

*Annual Report*  
OF THE  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION



FOR THE YEAR

1963



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 \$1.25 (paper cover)

## Letter of Submittal

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1964.

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 1963.

Respectfully,

S. DILLON RIPLEY, Secretary.

III

## Letter of Transmittal

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1964.

SIR: As provided by law, I submit herewith the Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1963. This consists of two volumes in one.

Volume I contains the proceedings of the Association for 1963, and the report of the secretary-treasurer for the Pacific Coast Branch for 1963.

Volume II will contain the Writings on American History for 1961.

W. STULL HOLT, 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 1964.....	XIX
Committees and delegates for 1964.....	XXIII
Ad interim appointments for 1963.....	XXVI
Pacific Coast Branch officers for 1964.....	XXVII
Proceedings of the American Historical Association for 1963	
The Philadelphia Meeting, 1963.....	3
Minutes of the meeting of the Council, December 27, 1963.....	24
Minutes of the business meeting, December 29, 1963 ..	29
Report of the Executive Secretary and Managing Editor for the year 1963.....	31
Report of the Treasurer for the fiscal year 1962-63 ..	34
Report of the Auditors for the fiscal year 1962-63.....	39
Report of the Board of Trustees for 1962-63 .....	40
Draft budgets, 1963-64, 1964-65, unrestricted funds ..	45
Statistics of membership .....	47
Committee reports for 1963 .....	49
Other reports .....	59
Report of the Pacific Coast Branch for 1963.....	63
Ten Years, 1953-63, of the Association and <u>Review</u> .....	68
List of members .....	85



## 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 2,900 to 4,000. 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 cooperates 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 his 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 \$941,013.45 if the book value of permanent investments is used. If market values, according to the August 31, 1963 appraisal are used, the total assets of the

Association amount to \$1,254,733.15. 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 12,000 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, D.C. 20003.

#### PRIZES

The Association offers the following prizes:

The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize. \$300. Awarded in the even-numbered years for a monograph in manuscript or in print (first or second book) in the field of European history. Submit work by June 1 year of award. Committee chairman: William Shanahan, University of Oregon. Last award, 1962, Jerome Blum, Princeton University, Lord and Peasant in Russia, Princeton University Press, 1961.

The Troyer Steele Anderson Prize. Awarded every ten years beginning in 1970 to the person whom the Council of the Association considers to have made the most outstanding contribution to the advancement of the purposes of the Association during the preceding ten years.

The George Louis Beer Prize. \$300. Awarded annually for the best work by a young scholar (first or second book) in manuscript or in print on European international history since 1895. Competition is limited to citizens of the United States and to works in English. Submit work by June 1 year of award. Committee chairman: Victor Mamatey, Florida State University. Last award, 1963, jointly to Edward E. Bennett, Washington, D.C., Germany and the Diplomacy of the Financial Crisis, 1931, Harvard University Press, 1962; and Hans A. Schmitt, Tulane University, The Path to European Union, Louisiana State University Press, 1962.

The Albert J. Beveridge Award. \$1500 plus publication. Awarded annually for the best complete original manuscript (50,000-150,000 words) in English on American history (history of the United States, Canada, Latin America). Must be author's first or second work. Carbon copies unacceptable. Submit by May 1. Committee chairman: John Higham, University of Michigan. Last award, 1962, Walter LaFeber, Cornell University, The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898.

The John H. Dunning Prize. \$300. Awarded in the even-numbered years for a monograph in manuscript or in print (first book) on any subject relating to American history. Submit by June 1 year of award. Committee chairman: Thomas Cochran, University of

Pennsylvania. Last award, 1962, E. James Ferguson, University of Maryland, The Power of the Purse: A History of American Finance, 1776-1790. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by the University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

The Clarence H. Haring Prize. \$500. Awarded every five years beginning in 1965 to that Latin American who in the opinion of the Committee has published the most outstanding book in Latin American history during the preceding five years. The Stanford University Press has expressed an interest in publishing an English translation of the book so honored.

The Littleton-Griswold Prize in Legal History. \$500. Awarded biennially for a 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. Committee chairman: Judge Edward Dumbauld, 614 New Federal Building, Pittsburgh.

The Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize. \$100. Awarded every five years by the Taraknath Das Foundation for the best work in the field of Modern British, British Imperial, and British Commonwealth history written by an American citizen and published in the United States. Committee chairman: Robert Walcott, Wooster College. Last award, 1961, Mark H. Curtis, U.C.L.A., Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, Oxford University Press, 1959. (Next award, 1966.)

The Watumull Prize. \$500. Awarded in the even-numbered years for the best work on the history of India originally published in the United States. Submit three copies of work by September 15 year of award. Committee chairman: Robert I. Crane, Duke University. Last award, 1962, jointly to George D. Bearce, Bowdoin College, British Attitudes Toward India, 1784-1858, Oxford University Press, 1961; and Stanley A. Wolpert, U.C.L.A., Tilak and Gokhale: Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India, University of California Press, 1962.

# 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 1964

## OFFICERS

### PRESIDENT

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

### VICE PRESIDENT

FREDERIC C. LANE  
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

### TREASURER

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

### EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR

W. STULL HOLT  
400 A Street, S.E., Washington, D.C.

### ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

WALTER RUNDELL, JR.  
400 A St., S.E., Washington, 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.

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.

CRANE BRINTON

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

#### ELECTED MEMBERS

ROBERT F. BYRNES

Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. (term expires 1966)

JOHN W. CAUGHEY

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

WALLACE K. FERGUSON

University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario (term expires 1967)

RICHARD HOFSTADTER  
Columbia University, New York, N.Y. (term expires 1967)

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

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

CARL BRIDENBAUGH  
Brown University, Providence, R.I.

ROBERT F. BYRNES  
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

W. STULL HOLT  
400 A St., S.E., Washington, D.C.

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

FREDERIC C. LANE  
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

CHARLES F. MULLETT  
University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

## Committees and Delegates

FOR 1964

Board of Trustees.--W.A.W. Stewart, Jr., United States Trust Co. of New York, 37 Broad Street, New York City, chairman--term expires 1968; 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.--John Tate Lanning, Duke University, chairman; David Donald, Johns Hopkins University; S. W. Halperin, University of Chicago;\* John Higham, University of Michigan;\* John Snell, Tulane University.

Board of Editors of the American Historical Review.--W. Stull Holt, 400 A St., S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003, Managing Editor; Gordon Craig, Stanford University\*--term expires in 1968; Richard Current, University of Wisconsin--term expires 1965; John W. Hall, Yale University\*--term expires in 1968; Charles Mullett, University of Missouri--term expires 1966; Robert R. Palmer, Washington University\*--term expires 1968; 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.

Committee on the Commemoration of the American Revolution Bicentennial.\*\*--John R. Alden, Duke University, chairman; Julian P. Boyd, The Papers of Thomas Jefferson; Lyman H. Butterfield, The Adams Papers; Alfred A. Knopf, New York City; Clarence L. Ver Steeg, Northwestern University.

Committee on Committees.--Donald Emerson, University of Washington; Joe Frantz, University of Texas; Louis Morton, Dartmouth College; Caroline Robbins, Bryn Mawr College.

Committee on Graduate Work in History.\*\*--Robert Ferrell, Indiana University, chairman; Thomas Clark, University of Kentucky; Richard J. Storr, University of Chicago; Charles G. Sellers, University of California (Berkeley); John Snell, Tulane University.

Committee on the Harmsworth Professorship.--Kenneth Stamp, University of California (Berkeley), chairman; Richard Current, University of Wisconsin; Frank Vandiver, Rice University.\*

---

\*New member this year.

\*\*New committee this year.

Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government.--Charles Barker, Johns Hopkins University, chairman; 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.

Committee on Honorary Members.--Oscar Handlin, Harvard University, chairman; John K. Fairbank, Harvard University; George Mosse, University of Wisconsin; Franklin Scott, Northwestern University; Howard Cline, Library of Congress; Val R. Lorwin, University of Oregon.\*

Committee on International Historical Activities.--Arthur Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Waldo Leland, Washington, D.C.; John Rath, Rice University; Caroline Robbins, Bryn Mawr College; Eugen Weber, University of California (Los Angeles); Raymond Grew, Princeton University;\* Richard Pipes, Harvard University;\* Boyd C. Shafer, Macalester College.\*

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Prize.--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.

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.

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, Univ. of Chicago; Charles Gibson, State University of Iowa; Earl Pritchard, University of Arizona.

Committee on Scholarly Historical Resources.--Robert F. Byrnes, Indiana University, chairman; David Dowd, University of Florida; Dewey Grantham, Vanderbilt University; Walter Johnson, University of Chicago; John Snell, Tulane University; Burton Stein, University of Minnesota; Melville J. Ruggles, Council on Library Resources;\* James E. Skipper, Association of Research Libraries;\* Howard Cline, Library of Congress.\*

Committee on Teaching (Service Center for Teachers of History).--Joseph R. Strayer, Princeton University, chairman; Robert Coon, Lakewood, Colorado; Margareta Faissler, Baltimore, Maryland; Frank Freidel, Harvard University; Stanley Idzerda, Michigan State University; Agnes Meyer, Washington, D.C.; Jim Pearson, University of Texas; Wilson Smith, Johns Hopkins University;\* L. F. Stavrianos, Northwestern University.\*

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.--William Shanahan, University of Oregon, chairman; Theodore

\*New member this year.

Hamerow, University of Wisconsin; Arthur Wilson, Dartmouth College.

Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize.--Victor Mamatey, Florida State University, chairman; Charles Delzell, Vanderbilt University; Piotr Wandycz, Indiana University.\*

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

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 Walcott, College of Wooster, chairman; Jack Hexter, Washington University; 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.--Mason Wade, University of Rochester, chairman;\* John Galbraith, University of California (Los Angeles); Robin Winks, Yale University;\* W. K. Ferguson, University of Western Ontario; T. M. Hunter, Ottawa, Canada; C. P. Stacey, University of Toronto.

The Historical Association (Britain) and American Historical Association Committee on National Bias in Textbooks.--E. H. Dance, B. R. Potter, Reginald F. Trehearne (British members), and Ray A. 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 E. Dickey, Valley Station, Kentucky; John Hope Franklin, Brooklyn College; Joe Frantz, University of Texas; Erling M. Hunt, Columbia University; R. W. Patrick, University of Florida.

The Executive Secretary is an ex-officio member of all but the nominating and prize committees.

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

---

\*New member this year.

Historical Publications Commission: Julian P. Boyd, Princeton University--term expires 1964; Boyd C. Shafer, Washington, D.C.--term expires 1965; Lyman H. Butterfield, Massachusetts Historical Society--term expires 1967. 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 Morton, Dartmouth College--term expires 1965; Bernard Bailyn, Harvard University--term expires 1966.

The following ad interim appointments as representatives of the American Historical Association were made in 1963: Burr C. Brundage of the Florida Presbyterian College at the inauguration of William Howard Kadel as president of the Florida Presbyterian College on January 18; Manfred Jonas of the Pennsylvania Military College at the inauguration of Ronald Vale Wells as president of the Crozer Theological Seminary on March 26; John W. Carson of Iowa Wesleyan College at the inauguration of John Wayne Henderson as president of Iowa Wesleyan College on March 30; George Green Shackelford of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute at the inauguration of Thomas Marshall Hahn, Jr., as president of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute on April 4; Jeannette Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania at the sixty-seventh annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science on April 5-6; Edgar B. Graves of Hamilton College at the inauguration of Vincent MacDowell Barnett, Jr., as president of Hamilton College on April 19; Lynn White, jr., of the University of California (Los Angeles) at the centennial convocation of Boston College on April 20; Sidney A. Burrell of Barnard College at the inauguration of Rosemary Park as president of Barnard College on April 22; Philip A. Walker of the Louisiana Polytechnic Institute at the inauguration of Foster Jay Taylor as president of the Louisiana Polytechnic Institute on May 4; Bernard D. Williams of the University of Scranton at the inauguration of Edward Joseph Sponga as president of the University of Scranton on September 13; Norman P. Zacour of Franklin and Marshall College at the inauguration of Keith Spalding as president of Franklin and Marshall College on September 26; Coen G. Pierson of DePauw University at the inauguration of William Edward Kerstetter as president of DePauw University on October 12; J. E. Victor Carlson of Waynesburg College at the inauguration of Bennett M. Rich as president of Washington and Jefferson College on October 12; Lawrence S. Kaplan of Kent State University at the inauguration of Robert Isaac White as president of Kent State University on October 25; Beatrice F. Hyslop of Hunter College at the inauguration of Dumont F. Kenny as president of Queensborough Community College on October 29; Walter B. Posey of Emory University at the inauguration of Sanford Soverhill Atwood as president of Emory University on November 15; Willis F. Dunbar of Western Michigan University at the inauguration of Calvin VanderWerf as president of Hope College on November 16; Sydney W. Jackman of Bates College at the centennial convocation of Bates College on November 20.



## PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OFFICERS FOR 1964

### PRESIDENT

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

### VICE PRESIDENT

JOHN S. GALBRAITH  
University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

### SECRETARY-TREASURER

JOHN A. SCHUTZ  
Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.

### COUNCIL

The above officers and the following elected members:

LEONARD J. ARRINGTON  
Utah State University, Logan, Utah (term expires 1966)

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

JOHN E. POMFRET  
Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif. (term expires 1966)

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

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

KENNETH M. STAMPP  
University of California, Berkeley, Calif. (term expires 1966)

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  
1963

---

---

## THE PHILADELPHIA MEETING, 1963

The Seventy-eighth Annual Meeting of the Association was held at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia, December 28-30, 1963. A general discussion of the preparation and content of the program presented at Philadelphia appeared in the April number of the American Historical Review. What follows is a more detailed report on the content of individual sessions and papers, based primarily on reports of session chairman, or, where these were not available, on summaries or reports by other participants, members of the program committee, or special observers. For some sessions no report was received, and in those cases we can only indicate what was scheduled to take place.

The variety of sessions and papers was such that no easy ordering of them is possible. However, since the program committee made a special effort to have a number of "mixed" sessions which sought to link different regions or eras under a common theme, we shall begin with the classification of "Mixed Sessions," hoping it will not turn out to be "mixed up." Then we shall proceed to specialized sessions on single nations or periods, breaking up United States history into colonial and early national, 19th century, and 20th century and European history into ancient and medieval, early modern, modern, and contemporary (20th century). English and Russian history will be placed with European, Asian, Latin American, Canadian, and African history will be placed next, under the soubriquet "Other." Lastly will be those sessions dealing with historical theory, problems and methodology, which will also include luncheon addresses on such themes.

### I. MIXED SESSIONS

A session chaired by Benjamin Schwartz of Harvard University was called "Studies in Non-Western Intellectual History." Stephen Hay of the University of Chicago delivered a paper on the thought of Ram Mohan Roy, in which he dwelt on the ready response of this early 19th-century Indian intellectual to contemporary British thought. The other two papers dwelt on parallels and contrasts between the reactions of Lenin and Mao Tse-tung on the one hand, and of Chaadaev and Lu Hsiün on the other, to the situations which faced them. The former was somewhat more suggestive than the latter, but the basic theme of similarities and differences of response on the part of intelligentsia in different areas to the Western impact was well brought out in the carefully prepared presentations.

James Morley of Columbia University led a well-attended session entitled "Japan and America: Concepts of National Defense." James B. Crowley of Yale University presented the first paper, a report on "Military Views on National Defense in Prewar Japan." He traced the course by which Japan came to be what Premier Konoe called a "National Defense State" by 1940. He pointed out that the Japanese Navy spoke always of "defending the Western Pacific" while the Army stressed "continental defense." Both groups thought of Japan as vulnerable unless she had sole control of sufficient raw materials as well as all approaches to Japan. Stetson Conn of the Department of the Army in "Changing Concepts of National Defense in the United States" stressed that unlike Japan the United States' purpose was defense and not aggression. This was conceived of first as defense of the continental United States and the overseas possessions of the United States, second the defense of the Western hemisphere, and third assistance to allies, a later extension of the defense plans. Marius B. Jansen of Princeton University and William Fox of Columbia University commented favorably on the papers, and there was lively discussion, especially concerning Pearl Harbor, it being brought

out that the presence of the United States fleet there had been considered a deterrence to Japan.

A session called "The United States and Central Europe 1900-1920," with Arthur J. May of the University of Rochester in the chair, explored virgin soil. Margaret Sterne of Wayne State University presented an analytical survey of the reports of Hapsburg diplomats stationed in Washington early in the 20th century. In an appraisal by Victor S. Mamatey of Florida State University the reports were defined as "fair, objective, and knowledgeable," though they appear not to have encouraged a realistic image of the New World giant among policymakers in Vienna. A second critic, Joseph P. O'Grady of LaSalle College dwelt on misleading impressions conveyed to Vienna, as, for example, in connection with the Venezuela crisis. In a meticulously documented inquiry into "The Wilsonian Concept of Central Europe: Lansing's Contribution", George Barany of the University of Denver endeavored to assess the impact of the pragmatic Secretary of State upon the thinking of the idealistic President with regard to Central Europe and the peace settlement to be made there. Both commentators chided Barany for squeezing more from the evidence than the facts allowed, and Mamatey pleaded for more semantic precision in dealing with the Danubian region.

"Russian Cultural Relations with Neighboring Societies," chaired by Nicholas V. Riasanovsky of the University of California at Berkeley, convened with one of its scheduled panelists, Arash Bormanshinov of Princeton University, absent due to an emergency. Therefore only two instead of the scheduled three papers were presented. These dealt with "Russia and the West" and "Russia and the Moslem World" and were read respectively by Walther Kirchner of the University of Delaware and Serge A. Zenkovsky of Stetson University. Richard Pierce of Queen's University, Ontario acted as the commentator of the session. Kirchner's revisionist paper covered, in a sweeping yet incisive manner, a thousand years of relations between Russia and the West. The salient points of the author's interpretation included a de-emphasis on the scope and significance of contacts in the Kievan period, a new emphasis on their importance in the period of Mongol domination, and a critical analysis of the nature of these contacts as to both their "quantity" and their "quality" in the modern period. Zenkovsky's paper traced along somewhat more conventional lines the complicated relations between Russia and the Moslem world immediately related to Russia, primarily the Mongols. The speaker stressed, but always with qualifications and restraint, both the contribution of the Mongols to the development of the centralized Moscovite state, and the later expansion of Russian state and culture to Moslem areas. The commentator pointed out that, although Kirchner's paper was a needed antidote to the clichés regarding allegedly abundant early Russian contacts with the West, many similarities between the two areas, especially in material culture, indicated a mass of unrecorded contacts which might be studied profitably by linking anthropological techniques with history. He proceeded to question Zenkovsky's views of Moslem acceptance of Russian rule, arguing that the Moslems simply accommodated themselves to the inevitable.

Bernadotte E. Schmitt served as chairman of a session devoted to "European Responses to American Diplomacy in the 1920's and 1930's." John Berutti of Sierra College discussed the case of Italy. He said that since Mussolini could expect no help from Britain or France, his only hope was American support. Germany was dealt with by Keith Eubank of North Texas State University. The Hitler regime, he argued, was not alarmed by the attitude or action of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for the United States sent few official protests against the Nazi treatment of the Jews. According to John M. Haight, Jr., of Lehigh University, the principal question asked in France was "Would the United States aid France in war against Hitler's Germany?" Early in 1938 the French government ordered 5000 planes and 20,000 aircraft engines in the United States; although this was contrary to the Neutrality Act, President Roosevelt winked at this. The commentator, René Albrecht-Carrié of Barnard College started from the fact that in the twenties and thirties, isolation was the policy generally followed by the American people and that an active policy was difficult for the United States. As regards Italy, he pointed out that its greatest achievement was the acceptance of Franco-Italian naval parity by the London naval conference of 1930. As for Germany, the

important thing was that, although the United States took no action against Hitler, the latter's conduct so alienated American opinion, which in the twenties had been sympathetic with Germany, that when the time came, the United States could and did act. In spite of the close attention paid in France to American policy, Albrecht-Carré thought that a good deal of illusion remained, as shown in June 1940 when premier Reynaud asked for "clouds of planes."

Jeannette P. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania and Arthur E. Tiedemann of the City College of New York participated in a session entitled "Currency Policy and International Relations," under the chairmanship of Karl Bopp, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. Commentators were Irwin Unger of the University of California at Davis and Hugh Patrick of Yale University. The purpose of the session was to illumine some of the dark spots in an important field that is relatively neglected by professional historians namely, monetary aspects of diplomacy. Nichols traced the two most important stages in United States history. The first episode (1893-1897) put a quietus on two decades of world uncertainty as to whether the United States would go on the silver standard. The second episode (1933-1937) was one of experimentation by Roosevelt on the domestic monetary scene as he prepared for the ill-timed, ill-humored World Monetary and Economic Conference. Tiedemann gave two Japanese examples of the relations between currency policy and international relations. The first episode was the decision of Japan, under the leadership of Matsukata, to adopt the gold standard in 1897. The second was the decision, at the very end of the new era of the 1920's, to return to the gold standard at the old parity rate.

Frederick H. Soward of the University of British Columbia served as chairman of a session on "Hemispheric Images of the United States." "The United States and Canadian Nationalism," by Gerald M. Craig of the University of Toronto, and "The United States and Cuban Nationalism," by José de Onís of the University of Colorado, both agreed that the impact of the United States upon the two countries could not be treated separately from the influence exerted upon them by the colonizing powers, the United Kingdom and Spain. The two commentators, Howard F. Cline of the Library of Congress and Richard W. Hale, Jr., Archivist of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, were largely in agreement with the authors. They pointed out that the fact that Cuba had remained a colony longer than any other Latin American country should not be overlooked and felt that the Canadian fear of Americanization was a universal phenomenon arising from the mechanization of culture.

