whole area of the social studies and languages. One very active group, which seems likely to receive a large grant, is sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies. The Chairman of the Committee on Teaching is a member of the advisory committee on this project. It is already clear that extensive revisions of school curricula are going to be proposed, some of which would either dilute the content of history courses or reduce the amount of time spent in studying history. The Committee suggests that the Council consider ways in which the historical profession can make its voice heard during this process of revision.

Finally, the Committee wishes to affirm once more its belief that the Service Center for Teachers is doing important and useful work and its hope that the Council will do everything in its power to see that this work continues.

November 19, 1962.

JOSEPH R. STRAYER, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS PRIZE

The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize Committee recommends that the award for the year 1962 be given to Professor Jerome Blum for his brilliant work, Lord and Peasants in Russia, published by the Princeton University Press. The Committee wishes to award Professor Ford Brown the most honorable mention for his work entitled Fathers of the Victorians, published by the Cambridge University Press.

Thirty-three books and two manuscripts were submitted to the Committee. The chairman respectfully submits that the awarding of this Herbert Baxter Adams Prize is a serious inducement to young scholars as well as those in mid-career and acknowledges with gratitude the close co-operation extended by the publishing industry. The chairman also wishes to extend his sincere thanks to the members of the Committee and to the Executive Secretary for their full co-operation.

The chairman and the Committee do not feel that any member of our Association should serve on this committee for more than two Prize award periods. This interesting and rewarding service should be spread as widely as possible within the profession, and this particular committee, of course, should be composed of men specializing in European history. The chairman asks the Executive Secretary to accept his resignation, then, at this time.

October 16, 1962.

RICHARD M. BRACE, Chairman.

#### THE GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE COMMITTEE

In February of this year we corresponded with eighty-two commercial and university presses to solicit entries. In total we received twenty-three books and one manuscript.

Following is our unanimous decision:

Award winner: Piotr S. Wandycz (Indiana University), France and her Eastern Allies, 1919-1925 (University of Minnesota Press, 1962).

November 19, 1962.

HENRY CORD MEYER, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE AWARD

The Committee on the Beveridge Award operated this year under revised rules, with the prize consisting of \$1,500 rather than \$1,000, and with no Honorable Mention or second prize. At its meeting in Washington on October 20 the Committee voted to grant the prize to Professor Walter LaFeber of Cornell University for his manuscript entitled "The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898." Discussions with Professor LaFeber on the preparation of his manuscript for publication on now under way.

Although some 300 announcements were distributed in the spring and correspondence was directly undertaken with numerous historians through the year, only five manuscripts were submitted. The Committee discussed ways by which this number might be increased: by raising the amount to \$2,000; by redesigning the circular for more effective display on bulletin boards; by advertising the competition more widely; and by giving additional publicity to the winning manuscript. The Committee expresses its concern at the small number of entries and hopes that next year will see a larger interest.

Professor Charles Gibson offered his resignation from the Committee, and nominations for a new member were submitted. To date the new appointment has not been completed nor has the selection of the new chairman been made.

October 20, 1962.

CHARLES GIBSON, Chairman.

## ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE AWARD

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements Sept. 1, 1961 to Aug. 31, 1962