"Ancients and Moderns," presided over by Chester G. Starr of the University of Illinois, had papers by George J. Szemler of Loyola University on "Ancient Historians and Modern Historical Interpretation" and by E. P. Panagopoulos of San Jose State College on "Classical Thinkers and Modern 'Checks and Balances'." Szemler demonstrated in a broadly ranging but solidly based study that historians of the ancient world developed many of the fundamental qualities which we are wont to term "modern" in historiography; and that ancient history was both a literary study and an object of scientific thought. Panagopoulos threw unexpected light upon the depth of interest which the Founding Fathers showed in classical precedents.

At a session on "Crisis Diplomacy in Southeast Asia," under the chairmanship of Trevor N. Dupuy of the Historical Evaluation and Research Organization, Washington, D.C., there were approximately 300 in attendance. Papers scheduled were by Bernard B. Fall of Howard University, "The Development of America's Indochina Policy, 1940-1960" and Richard Butwell of the University of Illinois, "SEATO: Evolution of an American Commitment," with comment by Kenneth Landon of the Department of State and Charles O. Houston, Jr. However, Fall's grave illness (from which he is now recovering) prevented him from completing the preparation of his paper and from attending the meeting. In the emergency his paper was stitched together and read by Dupuy, and it was quite well received despite the circumstances. Butwell's paper was scholarly and comprehensive. Landon gave a thorough comment on both papers, in the course of which he explained that Fall was not anti-French, anti-American or anti-Communist;

he was anti-everything. Houston was not present, sending in his comments from Madrid. These recommended further study and additional sources.

"Borderlands of Eastern Europe: Areas of Ethnic Conflict" was sponsored by the Conference on Slavic and European History. Peter Brock of Columbia University was chairman, and the papers were by Anna M. Cienciala of the University of Toronto, Ivan L. Rudnytsky of LaSalle College, and Gunther E. Rothenberg of the University of New Mexico. Cienciala in "The Role of Danzig in Polish-German Relations, 1933-1939" said that for Poland the "corridor" and the Free City were essential for existence, but the unwillingness of the League and the Western powers to uphold the Danzig statute was the ultimate cause of the Free City's failure. Rudnytsky in "The Carpatho-Ukraine: A People in Search of Their Identity" dealt with alternatives confronting the Carpatho-Ukrainian people in the era of emergent nationalism. Rothenberg in "The Croatian Military Frontier and the Rise of Yugoslav Nationalism" contended that the commonly accepted view that the Croatian military frontier was strongly attached to the Hapsburg dynasty needs reassessment.

Michael B. Petrovich of the University of Wisconsin commented on the need for detailed studies of single areas in East Central Europe. Here the province often forms the most suitable unit rather than the nation. Not ethnic but political and economic differences are at the root of the area's past difficulties.

## II. UNITED STATES HISTORY. (A) Colonial and Early National Periods.

Those interested in the session on "Historical Sites as Historical Documents" appropriately gathered in Congress Hall where once the Congress of the newly formed United States assembled. With John A. Krout of Arizona State University presiding, John D. R. Platt of Independence National Historical Park and Charles B. Hosmer of Principia College presented the main papers. Remarking that historical preservation in the United States was discovered by antiquarians and lodged with historical societies, patriotic organizations, and governmental authorities, Platt chided the professional historians for their fitful interest in the subject and their inclination to ignore the importance of the historic site as a form of source material.

Hosmer dealt with "Mt. Vernon and the Origins of the Historical Preservation Movement in America." Richard P. McCormick of Rutgers University directed his comments to the questions raised by Platt's paper regarding the posture of academic historians toward historic sites. He observed that because academic historians have little antiquarian interest in the past, they tend to ignore historic sites. They also find objectionable the didactic use made of history by preservationists. There is, it would seem, one version of history for the academy and another for the people. Contending that the preservation movement had produced a new and influential medium for the dissemination of "popular history," McCormick urged that the historical profession should interest itself in the movement. Anthony Garvan of the University of Pennsylvania argued that the preservation movement has become more closely allied with political, patriotic and economic interests than with academic research, because it is limited to sites on which one event of great importance has occurred or buildings which have an association with some notable historical figure. Drawing many of his illustrations from Hosmer's paper, he characterized the selection of certain sites as highly arbitrary. Until an unselective description of American regions is commenced, he insisted, neither the patriotic committee nor the isolated bureaucrat, however capable, can check the constant erosion of historic sites or persuade the nation to use the historic sites for historical research and teaching.

A more controversial early American session was held on "American Diplomacy in the Early National Period," chaired by Bradford Perkins of the University of Michigan. The first paper, "The Defiant Secretary of State: Timothy Pickering vs. John Adams," by Alexander DeConde of the University of California at Santa Barbara, was read in DeConde's absence by the chairman. In this paper DeConde maintained that historians have failed to take advantage of the methodological advances made by the behavioral

sciences. These new techniques, he maintained, make more understandable many important historical episodes. Taking the Adams-Pickering quarrel as a test case, DeConde showed how personality conflicts, still incomplete decision-making machinery at the governmental level, and a competition for power led to the break between Adams and Pickering. The second paper, by W. Patrick Strauss of Michigan State University, discussed the role of "United States Naval Officers in American Foreign Policy, 1815-1828." Strauss showed that, in addition to their relatively well-known service as executive agents, naval officers aided American diplomacy by gathering political intelligence, supporting American territorial claims, negotiating commercial treaties and occasionally appointing minor diplomatic officials. Strauss ascribed the federal government's dependence upon naval officers to the absence of a diplomatic corps and to the faith the government reposed in a cohesive, trustworthy naval elite. The two commentators, Stephen G. Kurtz of Wabash College and Norman K. Risjord of DePauw University, concentrated most of their attention upon DeConde's paper, although Risjord also suggested that Strauss overstated the importance of naval officers in the diplomatic process. Both commentators vigorously criticized DeConde for errors of fact in his historical passages and maintained that the author made no integrated use of social science techniques in analyzing the Adams-Pickering episode.

At a session on "Irish Americans and 19th Century Protest" John Hall Stewart of Western Reserve University acted as chairman. The first paper, "Irish Radicals and Jeffersonianism," was to have been presented by Edward C. Carter II of the Philadelphia Athenaeum. Unfortunately, illness prevented Carter from participating, and Caroline Robbins of Bryn Mawr College appeared in his place. Robbins spoke of the significance of Ireland in the development of the political theory of the American Revolution, of the evolution of an Irish anti-colonial, anti-mercantilist attitude, of the championing of civil and religious liberties, and of the influence of Irish migrants in fostering such ideas in the New World. She said that it was really their Anglophobia rather than their nationalism that gave Matthew Carey and his friends much in common with Jefferson and Madison. Thomas N. Brown of Portsmouth Priory followed with a paper on "Parnell and the American Irish," in which he indicated that, although Parnell's contemporaries believed that the Irish Americans contributed much to Parnell's drive towards a self-governing, democratic Ireland, their influence was negligible. Whatever the activity of Irish nationalists in the United States, they were handicapped by a conflict of interests, their desire to be, at one and the same time, rebels and respectable citizens. Their money and propaganda undoubtedly gave Parnell a flexibility that he might not have had otherwise, but they were too much a part of American life to be really influential in Irish domestic policy. The first commentator, Lawrence J. McCaffrey of the University of Illinois, stressed the relatively conservative nature of Irish nationalism, but pointed out that, in the long run, the Irish in America had influenced the ultimate outcome of Irish nationalism. Concluding the formal comments, Robert D. Cross of Columbia University emphasized the way Irish Americans had become preoccupied with the politics of their homeland, and hence were diverted from real trans-Atlantic activity.

Bernard Bailyn of Harvard University gave an interesting reinterpretation of the American revolution in a session entitled "Political Theory and the Origins of the American Revolution." His paper was "Haman and Ahasuerus: On the Conspiratorial Origins of the American Revolution." Richard B. Morris of Columbia University was in the chair and Merrill Jensen of the University of Wisconsin and Clinton Rossiter of Cornell University served as commentators.

"Patterns of American Colonial Trade, 1660-1760" was presided over by Victor L. Johnson of Muhlenberg College. Sister Joan de Lourdes of St. Joseph's College for Women in "New Initiatives and an Old Connection: Colonial Enterprise versus Restoration Empire, 1660-1685," revealed that with the return of Charles II to the throne in May 1660, Englishmen on both sides of the Atlantic looked forward with some uncertainty and great hopefulness to the possibility of a new alliance between trade and politics which would at once make individual fortunes and give England primacy among the nations of western Europe. James Lydon of Duquesne University in "Fish and Flour

for Gold: Southern Europe and the Colonial Balance of Payments," reported the importance of the trade between the English colonies in America and southern Europe in the balance of payments to England. Arthur L. Jensen of Westminster College in "Servants or Masters? Comments on the Relationship between British and American Merchants in Colonial Philadelphia," examined a variety of relationships between the Philadelphia merchants and their British counterparts in the British Isles prior to 1763.

## II. UNITED STATES HISTORY. (B) Nineteenth Century.

At the annual dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, with John Caughey of UCLA presiding, Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky gave a circumstantial account of the beginnings of highly personalized, liberal journalism in the lower Ohio Valley. The battle royal began in 1830 when George D. Prentice came from New England to do a biography of Henry Clay and stayed on almost forty years to edit the Louisville Journal. His chief antagonist was Shadrach Penn of the (Democratic) Advertiser. The practice of journalism in those days called for high-flown rhetoric, diatribe, buffoonery, chicanery, and for being ready for physical combat on or off the field of honor. It also, as Clark emphasized, gave opportunity to stand for principle. Prentice helped set the stage for his protégé and successor, Henry W. Waterson, editor of the Courier-Journal from 1868 to 1918, and for the tradition of courageous, outspoken, and principled journalism that has persisted in Louisville.

A session on "Varieties of Populism" was under the chairmanship of Harvey Wish of Western Reserve University. Robert F. Durden of Duke University, who spoke on "The Populist Ticket of 1896," rejected the idea that the national convention of the People's Party of 1896 was the scene of a conspiracy in which manipulators tricked the Populists into nominating Bryan for president in a clever fusionist strategy. He showed that many of the dramatic circumstances surrounding the Convention, such as the darkened hall and the atmosphere of sinister confusion have been given a wholly misleading interpretation. Walter T. K. Nugent of Indiana University in "The Attractions of Populism" used strikingly new quantitative methods and data to explain why people became Populists. He used a detailed series of quantitative economic comparisons between Republican and Populist officeholders and candidates to show that these two groups were much alike in many social characteristics though different in some economic respects. Economic conditions and political rhetoric seem to have corresponded; thus the Populist self-image as a yeoman farmer is derived from a real mirror of events. But the figures suggested that the attractions of Populism were not only economic, but social-psychological. In a lively discussion, introduced by the commentators and reinforced by questions from the floor, James A. Barnes of Temple University endorsed the general Durden interpretation with some minor exceptions but chose to concentrate on Nugent's quantitative analysis of Populism. His method, he felt, was much more imprecise than a purely social study of human beings would have been; and the paper lacked clear direction. Nugent had not actually discussed why western protesters turned to Populism and he tended to resort to unconvincing psychological explanations at the expense of obvious economic realities behind Populist discontent. Joseph F. Steelman of East Carolina College praised certain notable contributions in Nugent's paper such as the demonstration that Populists were not responsible for the boom and bust aspect of Kansas real estate transactions and were not preoccupied with speculative gains from land purchases and sales. Steelman thought that aside from whatever economic attractions held by Populism was the fact that many of the People's Party were Republicans disappointed over patronage controversies or factional splits in the regular organization. Nugent seemed to him to have drawn a well-balanced picture that stressed rational motives behind Populism and offered a useful antidote to those contemporary historians who read present day reactionary motives into the past by stressing the role of irrationality in political behavior.

At a session on "Law and Society" George L. Haskins of the University of Pennsylvania Law School presided. Three papers were presented and they were commented



on by Earl F. Murphy of Temple University. Peter J. Coleman of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin read a paper on "Some Aspects of the Development of pre-Federal Bankruptcy Law." He argued that the failure of Congress to enact a national bankruptcy law obliged the states to take action in this area, either by perpetuating colonial insolvency laws or by enacting new legislation. The paper of O. Lawrence Burnette, Jr., of Birmingham-Southern College, "The Impact of the Revolution on Criminal Law in the Old South," made the point that the new states of the Revolutionary South inherited from English statute and common law and their colonial experience a patchwork of criminal law which specified over 200 capital offences and which, in protecting property, bore most heavily upon the yeoman whites. Harold M. Hyman of the University of Illinois discussed the sources of the Granger legislation in Illinois on the basis of materials, only recently available, which point up the part played by Sidney Breese and Reuben M. Benjamin in helping to shape conceptions of the modern regulatory commission.

A joint session with the History of Education Society, presided over by Lawrence A. Cremin of Columbia University, considered the shift "from voluntarism to law in American education, 1800-1850." John W. Pratt of the State University of New York (Stony Brook) discussed "religious conflict in the development of the New York City public school system," pointing to the role of political controversy in the movement from private and quasi-public, to public education in the city. Jonathan Messerli of the University of Washington discussed "private and public sponsorship of educational reform in Horace Mann's Massachusetts," criticizing traditional attempts to portray Mann's crusade as either an effort to protect the interests of the propertied classes or an attempt to advance the cause of popular democracy. Commentaries by Timothy Smith of the University of Minnesota and Rush Welter of Bennington College emphasized (1) that the distinction between "public" and "private" education was neither clear nor precise in early nineteenth-century America; (2) that the distinction emerged only gradually, and in the context of related social, political, and intellectual changes; and (3) that a good deal of further research is needed on the history of private and quasi-public education in the early national period if we are to have an adequate view of the development of public education.

## II. UNITED STATES HISTORY. (C) Twentieth Century.

"Image and Reality: The South in the 1920's," a joint session sponsored by the Southern Historical Association, was chaired by Joseph J. Mathews of Emory University. In "The Modern Image of the Savage South," George B. Tindall stressed the 1920's as the seed-time of "a kind of neo-abolitionist image of the benighted South compounded out of elements both old and new." The general thesis of Anne Scott's paper, "The Southern Lady: Image and Reality," was that Southern women, more active politically and socially in the first two decades of the 20th century than generally realized, renewed their hope with enfranchisement and exerted even greater influence upon the life of the South; the extent of this influence has not been determined, but the historian of the recent South must label one of his unfinished tasks "Cherchez la femme." William R. Taylor expressed his appreciation of both papers but felt that some of their assumptions and conclusions were questionable. Had not Tindall arrived at his "monolithic image" of the benighted South by using specialized sources? Taylor felt that the real image was more complex than the one Tindall presented and doubted Tindall's assumption that Southern attempts to alter or improve the image were shaped entirely by the "outside" challenge. As for Scott's paper he expressed doubt whether the influence of Southern women in the twenties was as great as she had suggested and questioned whether it is really possible to treat women as a separate social group as one treats American Negroes and Indians.

"Shame of the Cities Revisited," with Constance McL. Green presiding, had some 400 attending--about fifteen times the number who attended the first AHA session on an urban theme in 1939. Samuel P. Hays of the University of Pittsburgh opened with an analysis of wherein Lincoln Steffens' observations on Pittsburgh's municipal government

of sixty years ago failed to penetrate to the salient facts of the situation, namely the purposes of an ambitious younger generation of industrialists intent on substituting for the parochial splintering of the prevailing ward system a centralized city and school board administration controlled not by popular votes but by "experts" representing the rich and well-born and professional classes. Arthur Dudden of Bryn Mawr College, on the contrary, contended that Steffens' treatment of Philadelphia was basically sound. The journalist, to be sure, left out of account significant reasons for the city's plight--the tangle of jurisdictions that enmeshed her officials, the tripling of her population in the preceding fifty years, and the role in her affairs of state Republican bosses primarily concerned with national politics and maintenance of a high protective tariff. In re-examining Steffens' findings on New York City, Arthur Mann of Smith College called attention to the fact that here were three men in one; the reporter, the mugwump, and eventually the Marxist, convinced that piece-meal tinkering with the machinery of American municipal politics was futile and that only communism supplied an answer. Robert C. Weaver, chief of the Federal Housing and Home Loan Agency, who commented on the papers, announced in so many words that he was not a historian and had no time in which to read up on the past, so that he would talk only about the present and the particulars in which city administration had changed for the better since Steffens' day. Weaver spoke of the publicity that attends any redevelopment proposal and all its detailed ramifications, the reliance on staffs qualified by training and Civil Service examinations, and the careful study always given today to the social consequences of any large-scale plan. An interesting summary, the commentary nevertheless had virtually no connection with the main topic of the session. Most of the questions from the audience during the discussion period were directed to Weaver, an indication perhaps that he rather than the historical problem under analysis was the main attraction for a large proportion of the listeners.

At a session on "Reform and the Progressive Era" Charles Forcey of Rutgers University examined "Progressivism and the Pattern of Reform." He attempted to enlarge upon the wave theory of recurrent reform movements in American history first expounded by Arthur M. Schlesinger. He suggested that the progressive movement, as in the case of other reform expressions, rested essentially on a shift in the mood of the American middle class from political apathy to awareness. Richard Lowitt of Connecticut College discussed "A Neglected Aspect of the Progressive Movement: George W. Norris and the Public Control of Hydro-electric Power, 1913-1917." His paper traced the emergence of the senator's view that public development and control of hydroelectric power was the only approach that protected the public interest. The commentators, Joseph Huthmacher of Georgetown University and William Leuchtenburg of Columbia University agreed that Lowitt's presentation could have been set in a broader perspective. They devoted most of their attention to Forcey's paper. Both questioned the application of cyclical theory to the progressive period, and asked if Forcey did not stress changes in the mood of the middle class to the exclusion of a proper concern with farmers, organized labor, and unorganized urban workers.

At the joint session of the American Jewish Historical Society, the first paper was delivered by Morton Rosenstock of Bronx Community College on "The Role of Biography in American Jewish History." He emphasized the importance of the lives of individuals and the lack of American Jewish biographies, using as a prime example the life and influence of Louis Marshall. Maxwell Whiteman of Dropsie College delivered the second paper, entitled "Problems of Research and Writing," but in fact, a study of Henry Hendricks, one of the major factors in the development of the American copper industry. In discussing the papers, Abraham G. Duker of Yeshiva University objected to the emphasis placed on Marshall, who represented the Jewish elite, rather than on the Jewish proletariat. Malcolm H. Stern of the American Jewish Archives pointed out how many pieces of history evolved from his own genealogical studies, and emphasized the importance of biographies. Edwin Wolf 2nd of the Library Company of Philadelphia served as chairman.

## III. EUROPEAN HISTORY. (A) Ancient and Medieval.

The first session in this category to be presented was "Varieties of Feudalism," under the chairmanship of Edgar Johnson of Brandeis University. The feudal varieties described were not then the varieties of all times and places on the globe but the varieties of a given time within certain specific areas in early medieval France: Champagne, Toulouse and Southern France, A.D. 850-1050, and Normandy, with some comparisons made between Normandy and England. In view of the illness of John Benton of the University of Pennsylvania, his paper on Champagne was read in an authoritative way by his gracious wife who stood beside a map of Champagne and handed out an elaborate genealogy of its counts to the audience. Taking as its point of departure the survey of the fiefs of the County of Champagne of about 1172, revealing the service of over two thousand vassals divided among twenty-six castellanies, each centering on one or more of the castles held directly by the count, (the Champagne of Count Henry the Liberal), the paper argued that the unity which the survey reveals was only a recent achievement, and that beyond the territory controlled directly by his castles the count of Champagne had very little power. Thibaut IV, in the estimate of Benton, was the true founder of the County, the first prince who saw the great economic possibilities in the great fairs which had already been started in some of his towns. In his paper on Toulouse and southern France, A. R. Lewis of the University of Texas disposed of the idea that there might have been much feudalism in the Mid during the period he was discussing. His study of charters made clear that by 900 most land in this part of southern France had come to be held allodially by large and small landholders. Southern French society became militarized by 1050 but it lacked those elements and instincts which we are accustomed to think of as feudal. C. W. Hollister of the University of California at Santa Barbara was concerned primarily with the Norman feudal survey of 1172 and the Bayeu Inquest of 1133. His paper turned out to be an explanation for the fact that although about 1500 knight's fees are recorded in the Inquest of 1172, yet only 581 knight's owed service to the duke. Hollister sought to explain this in terms of the various kinds of French feudal military service, i.e., host service, cheval-hia (equitatio) and arriereban (retrobannus), the French equivalent of the Anglo-Saxon fyrd.

A joint session with the Society for the History of Technology, with Richard H. Shryock as chairman, was devoted to the theme "Technology in the Ancient Near East." In the first of three papers, William F. Albright of the Johns Hopkins University presented "A Survey of Invention in the Ancient Near East." He stated that recent discoveries in this region have been epoch-making for our knowledge of early technology. It now appears that highly skilled crafts, evolved on an empirical basis, were well established in Anatolia as early as the seventh millennium B.C. The second paper was given by John D. Cooney, curator of Ancient Art at the Brooklyn Museum, on "Technical Methods of Detecting Fraud in Ancient Egyptian Works of Art." Citing specific attempts at fraud, Cooney explained the ingenious physical and chemical analyses which are used to unmask even the cleverest imitations of old Egyptian materials. The final paper was read by Louisa Bellinger, Curator-Analyst of the Textile Museum in Washington, D.C., on "Textiles in Ancient Palestine." She explained with slides how the knowledge of individual fibers was so helpful in developing early methods of weaving. She also noted that different materials--linen, cotton, wood--suggested different ways of making cloth. Textiles, because easily carried, throw much light on early trade.

At the session on Byzantine history, of which Kenneth M. Setton of the University of Pennsylvania was chairman, Milton V. Anastos of Dumbarton Oaks presented a searching analysis of the relations of church and state in "The Byzantine Emperor and the Church." Comments were made by Deno Geanakoplos of the University of Illinois and Peter Topping of the University of Cincinnati.