	Receipts	Disbursements
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1961.....	\$10,897.31	
Interest - Investments.....	\$3,675.00	
Savings Account.....	127.08	3,802.08
Royalties:		
Hofstadter, <i>Social Darwinism in America</i> .....	294.07	
Ver Steeg, <i>Robert Morris, Revolutionary Financier</i> .....	78.00	
Tryman, <i>History of Marshall Field</i> .....	26.00	
McNall, <i>Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley</i> .....	25.00	
Ryman, <i>Era of the Oath</i> .....	30.00	
Bentley, <i>History of the Freedmen's Bureau</i> .....	62.13	
Perkins, <i>The First Reapproachment</i> .....	44.63	
Van Deusen, <i>Horace Greeley</i> .....	114.00	
Dumond, <i>Letters of James Gillespie Birney 1831-1857</i> .....	21.33	
Dumond, <i>Southern Editorials on Secession</i> .....	62.50	
Perkins, <i>Northern Editorials on Secession</i> .....	110.50	
Graham, <i>Colonists from Scotland</i> .....	96.19	
Johnson, <i>Development of American Petroleum Pipelines</i> .....	71.21	
Saith, <i>Professors and Public Ethics</i> .....	61.00	
Schroeder, <i>The Axis and Japanese-American Relations</i> .....	229.74	
Spence, <i>British Investments and The American Frontier</i> .....	49.73	
Castel, <i>A Frontier State at War</i> .....	78.98	
Fletcher, <i>Rails, Mines and Progress</i> .....	76.23	
Zimm, <i>La Guardia in Congress</i> .....	76.77	
Conklin, <i>A New World</i> .....	146.35	
Paul, <i>Conservative Crisis and the Rule of Law</i> .....	464.58	
Clendenen, <i>The United States and Pancho Villa</i> .....	1,294.27	
Miller, <i>The Enterprise of a Free People</i> .....	883.70	
Fisher, <i>Negro Slave Songs</i> .....	100.00	
Brown, <i>Middle Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts</i> .....	306.68	4,803.59
Publication and editorial expenses:		
Schroeder, <i>Axis Alliance and Japanese-American Relations</i> .....		\$1,431.98
Clendenen, <i>The United States and Pancho Villa</i> .....		4,739.32
Miller, <i>The Enterprise of a Free People</i> .....		3,505.03
Membership dues of contributors.....		270.00
Committee meetings.....		962.26
Beveridge Award.....		500.00
	19,502.98	11,408.59
Balance, Aug. 31, 1962.....		8,094.39
	<u>\$19,502.98</u>	<u>\$19,502.98</u>

## THE JOHN H. DUNNING PRIZE COMMITTEE

The Dunning Prize Committee sent notices to publishers in May 1961 announcing the eligibility of works relating to American history published between June 1, 1960 and June 1, 1962, or in manuscript, "with a preference for the writing of younger scholars and of those who have not previously published a substantial scholarly work." A reminder was sent early in May 1962. Eighty-two entries, consisting of eighty-one books and one manuscript, were submitted to the committee (three copies of each entry were required). The Committee conducted its business by mail, selecting first an initial list of ten titles, from which the winning entry was chosen. The Committee awards the prize for 1962 to E. James Ferguson for *The Power of the Purse: A History of American Public Finance, 1776-1790*, published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia by the University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

November 1, 1962.

EDMUND S. MORGAN, Chairman.

## THE ROBERT L. SCHUYLER PRIZE COMMITTEE

The Committee awarded the prize for the quinquennium 1956-60 to Mark Curtis for his book, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition*.

As chairman during the past few months only, I have little to report. It seemed worthwhile to have a letterhead printed for correspondence with publishers, so this was done, and some fifty sheets distributed to each member of the committee with the request that he use it in asking for examination copies of books that are thought worthy of consideration by the committee. So far most of the requests have been made by the chairman, or books have been volunteered by publishers. A list of some twenty books appearing since January 1, 1961 which are eligible for the prize has been compiled and will be considered by the three members of the Committee who will be at the November 3-4 meeting of the Midwestern Conference on British Studies. From that consensus it will be possible to narrow the list and arrange for distribution of copies of the books deemed exceptional. These will then be considered at a meeting of the full committee at the American Historical Association meeting in Chicago in December 1962.

Thus far few problems have developed. Of major ones, the lack of a larger fund to finance the prize remains. The chairman will raise that question at the rump meeting of the committee in November. Another question that has occurred to the chairman is the matter of expenses for the committee. Should not a small percentage of the fund for the Schuyler Prize be allotted for the expenses involved in selecting the book to be honored?

One final point, the former chairman, Mrs. Manning, feels that all the major fields or periods of British history ought to be represented on the Committee. Instead, it appears that four of the present membership of five are in the Tudor-Stuart period; while only Mr. Webb represents the Victorian period, with some competence in the 20th century. This appears rather lopsided, but the chairman would not suggest any changes. After all, it is open to all of us to get advice and counsel from others more expert in fields outside our own, and I would hope that we all will do that.

October 23, 1962.

ROBERT WALCOTT, Chairman.

#### THE WATUMULL PRIZE COMMITTEE

The Watumull Prize Committee received an unusually large number of entries for consideration during 1962. It is very gratifying to the Committee that, perhaps in part due to the existence of the Watumull Prize, serious publication on India in the United States has thus increased in quantity and quality.

After a careful process of examination and comparison of titles submitted by the various presses, the Committee came to agreement that the award of the Watumull Prize for 1962 should go to Dr. George Bearce for his valuable book, British Attitudes toward India, published by the Oxford University Press in New York and London.

The Committee hopes that the present upward trend in the quality and quantity of titles dealing with India and published in the United States will continue.

October 29, 1962.

ROBERT I. CRANE, Chairman.

#### THE CANADIAN-UNITED STATES COMMITTEE FOR CO-OPERATION

Following preliminary informal conversations and correspondence in May 1961 between the two then Presidents of the American Historical Association (Samuel Flagg Bemis) and Canadian Historical Association (Wallace K. Ferguson), the respective Associations appointed the members of the joint committee. It was understood by the Council of the American Historical Association, at its meeting December 26, 1961, that the Presidents of the respective Associations would preside at alternate annual meetings of the Joint Committee, the first time to be decided by the toss of a coin. In the correspondence which has ensued between Professor Stacey and your American Historical Association chairman, this method of choice has given way to the President of the host Association being the first presiding chairman. The American Historical Association Chairman begs the indulgence of the American Historical Association Council for this deviation. An informal conversation was held between Professor Bemis and Professors Ferguson and Stacey at Washington on December 29, 1961. In this discussion the idea was projected, among other ideas, of a joint meeting of the two Associations in Canada



(presumably at Toronto) perhaps in December 1967, centennial of Canadian Dominionhood under the North American Act of that year.

So far no meeting of the Joint Committee has occurred. Discussion has proceeded in correspondence between Professor Bemis and his American colleagues, and between Professor Bemis and Professor Stacey. First fruit of this correspondence was the sponsorship by the Joint Committee of a section meeting on Canada and the American Civil War at the June 1961 meeting of the Canadian Historical Association at Hamilton, Ontario, with papers by a member of the American Historical Association and of the Canadian Historical Association; Dr. Albert B. Corey presided. Another section meeting, similarly sponsored by the Joint Committee, on the United States and Canada since 1945, has been arranged on the program of the American Historical Association at the Chicago meeting, December 28-30, Professor Wallace K. Ferguson to preside. It is hoped that such jointly sponsored section meetings may become a regular feature of the annual programs of each Association, if not every year in both Associations, at least every year alternately in each Association. This possibility may deserve the attention of the American Historical Association Council and Program Chairman for 1963.

The most important subject focused in the correspondence between Col. Stacey and Professor Bemis was the possibility of a joint meeting of American Historical Association and Canadian Historical Association in Canada in December 1967.

The Chairman of American Historical Association members of the Joint Committee has in mind recommending to the American Historical Association Council in December 1962, the following:

That should a mutual understanding be reached with the Canadian Historical Association to meet with them in Toronto in December 1967, the year of the centennial of Dominion of Canada, this Association accept the same and make arrangements accordingly, the program to be based on the preliminary framework already worked out by the Joint Canadian-American Committee on collaboration.

Another subject that has been discussed is the possibility of a prize to be offered annually or biennially for the best manuscript or publication on a subject of Canadian-American relations. Already Dr. Corey has received and forwarded to the American Historical Association through the Chairman an anonymous check for \$1,000.00 toward an adequate endowment for such a prize, and he is in correspondence with Colonel Stacey on this matter. We believe such a prize, if established, should be administered by the Joint Committee.