The joint session with the Conference on British Studies was devoted to an evaluation of the two volumes of the Oxford History of England on the later Middle Ages. The paper of Bertie Wilkinson of the University of Toronto dealt with May McKisack's volume on

the fourteenth century. While giving McKisack good marks for her erudition and impressive command of the sources and literature and while not differing too much with her treatment of social, economic, and political history, Wilkinson felt that she gave too little credit to the idealism, statesmanship, and creative political ideas of the fourteenth-century baronage. He also criticized McKisack for her weak section on religious development, especially that dealing with Wycliffe. Paul Murray Kendall of Ohio University read a paper on E. F. Jacob's volume on the fifteenth century. For the most part Kendall was highly critical of the volume, emphasizing its poor organization, the large number of factual and printing errors, and the skimpy treatment given to the Yorkist years. He also felt that Jacob had written a volume which had fallen quite short of what he would call meaningful history. In his comment Bryce Lyon of the University of California at Berkeley supported most of the views of Kendall but criticized him for falling victim to the factual detail he had found so pointless and boring in Jacob's book. Lyon also examined all the Oxford volumes on the pre-1485 period and stated that, except for the Collingwood and Poole volumes, all were weak in organization, highly insular in their approach to English history, and old-fashioned in their concept of history.

### III. EUROPEAN HISTORY. (B) Early Modern.

The joint session with the Society for Italian Historical Studies on "Social and Economic Problems in Italian History" was presided over by Charles F. Delzell of Vanderbilt University and revolved around a variety of socio-economic problems in Venice, Tuscany, and Italy as a whole. James C. Davis of the University of Pennsylvania discussed some of the techniques that facilitated "Conservation of Wealth in the Old Regime: The Case of Venice," paying particular attention to the role of restriction of marriage among the aristocracy. R. Burr Litchfield of Dartmouth College sought to explain how the "Tuscan Nobility in the Eighteenth Century" was less rigid in structure and less unpopular than the noble orders elsewhere in Italy and in northern Europe on the eve of the revolutionary era. Shepard B. Clough of Columbia University underscored the "State's Role in Financing Italian Industrial Development" during the century since unification. He pointed out numerous instances of such intervention during the late nineteenth century, the Fascist regime, and the post-World War II period. Comments on all of the papers were presented by David Herlihy of Bryn Mawr College. Although concurring with most of the contentions in the papers, he raised a question about Clough's suggestion that Italian emigration produced a deleterious effect upon the national economy.

An "early modern" English history topic was discussed at the luncheon meeting of the American Society of Church History, whose vice-president, Albert C. Outler of Southern Methodist University, presided. President Raymond W. Albright was introduced and proceeded to deliver his presidential address--always the "main event" of the annual luncheon. His topic was "Conciliarism in Anglicanism." After tracing the formation and evolution of canon law in medieval England, both in dependence upon the continental canonists and in response to distinctive local circumstances, Albright undertook to show the interactions of English canon law and the conciliarist reformers of the 15th and 16th centuries and the distinctive influence of this interaction in giving the Reformation in England its unique character as an event in English national life. He then surveyed the successive stages by which the Church of England developed a "conciliar temperament," from the Edwardian Homilies and the two Edwardian Prayer Books down to the so-called "Canons of 1603"--and their unfortunate contribution upon the subsequent turmoil of the 17th century.

William J. Bouwsma of the University of California at Berkeley presided over a joint session with the American Society for Reformation Research on the general theme "Councils and Reformation." In the first paper Francis Oakley of Williams College analyzed the conciliar theories of the early 16th century Gallicans Almain and Major; he concluded that, although their positions demonstrate the continuing importance of

conciliarism for European political and constitutional thought, conciliarism had lost its vigor as a movement of religious reform. In his comment Brian Tierney of Cornell University emphasized the importance and quality of recent research on the later conciliar movement. The second paper, by Heiko A. Oberman of Harvard University, argued that the doctrine of justification formulated by the Council of Trent did not exclude all human merit, as has been generally supposed, but, as a result of Scotist influence, leaves some room for merit. The comment by Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale University expressed reservations about both the philological and the hermeneutic arguments in Oberman's paper.

Curt F. Bühler of the Pierpont Morgan Library presided over a meeting devoted to "History and Historians in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century." Each speaker of this session dealt with this theme as it related to a specific area. William J. Bouwsma of the University of California at Berkeley analyzed the situation in Italy. He examined the differing attitudes of the three principal centers of Italian culture (Florence, Rome, and Venice) towards historiography, explaining the peculiar bias of each and the bases for their predilections. In the first city, the writing of history had reached the end of a great tradition; in the second, it had almost become a branch of dogma; while in the third it unexpectedly developed new vigor. He reviewed the work of the principal historical writers, especially Ammirato, Baronius, and Sarpi. F. Smith Fussner of Reed College surveyed the English attitude, specifically the Who, the What, and the Change in British historiography, as evidenced in the writings of the period. Here one may detect the beginnings of discontent with ancient authority expressed by a creative minority. Fussner pointed to the significant growth in the collections of library and archival materials, with the development of a corresponding interest in legal, ecclesiastical and territorial history and in English antiquities. Portugal and Spain came under the scrutiny of Elisabeth F. Hirsch of Trenton State College. For both countries, the sixteenth century was a glorious period of enormous progress, which was naturally reflected in a wealth of historical writing of high quality. The speaker chose to illustrate what went on in Iberia by examining the work of the two pre-eminent historians: the Lusitanian Damiao de Gois and the Spanish Juan de Mariana. The contrasting positions of these two writers towards history was stressed, in that Gois held that facts should speak for themselves, whereas for Mariana they were merely the raw materials from which moral lessons were to be drawn.

A session devoted to "Administration and Politics in Tudor England" was chaired by W. K. Jordan of Harvard University. G. R. Elton of Cambridge University presented a skillful and brilliant survey of the present state of Tudor studies, with a plea for more detailed and likewise more comprehensive attention to the mechanics of governmental administration. He held that we still have much to learn respecting the functioning of the mechanism of government and that a better understanding of this whole great area of historical knowledge would illumine both central and local institutional history. Stanford E. Lehmberg of the University of Texas followed with a detailed report on his investigations of the career of one of the great Tudor administrators, Sir Walter Mildmay. He dealt at some length with Mildmay's interest in financial reforms and sketched out with detail the private as well as the official life of one of the most important of the Elizabethan ministers of state. Perey Zagorin of McGill University commented that Elton in his paper as well as in his writings had perhaps overstated the revolutionary nature of the reforms and extension of early Tudor administration which he found marked by a notably continuous development under the guiding hand of a succession of very strong monarchs.

A session on "Lost Causes" was chaired by Franklin L. Baumer of Yale University. Papers were by Ralph Giesey of the University of Minnesota and Rosalie Colie of the State University of Iowa, with comment by Caroline Robbins of Bryn Mawr College. Giesey's paper dealt with the destruction by Philip II of the so-called "Liberties" of Aragon in the abortive Rebellion of 1591-92. These "Liberties" centered in the office of the Justice of Aragon who was considered to be their guarantor, and consequently when Philip triumphed over the Justice he not only reduced the latter's status to that of

a provincial judge but effectually destroyed Aragon's "Liberty" (i.e., autonomy in the kingdom of Spain. A substantial part of Giesey's paper involved a clever bit of detective work in tracing the historical origins of the liberties which Philip destroyed. Widely believed to have originated in "a single great creative moment" at the time of the Muslim invasion of the eighth century, they in fact grew up much later and were indeed partly mythical, invented or at least not synthesized until the struggle with Philip II in the sixteenth century. Colie's paper similarly dealt with the loss of "True Freedom" in Holland in the late seventeenth century. Just as Philip II destroyed the "Liberties" of Aragon, so William of Orange, beginning in 1672, curtailed Holland's "True Freedom" as defined by John De Witt, the brothers De la Court, and Spinoza. "True Freedom" was a political theory which attempted to define and consolidate the republican freedoms which the Dutch had won during the revolt against Spain. Though it never disappeared completely, it began to recede after William gained his majority and simultaneously with the rising power of the church and the external threat from France and England. In her comments Robbins stressed the fact that the lost "Liberty" of Aragon was a medieval liberty, i.e., an immunity or "state right"; also that belief in freedom is an important phenomenon even though it may be based on myth rather than fact. She further distinguished between Wittian freedom and the kind of freedom advocated by the House of Orange, and asked whether the discussion of freedom in seventeenth-century Holland ought not to be broadened to include the idea of federal freedom.

Felix Gilbert of the Institute for Advanced Study convened a session entitled "New Light on the Medici in Florence." C. C. Bayley of McGill University was not able to be present and his paper was read by his colleague Robert Vogel. Bayley first sketched the early history of the Medici family in the fourteenth century; in describing "The Rise of the Medici" to power in the fifteenth century Bayley analyzed the position of the Medici within the Florentine oligarchy and placed particular emphasis on the close relation between the Medici and some of the leading condottieri of the time. Nicolai Rubinstein of the University of London gave a succinct description of the working of the Florentine government machinery in "The Medici at the Height of Their Power." Rubinstein stressed the republican traditionalism of the Medici; in Rubinstein's view the Medici were most anxious not to change the institutions of the republic. Their chief attention was directed towards finding devices which would reserve the influential government positions to adherents of the regime. Donald Weinstein of Rutgers University in "The Fall of the Medici in 1494" tried to show that the overthrow of the regime could not be ascribed only, as it is usually done, to the personal defects and failures of Piero Medici; already in his father's, Lorenzo's, time, largely for financial reasons, the Medici had become dependent on the Pope so that Piero was not able to disentangle himself from the alliance with Alexander VI and Naples. Weinstein suggested, however, that in Piero's time the ruling oligarchy split into two opposing groups.

"Central Europe and the Enlightenment" was the subject of a joint session sponsored by the Conference Group for Central European History. Oron J. Hale of the University of Virginia presided. William E. Wright of the University of Minnesota spoke on "The Philosophes and Joseph II." He pointed out that while Joseph II and the philosophes were in agreement on many points, the latter did not lavish praise on the Austrian monarch as they did on his contemporaries Frederick of Prussia and Catherine of Russia. The coolness of the philosophes toward Joseph resulted from their disillusionment with absolute monarchy as the vehicle of reasoned reform and renovation, and in Joseph's case from the development and employment of the Leviathan state as the vehicle of change and reform. While his reforms fell within the range of their ideology, they were repelled by Joseph's despotic procedures. Herman Weill of the University of Rhode Island discussed "Prussian Judicial Reform and the Enlightenment," taking the position that Frederick II of Prussia conformed to the philosophes' definition of the enlightened ruler, especially in the matter of reform of judicial administration and advancement of the principle of the rule of law. His thesis was supported by contrasting the conditions prevailing in the Prussian courts under Frederick William I and the reforms instituted by his son Frederick the Great. While legal reform and codification

were important, the heart of the problem was the abolition of corruption and bribery, sale of judicial offices, and reform of court procedure. In using his absolute powers to reform the administration of justice, Frederick conformed to the Enlightenment's image of a philosopher king. "Enlightened Influences on Austro-Prussian Military Practice," by William O. Shanahan of the University of Oregon, said that while the age condemned senseless wars, the employment of force was by no means repudiated. War was a juridical act, justified by moral purpose when employed to enforce a legal right or principle. An enlightened officers' corps was the product of the new military schools in the German states, including Prussia. The new ideas also found expression in an extensive literature of military science. The "learned officer" became the source of Prussia's revival after Jena and Auerstadt as well as the ancestor of the Prussian concept of an officer in the nineteenth century. The intellectual style of the "learned officer" was not absorbed into the Hapsburg military tradition. Walter M. Simon of Cornell University, the commentator, suggested that lack of approval of Joseph's work of renovation may have been due to the fact that many of the leading lumières had passed from the stage by 1790. And with regard to Frederick of Prussia, the rule of law was hardly fully established when the sovereign and his office were exempt from the principle.

### III. EUROPEAN HISTORY. (C) Modern.

Two modern European sessions met on the first morning. One was sponsored by the American Catholic Historical Association as a joint session. Presided over by Lynn M. Case of the University of Pennsylvania, it dealt with "Liberal Catholicism and Franco-American Relations in the 1860's." Walter D. Gray of the University of Notre Dame discussed "Edouard de Laboulaye as Liberal Catholic and Americanist during the Second Empire." Gray stressed particularly Laboulaye's advocacy of freedom of conscience for Catholics as for all men and of the separation of church and state. To Laboulaye the United States was the favorite example of these objectives as well as of sound and practical government and he was also a great admirer of the American Unitarian, William Ellery Channing. The second paper by Arnold Blumberg of Towson State College discussed "George Bancroft, France, and the Vatican, 1866-1870." Blumberg brought out that Bancroft denounced Napoleon III and Pius IX for their sympathy with the South during the Civil War and their involvement in the Mexican expedition. Bancroft was also a great admirer of Bismarck, Protestant Prussia, and the German federal system. As minister to Prussia he sided with that country against France in the Franco-Prussian War. Sister M. Caroline Ann Gimpl of Marylhurst College commented that neither paper showed much connection between liberal Catholicism and diplomatic relations.

A joint meeting with the American Society of Church History was devoted to discussions of the Vatican Councils I and II. This session, of central importance in the three-day consideration of the Church History Society's general theme, "The Significance of the Church Councils," proved to be most exciting. Speaking on "The Vatican Council I and the Crisis of the Times," Emiliana P. Noether of Regis College said that this Council can be properly understood only when seen against the background of nineteenth-century conflict between the Church and an increasingly secular society. Threatened by new political and intellectual movements, the Church faced dissension among liberal Catholics pressing for internal changes and reforms. To reaffirm and to strengthen papal leadership and authority, Pius IX determined to convene a general Church Council. The Council opened on December 8, 1869 and, despite internal opposition, external criticisms, and attempts at interference by Bavaria, France, and Austria, remained in session until July 18, 1870, when it proclaimed papal infallibility. It then recessed until the fall. However, overwhelmed by international developments and the complete loss of his temporal domain, Pius IX suspended the Council on November 20, 1870. Albert C. Outler of Southern Methodist University in "The Vatican Council II--Two in One" portrayed this Council as a massive experiment in self-examination on the part of the Roman Catholic Church. He described the constructive influences on this

Council by Pope John XXIII and Pope Paul VI, calling the latter a Lincoln-like character, "one who favors reforms, but is unwilling to impose them." Since the first session of the Council was largely devoted to planning and outlining the major documents, the schema to be considered, Outler analyzed the positions of the liberal and conservative parties which became clear in the spirited discussions in the second session which concluded last December. He admitted that there were complex influences from the political and social world scene as well as from within the church itself which have at least temporarily delayed the Council's action. Two major pronouncements on liturgical revisions and Christian communication have been approved and Outler optimistically reported that the members of the Council-in-recess are already hard at work in abbreviating and clarifying the remaining schema which will probably be approved when the third session convenes next fall. Less optimistic was the outlook of James Hastings Nichols of the Princeton Theological Seminary, who commented on this paper. Nichols contended that the majority of liberal bishops in the Council were not being frustrated by the Curia and that the Council can hardly be considered an example of "collegiality" but rather as a privy council of a monarch. Further discussion revealed doubt that the Council can be considered ecumenical since it has repudiated neither Trent nor Vatican I in which final authority and infallibility were asserted. Raymond W. Albright of the Episcopal Theological School and the president of the American Society of Church History presided at this session.

The session on "French Society of the Louis Philippe Era" had Frederick B. Artz of Oberlin College as chairman. David H. Pinkney of the University of Missouri read a paper on "The Crowd in the French Revolution of 1830." Using police records and indemnity applications, he was able to make some definite statements about the nature of the participants in the fighting. He pointed out that the crowd did not represent either unskilled proletarians or criminal elements, but was made up chiefly of skilled craftsmen, printers, and small shopkeepers. Doctors, lawyers, teachers, and members of the middle and higher bourgeoisie played little part in the street fighting. In a paper on "The Church and Social Changes 1815-50," Raymond Grew of Princeton University showed extended work of the Church to help workers get jobs and to give technical training to young workers. The Church was aware of the maladjustments due to changes in agriculture and industry and made great efforts to help the working classes. In commenting Elizabeth L. Eisenstein of the American University ranged up and down nineteenth-century French history and even sought perspectives in the earlier centuries, especially to show the role of ideas transmitted orally from generation to generation and to show the role of urban dwellers and intellectuals in political upheavals.

The Modern European Section of the Association had its traditional luncheon meeting, under the chairmanship of Gordon A. Craig of Stanford University. Felix Gilbert of the Institute For Advanced Study gave the luncheon address, "The Establishment of 'Professional History' in the Nineteenth Century." Gilbert was chiefly concerned with the "history of the professor of history." Before the end of the eighteenth century, history was usually taught in connection with other fields, particularly with moral philosophy. The creation of professorships exclusively devoted to instruction in history and the establishment of history as an independent field of study was the result of developments in the nineteenth century and originally motivated by the increasing attention given after the French Revolution by the European governments to civic education. But it was also of great significance that the governments undertook to continue the great research enterprises which, in the eighteenth century, corporate organizations like religious orders had carried out and which had been interrupted by the developments of the French Revolution. The governments entrusted the direction of these research enterprises to the professor of history. Teaching and research became closely combined. Gilbert tried to show that some features of nineteenth-century historiography, particularly the emphasis which some of the greatest nineteenth-century historians placed on the value of knowledge of history for morality, can be better understood if viewed in the light of the old tradition which connected history with moral philosophy. Gilbert also pointed out that willingness to judge was an inherent element in the historian's task.



Another session devoted to nineteenth-century European history was "Two Approaches to Russian Economic Development, 1801-1861," presided over by Cyril E. Black of Princeton University. In the opening paper William L. Blackwell of New York University discussed the views of Admiral Mordvinov, whose career in the upper echelons of government spanned the entire reign of Alexander I and most of that of Nicholas I. In his writing Admiral Mordvinov developed a broad program for the transformation of Russian society from an agrarian to an industrial base, and as bureaucrat and civic leader he achieved some of his objectives. The reform of currency, encouragement of scientific agriculture, development of canal and railroad transportation, and expansion of trade with Asia accomplished during his lifetime owed much to his personal initiative. As a private citizen, he also pressed successfully for an empire-wide vaccination program and for the establishment of the first private insurance company. He never succeeded, however, in overcoming the barrier to reform represented by a conservative state that was concerned principally with finding the resources to meet the burden of military expenses. The second paper, presented by Walter M. Pinmer of Cornell University, was concerned with the views and policies of Count Kankrin who served as Minister of Finance from 1823 to 1844. The main focus of his interest, in contrast to that of Admiral Mordvinov, was to conserve the limited resources at his disposal with a view to balancing his annual budget. Count Kankrin was therefore attracted only to those reforms that promised an immediate increase in revenue, and he even went so far as to oppose the construction of railroads until he was overruled by Nicholas I. Count Kankrin was nevertheless not entirely out of touch with the spirit of the times, and should be credited with the establishment of the Journal of Manufacturing and Trade, the initiation of periodic industrial exhibitions in St. Petersburg and Moscow, and the founding of the Practical Technological Institute. In his comments, Sidney Monas of the University of Rochester commended the two papers for undermining the cliché of the economic stagnation of Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century. He noted that both Soviet and American historiography had reversed their positions in regard to this period since the 1930's, and he reflected on the role of perception and consciousness in the attitudes of political leaders.

Another primarily nineteenth-century session was "Organization and Agitation in England, 1780-1850," over which William O. Aydelotte of the State University of Iowa presided. Eugene Black of Brandeis University argued, in opposition to the usual interpretation, that even during the era of the French Revolution and Napoleon there were notable advances in England in the forms and goals of extraparliamentary agitation and in the continued expansion of a politically conscious and active public. The efforts of the London Corresponding Society, he held, bore fruit in the metropolitan elections in the first decade of the nineteenth century. Even the Proclamation Society and the Society for the Suppression of Vice played a significant role in continuing the education of the British public and thus paving the way for later agitation and reform. Naomi Churgin of Hunter College discussed the career and achievements of John Cartwright, the organizations through which he worked, and the development and refinement of his techniques of political propaganda. The commentator, A. R. Schoyen of Syracuse University, addressed himself principally to Black's paper and explained his grounds for regarding the account it gave as being, in certain important respects, overoptimistic.

A session entitled "European Industrialists and Social Change," was under the chairmanship of Franklin D. Scott of Northwestern University. The first paper, "The French Industrialist and Control of Enterprise, 1820-1848," by Peter N. Stearns of the University of Chicago, emphasized the desire of industrialists to impose order and control in the economy. This desire for control by individuals and families was so strong during the first period of significant mechanization that it sometimes took precedence over the profit motive. But control was difficult to achieve because of intense competition, changes in technology, and changes in consumer preference. The paper by Gerald D. Feldman of the University of California at Berkeley dealt with "German Industrialists and the Trade Unions, 1890-1918: the Origins of the Stinnes-Legien Agreement." This

paper studied the origins of the agreement of November 15, 1918, which marked the breakdown of the employer resistance to collective bargaining. The paper sought to demonstrate that the agreement was a deliberate effort by both heavy industry and the trade unions to assume joint control over the economy to the exclusion of government, parliament, and soldiers' and workers' councils.

### III. EUROPEAN HISTORY. (D) Twentieth Century.

"Germany: From Empire to Republic" was presided over by Hans W. Gatzke of Johns Hopkins University. The first paper, by John L. Snell of Tulane University, dealt with "Imperial Germany's Lost Decade, 1904-1914." Snell concluded that Wilhelmian Germany's neglect to introduce a more democratic system of government before 1914, was "one of the more important failures in modern history." The responsibility lay first and foremost with William II and his chancellors; secondly, with Imperial Germany's "persistent particularism" and its fear that democracy was synonymous with centralization; and thirdly, with the bourgeois parties who, at best, were only lukewarm toward democratic reform. The second paper, presented by Henry Cord Meyer of Pomona College, discussed "Naumann and Rathenau: Their Way to the Republic." The tragedy of both these men, Meyer held, was "that they were out of step with their times." Klaus Epstein of Brown University commented on both papers. He disagreed with Snell's view that democratization in Prussia and the Reich could have been achieved through gradual evolution and instead maintained that only the discrediting effect of military defeat could break the hold of the Junker oligarchy. With respect to Naumann and Rathenau, Epstein stressed the many differences between the two men and agreed with Meyer's evaluation of Rathenau, whose martyrdom was perhaps the greatest service he rendered to the new German republic.

"The British Labour Party: The Conflict between Social Ideals and Practical Politics" had as chairman Samuel C. McCulloch of San Francisco State College. The two papers presented provided strikingly different approaches to the issue posed. Philip P. Poirier of Ohio State University gave a detailed study of one crucial development (the reaction to the Osborne Decision of 1909) and an analysis of Labour strategy and tactics revolving in large measure about the implications of that judgment. He showed how the parliamentary position of the Labour party was an exceedingly difficult one, and how it remained a tail wagged by the massive Liberal bulldog. Richard W. Lyman of Stanford University offered a wide-ranging commentary on the two major lines of analysis of Labour party history between the wars. He found the orthodox version overoptimistic in that it conceals the contradictions within the party and overemphasizes accidents and exceptional circumstances in explaining Labour's failures between wars. He pointed out that the Left interpretation emphasizes all that has been wrong with the past history of the Labour party. Henry R. Winkler of Rutgers University, as commentator, pointed up the conclusions reached and disagreed with Lyman over the orthodox version of the history. Winkler considered the interwar history almost consistently disastrous, the tale of missed chances and opportunistic goals and one in which excessive devotion to parliamentary methods led to the effective rejection of most of what socialism stood for. He showed, also, how both the papers brought out the complex character of the Labour party and the story of tension among its various elements. He concluded that the conflict between socialistic ideals and practical politics was less real to the leaders of the party than to their critics and actually a matter of definition.

"Left and Right in France in the Thirties," chaired by Gordon Wright of Stanford University, focused on contemporary and retrospective judgments of the Popular Front episode. Joel Colton of Duke University, in his paper "The Blum 'New Deal': an Appraisal," surveyed the economic and psychological problems confronting Blum and concluded that the experiment was, at best, only a qualified success. Although Blum did prove that Socialists could govern France "without the sky falling," he also proved

himself to be the captive of his own formulas. His habit of thinking in the rigid categories of capitalism and socialism prevented him from transforming the old system in the way that a less doctrinaire New Dealer--Franklin D. Roosevelt--had managed to do. Samuel M. Osgood of Drexel Institute of Technology spoke on "The Front Populaire: Views from the Right," directing his attention to the attitudes of the middle and upper bourgeoisie in 1936-37. The extreme right's politics of hate, according to Osgood, did contribute to the failure of the Popular Front, but was not a major factor in that failure. Most bourgeois Frenchmen adopted a less virulent stance of hostility toward Blum; yet their attitude also helps to explain the impermanence of the Popular Front. John C. Cairns of the University of Toronto commented on the two papers and took particular issue with a number of Colton's judgments.

#### IV. OTHER. (A) Asian History.

"Constitutional Movements in Asia" had Woodbridge Bingham of the University of California at Berkeley presiding. He introduced the topic of the session by remarking that constitutions in Asia were largely a twentieth-century phenomenon. Only in Turkey (1876) and in Japan (1889) were there any constitutions in Asia before 1900. In the three countries discussed in this session traditions of royalty and lack of constitutional rights for the peoples continued until the twentieth century. Robert H. G. Lee of Columbia University read a paper on "The Constitutional Movement in China during the Early Twentieth Century." China's weakness at the end of the nineteenth century was laid to the political system which seemed incapable of producing leaders. Those who advocated a constitutional monarchy looked to the British system in which "the local gentry" governed through the House of Commons. Nikki R. Keddie of the University of California at Los Angeles read a paper on "Iranian Constitutional Revolution, 1905-1911." The constitutional movement in Iran brought to a head grievances against the Kajar dynasty and against British and Russian exploitation of Iran religious leaders (the ulama); intellectuals influenced by the West and city populations united in opposing the government and in demanding a Constitution. B. G. Gokhale of Wake Forest College read a paper on "Communal Representation and Constitutional Development in India." In the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909, the British introduced the principle of communal representation. Muslims were given the right to separate electorates which they demanded; thus self-government through the rule of a parliamentary majority on western lines became impossible. Hyman Kublin of Brooklyn College commented. He pointed out the value for comparative study of the Japanese experience in constitution-making. Differences in methodological approach were apparent in the three papers. In the case of China the problem of labels ("constitutionalists," "traditionalists," etc.) presents itself. Kublin saw a need for more clarification of "programs" in China, class analysis in Iran, and details on the actual communal situation in India. He also pointed out the danger of projecting today's values into past situations. He questioned the judgments of "success" or "failure" in the cases presented.

The luncheon meeting of the Conference on Asian History had as chairman Robert Van Niel of Russell Sage College. Harry J. Banda of Yale University read a paper entitled "Modern Indonesia under the Historian's Looking Glass." Indicating the basic configurations of Indonesian history during the past two centuries, the speaker noted the tendency to develop historical categories premised upon the features of Western influence upon the archipelago. This interpretation has placed the emphasis upon change rather than continuity in Indonesian history. As a result, the relationship of standard historical narratives to the country's current situation gives the observer the impression that a great tragedy of errors is occurring in Indonesia and that the historical developments and progressions which had been guided by the West are being negated. More accurate and comprehensible, however, would be a reappraisal of our historical assessments which have exaggerated the impact of Western concepts upon the society and growth of Indonesia.

At a session on "Far Eastern Diplomacy," the chairman was Maurice Matloff of the Department of the Army. Kwang-Ching Liu of University of California at Davis presented the first paper, "The Korean Policies of Li Hung-chang, 1871-1885." He dealt with the relationships of China and Korea in the diplomacy of the late Ch'ing dynasty and offered a reinterpretation of China's Korean policies based on his fresh examination of Chinese sources in the period. The second paper, presented by William R. Braisted of the University of Texas, was entitled "China, the United States Navy and the Bethlehem Steel Company, 1909-1922." It dealt with a phase of American experience in Far Eastern diplomacy in the decade that saw the end of the Ch'ing dynasty and the rise of the Chinese republic. Basing his interpretation largely on State Department and Navy Department files, he traced the evolution of an "unusual" naval building contract concluded in 1911 between China and the Bethlehem Steel Company and its subsequent story amid "the buffets of politics, war and revolution" in the following decade. The third paper, presented by Walter Hermes of the Department of the Army was "Soldiers Become Diplomats: The Military Role in the Korean Truce Negotiations." Based largely on his research in military sources, it described American military experience with diplomacy in a limited war in the era of the cold war. He described how United States military representatives learned to cope with the enemy over the conference table through two years of negotiations. The commentators were Chong-sik Lee of the University of Pennsylvania and Theodore Ropp of Duke University. Ropp raised questions about the role of the Bethlehem Steel Company and of such individuals as Commander Irving Gillis of the United States Navy involved in the contract negotiations. He noted the political maturity of American military by the time of the Korean War.

#### IV. OTHER. (B) Latin American History.

The Conference on Latin American History took advantage of the attractive invitation of the University of Pennsylvania Museum and treated itself to a Hispanic menu in the surroundings of the Museum's impressive archeological collections. Charles Gibson of the State University of Iowa presided. The luncheon speaker, John Tate Lanning of Duke University, reading a paper on "The Hispanist of the American Historical Association," reviewed the development of the Conference and of the Hispanic American Historical Review within the Association. In spirited and humorous style, Lanning contrasted the reputation and professional prestige of Hispanic subjects in the nineteenth century with those of today, pointed out the failure of Latin Americanists to make education instructive, and connected these with modern United States attitudes and policies toward Latin America.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the Conference on Latin American History, on "The Crisis of Colonialism in Latin America, 1763-1818," followed. Hugh M. Hamill, Jr. of the University of Connecticut presided. Speaking on "Bourbon Loyalty and the Guatemalan Aristocracy, 1773-1818," Troy S. Floyd of the University of New Mexico indicated that Guatemalan attitudes of the period prior to independence were less passive than has been generally supposed. The Guatemalan aristocracy adopted liberal positions in the late eighteenth century, successfully modifying the crown's fiscal policies, gaining self esteem, and endorsing constitutional monarchism in an enlightened context. In the second paper, "The Nuevo Reino de Granada between Rebellion and Revolution, 1782-1808," Robert L. Gilmore of Ohio University described the condition of the post-comunero colony, the congregation, the economic situation of rising prices and export of specie, and various incidents resulting in the reinforcement of the military. Gilmore concluded that Nueva Granada had the makings of crisis in this period, but that the true crisis was not in the colony but in Spain. In commentaries, Moisés González Navarro of the Colegio de México questioned to what extent one may speak of a true "aristocracy" in Guatemala, and Robert J. Shafer of Syracuse University pointed to the general problem of internal and external factors in prerevolutionary Latin America, where external pressures brought additional strains on internal conditions.

In the session on "Ideology and Reality: Liberalism in Latin America, 1850-1880," Ricardo Donoso of the Sociedad Chilena de Historia y Geografía and Harvard University served as chairman. Charles A. Hale of Amherst College spoke on "Mexico: The Structure and Orientation of Liberalism." Hale sought an objective view of Mexican liberalism through a comparison with European liberalism, finding similarities between Mora and French constitutional liberals. The key difference between liberals and conservatives in Mexico Hale found in the liberals' utilitarianism, and he identified the continuity of liberalism from the earlier period to the period after 1867 in positivism, which preserved the spirit of the early utilitarianism. Speaking on "Argentina: Innovators and Imitators," James R. Scobie of the University of California at Berkeley observed that Argentine liberalism, which originated as a mixture of European ideas, developed into a coherent doctrine during the fifteen years of liberal exile. The doctrines of liberalism were programmatically expressed in the constitution of 1853, after which liberalism became identified with the material progress of the nation and lost touch with the earlier ideals. Richard Graham of Cornell University, speaking on "Brazil: Liberalism and the Onset of Modernization," observed that Brazilian liberalism developed very slowly in the first half of the nineteenth century and had practically disappeared again by 1850. The new liberals of the 1860's and 1870's were concerned with economic change, social reform, and modernization, but realizing that the state had to be the instrument of these reforms, they reverted to the political concentration of the earlier liberals. In his commentary Joseph R. Barager of the University of Pennsylvania pointed out the diversities of liberalism in the three areas. More than the speakers, he emphasized the Spanish tradition in Mexico and Argentina and the effects of the Paraguayan War in Argentina and Brazil.

#### IV. OTHER. (C) Canadian History.

The session sponsored by the Joint Committee of the American Historical Association and the Canadian Historical Association was under the chairmanship of C. P. Stacey of the University of Toronto. The subject was "French-Canadian Nationalism." Illness prevented Laurier La Pierre of McGill University from being present, and his paper, "The Evolution of French-Canadian Nationalism to 1896," was read by the chairman. It pointed out that the foundations of French-Canadian nationalism were laid before 1760. Until the American Revolution, this nationalism was dedicated to emancipation; thereafter, however, its task was survival. The second paper, "French-Canadian Nationalism in the Twentieth Century," was by Mason Wade of the University of Rochester. He pointed out that by the turn of the century two categories of French-Canadian nationalism had emerged, one "truly national in the Pan-Canadian sense," the other essentially provincial. The latter had been most active in periods when French Canadians tended to lose confidence in the Canadian partnership. Blair Neatby of the University of British Columbia commented.

#### IV. OTHER. (D) African History.

"Nineteenth-Century Africa" had Philip D. Curtin of the University of Wisconsin as chairman. The three contributions to the session dealt with aspects of African history during the "pre-colonial century," when the Europeans began to have some influence on African affairs but before the full impact of the European conquests. James E. Duffy of Brandeis University said in "The Abolition of Slavery in Portuguese Africa" that as the Portuguese sought to adjust to foreign and humanitarian demands for the abolition of slavery, they were asked to bring about a social revolution in their African colonies. The response was to abolish the legal status of slavery in 1878. But the reality of forced African labor was continued under new guises, and the social revolution was postponed. Jean H. Kopytoff of Swarthmore College took up an aspect of West African history where the European factor was less prominent. Her paper on "Liberated Africans and the Making of Nigeria" treated the role of those who were first sold as slaves, then recaptured by British cruisers, landed in Sierra Leone, and subjected to missionary

instruction. Many returned to Nigeria after years or decades of contact with the West. When they did so, they were not merely the "poor imitations" of Western man, as they were often depicted at the time. Instead, they acted by choice to preserve much of their own civilization, while borrowing some aspects of European culture. The resulting amalgam was the first foreshadowing of modern Nigeria. William A. Brown of the University of Wisconsin discussed "Conflicting Views of the Masina Revolution"--thus moving the focus to an aspect of African history well beyond the range of European influence. He exposed some of the complexity and interest of a developing field of historical scholarship by dealing critically with some of the texts on which our accounts of the Fulbe jihad in Masina are based. Among other things, he showed that many of the oral traditions that have been printed uncritically are in fact *ex parte* political tracts. Full assessment of the revolution must therefore rest on more sophisticated critical analysis than historians have applied to it so far.

#### V. HISTORICAL THEORY, PROBLEMS, AND METHODOLOGY.

Crane Brinton of Harvard University took the chair of a session entitled "History and Theory" and featuring papers by George H. Nadel of the Warburg Institute, London, and Frank E. Manuel of Brandeis University. Their papers were, respectively, "The Rise and Fall of the Example Theory of History" and "Ixion's Wheel: Varieties of Cyclical Theory." Nadel discussed the history of the "example theory" whereby history served as the "empirical part of moral science" and was justified only insofar as the facts it brought forth could contribute to right moral teachings and conduct. He traced the theory from its ancient origins through to the middle and second half of the eighteenth century, at which time it declined, and he gave special consideration to Bolingbroke as an example of the "example theory." He concluded by showing why the professionalization of history, with the development of the idea of studying historical facts for their own sake, brought the downfall of the "example theory." Manuel traced the broad outlines in the transformation of the idea of historical cycle since the Renaissance, with rich and exciting allusions to many specific authors and their works. Some of the Renaissance and early modern writers, he pointed out, controlled the whole historical literature of their time.

Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania chided the American Studies Association luncheon meeting with the question, "Why So Much Pessimism?" Nichols said: "If our democratic culture is in the throes of an unnamed revolution, it is surely so because of many influences with a long history, a history of which we are still painfully ignorant. The dispelling of this ignorance is our responsibility and surely no one can conceive a greater challenge. . . . Society needs something and we alone can provide a major element in it. This something is a comprehensive synthesis of past behaviour which illuminates the present and future. This synthesis will concentrate on a conceptualization to make possible the recording of the evolution of the image of our society or any civilization in question which is the joint responsibility of the historian and the cultural analyst. For this task we need a new training. . . . With a new sense of our own intellectual significance we shall feel the glow of optimism returning to us as we realize we are standing on the threshold of discoveries which may reveal to man a new sense of capacity."

Marc Szeftel of the University of Washington addressed the Conference on Slavic and East European History on "Some Reflections on the Particular Features of Russian Historical Development." He tried to show why the Russian historical development was, at certain periods, different from that of Western Europe. Francis Dvornik of Dumbarton Oaks-Harvard University was chairman of the meeting.

Arthur Bestor of the University of Washington told a luncheon meeting of the Society of American Archivists that a master newspaper repository of all the newspapers in the United States is "the greatest research need of all." Such a central repository would furnish quickly on microfilm "any issue for any day." He suggested in his talk on archival sources of the future that a publishers' association might be the financial backer in setting up such a repository.

A joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association met under the chairmanship of John Higham of the University of Michigan to discuss "The Tasks of Research in American History." All three speakers dealt with general strategies of research, and all were concerned with the impact of the contemporary social disciplines on the study of the past. Thomas C. Cochran of the University of Pennsylvania concentrated on ways and means of utilizing quantitative techniques and data, suggesting how gradual changes in basic socio-economic institutions can be detected, how statistical correlations and classifications can be established, and how statistics that are already available on such subjects as migration can be milked for new meanings. David M. Potter of Stanford University addressed himself to the conceptual value of contemporary social thought in analyzing the past. He argued that social and psychological problems rather than political and economic ones are uppermost in our consciousness today and must therefore command increasing historical attention. As a result, emphasis is shifting from rational to non-rational motivation; but historians have no adequate criteria as yet for preferring one explanation to the other. C. Vann Woodward of Yale University expressed a genial and witty skepticism about the durability and historical adequacy of many theories currently in vogue among social scientists. He recommended less humility on the part of historians and a more actively critical examination of sociological and anthropological theories.

For "Psychology and History" Donald Fleming of Harvard University served as chairman. Richard L. Schoenwald of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology gave a paper entitled "A Psychological Approach to Intellectual History." He said that no longer can the intellectual historian content himself with tracing the origin of ideas to other ideas. That technique does not explain why one particular individual rather than another formulated a particular concept. It also does not account for the acceptance of an idea. To grasp how men fashion ideas, and how men respond to those creations, the intellectual historian now must use the complex hypotheses and result of modern psychology: not intuition or common sense, but intricately detailed structures such as psychoanalysis (in both its classical and later versions, and among the latter, ego psychology is particularly helpful), social psychology, and learning theory. The mind produces ideas; the best way to understand the development and meaning of ideas is to examine the activity of the minds which produced ideas, and modern psychology makes available powerful techniques for investigating that activity. The task of intellectual historians thus becomes the writing of the history of the mind. Findings from two projects illustrated these contentions: a study of why Freud discovered psychoanalysis, and an inquiry into the life of Herbert Spencer. Next Donald B. Meyer of the University of California at Los Angeles discussed "Psychology and Political History." He said that politics may remain the appropriate focus for historical study whether or not political action was as important as the older history tended to indicate. The focus of historical studies would seem to be men's efforts to gain control over their own lives, whether successful or not, and politics manifests these efforts in their most systematic and deliberate forms. Helen Merrell Lynd of Sarah Lawrence College commented that in Langer's 1957 presidential address he said that historians have shunned psychology for three reasons: (1) every historian wants to be his own psychologist; (2) any psychology used should be a psychology of reason, ignoring "irrational" aspects of behavior; (3) historians have feared that a humanistic explanation would give way to the calculating machine. To these three reasons she added two others: (1) the fear that use of psychology may lay undue stress on the individual in history, and (2) that use of psychology will divert attention from other essentials for historical understanding.

An unprogrammed meeting on "Peace Research" was chaired by Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin. It was called by Curti, Frederick B. Tolles of Swarthmore College, Edwin B. Bronner of Haverford College, and Arthur Waskow of the Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, to discuss whether questions relating to peace and disarmament could be approached by historians in ways that could contribute more to understanding the problems involved than has been the case heretofore. The meeting developed a lively discussion of the problems involved and the areas of research which

might be fruitful. In view of the evident interest of those present in further pursuit of the matter a committee was named including Curti, Tolles, and Waskow to spearhead the organizing of a Peace Research Group. Waskow agreed to be the channel for inquiries and arrangements. His address is Institute for Policy Studies, 1900 Florida Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Crane Brinton's presidential address, "Many Mansions," has been printed in full in the January 1964 issue of the Review.

At the annual Association luncheon the guest of honor, Boyd C. Shafer, former Executive Secretary, was loudly applauded for his address, "History in the United States: Some Doubts and Affirmations." In it he described particular debates of historians during the last thirty and especially the last ten years, e.g., humanist versus social scientist, philosopher versus practicing historian, "presentist" versus "pastist." These debates, he thought, were too often of the "white and unwhite" variety, reflected thinking of a time of scarcity when a Ricardian iron law of learning seemed to apply, and now, in this time of affluence, hampered realization of the heavenly city of the twentieth-century historian. History is endless argument, he said, and if the old dialogues are outworn, none need fear that any historian or philosopher will become king. History needs all serious workers.

University of Pennsylvania.

HILARY CONROY.

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION THE SHERATON HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA DECEMBER 27, 1963 10:00 A.M.

Present at the meeting were Crane Brinton, President; Julian P. Boyd, Vice President; Elmer Louis Kayser, Treasurer; W. Stull Holt, Executive Secretary; Councilors Robert F. Byrnes, John W. Caughey, W. Clement Eaton, Charles F. Mullett, Gaines Post, Gordon Wright; and former Presidents Samuel Flagg Bemis, Carl Bridenbaugh, and Bernadotte Schmitt. Abraham P. Nasatir, President of the Pacific Coast Branch; Walter Rundell, Jr., Assistant Executive Secretary; and Henry Winkler were also present.

The minutes of the October 1963 meeting of the Council, which had been distributed by mail, were approved without reading.

The President proposed and the Council instructed the Executive Secretary to send a telegram expressing best wishes to former President William L. Langer who was in a hospital recovering from an operation.

The report of the Executive Secretary and Managing Editor of the Review was not read as copies of this report were distributed and would be read at the Business Meeting. The report of the Treasurer which also had been distributed was not read for the same reason.

There was a long discussion about the position of Executive Secretary and the names of a number of scholars were considered. A plan of action was approved by the Council.

The Treasurer and Executive Secretary discussed the proposed revision of the budget for 1963-1964 and the proposed budget for 1964-1965. The two budgets were approved as submitted on a motion by Carl Bridenbaugh which was unanimously approved. Two questions of policy were raised by the budget and were decided by the Council. The salary of Walter Rundell, Jr., was to be increased in 1964-1965 by the amount the Association had been contributing to a life insurance policy for him, and hereafter life insurance was not to be included among the fringe benefits for the staff of the Association. The other issue of policy involved a suggestion that the life membership of President John F. Kennedy should be granted as a memorial to him to all future Presidents of the United States. The suggestion was not adopted.



For the Pacific Coast Branch its President, Abraham P. Nasatir, reported on its activities. A complete report of the Branch is printed in this Annual Report.

The Executive Secretary nominated and the Council confirmed the appointment of Robert Palmer as a member of the Board of Editors of the Review to replace Leo Gershoy whose term expired, and Gordon Craig and John W. Hall. These last two represented an increase in the Board from six to eight in order to cover fields of history not previously represented by specialists on the Board.