It seems to be agreed among the Joint Committee to hold a meeting on the occasion of the meeting of the American Historical Association at Chicago in December 1962, the precise date and hour still to be fixed.

Other business conceivably may develop out of the correspondence between Colonel Stacey and Professor Bemis before the American Historical Association Council meeting.

The Chairman believes that in view of his advancing years and uncertainty whether he may be able to attend any meeting in 1967, he should be relieved of the chairmanship of the American Historical Association contingent of the Joint Committee and recommends that he be replaced by Dr. Corey, who is closest in touch both professionally and geographically (from Albany) with our Canadian colleagues; and also that at the expiration of his term on the Committee, or sooner, he be replaced by Dr. Robin Winks when he returns to the United States.

November 1962.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS, Chairman.

#### THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION (BRITAIN) AND AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL BIAS IN TEXTBOOKS

The Committee, established by the Council in December 1961, is co-operating with a similar committee of the Historical Association of England and Wales in a study of national bias in the history textbooks used in the schools of the United Kingdom and the

United States. During the year, grants were received from the Ford Foundation and the Nuffield Trust to finance the project. The chairman and the Executive Secretary of the Association met in London with the British sponsoring committee to formulate plans for the study, which will be carried out by a working group of three American and two British scholars. It is anticipated that work will get under way in 1963 and will terminate with the publication of a report in 1965.

November 14, 1962.

RICHARD P. McCORMICK, Chairman.

#### MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE ON CENSORSHIP IN TEXTBOOKS

The Committee has held two meetings, one in Washington, December 1961, the other at Milwaukee, April 1962, to discuss the task before it. Erling M. Hunt agreed to undertake a general survey of pressures exerted by special interest groups on both the writing and use of history textbooks during the past century or more. It is expected that a preliminary draft of this survey will be ready early in 1963 and it will indicate further appropriate steps to the Committee.

December 17, 1962.

VERNON CARSTENSEN, Chairman.

### OTHER REPORTS

#### REPORT OF THE DELEGATE TO THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

The American Council of Learned Societies continues to be in a vigorous condition, operating in 1962-63 with a budget approaching a million dollars, of which over half is for fellowships and grants-in-aid. Of fifty-three fellowships eighteen were awarded to members of Departments of History, a share which, considering that the American Historical Association is one of thirty-one component societies in the American Council of Learned Societies, may be a sign of the numbers, industry, and persuasiveness of historians in the United States. The American Council of Learned Societies reports progress in its programs for sponsoring American Studies in Europe, exchange of scholars with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and institutes for secondary school teachers. Efforts continue for the bringing of federal funds into the support of humanistic subjects.

October 23, 1962.

R. R. PALMER.

#### REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ON THE JOINT ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON BRITISH BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Progress has been made on each of the bibliographies, though not as great as was anticipated last year. Professor Edgar B. Graves has finished volume one, on Pre-Norman Britain, of the revision of Gross, *Sources and Literature of English History*, and hopes to have the second volume ready for printing by the summer of 1963. Dean Mary Frear Keeler has nearly completed those sections of the Stuart bibliography for which she was primarily responsible, and is well along with sections on which she had help from others. She also hopes to finish sometimes in 1963, Messrs. I. R. Christie and A. J. Taylor have about a quarter of the bibliography for 1789-1851 in draft form, including the bulky section on colonial history, and have made headway on other sections.

They anticipate speedier progress next year. Mr. Hanham has finished revised drafts of four sections of the bibliography for 1851-1914 and has first drafts for most of the others.

Collection and classification of material for "Writings on British History, 1901-1933", have been virtually completed. The number of entries runs to 32,000 and will fill six volumes. As soon as numbering and indexing is finished, this substantial work can go to press. Professor H. Hale Bellot and Mrs. C.S.B. Euckland have brought the work of collecting and arrangement to its conclusion.

November 1962.

STANLEY PARGELLIS.

#### REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF SOCIAL EDUCATION

By the standards of commercial magazine publishing, 1962 constituted a successful year for Social Education, official journal of the National Council for the Social Studies published in collaboration with the Association. The eight issues in 1962 carried 47 per cent more advertizing than in 1961. While this increase brought in welcomed revenue, it also highlighted a continuing problem for the editorial staff: maintaining the balance among articles, advertizing, departmental reports, and official news of the National Council for the Social Studies. As the advertizing in the journal has increased, the number of pages has grown similarly. The standard size of the magazine is forty-eight pages, yet in 1962 it carried 102 additional pages, the equivalent of two extra issues. Dr. Lewis Paul Todd, the editor, has suggested strongly that the National Council for the Social Studies increase the magazine's budget to expand the substantive content so that the increasing amount of advertizing and National Council for the Social Studies official news will not reduce the percentage of space devoted to articles.

The May issue reprinted in full the Advanced Placement Test in American history prepared by the College Entrance Examination Board and published by the Educational Testing Service in 1958. Professor Henry F. Graff, chairman of the Advanced Placement American History Committee, provided commentary on the examination. (In November 1961 Social Education reprinted the Advanced Placement Test in European history.) A special issue in November was devoted to "World Peace Through World Law." This eighty-page issue was made possible in part through a grant from the Fund for Education Concerning World Peace Through World Law.

I have suggested to the editor that the book review section of the magazine would be of greater value to teachers if the volumes for review were chosen more systematically. By exercising greater selectivity among books to be reviewed and perhaps by planning the review section around certain themes, the magazine would perform a more beneficial service to its readers.

November 1962.

WALTER RUNDELL, JR.

Social Education is the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, whose membership now numbers over 10,000. Eight issues were put out in 1962, averaging 60 pages an issue. This represents an increase of 12 pages over the normal issue of five years ago. As the editor pointed out last year, the increased size can be attributed largely to an increase in advertizing which as a result now occupies 28 per cent of the journal. The November issue was a special one of 80 pages, put out in co-operation with, and with a partial subvention from the Fund for Education Concerning World Peace Through World Law.

The editor hopes to put out two such special issues next year as well as continue the reports on significant general education programs like the article on the Wisconsin program in March 1962. The issue for May carried a complete reprint of the Advanced Placement Test in American history. The December issue contained the annual list of textbooks published during the year.

Of particular concern to the editor is the danger advertizing, however welcome for income, may bulk too large in the journal. He has hopes of introducing a section for 'exchange of ideas' on classroom experiments, articles in the journal, or anything which should be of interest to teachers. Historians who examine Social Education may well regret the proportion of space devoted to what is essentially pedagogy or methods as compared with content (my informal check would put the ratio at about two to one!). The best advice for any historian who shares this concern is to urge him to offer the editor, Lewis Paul Todd, Castle Road, Truro, Massachusetts, the kind of article which many historians would prefer to see in Social Education. Editor Todd, as the writer can testify, will welcome materials of this sort!

December 1962.

T. C. MENDENHALL.

#### REPORT OF DELEGATES TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

The general structure of the Social Science Research Council and its operations, as pertaining to history, were briefly described in the Association's Annual Report for 1960, Vol. I, pp. 45-46.

For 1961-62, the Council continued many of the activities previously described, including its fellowship programs and its sponsorship, through active committees, of research in areas which promise to develop new aspects of the social sciences or to strengthen their discipline.

The Council continued as a member of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, and through the Board's Committee on International Exchange of Persons participated in the administration of the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs. The Council also continued to administer a broad program of faculty research fellowships and grants-in-aid for mature scholars who are not candidates for degrees, as well as a research training fellowship program primarily for pre-doctoral scholars, to develop their competence beyond the level ordinarily required for the Ph. D. Historians serve on the Committees which award these fellowships. In 1962, thirty-six faculty research fellowships were awarded, of which sixteen went to historians; thirty-six grants-in-aid were awarded, of which eight went to historians; and fifty-three research training fellowships were awarded, of which thirteen went to candidates in history. The ratios of applicants in history to other applicants and of applicants to recipients have not changed materially since 1960, and were discussed briefly in the report cited above.