The time and place of future annual meetings, all during December 28-30, were announced as follows:

- 1964- Washington, D.C., The Sheraton Park Hotel and the Shoreham Hotel
- 1965- San Francisco, The Hilton Hotel
- 1966- New York, The New York Hilton
- 1967- Toronto, The Royal York
- 1968- Chicago, The Conrad Hilton

The possibility of changing the time of future meetings was discussed and Robert Byrnes was asked to submit a report.

The Council, on the recommendation of the Pacific Coast Branch, selected Brainerd Dyer of the University of California at Los Angeles as Chairman of the Program Committee and Gerald White of San Francisco State College as Chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements for the meeting in 1965.

An amendment to the Constitution of the Association increasing the number of signatures required for the nomination of an officer from the floor from 20 to 200 had previously been adopted by the Council. It was decided to print it in a future issue of the Newsletter as a notice to members as required by the Constitution before voting on it in 1964.

A statement defining the powers and duties of the officers was approved for internal use only and was to be distributed to all present and future officers and members of the Council.

The Council elected on the recommendation of the Committee on Honorary Members the following historians as honorary members of the Association, thus bringing the total number to twenty-one.

Dello Cantimori, Italy; Sir Winston S. Churchill, England;  
Pyong-do Yi, Korea; Arnaldo Momigliano, Italy and Eng-  
land; Mikhail N. Tikhomirov, U.S.S.R.; Roland Mousnier,  
France; Sir Ronald Syme, England.

Recommendations coming from the Committee on Research Needs of the Profession, the Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government, and the Committee on Scholarly Historical resources overlapped to a considerable degree on important issues. The Council voted to ask the chairmen of these three committees, plus the Treasurer and the Executive Secretary, to act as special committee to consider and consolidate recommendations.

In accordance with recommendations from the committees, the Council voted to terminate the Committee on Maritime History and the Committee on South Asian History as their work was finished.

The Council voted to request the National Archives to publish a statement on the accessibility to scholars of all types and bodies of government records down to a quarter of a century ago.

The Council endorsed the program of the National Assembly on Teaching the Principles of the Bill of Rights with the understanding that curriculum changes, if any, are not to be made by action of legislatures.

The Council created a new Committee on Graduate Work in History to gather information regarding graduate work in history in the United States, to keep the Association informed of developments, and to make such recommendations as seem appropriate.

The Council received a report from the Special Committee on the Future of the Territorial Papers but substituted for its recommendations the following resolution:

The confidential preliminary report of the joint Special Committee on the future of the Territorial Papers of 1 May 1963 addressed to the Council of the American Historical Association and to the Archivist of the United States has a close relationship to the proposal set forth in the Report to the President of the National Historical Publications Commission. Both involve the responsibility of the historical profession for documentary sources and both, by implication at least, pose two far-reaching questions: (1) whether the historian's responsibility to the profession and to the public ends with making archival and manuscript records available through dissemination by microfilm or other facsimile reproductions; and (2) whether the historian's responsibility to his own profession and to the general public does or does not require the support and stimulation of that form of historical scholarship lying between the more or less mechanical aids at one extreme and the analytical, interpretative role of the historian at the other--that is, the role of the scholarly editor of documentary sources which began in America more than three centuries before that.

The Report of the Commission faces these two questions squarely. The report of the Special Committee on the Territorial Papers, confronted by the overwhelming mass of records and the highly selective specialized character of the twenty-five Carter volumes published in the past thirty years, is less concerned with these underlying concerns of the profession than with the particular problems. The Special Committee, aided by the Archivist of the United States and his staff, has performed an important duty in defining the sheer immensity of the problems of mass, complexity, cost, time, and staff. It has concluded unanimously that editing and publication on the scale and under the method followed by Carter must be rejected for these compelling reasons.

The Committee recommends that the National Archives employ, "in place of the editor of the Territorial Papers . . . a specialist in the history of the American West" to supervise the recommended program of microfilming of Territorial Papers as outlined in the report. Admitting the very great dimensions and complexities of the problem that compelled the Special Committee to reach this conclusion, I cannot recommend its acceptance without modification. First, in its dismissal of the role of the scholarly editor, the report reflects the assumption of many in the profession that all that the scholar needs is accessibility through some form of mechanical reproduction of texts. But technological aids to the historians, like weaponry, cannot be a sole reliance. A function growing out of the tradition of Jameson, Ford, Farrand, Burnett, Carter and others cannot be so summarily dismissed, no matter how formidable the problems. Second, our concern for the future of the profession as well as our responsibility to the public requires that we should do far more, not less, than we are now doing to sustain this middle function lying between the mechanical reproduction and the interpretation of the sources--to recognize its value, to provide for the training of those competent to discharge it, and to hold forth status and other incentives now generally lacking. Neither the microfilm technician nor the interpretative historian is required to confront the sources with precisely the sort of questions that the scholarly editor must ask of them and the latter, as Carter and others have proved, exposes himself to grave danger if this middle link is discarded. Third, the problems of mass, complexity, and cost are not minimized by dismissing the one specialist who by training and experience is perhaps best qualified to cope with them. Further, one of the Special Committee's reasons for recommending abandonment of the Carter volumes is the assumption that cost would be prohibitive and that the federal government would not be likely to sustain such a cost indefinitely. But the proposal of the National Historical Publications Commission, which has called upon the government and private philanthropy to aid the profession in meeting this general responsibility, has already received the highest support of the Chief Executive, has passed the House of Representatives, and will presumably pass the Senate in the next session. That proposal does not place its emphasis upon massive multi-volume documentary publications: it is concerned about

every phase of the problem--the gathering, ordering, controlling, editing, and publication by microform and letter-press of documentary sources of every sort. Most of all it is concerned about the ominous decrease of our seed corn in this area of American historical scholarship. Scholarly editors of competence and experience are extremely rare and they cannot be produced unless the historical profession concerns itself about producing them. We have a right to expect that public funds will be provided even if scholarly editors cannot be found. Those familiar with the Commission's Report regret now that it did not call for \$1,000,000 a year from the Federal Government for the next ten years instead of half that amount, for had it done so we could look forward with confidence to the appropriation a decade from now of perhaps five times that amount for the gathering, preservation, and dissemination of the documentary sources needed by the historian and by the public. We may safely predict that the Federal Government is not going to support the historian in his general function of interpreting the past, even though it has employed historians in its own service and has, perhaps unwittingly, supported the writing of a history of quantum physics with a grant of \$200,000. The government, however, has long aided the collection, preservation, editing, and publication of the documentary sources. It is almost certain that it will do so more and more generously in the future. If this is so, it would come at a most inauspicious moment if the profession which has so long argued the case for the scholarly editing and publication of the Territorial Papers should now decide that such an endeavor must be abandoned because the obstacles are so difficult.

I therefore urge that we accept the implications of these general concerns of the historical profession and make the following recommendation to the Archivist of the United States:

(1) That he place the complex problem of the Territorial Papers before the body that has long concerned itself with such matters and in whose jurisdiction this particular problem should lie--that is, the National Historical Publications Commission.

(2) That he recommend to the Commission the employment of a specialist in the history of the American West not in place of but as Editor of the Territorial Papers.

(3) That he recommend to the Commission that the unfinished volume of the Territory of Wisconsin be carried to completion by such Editor according to the established plan.

(4) That he recommend to the Commission the publication of the Territorial papers of those other Territories that became States prior to the Civil War--that is, Iowa, Minnesota, and Oregon--and that the Editor be directed to study the problems presented by the documentation of these three Territories and advise the Commission whether in his opinion the standard set by previous volumes as to scope and degree of selectivity should be maintained or modified.

(5) That he recommend to the Commission that, with respect to the papers of all subsequent Territories, the Editor be directed to bring forward a plan for carrying the total enterprise to completion that would combine publication by microfilm or other cheap means of reproduction and scholarly presentation of highly selected documents of such importance as to be of interest both to the historical profession and to the public, arranged possibly according to topics.

If this recommendation should be adopted, I should like, in conclusion to suggest that the Council express its appreciation to the Archivist for the generous co-operation he has extended to the Special Committee and ask that he inform the Council of any action that he proposes to take on this recommendation. I should also like to recommend that the Special Committee be given particular thanks for the time and thought its members have devoted to this extremely formidable problem. The magnitude of that task is by no means minimized in the recommendations I have made that differ so greatly from theirs. Theirs, indeed, is an understatement, for the Special Committee has omitted the most formidable problem of all--that of finding a qualified scholarly editor to direct all phases of this great task. My recommendation differs from theirs not so much in aim as in asking these two questions of the profession: (1) Where are the Carters, the Farrands, and the Burnetts among the young men and women of the

profession today? (2) What are we doing to encourage and nurture their indispensable form of scholarship? We cannot answer these questions satisfactorily by turning to the microfilm camera.

I must add one further comment. What I have said about the overarching concerns of the profession are applicable to any kinds of massive documentation that need to be made accessible to historians and to the public. But these documents reflecting the growth of the Territories present a subject altogether unique. The statesmen who argued that under the British imperial constitution there was no middle ground between total submission and total independence proceeded in 1784 to find middle ground that the nation has stood on ever since. In a day in which all political empires are shrinking save the one that is still expanding into the Pacific and the Arctic under the principles then established, I for one should regard our profession as having failed in its responsibility toward so significant a fact in world history if we should make no better compromise than to rely on microfilm at one end and interpretation at the other. A compromise must obviously be made, but I think we can make a better one than this.

Respectfully submitted,

Julian P. Boyd

The Council recommended that the resolution on pending legislation on the program of the National Historical Publications Commission be approved at the Business Meeting.

A proposal regarding a history of education in the United States since 1867 was received from Dr. Francis Keppel, United States Commissioner of Education. The Council decided to inform Dr. Keppel the Association would be interested if satisfactory arrangements could be made.

The Council voted to instruct the delegates of the Association to the American Council of Learned Societies to favor the proposed "Encyclopaedia Medii Aevi."

The proposal received from University Microfilms, Inc. for the microfilming of back and current issues of the American Historical Review was referred to the future and present editors of the Review for examination and recommendation.

The Council established the Clarence H. Haring Prize with funds raised by a voluntary committee. It will be awarded at five-year intervals beginning in 1965 to that Latin American who in the opinion of a committee of three specialists in Latin American history has published the most outstanding book in the field of Latin American history during the preceding five-years. The amount of the Prize is \$500.00. The Stanford University Press has expressed an interest in publishing an English translation of the book so honored.

The Council, on the recommendation of the Canadian-United States Committee for Co-operation, established the Albert B. Corey Prize for a manuscript or book on Canadian-American relations. The first award will be made in 1965.

Frank Maloy Anderson, a loyal member of the Association for many years, made three bequests, each of \$1000.00, in his will to the Association. One was to be used in any way the Association might wish. The Council voted to add it to the general endowment fund. A second bequest was to be used to foster research with respect to the founders of the American Historical Association. The Council voted to use this gift to assist in the publication of a volume of essays on the work of J. Franklin Jameson, now in preparation by a group of scholars. The third bequest was to be used to establish a fund out of which an award should be made every tenth year, in the name of Troyer Steele Anderson, to the person whom the Council considers to have made the most outstanding contribution to the advancement of the purposes of the Association during the preceding ten years. The Council voted to make the first award in 1970.

The Executive Committee of the Council for 1964 is to consist of Julian P. Boyd, chairman; Frederic C. Lane; Carl Bridenbaugh; Elmer Louis Kayser; Robert F.

Byrnes; Charles F. Mullett; and W. Stull Holt. The Finance Committee is to consist of Elmer Louis Kayser, chairman; Julian P. Boyd; and W. Stull Holt.

Mr. W. A. W. Stewart, Jr., of the United States Trust Company was re-elected to the Board of Trustees for a term of five-years.

Robert F. Byrnes was selected to draft resolutions to be presented at the Business Meeting.

A communication was received from Dr. George Hallgarten. After discussion it was decided that the Council could not constitutionally take any action. Dr. Bernadotte Schmitt was asked to reply to Dr. Hallgarten.

A protest against holding meetings of the Association on Sunday was discussed and tabled.

The Council adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

W. STULL HOLT, Executive Secretary.

**MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF  
THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION  
THE SHERATON HOTEL,  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA  
DECEMBER 29, 1963, 4:30 P. M.**

President Crane Brinton called the meeting to order with approximately eighty members present. The minutes of the last meeting (AHR, LXVIII [April 1963], 896-898) were approved.

The Treasurer, Elmer Louis Kayser, presented his report for 1962-1963. The Association on August 31, 1963 had cash on hand for general purposes amounting to \$102,057.51, an increase of \$13,919.84 over 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 \$299,507.63. These three items (headquarters building and equipment, cash, and invested funds) constitute the total assets of \$506,624.98 available for the general purposes of the Association.

Securities in the portfolio of the Matteson Fund amount to \$93,715.20 and those in the other special funds of the Association, restricted in purpose, amount to \$169,856.28. Unexpended portions of grants made by foundations and others for specified purposes amount to \$170,816.99. These various restricted funds total \$434,388.47.

Funds, restricted and unrestricted, composing the total assets of the Association amount to \$941,013.45, if the book value of permanent investments is used. If market values, according to the August 31, 1963 appraisal, are used, the total assets of the Association amount to \$1,254,733.15. There is an increase of \$55,994.95 over the preceding year if the book value of permanent investments is used. An increase of \$142,703.15 over the preceding year is shown if market values are used, as the result of the increase in the value of securities in permanent investment.

The report, which was distributed at the meeting and which may be examined at the Association's headquarters, was accepted without dissent. It is published on pages 34-38 of this Annual Report of the American Historical Association.

Franklin D. Scott of Northwestern University, chairman of the Nominating Committee, reported for the Committee. For the officers of the Association, the following were nominated for 1964: President, Julian P. Boyd, Princeton University; Vice President, Frederic C. Lane, Johns Hopkins University; Treasurer, Elmer Louis Kayser, George Washington University. Upon motion and instruction the Executive Secretary cast one ballot for these nominees and they were declared elected. Reporting on the mail ballot, Scott announced that Wallace K. Ferguson of the University of Western Ontario and Richard Hofstadter of Columbia University were elected to the

Council of the Association and that S. William Halperin of the University of Chicago and John Higham of the University of Michigan were elected to the Nominating Committee. The report was unanimously accepted.

The Executive Secretary reported on actions taken by the Council at its meeting on December 27 (see pages 24-29). He announced the places of meetings through 1968 and the Committee chairmen for the 1964 meeting. He also announced the appointment of Robert Palmer of Washington University to the Board of Editors replacing Leo Gershoj of New York University whose term had expired; and the addition to the Board of Editors of Gordon Craig of Stanford University and John W. Hall of Yale University to cover fields not previously represented by specialists on the Board. The Executive Secretary called attention to the Clarence H. Haring Prize and the Albert B. Corey Prize, both of which had just been established by the Council. He also announced the action taken on the three bequests received from the will of Frank Maloy Anderson.

The Executive Secretary then presented the following resolution with the recommendation of the Council that it be passed:

Mindful of the fact that a characteristic of every enlightened nation is its concern for the preservation and study of the essential documents on which a knowledge of its origins and progress must rest; that the federal government has in the past demonstrated an awareness of its responsibility for protecting its own documentary sources and by publication making them more accessible alike to scholars and to the public; that such support is imperative in a free society because the principles of a democracy make it an absolute necessity that the record of the people be kept open, inviolable, and accessible to all in perpetuity; that, in order to insure that this necessity be met in a manner befitting a free people, additional resources are needed not solely for activities carried on directly by government agencies but also for assistance in the form of grants to encourage parallel and supporting activities of this nature in our educational institutions, libraries, and historical societies, public and private, which now lack resources to make known and generally available rich holdings of historical papers of national significance; that the resources needed for this purpose over a ten-year period and plans for their employment are set forth and justified in convincing manner in the recent Report to the President Containing a Proposal . . . to Meet Existing and Anticipated Needs over the Next Ten Years Under a National Program for the Collection, Preservation, and Publication, or Dissemination by Other Means, of the Documentary Sources of American History, prepared by the National Historical Publications Commission and strongly endorsed by our late President, John F. Kennedy; that, in the administration of such resources, it is essential that some public body be given responsibility for calling upon historians, librarians, archivists, administrators of historical societies, and others to advise it so that all proposals coming before it may be placed in competition with each other and their respective merits assessed in a just, balanced, and impartial manner in accordance with the highest standards of historical scholarship; that the National Historical Publications Commission, nonpartisan in its composition, is in fact such a public body, having been called into existence by an Act of Congress in 1934; and that the Commission has demonstrated in its past record of achievements as well as in its new Proposal that it is a body deserving of confidence and qualified to administer the resources to be made available for its proposed "National Program" set forth in its Report: therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Historical Association fully endorses the proposal set forth in the Report to the President by the National Historical Publications Commission and emphatically urges the Congress of the United States to adopt the proposed legislation in order to meet this imperative national need in a manner appropriate to this nation and to its achievements.

Resolved, further, that these resolutions and their preamble be printed and that a copy be sent to every member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

On motion the resolution was unanimously adopted.

Abraham P. Nasatir of San Diego State College gave the report of the Pacific Coast Branch.

For the Committee on Resolutions, Robert Byrnes moved the following resolutions:

Resolved, that the members of the American Historical Association express their most profound grief to Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy for the tragic and senseless death of her husband, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, an active life member of the Association. He was a young man who gave new life and vigor to the arts and all intellectual activity. He was blessed with an understanding of our age and of our future which illumined his country and the world. He was a statesman whose courage in all matters was equalled only by his magnanimity. President Kennedy in his private and public life exemplified our finest national ideals. He honored us all. We salute him. We grieve with you and your children.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Resolved, that the American Historical Association express its gratitude to Professor Hilary Conroy and his colleagues on the Program Committee for the fascinating and provocative sessions which provided us such stimulation, and to Professor Clement Motten and the members of his committee for the comfortable and efficient conditions they so skillfully arranged. The members of both committees have been faithful to the splendid traditions of the city of Philadelphia in the care and friendly spirit with which we have been made welcome, and the papers presented have reflected the high quality which their efforts richly deserve.

This resolution, too, was adopted.

As no other business was proposed, President Crane Brinton, on the motion of Lawrence Gipson, one of the oldest members of the profession and of the Association, adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

W. STULL HOLT, Executive Secretary

## REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR FOR 1963

Mr. President, Members of the Association:

This is the first and last report I will make to you as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor. When President Brinton phoned me last April and told me of the crisis produced by Boyd Shafer's resignation, he asked me to serve as locum tenens for a year while more permanent arrangements were being made. I accepted on condition that in no circumstances would I be a place holder for more than one year. Only four months of that year have passed so my experience is limited. But some of my first impressions may give a freshness to this report on the affairs of the Association.

First and foremost among my impressions is my amazement and dismay at the huge burden of work that anyone occupying this position must carry. This leads me at once to a tribute to my predecessor. During his ten years in office I had served a term on the Council but I, and the same holds true for all the others including the ten Presidents, had little or no appreciation of the sheer volume of the work he was called upon to perform. Scholars are accustomed to take their work to bed with them. At least they have time to go to bed while one wonders how Boyd Shafer could devote all his thoughts and energies, as he did, to the quantity of work he accomplished and still find time to sleep. The Association owes him a vast debt of gratitude for the unstinted care and single-minded devotion with which he served it for ten years.

Dr. Boyd C. Shafer has requested that the record should include his wish to thank the following members of the staff of the Association, all of whom served the Association for more than a year during the ten years he was Executive Secretary and Managing Editor.

Elmer Kayser, Treasurer  
Miss Patty Washington, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer  
George Carson, Jr., Director of the Service Center

Walter Rundell, Jr., Assistant Executive Secretary and Director of the Service Center

Mary R. Dearing, Assistant Editor and Assistant Executive Secretary

Patricia Fox, Assistant Editor

Catharine Seybold, Assistant Editor

Nancy Kane Rosenberg, Assistant Editor

Clinton Douglas, Bookkeeper

Rita Shea, Bookkeeper

John Appleby, Membership Secretary

Belinda Dameron, Clerk

Rita Howe, Editorial Assistant

John Yoder, Secretary

Margarete Walton, Secretary

After he laid down the burden the Council wisely decided to appoint two men to take his place. Such a solution had been adopted during several periods in the past. On those occasions convenience or compromise had been responsible but now because of the increased volume of work necessity dictates the appointment of two men. Both the Editor and the Executive Secretary need time to think, to plan, to raise their vision beyond the day to day problems. If one man acts in both capacities there simply isn't enough time for him to act on the levels of both strategy and tactics.

The Council believed it is possible for the Managing Editor to function successfully if he were in Washington half-time and remained at his university half-time. It is unnecessary to remind you that the Editor of the *American Historical Review* is perhaps the chief custodian of scholarly standards in the historical profession. As such his influence and his responsibilities are great. What you may not know so well are some of the details involved. About two hundred articles were submitted to the *Review* last year. Of these over twenty, or slightly over 10 per cent, were published either as articles or as notes. The procedure followed by Dr. Shafer and continued by me is roughly as follows: The Editor examines each article carefully and if it is not clearly impossible refers it to a member of the Board of Editors if there is one who has specialized knowledge including the subject of the article. Sometimes that one evaluation is all that is necessary, especially if it is strongly negative. More often a second reader is necessary and sometimes, when the first two disagree, a third judgment is asked. My brief experience with the established scholars upon whom I have called for critical reports and whose services, of course, are known only to the Editor, is that they have rendered this service to the *Review* conscientiously, thoroughly and, thank goodness, promptly. Ultimately the decision is made, and must be made, by the Managing Editor alone.

He is also solely responsible for the selection of the books to be reviewed and of the scholars to review them. Nearly two thousand books are received each year. Of these from 750 to 800 are actually reviewed. The problem of securing the right reviewer is a difficult one with many aspects. Most of these are readily apparent to you. By reading the reviews you can judge their quality and you may agree with me that most are too bland and lack depth. You probably do not know how hard it sometimes is to find a well qualified reviewer when the author expresses gratitude in his preface to a long list of specialists who read his manuscript and contributed help. And I am sure you do not know how many of the reviewers are delinquent. I, too, have sinned in this fashion in the past but will never again if ever invited to review a book.

It is obvious that the power to accept articles and to select reviewers makes the Managing Editor a distributor of academic loaves and fishes. He can contribute significantly to the success of younger men in the profession. Consequently the Council looked for a man not only with extensive knowledge and with wise judgment but also with integrity. They found him in Professor Henry Winkler. He has accepted the position of Managing Editor and sometime before next September 1st will take over.

The search for exactly the right man to be Executive Secretary has not yet been completed. In many ways this problem is more complicated than finding an Editor. The



function of the Executive Secretary is not that solely or chiefly of an administrator. The man who would permit himself to become a housekeeper is not the man who is wanted. It is true there is a lot of work necessary merely to keep the wheels in motion and that it has been increasing. Our membership now exceeds twelve thousand, an increase of nine hundred during the past year. This means more letters to write, and not just the form notices because a member has forgotten to change his address.

We also use routine forms for the many letters received from students not only in grades four through twelve but also from undergraduates who want help in their courses. Some of the numerous letters coming from the public are challenging. What, for instance, would you do with this letter which came last week?

Written in Fort Worth, Texas, on December 9th, it says:

Dear Sirs:

Would you be so kind as to send any kind of material you might have available that would comfort the mother of a fourteen-year old boy whose nose is constantly buried in a history book? Instead of being outdoors doing all the wild things that God intended boys to do, this boy is always indoors tangled up with some history book.

His father is afraid he'll have to support him forever. How can you make a living reading history books?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Joe \_\_\_\_\_

The routine business of running an organization of twelve thousand members with many activities demands attention and the Executive Secretary must devote part of his time to it. He must, however, be much more than an administrator. He must be a scholarly statesman with vision and with executive capacity of a high order. As such his opportunities for making an impact on historical scholarship surpass those of the Managing Editor of the Review. He should be the leader of the profession. If some field of historical knowledge is threatened with decay, as Ancient history has been during the past decade or more, he should be the one to alert the profession and to initiate corrective action. Twenty-five years ago he should have known that we need in the United States some specialists in African history and he should have taken steps to see that they were prepared. A few years ago the Association recognized it has some responsibility for and some vital interest in the teaching of history in the pre-college grades. The Service Center is doing valuable work but the possibilities and need to do more are infinite. The new Executive Secretary has an opportunity and a challenge there, the importance of which cannot be exaggerated. At the other end of the scholarly scale is another opportunity for leadership. Anyone who has read the Annual Reports of the Association must have noted the increase in recent years of the contacts with scholars and organized scholarship in other countries. Who can doubt that this development is only in its early stages? The Executive Secretary is inevitably the main representative of organized American historical scholarship on the international stage and should be a leader there as well as at home. I repeat, the need and the opportunities for a man of vision, force, and wisdom are great. It is no wonder the Council must act with care and deliberation. An announcement of the appointment will, I hope, be made in the near future.

So far not much has been reported on the work of the year. We operate through many committees and later you will learn of the Council's action on their recommendations. The details of their operations will be given in the reports which will be published in the Annual Report of the Association for 1963.

Let me say only this. The condition of the Association is healthy. Year after year we have lived within our income. Let me identify my political principles at once by saying that the surpluses that we have realized are only justifiable if we are already doing everything we can to promote the study of history in America, which is the way in which our charter describes our purpose. Our various publications have appeared on schedule, although plans are under way to have the Review come out earlier in the month of each issue. I should perhaps call your attention to the fact that the Professional Register which the Association maintains for the benefit of institutions and of individual members has an office in the hotel, Room 554. There are somewhere around 150 positions waiting to be filled, and those of you who are seeking new staff can find files on approximately 800 scholars most of them at or near the beginning of their careers but including some mature scholars who are willing to move.

One final comment. I am enjoying the association with colleagues in history who appear to me at least to be a select and superior species. I even enjoy some of the work, only there is too much of it.

W. STULL HOLT, Executive Secretary and Managing Editor.

## ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER FOR THE FISCAL YEAR, 1962-63

The American Historical Association headquarters and its equipment are valued at \$105,059.84. The Association on August 31, 1963 had cash on hand for general purposes amounting to \$102,057.51, an increase of \$13,919.84 over 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 \$299,507.63. These three items (headquarters building and equipment, cash, and invested funds) constitute the total assets of \$506,624.98, available for the general purposes of the Association.

Securities in the portfolio of the Matteson Fund amount to \$93,715.20 and those in the other special funds of the Association, restricted in purpose, amount to \$169,856.28. Unexpended portions of grants made by foundations and others for specified purposes amount to \$170,816.99. These various restricted funds total \$434,388.47.

Funds, restricted and unrestricted, composing the total assets of the Association amount to \$941,013.45 if the book value of permanent investments is used. If market values, according to the August 31, 1963 appraisal, are used, the total assets of the Association amount to \$1,254,733.15. There is an increase of \$55,994.95 over the preceding year if the book value of permanent investments is used. An increase of \$142,703.15 over the preceding year is shown if market values are used, as the result of the increase in the value of securities in permanent investment.

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 1963.

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER, Treasurer.

## GENERAL ACCOUNT

Comparative Statement for 1961/62 and 1962/63 of Receipts  
and Disbursements of Unrestricted Funds

	<u>1961/62</u>	<u>1962/63</u>
<b>Receipts</b>		
Cash on hand Sept. 1.....	\$102,173.18	\$88,137.67
Annual Dues.....	86,990.10	97,354.83
Registration Fees.....	4,166.70	4,126.68
Interest.....	21,048.50	23,148.27
<u>American Historical Review</u> .....	2,400.00	44,272.01
Royalties.....	709.60	4,993.00
Advertising.....	11,014.76	16,533.70
Miscellaneous.....	944.87	1,083.69
Foundation Grants (portions allocated to administration).....	<u>8,635.61</u>	<u>1,800.00</u>
	<u>\$238,083.32</u>	<u>\$281,449.85</u>
<b>Disbursements</b>		
General Administration.....	\$66,017.12	\$80,133.25
Council and Committees.....	3,416.61	3,872.25
Annual Meetings.....	6,020.89	7,668.85
Review -- copies to members.....	38,827.00	42,095.00
A.C.L.S. dues.....	100.00	100.00
American Council on Education.....	.....	300.00
Pacific Coast Branch.....	300.00	300.00
International Com. of Hist. Sciences.....	116.30	116.70
National Trust for Historic Preservation.....	100.00	100.00
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize award.....	.....	300.00
Investments.....	.....	10,000.00
Special Projects Committees.....	2,167.95	1,218.54
Doctoral Dissertation Lists.....	77.12	59.78
Newsletter.....	.....	2,043.22
Employees Taxes withheld from Salaries.....	(21.48)	20.66
Land and Building.....	32,754.32	26,501.18
Furniture and equipment.....	<u>69.82</u>	<u>2,562.91</u>
	<u>\$149,945.65</u>	<u>\$179,392.34</u>
Balance, Aug. 31.....	<u>88,137.67</u>	<u>102,057.51</u>
	<u>\$238,083.32</u>	<u>\$281,449.85</u>

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1962/63 of  
Special Funds and Grants included in the General Account

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
<b>Endowment Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$7,166.50	
Contributions.....	415.00	
Life Membership dues.....	1,200.00	
Balance, August 31, 1963.....		<u>\$8,781.50</u>
	<u>\$8,781.50</u>	<u>\$8,781.50</u>
<b>Andrew D. White Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$414.34	
Interest on Investments.....	42.00	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		<u>\$456.34</u>
	<u>\$456.34</u>	<u>\$456.34</u>
<b>George Louis Beer Prize</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$692.25	
Interest on Investments.....	294.00	
Prize of 1962.....		\$300.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		<u>686.25</u>
	<u>\$986.25</u>	<u>\$986.25</u>
<b>John H. Dunning Prize Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$3,673.57	
Interest on Investments.....	73.50	
Royalties.....	194.28	
Reimbursement of Subsidies.....	522.50	
Prize of 1962.....		\$300.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		<u>4,163.85</u>
	<u>\$4,463.85</u>	<u>\$4,463.85</u>

## GENERAL ACCOUNT--Continued

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1962/63 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, 1962.....	\$395.81	
Interest on Investments.....	17.32	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		\$413.13
	<u>\$413.13</u>	<u>\$413.13</u>
<b>J. Franklin Jameson Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$619.96	
Interest on Investments.....	154.70	
From sale of "List of Doctoral Dissertations".....	251.60	
Expense on account of "List of Doctoral Dissertations".....		\$33.45
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		992.81
	<u>\$1,026.26</u>	<u>\$1,026.26</u>
<b>David M. Matteson Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$28,103.13	
Interest on Investments.....	4,125.04	
Sale of Index and Guide.....	260.98	
Preparation of Index.....		\$6,506.57
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		25,982.58
	<u>\$32,489.15</u>	<u>\$32,489.15</u>
<b>Professional Register Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$1,302.61	
Annual Fees.....	1,850.15	
Office Expenses.....		\$1,722.39
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		1,430.37
	<u>\$3,152.76</u>	<u>\$3,152.76</u>
<b>Reserve Fund (for house repairs and renovations)</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$1,791.72	
Addition to reserve.....	600.00	
Repairs.....		\$2,750.46
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		(358.74)
	<u>\$2,391.72</u>	<u>\$2,391.72</u>
<b>Revolving Fund for Service Center for Teachers of History</b>		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$55,693.64	
Sale of Publications.....	17,962.86	
Disbursements.....		\$19,197.54
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		54,458.96
	<u>\$73,656.50</u>	<u>\$73,656.50</u>
<b><u>Ford Foundation Grants:</u></b>		
<b>Bibliographies of British History</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$9,123.12	
Disbursements.....		\$2,400.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		6,723.12
	<u>\$9,123.12</u>	<u>\$9,123.12</u>
<b>International Committee for Historical Sciences</b>		
Grant.....	\$10,000.00	
Transferred to committee treasurer.....		\$10,000.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		-0-
	<u>\$10,000.00</u>	<u>\$10,000.00</u>
<b>National Bias in British-American Textbooks</b>		
Balance Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$16,166.67	
Disbursements.....		\$264.68
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		15,901.99
	<u>\$16,166.67</u>	<u>\$16,166.67</u>

## GENERAL ACCOUNT--Continued

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements for 1962/63 of  
Special Funds and Grants included in the General Account--Continued

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
<u>Rockefeller Foundation Grant:</u>		
Assistance for Professors of South Asian History		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$11,912.99	
Grant.....	11,087.01	
Disbursements.....		\$11,789.77
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		11,210.23
	<u>\$23,000.00</u>	<u>\$23,000.00</u>
<u>Carnegie Corporation of New York Grant:</u>		
Travel Expenses of Delegates to International Meetings		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$3,576.42	
Disbursements.....		\$599.48
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		2,976.94
	<u>\$3,576.42</u>	<u>\$3,576.42</u>
<u>Asia Foundation Grant:</u>		
Travel Expenses and membership dues for Asian Historians		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$2,511.38	
Grant.....	2,500.00	
Disbursements.....		\$1,963.06
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		3,048.32
	<u>\$5,011.38</u>	<u>\$5,011.38</u>
<u>History as a Career</u>		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$1,458.65	
Receipts (Sale of publications).....	253.08	
Disbursements.....		\$1,116.04
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		595.69
	<u>\$1,711.73</u>	<u>\$1,711.73</u>
<u>Canadian-American History Prize Fund</u>		
Balance, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$1,000.00	
Contributions.....	2,950.00	
Interest on investment.....	80.94	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		\$3,730.94
	<u>\$3,730.94</u>	<u>\$3,730.94</u>
<u>Clarence Haring Prize Fund</u>		
Contribution.....	\$2,553.14	
Interest on investment.....	37.25	
Invested in Fiduciary Trust Co.....		\$2,553.14
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		37.25
	<u>\$2,590.39</u>	<u>\$2,590.39</u>
<u>Watumull Prize Fund</u>		
Contribution.....	\$500.00	
Prizes awarded.....		\$500.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		.....
	<u>\$500.00</u>	<u>\$500.00</u>

## SPECIAL ACCOUNTS

Statement for 1962/63 of Receipts and Disbursements

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
<u>A.H.A. Revolving Fund for Publications</u>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$3,637.00	
Interest (Savings account).....	146.24	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		\$3,783.24
	<u>\$3,783.24</u>	<u>\$3,783.24</u>

## SPECIAL ACCOUNTS--Continued

Statement for 1962/63 of Receipts and Disbursements--Continued

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
<b>Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$8,094.39	
Interest (from Investments and Savings Account).....	3,861.73	
Royalties.....	4,667.61	
Disbursements.....		\$5,956.27
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		10,667.46
	<u>\$16,623.73</u>	<u>\$16,623.73</u>
<b>Littleton-Grissold Fund</b>		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$13,213.43	
Interest (from Investments and Savings account).....	1,751.43	
Sale of Publications.....	206.50	
Disbursements.....		\$36.80
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		15,134.56
	<u>\$15,171.36</u>	<u>\$15,171.36</u>

## FINANCIAL ASSETS

Securities (book value) Aug. 31, 1963		\$563,079.11
Credited to		
Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund.....	\$105,000.00	
Littleton-Grissold 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	
Clarence Haring Fund.....	2,553.14	
Endowment Fund.....	11,183.14	169,856.28
David M. Matteson Fund (Special Portfolio).....		93,715.20
Unrestricted.....		<u>299,507.63</u>
Cash in checking, saving accounts, U.S. Treasury bills and certificates of indebtedness, and petty cash.....		\$272,874.50
Credited to		
Special accounts.....	\$29,585.26	
Special funds and grants.....	141,231.73	170,816.99
Unrestricted.....		<u>\$102,057.51</u>
<b>Fixed Assets</b>		
Real Estate.....	\$97,446.07	
Furniture and equipment.....	7,613.77	\$105,059.84

Summary

<b>Unrestricted Funds</b>		
Securities.....	\$299,507.63	
Cash in custody of Treasurer.....	102,057.51	\$401,565.14
<b>Fixed Assets.....</b>		105,059.84
<b>Restricted Funds</b>		
Securities.....	\$263,571.48	
Cash in custody of Treasurer.....	170,816.99	434,388.47
		<u>\$941,013.45</u>

## REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

October 23, 1963

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, 1962 to August 31, 1963, 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, 1963. The assets included are cash, investments and fixed property. Dues receivable, salable books, library books and deferred charges are not included, nor are any liabilities reflected therein. We were advised that there were no liabilities other than those 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, 1963 and the recorded cash transactions for the year then ended, and have been prepared on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

## CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

A combined summary of all receipts and disbursements 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, 1962.....	258,685.45	145,602.96	88,137.67	24,944.82
Receipts.....	261,571.04	57,625.35	193,312.18	10,633.51
Disbursements.....	520,256.49	203,228.31	281,449.85	35,578.33
	247,381.99	61,996.58	179,392.34	5,993.07
Cash and temporary investments balance, August 31, 1963.....	272,874.50	141,231.73	102,057.51	29,585.26

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 27,018.89.

Dues received during the year are in the total amount of 97,354.83, 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.

Total dues collected in the fiscal year ended August 31, 1963 amounted to 97,354.83 as compared with 86,990.10 for the preceding fiscal year, an increase of 10,364.73. A comparative distribution of the dues between regular and student members is as follows:

	<u>Number</u>		<u>Amount</u>	
	<u>August 31,</u>		<u>August 31,</u>	
	<u>1963</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1962</u>
Regular .....	8,782	7,913	87,733.33	78,760.10
Student .....	1,924	1,655	9,621.50	8,230.00
Totals .....	<u>10,706</u>	<u>9,568</u>	<u>97,354.83</u>	<u>86,990.10</u>

The annual membership dues for this and the preceding fiscal year were 10.00 regular and 5.00 student.

F. W. LAFRENTZ & CO.  
Certified Public Accountants

## REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES

December 1, 1963

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, 1963.

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

### REGULAR SECTION

#### VALUE OF ORIGINAL AND PRESENT HOLDINGS

Original Value.....	\$271,371.00
Present Value.....	736,031.00
Estimated Annual Income.....	23,212.00
Return on Current Market Value.....	3.2%
Return on Original Value.....	8.6%
Bond Premiums are Amortized.....	

#### ANALYSIS OF INVESTMENTS

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Cash and Bonds		
Cash.....	\$1,322	0.2
U.S. Government.....	143,200	19.4
Railroad.....	7,700	1.1
Public Utility.....	25,250	3.4
Industrial.....	49,300	6.7
Other Bonds.....	18,600	2.5
Total Cash and Bonds.....	\$242,728*	32.9



REGULAR SECTION--Continued

	Amount	Percent
<b>Preferred Stocks</b>		
Public Utility.....	\$10,600	1.5
Industrial.....	54,170	7.3
Other Pfd Stocks.....	15,860	2.2
Total Preferred Stocks.....	\$80,630*	11.0
<b>Common Stocks</b>		
Financial		
Insurance.....	53,040	7.2
Other Financial.....	2,620	0.3
<b>Public Utility</b>		
Electric Utilities.....	70,940	9.7
Natural Gas.....	22,268	3.0
<b>Consumer Goods</b>		
Photographic.....	22,000	3.0
Container.....	14,100	1.9
Other Consumer.....	19,500	2.7
<b>Semi-Capital Goods</b>		
Chemical.....	58,500	7.9
Oil.....	92,355	12.6
Automotive.....	3,750	0.5
<b>Capital Goods</b>		
Elec & Electronic Equip.....	53,600	7.3
Total Common Stocks.....	\$412,673*	56.1
Total Account.....	\$736,031*	100.0

	Approximate		Estimated annual income	
	Price	Value	Rate	Amount
<b>Bonds:</b>				
80,000. U.S.A. Treasury Bonds 1967-72 2.500% 12/15/72.....	\$89	\$71,200		\$2,000
80,000. U.S.A. Treasury Bonds 1978-83 3.250% 6/15/83.....	90	72,000		2,600
10,000. Virginian Ry. 1st Lien & Ref. B 3.000% 5/ 1/95.....	77	7,700		300
25,000. American Tel. & Tel. Deb. 4.375% 4/ 1/85.....	101	25,250		1,094
9,000. Aluminum Co. of America Deb. 3.125% 2/ 1/64.....	100	9,000		281
10,000. Scott Paper Cv. Deb. 3.000% 3/ 1/71.....	148	14,800		300
25,000. Standard Oil California Deb. 4.375% 7/ 1/83.....	102	25,500		1,094
20,000. General Motors Acceptance Deb. 3.500% 3/15/72.....	93	18,600		700
Total Bonds.....		\$244,050		\$8,369
<b>Preferred Stocks:</b>				
100 Cons. Edison of New York \$5 Pfd.....	106	10,600	5.00	500
100 E.I. du Pont de Nemours \$4.50 Pfd.....	106	10,600	4.50	450
150 Intl. Pipe & Ceramics 5% Cv Pfd.....	111	16,650	5.00	750
70 U.S. Rubber 8% N-Gm. 1st Pfd.....	166	11,620	8.00	560
100 U.S. Steel 7% Pfd.....	153	15,300	7.00	700
130 Beneficial Finance \$4.50 Cv. Pfd.....	122	15,860	4.50	585
Total Preferred Stocks.....		\$80,630		\$3,545

## REGULAR SECTION--Continued

	Approximate		Estimated annual income	
	Price	Value	Rate	Amount
<u>Common Stocks</u>				
180 Connecticut General Life Ins.....	\$168	\$30,240	.90	\$162
240 Insurance Co. of North America.....	95	22,800	2.00	480
262 Commonwealth Investment.....	10	2,620	.31	81
1,090 Cincinnati Gas & Electric.....	26	28,340	.92	1,003
400 Texas Utilities.....	57	22,800	1.20	480
450 Virginia Electric & Power.....	44	19,800	1.04	468
586 Oklahoma Natural Gas.....	38	22,268	1.40	820
200 Eastman Kodak.....	110	22,000	2.45	490
300 American Can.....	47	14,100	2.00	600
100 Corning Glass Works.....	195	19,500	2.00	200
200 American Cyanamid.....	62	12,400	1.80	360
100 E.I. Du Pont de Nemours.....	243	24,300	7.50	750
200 Union Carbide.....	109	21,800	3.60	720
400 Continental Oil.....	65	26,000	2.00	800
600 Shamrock Oil & Gas.....	39	23,400	1.50	900
605 Standard Oil of New Jersey.....	71	42,955	2.70	1,634
50 General Motors.....	75	3,750	3.00	150
400 General Electric.....	81	32,400	2.00	800
400 International Tel. & Tel.....	53	21,200	1.00	400
Total Common Stocks.....		\$412,673		\$11,298
Securities Value.....		\$737,353		
Principal Cash Overinvested.....		\$1,322		
Total Account.....		\$736,031		
Estimated Annual Income.....				\$23,212

## Statement of Transactions During the Period from September 1, 1962 Through August 30, 1963

<u>Date</u>	<u>Redemption</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Principal</u>
2/1/63.....	\$6,000. Aluminum Co. of America Deb. 3.12% 2/1/64 (Called).....	100	\$6,000.00
	<u>Purchases</u>		
2/7/63.....	100 Shs. International Pipe & Ceramics 5.000% Cv. Pfd.....	105 1/4	\$10,574.53
2/7/63.....	50 Shs. International Pipe & Ceramics 5.000% Cv. Pfd.....	105 1/2	5,317.28
2/13/63.....	100 Shs. Beneficial Finance 4.500% Cv. Pfd.....	116	11,650.60
2/13/63.....	30 Shs. Beneficial Finance 4.500% Cv. Pfd.....	116 1/4	3,521.94
			\$31,064.35
	<u>Sales</u>		
10/16/62.....	3/10 Shr. Oklahoma National Gas Order Form Void 10/1/62...		\$9.60
2/7/63.....	400 Shs. Aluminum Ltd.....	22 1/4	8,763.26
2/7/63.....	500 Shs. Westinghouse Electric.....	35	17,290.15
			\$26,063.01
	<u>Securities Received</u>		
4/22/63.....	262 Shs. Commonwealth Investment Co. Plus Cash of \$9.27 in Lieu of Fractional Shr. Representing a Gift from Dr. James R. Scotie		
	<u>Securities Distributions Received</u>		
5/27/63.....	150 Shs. Virginia Electric & Power Representing a 50% Stock Distribution on 300 Shares Payable 5/24/63 to Holders of Record 4/26/63		
5/29/63.....	545 Shs. Cincinnati Gas & Electric Representing a 100% Stock Distribution on 545 Shares Payable 5/29/63 to Holders of Record 5/2/63		

MATTESON FUND

VALUE OF ORIGINAL AND PRESENT HOLDINGS

Original Value.....	\$73,501.00
Present Value.....	130,767.00
Estimated Annual Income.....	4,211.00
Return on Current Market Value.....	3.2%
Return on Original Value.....	5.7%
Bond Premiums are Amortized.....	