While providing fellowship support for individual projects, the Council has also consistently sought to further the development of improved method in historical research. The best-known of its efforts in this direction have been the Reports in 1946 and 1954 of the Council's two Committees on Historiography (Bulletins 54 and 64), which are to be followed this year by a report of the Committee on Historical Analysis, Louis Gottschalk, chairman, (to be published by the University of Chicago Press under the title Generalization in the Writing of History). But while these reports are well-known, it might be questioned whether the historical profession has made as good use of the Council's support in improving the methodology of its discipline as the other social sciences which are affiliated with the Council have made.

November 12, 1962.

DAVID M. POTTER.

The Committee on Historical Analysis has reached the point in its inquiry into the role played by generalizations in historical study where it is ready to submit its concluding report, Generalization in the Writing of History, edited by Louis Gottschalk. It will be published by the University of Chicago Press during the coming winter. The volume includes the following essays prepared for the committee: "Reflections upon the Problem of Generalization," Chester G. Starr; "Generalizations in Ancient History," M. I. Finley; "On the Uses of Generalization in the Study of Chinese History,"

Arthur F. Wright; "Comments on the Paper of Arthur F. Wright," Derk Bodde; "Generalizations about Revolution: A Case Study," Robert R. Palmer; "Generalizations about National Character: An Analytical Essay," Walter P. Metzger; "The Historian's Use of Social Role," Thomas C. Cochran; "Categories of Historiographical Generalization," Louis Gottschalk; "The Genealogy of Historical Generalizations," Roy F. Nichols; "Notes on the Problem of Historical Generalization," William O. Aydelotte; "Explicit Data and Implicit Assumptions in Historical Study," David M. Potter. The Foreword and a concluding Summary have been contributed by the editor. Included also are a "Bibliography on Historiography and the Philosophy of History," by Martin Klein, and commentaries, in footnotes, by Hans Meyerhoff.

November 1962.

LOUIS GOTTSCHALK.

---

---

REPORT  
of the  
PACIFIC COAST BRANCH  
OF THE AMERICAN  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

---

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

On August 28, 29, and 30, 1962, the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association held its fifty-fifth annual meeting at Loyola University of Los Angeles. In charge of campus arrangements were Richard H. Trame, S. J., and John A. Donohue, S. J. The program for the meeting was put together by Gerald E. Wheeler, Chairman, John S. Galbraith, Gordon Griffiths, Charles Larsen, Bryce Lyon, Jackson T. Main, Margaret A. Ormsby, Mario Rodriguez, and Anthony Turhollow. Three hundred and thirty historians registered for the sessions and nearly a hundred additional participants were present for the jointly-sponsored meetings.

Three of the twenty-one sessions were co-sponsored. The American Aviation Historical Society presented on the first evening of the meeting a program on aviation as a determinant in history. With Eugene M. Emme of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration presiding, a two-paper session analyzed the problems of aviation as a factor in the victories of recent wars. The Pacific Coast Branch of the American Society for Legal History, with Judge Leon T. David presiding, heard three papers that covered selected topics of legal history from colonial times to the present. Brainerd Dyer traced the intricate evolution of California's Civil War claims. The Conference on British Studies first heard two papers on Anglican Church history and then adjourned to the Del Rey Room of the Loyola University Student Union for a business meeting and examination of certain imports from Scotland. Professor G. H. Guttridge was elected its president and Anthony Forbes the secretary-treasurer.

At the two general sessions members heard Monsignor John Tracy Ellis compare and contrast the spirit and expectations of the Vatican councils of 1869 and 1962, concluding that the Roman Catholic Church is not a monolith, and Mrs. Theodora Kroeber speak on her personal experiences in writing Ishi in Two Worlds, the story of life among the Yana Indians and Ishi's adjustment to the ways of the white man.