ANALYSIS OF INVESTMENTS

	Amount	Percent
<b>Cash and Bonds:</b>		
Cash.....	\$1,097	0.8
U.S. Government.....	25,000	19.2
Railroad.....	8,600	6.5
Public Utility.....	14,400	11.0
Industrial.....	16,100	12.4
Total Cash and Bonds.....	\$65,197*	49.9
<b>Common Stocks:</b>		
Public Utility		
Electric Utilities.....	7,752	5.9
Communication.....	26,040	19.9
<b>Semi-Capital Goods:</b>		
Oil.....	26,478	20.2
<b>Capital Goods:</b>		
Electric & Electronic Equip.....	5,300	4.1
Total Common Stocks.....	\$65,570*	50.1
Total Account.....	\$130,767*	100.0

	Approximate		Estimated Annual Income	
	Price	Value	Rate	Amount
<b>Bonds:</b>				
25,000. U.S.A. Treasury C/I B-1964 3.250% 5/15/64.....	\$100	\$25,000		\$813
10,000. Union Pacific RR Deb 2.87% 2/ 1/76.....	86	8,600		288
15,000. Cons. Edison of N.Y. 1st Ref O 4.000% 6/ 1/88.....	96	14,400		600
5,000. Scott Paper Cv. Deb.. 3.000% 3/ 1/71.....	148	7,400		150
10,000. Standard Oil N.J. Deb. 2.750% 7/15/74.....	87	8,700		275
Total Bonds.....		\$64,100		\$2,126
<b>Common Stocks:</b>				
204 American Electric Power.....	38	7,752	1.08	220
210 American Telephone & Telegraph.....	124	26,040	3.60	756
100 Shamrock Oil & Gas.....	39	3,900	1.50	150
318 Standard Oil of New Jersey.....	71	22,578	2.70	859
100 International Tel. & Tel.....	53	5,300	1.00	100
Total Common Stocks.....		\$65,570		\$2,085
Securities Value.....		\$129,670		
Principal Cash.....		\$1,097		
Total Account.....		\$130,767		
Estimated Annual Income.....				\$4,211

MATTESON FUND--Continued

Statement of Transactions During the Period From September 1, 1962 Through August 30, 1963

<u>Date</u>	<u>Security Received by Exchange</u>
5/15/63.....	\$25,000. U.S. Treasury C/I B/1964, 3.250% 5/15/64 Received in Exchange for \$25,000 U.S.A. Treasury Notes D/1963, 3.250% 5/15/63
	<u>Security Distribution Received</u>
11/1/62.....	102 Shs. American Electric Power Representing a 100% Stock Distribution on 102 Shares, Payable 10/30/62 to Holders of Record 10/15/62

The holdings of the American Historical Association as of Aug. 31, 1963, compare with its holdings of Aug. 31, 1962, as follows:

	Value of principal	Estimated income		Value of principal	Estimated income
REGULAR SECTION			MATTESON FUND		
Aug. 31, 1962.....	\$654,324.00	\$22,026.00	Aug. 31, 1962.....	\$118,430.00	\$4,115.00
Aug. 31, 1963.....	736,031.00	23,212.00	Aug. 31, 1963.....	130,767.00	4,211.00

Charges made by the Fiduciary Trust Co. for management of securities as well as brokerage charges on purchases and sales amounted to \$2,695.00 for the Regular Section and \$487.00 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, 1963-64, 1964-65

## UNRESTRICTED FUNDS

(Submitted to the Finance Committee and the Council, December 1963)

Approved by Council, December 27, 1963

	Actual income and expenditure 1962/63	Original proposed budget 1963/64	Proposed revised budget 1963/64	Proposed tentative budget 1964/65
<u>Receipts</u>				
Annual dues.....	\$97,354.83	\$90,000	\$97,000	\$97,000
Registration fees.....	4,126.68	4,200	4,200	4,200
Interest.....	23,148.27	18,000	20,000	20,000
Advertising and exhibit space..... (Annual Meeting)	16,533.70	13,000	15,000	15,000
Royalties, publications and miscellaneous.....	6,076.69	1,200	1,200	1,200
<u>American Historical Review</u>				
Macmillan, editorial expense.....	2,400.00	2,400	2,400	2,400
Share of receipts.....	41,872.01	10,000	20,000	20,000
Administration of, services to, and housing of special grant projects.....	1,800.00	500	500	500
	\$193,312.18	\$139,300	\$160,300	\$160,300
<u>Disbursements</u>				
Payments to Macmillan Co. for copies of the <u>Review</u> supplied members.....	\$42,095.00	\$44,000	\$45,000	\$45,000
General Administration				
Salaries				
Exec. Secy. & Editor.....	\$18,000.00	\$18,000	\$18,000	--
Executive Secretary.....				\$20,000
Editor.....				10,000
Treasurer.....				1,000
Asst. Exec. Secy. (part time).....	662.06	2,000	2,000	
Asst. Exec. Secy.....	5,200.00	5,450	5,450	5,600
Asst. Editor.....	5,900.00	6,200	6,200	6,400
Bookkeeper.....	5,200.00	5,500	5,500	6,000
Editorial Asst.....	4,500.00	4,800	4,800	5,200
Secy. to Exec. Secy.....	4,494.51	5,200	5,200	5,400
Clerical Assistant.....	4,100.00	4,300	4,300	4,500
Membership Secy.....	4,700.00	5,100	5,100	5,400
Janitor (part time).....	1,749.36	2,400	2,400	2,500
Annuity for Exec. Secy. & Editor.....	1,426.67	1,440	1,440	2,400
Retirement pay - Miss Washington.....	699.96	700	700	700
Bonding Staff.....	131.24	200	200	200
Auditing.....	1,699.50	1,700	1,700	1,700
Travel.....	1,067.47	1,500	1,500	3,000
TIAA & CREF for Staff.....	1,473.86	1,600	1,600	1,925
Social Security for Office Staff.....	1,322.25	1,474	1,474	1,510
Life Insurance.....	253.20	280	25	
Contribution toward hospitalization of office staff.....	219.41	275	275	300
Unemployment Insurance Tax.....	1,024.70	800	800	1,000
Contingent & Miscellaneous.....	3,196.13	2,500	2,500	2,500
Legal Counsel.....		100	100	100
Office Expense:				
(Stationery, supplies, printing, postage, telephone & telegraph).....	7,458.77	8,500	8,500	8,500
House operating expense:				
(Gas, water, trash, electricity, insurance, supplies & minor replacements, etc.).....	3,064.80	3,500	3,500	3,500
Office furniture & equipment.....	2,562.91	1,500	1,500	1,500
Service Center conferences.....	.....	2,000	2,000	2,000
Notes contributed to the <u>Review</u> .....	924.36	1,000	1,000	1,000
Newsletter.....	2,043.22	3,500	3,500	3,500
Payment <u>Review</u> articles.....	1,665.00	2,500	2,000	2,000
Doctoral Dissertation Lists.....	59.78			
House Sinking Fund.....		1,000	1,000	1,000
	\$84,799.16	\$95,019	\$94,264	\$110,335

## DRAFT BUDGETS, 1963-64, 1964-65--Continued

	Actual income and expenditure 1962/63	Original proposed budget 1963/64	Proposed revised budget 1963/64	Proposed tentative budget 1964/65
<u>Disbursements--Continued</u>				
Historical Activities				
Pacific Coast Branch.....	\$300.00	\$300	\$300	\$300
Council and Committees.....	5,872.25	5,000	6,000	6,000
Special Projects Committees.....	1,218.54	3,000	3,000	3,000
Annual meeting:				
Program Printing & Mailing.....	5,660.44	6,000	6,000	6,000
Program Committee				
1962.....	386.72			
1963.....		1,000	1,000	
1964.....				1,000
Local Arrangements Committee.....	1,239.46	1,500	1,500	1,500
Ballot (printing).....	382.23	400	400	400
Dues:				
ACLS.....	100.00	100	100	100
Intl. Comm. on Hist. Sciences.....	116.70	135	135	135
(membership dues)				
Natl. Trust for Historic				
Preservation.....	100.00	100	100	100
American Council on Education.....	300.00	300	300	300
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.....	300.00			
	\$15,976.34	\$17,835	\$18,835	\$18,835
Investments, unrestricted funds.....	\$10,000.00			
<u>Summary of Disbursements</u>				
Macmillan Co. for copies of				
Review to members.....	\$42,095.00	\$44,000	\$45,000	\$46,000
General Administration.....	84,799.16	95,019	94,264	110,335
Historical Activities.....	15,976.34	17,835	18,835	18,835
Investments.....	10,000.00			
	\$152,870.50	\$156,854	\$158,099	\$175,170
<u>SERVICE CENTER</u>				
<u>Receipts</u>				
Sale of Publications - net.....	\$4,907.98			
Royalties.....	3,054.88			
Macmillan.....	10,000.00			
	\$17,962.86		\$15,000	\$15,000
<u>Disbursements</u>				
Salaries				
Asst. Exec. Secy. & Director.....	\$5,200.00		\$5,450	\$5,600
Secretary.....	4,380.35		4,750	5,000
Clerical Assistance.....	126.25		500	500
Office supplies, etc.....	916.28		1,000	1,000
Mailing services, etc.....	821.23		1,000	1,000
Travel.....	944.05		1,000	1,000
Authors' fees, printing etc.....	4,526.21		3,500	3,500
TIAA & CREF.....	315.46		500	500
Soc. Sec. Tax, etc.....	374.43		500	500
Contingent.....	95.19		1,000	1,000
Conferences.....	1,498.09		3,000	3,000
	\$19,197.54		\$22,200	\$22,600
<u>REVOLVING FUND FOR SERVICE CENTER</u>				
Balance, Sept. 1.....	\$54,458.96		\$47,258.96	\$38,658.96

## MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS

December 16, 1963

## I. GENERAL

<u>Total Membership:</u>		
Individuals - Honorary.....	14	
Life.....	329	
Annual.....	10,790	
Trustees.....	5	
Fifty years and over.....	28	11,166
Total paid membership, including life members .....		11,119
Delinquent .....		901
Total membership .....		12,020
<u>Gains:</u>		
Life members.....	6	
Annual members.....	1,774	1,780
<u>Losses:</u>		
Deaths - Honorary.....	3	
Life .....	11	
Fifty years and over.....	3	
Annual.....	38	55
Resignations.....	75	
Drops.....	776	906
Net Gain.....		874
Total membership, December 14, 1962.....		11,146
Total membership, December 16, 1963.....		12,020

## II. BY REGIONS

New England: Me., N.H., Vt., Mass., R.I., Conn.....	1,109
North Atlantic: N.Y., N.J., Pa., Md., Del., D.C.....	3,463
South Atlantic: Va., N.C., S.C., Ga., Fla.....	899
North Central: Ohio, Ind., Ill., Mich., Wisc.....	2,016
South Central: Ala., Miss., Tenn., Ky., W.Va.....	361
West Central: Minn., Iowa, Mo., Ark., La., N.Dak., S.Dak., Nebr., Kans., Okla., Texas.....	1,180
Pacific Coast: Mont., Wyo., Colo., N.Mex., Idaho, Nev., Utah, Ariz., Wash., Ore., Calif., Hawaii, Alaska.....	1,526
Territories and Dependencies: Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, Canal Zone.....	17
Canada.....	180
Other Countries.....	338
Address Unknown.....	77
Total Active Membership.....	11,166

## III. BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

	Total membership			Total membership	
	Dec. 14, 1962	Dec. 16, 1963		Dec. 14, 1962	Dec. 16, 1963
Alabama.....	64	66	New Hampshire.....	60	62
Alaska.....	6	8	New Jersey.....	392	421
Arizona.....	46	40	New Mexico.....	39	42
Arkansas.....	22	22	New York.....	1,621	1,588
California.....	866	962	North Carolina.....	207	254
Canal Zone.....	.....	.....	North Dakota.....	22	20
Colorado.....	110	136	Ohio.....	432	471
Connecticut.....	239	275	Oklahoma.....	49	56
Delaware.....	42	52	Oregon.....	100	101
District of Columbia.....	355	376	Pennsylvania.....	574	647
Florida.....	107	117	Puerto Rico.....	12	12
Georgia.....	84	100	Rhode Island.....	64	69
Guam.....	.....	1	South Carolina.....	62	72
Hawaii.....	21	22	South Dakota.....	21	24
Idaho.....	17	18	Tennessee.....	92	111
Illinois.....	462	623	Texas.....	244	303
Indiana.....	229	265	Utah.....	20	25
Iowa.....	114	133	Vermont.....	46	52
Kansas.....	92	104	Virgin Islands.....	2	4
Kentucky.....	93	98	Virginia.....	299	356
Louisiana.....	62	66	Washington.....	108	132
Maine.....	41	47	West Virginia.....	45	53
Maryland.....	345	379	Wisconsin.....	248	266
Massachusetts.....	554	604	Wyoming.....	7	9
Michigan.....	347	391	Canada.....	144	180
Minnesota.....	155	171	Other Countries.....	331	338
Mississippi.....	30	33		9,987	11,089
Missouri.....	148	213			
Montana.....	20	20			
Nebraska.....	69	68	Address Unknown.....	173	77
Nevada.....	6	11		10,160	11,166

## MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS--Continued

## IV. DEATHS REPORTED SINCE DECEMBER 14, 1962

Honorary members:

	Date of Death
Sir Frederick Maurice Powicke, Oxford, England.....	May 28, 1963
Alfonso de Esquivelle Teunay, Sao Paulo, Brazil.....	Mar. 20, 1958
Sei Wada, Tokyo, Japan.....	1963

Life members:

Arthur E. R. Boak, Ann Arbor, Mich.....	1962
Frederic Duncalf, Austin, Tex.....	Mar. 29, 1963
Austin Patterson Evans, Barnard, V.....	Sept. 1, 1962
Guy Stanton Ford, Washington, D.C.....	Dec. 29, 1962
John F. Kennedy, Washington, D.C.....	Nov. 22, 1963
Newton Dennison Mereness, Pikeville, Md.....	1963
Paul A. Moyer, Ames, Ia.....	Nov. 26, 1963
Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Scarsdale, N.Y.....	Mar. 12, 1963
Dorothy Mackay Quynn, Frederick, Md.....	May 21, 1963
Waldemar Christian Westergaard, Pomona, Calif.....	June 4, 1963
Edward Allen Whitney, Augusta, Me.....	June 27, 1963

Fifty year members:

Samuel Edward Corwin, Princeton, N.J.....	1963
May Patterson Marion, Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1963
Charles Seymour, New Haven, Conn.....	Aug. 11, 1963

Annual members:

Yury G. Arbatsky, New Hartford, N.Y.....	1963
Nathaniel Edward Ashby, Huntville, Ala.....	1962
A. D. Beeler, Indianapolis, Ind.....	July 1963
Pincus Berner, Ridgefield, Conn.....	Aug. 1962
Rev. Frederick W. Blatz, Washington, D.C.....	1963
Mary Elisabeth Bohannon, Aurora, N.Y.....	Sept. 29, 1963
Theodore H. Collier, Providence, R.I.....	April 1963
Albert Bickmore Corey, Castleton, N.Y.....	Nov. 1963
Sarah Dolan, Cambridge, Mass.....	June 10, 1963
Charles M. Gates, Seattle, Wash.....	Mar. 24, 1963
Henry A. Gencorelli, Glen Head, N.Y.....	1963
Charles Lacey Hall, Washington, D.C.....	May 31, 1963
Paul Kirby Herneay, St. Bernard, Ala.....	1962
Paul Honigsheim, East Lansing, Mich.....	Jan. 22, 1963
Ernst Kantorowicz, Princeton, N.J.....	Sept. 8, 1963
Rev. John A. Kemp, S.J., Chicago, Ill.....	1963
James Edward King, Chapel Hill, N.C.....	Dec. 1962
Harry W. Kirwin, Baltimore, Md.....	Mar. 11, 1962
Marshall J. Laforet, Waltham, Mass.....	1963
Conrad H. Lanza, Manchester, N.H.....	Sept. 1963
Carl Longay, West Hollywood, Calif.....	1963
Henry E. Luhrs, Shippensburg, Pa.....	1963
Loren Corey MacKinney, Chapel Hill, N.C.....	Oct. 27, 1963
Thomas P. Martin, Dunn Loring, Va.....	Mar. 17, 1963
Garrett Mattingly, New York, N.Y.....	Dec. 18, 1962
William G. Morrison, Los Angeles, Calif.....	Dec. 10, 1962
Joe L. Norris, Detroit, Mich.....	Dec. 4, 1962
Clifton E. Olmstead, Takoma Park, Md.....	Dec. 1, 1962
Cornelius D. Penner, Berea, O.....	May 1963
Fred Albert Shannon, Urbana, Ill.....	Feb. 5, 1963
William Francis Raney, Appleton, Wisc.....	June 24, 1963
Lewis D. Stilwell, Hanover, N.H.....	1963
George August Sumner, Philadelphia, Pa.....	Sept. 17, 1963
Arthur L. Throckmorton, Portland, Ore.....	1963
Alfred Tischendorf, Durham, N.C.....	Nov. 26, 1962
William Toth, St. Louis, Mo.....	June 21, 1962
Walter Prescott Webb, Austin, Tex.....	Mar. 8, 1963
William T. Wolf, Dallas, Tex.....	Apr. 18, 1963



## COMMITTEE REPORTS FOR 1963

### THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the American Historical Association met on May 18, 1963. The nominations agreed on were as follows:

For President.....Julian P. Boyd  
For Vice President.....Frederic C. Lane  
For Treasurer.....Elmer Louis Kayser

For members of the Council:

First vacancy .....Richard Hofstadter of Columbia University  
Richard W. Leopold of Northwestern University  
Second vacancy .....Wallace K. Ferguson of the University  
of Western Ontario  
Hajo Holborn of Yale University

For members of the Nominating Committee:

First vacancy ..... John Higham of the University of Michigan  
W. E. Leuchtenberg of Columbia University  
Second vacancy ...S. W. Halperin of the University of Chicago  
Donald W. Treadgold of the University of Washington

For Chairman of the Nominating Committee: John Tate Lanning of Duke University

As a result of the mail ballot, the following have been elected as members of the Council: Richard Hofstadter of Columbia University and Wallace K. Ferguson of the University of Western Ontario; as members of the Nominating Committee: John Higham of the University of Michigan and S. W. Halperin of the University of Chicago.

December 29, 1963.

FRANKLIN SCOTT, Chairman.

### THE COMMITTEE ON ANCIENT HISTORY

Report on Current Situation in the Field of Ancient History:

1. Demand and Supply. For the past few years the situation in ancient history has become seriously unbalanced. In 1960-61 at least 17 positions were open in colleges and universities; last year (1962-63) at least 21 positions were open.

The demand for ancient historians is rising partly because students appear to be increasingly interested in the origins of Western civilization; we find enrollments in courses now offered are on the rise. Partly, too, growing universities wish to round out their departments (either of history or of classics) by adding a man; sometimes this appointment is for a specialist, sometimes for a man in another field who will be qualified to give general courses in ancient history. Finally, major institutions now often desire two rather than one specialist in the area.

The supply on the other hand is at best static. Only about 12 major universities regularly prepare Ph.D.'s in ancient history (i.e., a graduate every year or two or three); the supply in any one year probably is not much more than the 6 reported for 1960-61.

2. Problems in the Supply and Training of Ancient Historians. Many fields today share our problem in lacking the numbers of specialists they need; it may perhaps be that the cult of modernism sometimes leads men away from the field of ancient history. Yet colleagues all over the country report the same fact--that really able men do exhibit a serious interest, but are not always able to translate this interest into completion of a Ph.D. program. The reasons seem to be several:

a. Preparation as an ancient historian requires more time and variety of training than is sometimes recognized: a man must know not only French and German but also Greek and Latin, and must be at home in two great disciplines, the historical and the philological (let alone archaeology and numismatics on occasion). All too few students have good grounding in Latin in high school, let alone Greek; and in college it appears that students frequently do not decide until their junior or senior year on a specific interest. As a result, their background is weak.

b. An interesting range of problems emerges in the overlap of ancient history between history and classics. Within most universities these departments feel that they have good relations; but in the practical results of requirements and attitudes, as shown in the programs of individual students, complications sometimes arise. Classics, for instance, often has primarily in mind linguistic and philological requirements and may allow little time for work in history (especially in other than ancient history); history may minimize the need for philological training. Men in classics, again, may feel that even minors in ancient history must be prepared in Latin and, hopefully, Greek; such requirements militate to reduce the number of graduate students majoring in another area of history who might wish to offer a minor in ancient history.

3. Actions of the Committee. By holding open meetings at the 1962 meetings of the American Historical Association and American Philological Association and by individual discussions, the Committee has sought to awaken colleagues to the shortage of ancient historians and to the problems involved. This has had more benefit than might be expected; colleagues, to a remarkable degree, have not been aware of the situation.