While the fifteen specialized sessions were divided into the traditional subjects and time periods, there were four that departed a bit from the pattern. A session on the Jewish businessman in the West was presided over by Raymond Rydell. The three papers traced the migration of peddlers and merchants into the West from the 1850's to 1890, noting that some of these people were Jewish enterprisers who saw opportunity and made the most of it. The challenge of this new dimension in western history was accepted in another session, with Wilbur Jacobs as chairman, which considered the problems of synthesis and treatment of regional history. Professor Jacobs, with Leonard J. Arrington, John A. Carroll, Earl Pomeroy, and H. Brett Melendy as participants, criticized the heavy concentration of researchers on detail when there was an urgent need for concepts; some called for new Turners.

European specialists likewise were in search of sharper perspectives. In the session on imperialism, Samuel C. McCulloch and his colleagues re-evaluated the validity and significance of British theories in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the session on World War I and the German Historians, Joachim Remak, Philip K. Lundeborg, Helmut Haeussler, Werner T. Angress, and Roger P. Fox reviewed German documentation and interpretation of certain war episodes; much, they concluded, remained to be done to harmonize Allied and German accounts.

At the annual dinner former President Max Saville presided and introduced Frederick H. Soward who spoke on his life-long specialty of Canadian foreign policy, entitling his presidential address "On Becoming and Being a Middle Power--The Canadian Experience." In the course of his powerfully delivered speech Professor Soward described how Canada became a middle power in 1945 and illustrated how her bewildering experiences in that role had been most disillusioning.

The awards of the Pacific Coast Branch were announced at the annual dinner. John W. Caughey reported that the Board of Editors of the Pacific Historical Review voted the 1962 Louis Knott Koontz Memorial Award to Fred L. Israel of City College,

New York, for his article "The Fulfillment of Bryan's Dream: Key Pittman and Silver Politics, 1918-1933," which appeared in the November 1961, issue of the Review. The Pacific Coast Branch award for the year was given to John Gimbel of Humboldt State College, Arcata, for his monograph The German Community under American Occupation (Stanford, 1961).

On Thursday morning at 9:00 o'clock, President Soward convened the business meeting. The Secretary-Treasurer announced that the Branch had approximately 1,300 members and was sending annual programs to a vast number of historian-subscribers of the Review, the patrons of the host university, and a selected number of historians outside of the western states who wanted to keep in touch with their former homeland. The financial position of the Branch remained favorable, as in former years, but this situation depended primarily on maintaining its good relations with sponsoring and host universities.

The editor of the Pacific Historical Review reported that the Review was making progress, like most things since 1961, but there was always a need for more subscriptions and articles. The University of California Press, he noted, was ready with a special invitation to Branch members who were not already subscribers of the Review.

After these reports, President Soward announced the decisions of the Council. The 1963 meeting of the Branch will be held at San Francisco State College on August 27, 28, and 29. He also announced that the American Historical Association planned to meet in San Francisco during the Christmas holidays in 1965 and that the Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to convey our best wishes to the Association Council on this Second Coming.

Professor Charles Gates, on behalf of the Resolutions Committee, himself, Robert Hine, and Clifton Kroeber, offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association expresses to Loyola University of Los Angeles, to President Charles S. Casassa, and especially to the Department of History, its deep appreciation of the hospitality provided in these beautiful surroundings on the occasion of the fifty-fifth Annual Meeting.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Pacific Coast Branch tender to Professor Gerald Wheeler and the members of the Program Committee its congratulations, in grateful acknowledgement of the care with which they have planned a varied selection of scholarly papers for our consideration.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Pacific Coast Branch extend to Father Richard H. Trame and his colleagues an expression of our sincere thanks for the arrangement of lodging, meals, and pleasant facilities which contribute greatly to make our visit to Loyola University a particularly happy one. Our scholarly community has suffered bereavement during the past year with the death of three of our number, with whom we have shared intellectual interests and educational purposes.

Henry S. Lucas, former president of the Pacific Coast Branch (1939) and professor emeritus at the University of Washington since his retirement three years ago, died on December 29, 1961, at the age of seventy-two. Internationally known for his writings, Professor Lucas was twice decorated with the Netherlands Order of Oranje-Nassau and received the Picardt Medal of the Drenthe (Holland) Historical Society in 1949.

David Kenneth Bjork, professor emeritus at the University of California, Los Angeles, since his retirement in 1958, died on March 3, 1962 at the age of seventy. An authority in Hanseatic and north European medieval history, he was decorated in 1944 as Knight of the Royal Order of Vasa by the King of Sweden. He was elected vice-president of the Medieval Academy of America in 1954.



Lucy Mathews Gaines, assistant professor emeritus at the University of California, Los Angeles, died on April 8, 1962, at the age of eighty-six. She joined the faculty of the Los Angeles State Normal School in 1914 and remained with the institution through its evolution into the University of California, Los Angeles, until her retirement in 1941.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Association pay tribute to these our colleagues, honoring them for their achievements, their years of service in this organization, their qualities of mind and character, which have been an inspiration alike to their associates and to their students; AND BE IT RESOLVED that we record in the proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch this testimonial of our respect and affection.

Professor Donald Rowland, chairman of the Committee on Nominations, announced the recommendations of his associates, John Carroll, W. L. Davis, Francis Herrick, Solomon Katz, Benjamin Sacks, Robert S. Smith, Gerald Wheeler, and Richard Wilde, and the Committee report was unanimously adopted: Richard Van Alstyne, President; Abraham P. Nasatir, Vice-President; and John A. Schutz, Secretary-Treasurer; and for three year terms on the Council: Dorothy O. Johansen and Gordon Wright. Also elected were three members of the Board of Editors of the Pacific Historical Review: Norman Harper, David M. Potter, and Joseph Levenson. The Board of Editors re-elected John W. Caughey as managing editor of the Review and August Frugé as its business manager. Ronald Sires of Whitman College was elected to a three-year term on the Awards Committee and John D. Hicks was named its chairman.

Vice-President Van Alstyne announced that Richard Wilde of Long Beach State College was the 1963 chairman of the Program Committee. Professor Eldon L. Modisette of San Francisco State College was the chairman of Local Arrangements. The concluding item of business for the meeting at Loyola University was transacted by letter from Father Richard Trame, who sent a check to the Branch for \$550.15.

March 1, 1963.

JOHN A. SCHUTZ, Secretary-Treasurer.

## AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

## FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1962

Balance, January 1, 1962.....		\$1,629.33
-------------------------------	--	------------

## Income:

American Historical Association.....		300.00
1962 Meeting fees, Loyola University.....		370.00
Publicity at Loyola University.....		170.00

Total.....		\$2,469.33
------------	--	------------

## Expenditures:

Program printing.....	\$137.28	
Program mailing.....	59.00	
Secretarial assistance.....	41.00	
Secretarial assistance, Loyola University.....	70.96	
Insurance.....	5.00	
Travel.....	100.00	
Misc. expense, telephone calls, etc.....	18.18	
Program Committee.....	49.41	
Award.....	100.00	
Award's Program expense.....	2.44	
Binding <u>PHR</u> .....	4.40	<u>587.67</u>

Balance, December 31, 1962.....		\$1,881.66
---------------------------------	--	------------

## THE LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ MEMORIAL FUND

Balance, January 1, 1962.....		\$2,379.93
-------------------------------	--	------------

## Income:

Interest.....		151.96
Total.....		\$2,531.89

## Expenditures:

Award for 1962.....	\$100.00	100.00
---------------------	----------	--------

Balance, December 31, 1962.....		\$2,431.89
---------------------------------	--	------------

Branch funds are deposited in the Lincoln Savings and Loan Association, Sixth and Flower Streets, Los Angeles, and California Bank, Spring Street Branch.

March 1, 1963.

JOHN A. SCHUTZ, Secretary-Treasurer.