Much, too, could be done on the local level without any expenditure of money or formalities. The Committee has set before the chairmen of major departments of history and classics across the country the problems it has discovered and has requested that each institution consider the situation within its own framework. On this point, incidentally, particular benefit might come with respect to minors in ancient history; a very large percentage of the courses in the subject taught by all colleges and universities is given by men whose primary interest is another area of history or classics.

Further publicity will be sought through the medium of classical journals and forthcoming historical meetings. We must, naturally, tread with some care in presuming to give advice to individual institutions; but feel that the good will shown by our colleagues generally toward our efforts permits us to invite universities to consider the issues for themselves. During the coming year the Committee hopes to prosecute its efforts in this direction.

4. Fellowships. The problem still remains; if departments of history and classics can work out means of encouraging, in practice, minors and can arrange programs suited to well-prepared majors, what can be done to help those able students who are not fully prepared by their undergraduate work? This is the source of a marginal, but perhaps critical supply to meet the demand.

One obvious answer would be to gain the attention of these men early enough in their undergraduate careers so that they would be properly prepared. This deserves exploration on the local level; but unfortunately there will surely be many (and not always from major universities) who come late to their decision.

For these, the answer would appear to be fellowships over and above the usual assistance so that they could adequately ground themselves in the necessary languages and auxiliary subjects. From its beginning the Committee has had this step in mind, and to be truthful the more it explores the issue the more difficult it appears to be to

obtain the funds from foundations and to arrange a program solely for ancient historians (as against medieval historians, classical students generally, and so on). Very recently the Woodrow Wilson Foundation has announced that it will award fellowships for a "qualifying" year to able but ill-prepared students so that they can acquire necessary techniques and linguistic skills. The Committee feels that this step, together with increased local awareness of the need for financial support, may well help considerably in our problem.

5. Conference. Last fall the ACLS was approached with a request to underwrite a conference of interested elements, which was considered a necessary step by Dr. Boyd Shafer before formulating a fellowship appeal. At that time ACLS was unable to give assistance, but this spring (while the chairman of the Committee was in Europe) it felt such a conference might be possible if detailed proposals were submitted. As the thinking of the Committee has clarified with respect to the difficulties of getting fellowship aid, it has not taken steps in this matter to the present, but will consider in the future whether a conference would have genuine utility in its program under No. 3 above.

In conclusion the Committee has a very real obligation to express its thanks to the encouragement and advice it has received wherever it has turned.

NOVEMBER 1, 1963.

CHESTER G. STARR, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE HARMSWORTH PROFESSORSHIP

Because of the unfortunate illness of Professor Allan Nevins, the Committee on the Harmsworth Professorship was obliged to make a supplementary recommendation for this post for 1963-64. Professor Frank Vandiver, of Rice University, was proposed by the Committee and chosen by the Oxford electors. It is expected that Professor Nevins will serve during 1964-65.

November 1, 1963.

DAVID DONALD, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE HISTORIAN AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Committee met at AHA headquarters on September 28, 1963. It conducted its annual review of the government's historical publications: the Foreign Relations series, Writings on American History, and the Territorial Papers. It learned with approbation that a special committee of the AHA is recommending that the still unpublished part of the territorial papers be published by microfilm instead of by letter press; hearing of certain criticisms of the indexing of the Writings, it asked the Executive Secretary to transmit those criticisms to Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the National Historical Publications Committee. It also asked the Executive Secretary to discover what progress is being made in preparing a volume of the Writings to fill the 1904-05 gap. The Committee noted with approval Secretary Rusk's hope to keep the Foreign Relations series, now edited by Dr. S. Everett Gleason, within twenty years of the present time. Further in the direction of making historical records available, the Committee recommended that the Executive Secretary communicate to the proper person in the House of Representatives the natural interest of the AHA favorable to HR 6237, which would provide \$500,000 annually for ten years to support the publication program of the National Historical Publications Commission. (Some days later the bill passed the House, by a three-vote margin.) The Committee recommended also that the Council of the AHA request the National Archives to publish a statement on the accessibility to scholars of all types and bodies of government records down to a quarter-century ago.

The Committee gave detailed attention to a sub-committee report, a "Proposal for a Co-ordinating Advisory Committee" which would promote liaison between scholars

and government historical agencies, and which would help co-ordinate and advance the many historical programs within the national government. The Committee agreed that the needs of historians investigating the operations of government can be met by other agencies, of which the AHA is one. It endorsed the recommendation of the sub-committee, in respect of a co-ordinating agency among the present agencies of government, by passing a resolution of which the following are the essential clauses: (A) "that the Council of the AHA recommend to the President of the United States the establishment of an Office of Historical Adviser to be lodged within the Bureau of the Budget. This office would be headed by a senior historian . . . (B) that the office's functions would be as follows: (1) To explore the necessity and creation of new historical programs within the government. (2) To assist in the co-ordination of existing historical programs. (3) To assume responsibility for clarifying matters on the accessibility of records. (C) That the Association recommend members of an advisory committee for the Office of the Historical Adviser," who presumably would be appointed by the Director of the Budget.

The Committee resumed from the 1962 meeting, and from intervening correspondence, its discussion of pressing needs for the publication of certain government documents. (1) It asked the Executive Secretary to inform the chief of the photoduplication service of the Library of Congress that the AHA applauds the Library's microfilming of the House and Senate bills from 1789. (2) It agreed, farther, that whenever a member of the Committee thinks that some project is worthy of publication, he may communicate the matter to all the members for action by mail; when the Committee reaches a consensus, the chairman is to ask the Executive Secretary to write the appropriate government agency. This action constituted the Committee a kind of year-round committee on new government historical publication.

Finally the Committee requested the Council to submit to the 1963 business meeting of the AHA a resolution which, if passed, would request the House of Representatives to lift the broad restriction now imposed on consulting and publishing the records of the House which are deposited in the National Archives. This action would permit the publishing of the records of the First Congress, which has been requested by the National Historical Publications Committee. The Committee requested that the Executive Secretary inform the Commission that it recommends the early execution of this project.

November 1, 1963.

CHARLES A. BARKER, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON HONORARY MEMBERS

The Committee on Honorary Members nominates the following historians to honorary membership in the American Historical Association:

Roland Mousnier--France; Delio Cantimori--Italy; Sir Winston Churchill--England; Pyong-Do Yi--Korea; M. N. Tikhomirov--U.S.S.R.; A. Momigliano--Italy; and Sir Ronald Syme--England.

October 29, 1963.

CHARLES MORLEY, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES

The Committee held one meeting, on May 4, 1963, at the Association headquarters in Washington, D.C. After the presentation of a written report (which required no action) from Robert N. Burr, the United States Member of the Commission on History, Pan American Institute of Geography and History, the Committee devoted the rest of the meeting to matters connected with the International Congress of Historical Sciences

to be held at Vienna in 1965. For consideration by the Bureau of the International Committee on Historical Sciences (ICHS) at its meeting in Warsaw in May 1963, the Committee adopted recommendations regarding the program of the Congress, meeting places and hotel accommodations for those attending it, and the conduct of sessions and duties of chairmen. For consideration by the American Historical Association, it recommended that selected Service Center pamphlets and copies of the American Historical Review be made available for distribution to those attending the Congress; and that Boyd Shafer (a member of the Bureau) be made a regular member of this Committee on the termination of his service as Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association.

In September the Committee was canvassed by mail concerning a proposal for an international round-table on certain problems in the history of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, 1917-1945, the participants to be drawn mainly from those countries. The result of the canvass was a recommendation that the proposal should not be adopted in this form, but that it might be desirable to bring United States and Soviet historians together in such a meeting provided the historical questions to be considered promised to lead to a fruitful discussion.

November 6, 1963.

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER, Chairman.

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

There was no meeting of the Committee during the year. The Committee eagerly looks forward to the appearance of Vol. IX in the series, Court Records of Prince George's County, Maryland.

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

November 1, 1963.

EDWARD DUMBAULD, Chairman.

#### LITTLETON-GRISWOLD FUND

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements, Sept. 1, 1962 to Aug. 31, 1963

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$13,213.43	
Interest - Investments.....	\$1,225.00	
Savings Account.....	<u>526.43</u>	1,751.43
Proceeds on Sales of American Legal Records:		
Vol. I, <u>Maryland Court of Appeals</u> <u>1695-1729</u> .....	48.00	
Vol. II, <u>Select Cases of the Mayor's Court</u> <u>of New York City</u> .....	43.50	
Vol. VII, <u>Court Records of Virginia</u> .....	46.50	
Vol. VIII, <u>Court Records of Kent County,</u> <u>Delaware</u> .....	<u>68.50</u>	<u>206.50</u>
Postage, handling charges and storage.....		\$22.02
Membership dues of contributor.....		10.00
Expenses preparing Vol. IX, <u>Smith,</u> <u>Prince George's County Records</u> .....		<u>4.78</u>
	<u>\$15,171.36</u>	<u>\$36.80</u>
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		<u>15,134.56</u>
	<u>\$15,171.36</u>	<u>\$15,171.36</u>

## THE COMMITTEE ON MARITIME HISTORY

The Committee on Maritime History was constituted as a temporary committee to explore the desirability of forming a permanent association or commission on maritime history in the United States to collaborate with the Commission on Maritime History of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. Correspondence with Professors Mollat and Verlinden of the International Commission on Maritime History have resulted in plans for American participation in the program of that Commission at the Vienna meeting in 1965 and in arrangements for American participation in the preparation of the Bibliography of the Routes of Maritime Commerce being prepared by that Commission. These arrangements are now being handled by the Society for the History of American Discovery and by the Division of Naval History of the Smithsonian Institution, Philip K. Lundeborg, Curator. The immediate needs for international collaboration being thus taken care of, and consultation with members of the committee and others having persuaded me that there is not a good opportunity at present to create any useful new American organization concerning maritime history, I recommend that the committee be discharged.

December 23, 1963.

FREDERIC C. LANE, Chairman.

## THE COMMITTEE ON THE PROFESSIONAL REGISTER

During 1963 the Professional Register continued to serve an increasing number of members of the Association and institutions. Eighty-six vacancies were published in the five issues of the AHA Newsletter, and 197 vacancies were posted at the Annual Meeting. In addition, the Register made special searches for institutions requesting them. By the end of the year, the Register had approximately 1100 members.

The Committee reaffirmed its standing policy that all members of the Association are welcome to participate in the Register, but that the Register cannot transmit data of non-members to institutions listing vacancies, nor reveal the names of institutions whose vacancies are published in the Newsletter. Vacancies posted at Annual Meetings will continue to carry names of institutions, as well as other pertinent data.

January 15, 1964.

WALTER RUNDELL, JR., Assistant Executive Secretary.

## THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH NEEDS

The Committee, as re-constituted by the Council at the end of 1962, met in April. In view of the recent establishment of a Committee on Scholarly Historical Resources, the Committee on Research Needs left aside all considerations of material needs with one exception, noted in the last paragraph of this report.

The Committee reaffirmed its earlier conclusion that there is no present necessity for compiling a list of worthwhile subjects for research, or of gaps to be filled. Rather there seems a need for a stimulating presentation of new approaches to research, new concepts of analysis, new techniques of processing historical data. Re-working a previous proposal which had failed to win foundation support, the committee inclined to recommending the production of a top-flight guide to historical method and research, which might be a companion to the Guide to Historical Literature. The proposed guide would take up the traditional problems of historical method in present-day context, as well as new departures. It would presumably be directed to an audience not only of graduate students, but of practicing historians, scholars in other disciplines, and a broader public. The committee is, however, not quite ready to make a recommendation to the Council on this point.

Convinced that the research needs of the profession could in part be met by an institute which might offer many facilities, and attract sorely needed funds, the committee adopted the following resolution: "That the Council of the Association initiate action looking toward the establishment of an independent institute of historical studies that will promote and carry on research in the general interest of invigorating and enlarging the historical dimension in American culture."

November 7, 1963.

RODERIC H. DAVISON, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARLY HISTORICAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Scholarly Historical Resources, which was created in December 1962, has held two meetings at the Association Headquarters in Washington, the first on March 8, 1963 and the second on October 12, 1963. The original Committee has been immeasurably strengthened by the addition of three scholars who are also librarians--Howard Cline, Director of the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress; Melville J. Ruggles, Vice President of the Council on Library Resources, Inc.; and James E. Skipper, Executive Secretary of the Association of Research Libraries--and who have particular competence concerning library administration and the probable impact of modern technology and technical equipment on collecting, storing, and reproducing materials.

The Committee's basic problems derive from the expansion of historical research and training from the old centers into a large number of universities and colleges throughout the country at a time when both the established and the new centers are engaging in intensive research and instruction concerning areas of the world and fields of knowledge which were neglected until recently. Thus, a number of institutions have 1963 faculties looking ahead to 1980 or 2000, but operating with 1910 libraries and with collection and storing systems which are haphazard and unco-ordinated. Other universities, old and new, in old and new countries, face basically the same problems; our institutions are interested in knowledge everywhere, and universities in other parts of the world have many of the same concerns as we and are also increasingly interested in American history. The Committee therefore is considering these issues in an international as well as a national framework.

In its first meeting, the Committee ranged widely in its discussions of the problems, reviewing principally the technical developments in progress, the efforts made in various areas new to historical research in the United States, particularly with regard to Russia and Eastern Europe, Latin America, and South Asia, and the impressive effort under way to create an international bibliographic center in Paris. At the close of its second meeting, the Committee drafted a proposal for the Council of the Association in which it recommended the creation of a Center for Scholarly Historical Resources in the offices of the Association to serve as a co-ordinating institution or clearing house for information concerning new methods and equipment for collecting, storing, reproducing, and distributing historical materials and as a central agency for identifying, reproducing, and distributing those materials, guides, and bibliographies most needed.

November 12, 1963.

ROBERT F. BYRNES, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON SOUTH ASIAN HISTORY

In the Chairman's absence in India, Professor Earl H. Pritchard kindly agreed to continue as Acting Chairman through the summer of 1963. Since the Committee's application for renewal of the Rockefeller Grant was unsuccessful, the only business was the arrangement for the final appointment permissible under the terms of the

extension of the grant until September 1964. We have been fortunate in persuading Dr. Tapan Raychaudhuri of the Delhi School of Economics to come to Duke University as Visiting Professor for the second semester of 1963-64, and to the University of California for its summer program of 1964 in which other universities will participate. Dr. Raychaudhuri has already established a reputation as an economic historian, and is one of the very few Indian scholars who are thoroughly versed in Dutch as well as British materials for India's economic history in the modern period. He is also a member of the new Institute of Historical Studies and took a leading part in the seminar on Indian historical writing held in Delhi in January 1963 at which both the Chairman and Robert Crane were able to be present.

Dr. A.F.S. Ahmed, Reader in History at Rajshahi University, East Pakistan, completed a very successful semester at the University of Pennsylvania and summer session at the University of Chicago as a Visiting Lecturer in 1963.

The Committee hopes that the Asia Foundation will continue the annual grant \$2,500 to the Association which is making it possible for about 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.

Next year, the Committee will make a final report on its administration of the Rockefeller grant and submit recommendations as to its future.

The following expenditures were charged against the Rockefeller grant during the current year:

<u>Rockefeller Foundation Grant:</u>	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
Assistance for professors of South Asian history		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$ 11,912.99	
Grant .....	11,087.01	
Disbursements.....		\$ 11,789.77
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963 .....		<u>11,210.23</u>
	\$ 23,000.00	\$ 23,000.00

November 5, 1963.

HOLDEN FURBER, Chairman.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

The Committee met twice during the year, in the spring and fall, to discuss the work of the Service Center for Teachers of History and the status of history in the schools. As before, the most important work of the Service Center was publishing pamphlets and co-sponsoring conferences for secondary school history teachers. During the year six new pamphlets were added to the series, bringing the total to fifty-three. Plans were also made for the next year's pamphlets. The Service Center, in cooperation with history departments in colleges and universities across the country, sponsored sixteen conferences for teachers of history and the social sciences. The response from those participating in the conferences was enthusiastic.

The Committee is grateful to the Council of the Association for the authorization to devote \$5,000 per year to such conferences. Although this sum is small in comparison with the conference funds available for teachers of the sciences and mathematics, it nonetheless creates some activity in a critical area. Were it not for these efforts of the Service Center, the relations between the profession and teachers in the schools would be even more tenuous than they now are.

As a result of growing pressures for a general revision of the history curriculum in the schools, the Committee has prepared a proposal for a study of the sequence of history courses being presented in the schools. This proposal will be submitted to a



foundation. If funds are forthcoming, the Association will undertake an intensive study of the history curriculum and make concrete suggestions for improvements. The Committee would hope that the recommendations would be as helpful as those made by the Association committees around the turn of the century. Although, and partly because, other groups are making studies of the social studies curriculum, the Committee thinks the Association's influence should be exerted on this vital issue.

November 29, 1963.

JOSEPH R. STRAYER, Chairman.

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

The circumstance that the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize is awarded only in even-numbered years has not over-burdened the committee with work during 1963. Still, a number of books, and one manuscript, have been submitted to date. The number may be expected to increase early in 1964. However, the rules adopted by the Council in 1959 should enable the committee to cope with this literary influx.

November 10, 1963.

WILLIAM O. SHANAHAN, Chairman.

#### THE GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE COMMITTEE

The Committee has given even more careful than usual attention to the studies submitted for consideration, because the quality of half a dozen of them was quite high. Our recommendation is that a joint award be made this year to the following:

Dr. Edward W. Bennett, Germany and the Diplomacy of the Financial Crisis, 1931 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962). This book grew out of a Harvard Ph.D. dissertation and is distinctive for its detailed analysis of a restricted but important subject, utilizing still unpublished captured German Foreign Ministry archives and other material.

Professor Hans A. Schmitt, The Path to European Union (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962). Using published and unpublished sources in five languages, plus interviews, Schmitt has provided a balanced, provisional synthesis of a movement not yet completed as a historical phenomenon. We believe that the quality of this study plus our desire to encourage work in recent history and studies of broad synthesis as well as detailed studies warrant the selection of this volume along with Bennett's for the joint award.

In preparing for the work of the Committee in 1963, I sent invitations to about 220 publishers to invite them to submit studies for consideration. We received nineteen volumes, some of them only after I specifically requested them. As in the past several years, we have assumed that the award should be made to an American student of history for his first or second book, not to foreign nationals and not to more mature scholars.

November 11, 1963.

JOHN L. SNELL, Chairman.

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

Eight manuscripts were submitted in this year's competition, this being an increase of four over the number submitted in the previous year. These manuscripts were read carefully by the members of the Committee during the summer and early fall, and discussed at a meeting of the Committee on November 2nd.

The Committee's recommendation is that no prize be awarded this year. Several of the manuscripts had undoubted merits, but none was considered to be on balance worthy of the award. Rather than award the prize to a manuscript that failed to show

the necessary excellence, and thus perhaps lower the reputation of the published series, the Committee decided that no award should be made.

It is hoped that next year, if more than one manuscript of the necessary quality is submitted, it will be possible to award both the prize and an "honorable mention," the latter implying publication in the Beveridge series.

The Committee feels that the best manuscripts completed each year are probably not being submitted in competition but are instead being published through other channels. This is unfortunate, but remedies are not easy to discover. The Committee recommends, however, that the results of this and other competitions might well be more effectively publicized, perhaps by a full-page announcement in the Review.

November 3, 1963.

HUGH G. J. AITKEN, Chairman.

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE AWARD

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements Sept. 1, 1962 to Aug. 31, 1963

	<u>Receipts</u>	<u>Disbursements</u>
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1962.....	\$8,094.39	
Interest - Investments.....	\$3,675.00	
Savings Account.....	<u>186.73</u>	3,861.73
Royalties:		
Hofstadter, <u>Social Darwinism in America</u> .....	944.43	
McNail, <u>Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley</u> ...	31.00	
Hyman, <u>Era of the Oath</u> .....	72.00	
Perkins, <u>The First Reapproachment</u> .....	101.13	
Bentley, <u>History of the Freedmen's Bureau</u> .....	90.88	
Twyman, <u>History of Marshall Field</u> .....	24.00	
Van Deusen, <u>Horace Greeley</u> .....	99.00	
Ver Steeg, <u>Robert Morris</u> .....	40.00	
Perkins, <u>Northvern Editorials on Secession</u> .....	16.00	
Davis, <u>The United States and the First Peace</u> <u>Conference</u> .....	849.87	
Brown, <u>Middle Class Democracy and the Revolution in</u> <u>Massachusetts</u> .....	300.75	
Graham, <u>Colonists from Scotland</u> .....	57.27	
Johnson, <u>Development of American Petroleum</u> <u>Pipelines</u> .....	53.22	
Smith, <u>Professors and Public Ethics</u> .....	30.30	
Schroeder, <u>Axis Alliance and Japanese-American</u> <u>Relations</u> .....	169.66	
Spence, <u>British Investments and the American</u> <u>Mining Frontier</u> .....	41.67	
Castel, <u>A Frontier State at War</u> .....	121.05	
Pletcher, <u>Rails, Mines and Progress</u> .....	63.02	
Zinn, <u>LaGuardia in Congress</u> .....	34.97	
Conkin, <u>Tomorrow A New World</u> .....	108.95	
Paul, <u>Conservative Crisis and the Rule of Law</u> .....	139.46	
Clandenon, <u>The United States and Pancho Villa</u> .....	678.43	
Miller, <u>The Enterprise of a Free People</u> .....	<u>600.55</u>	4,667.61
Publication and editorial expenses:		
Davis, <u>The United States and the First Hague</u> <u>Peace Conference</u> .....		\$3,261.58
Membership dues of contributors.....		260.00
Committee meetings.....		434.69
Beveridge Award.....		<u>2,000.00</u>
	<u>\$16,623.73</u>	\$5,956.27
Balance, Aug. 31, 1963.....		<u>10,667.46</u>
	<u>\$16,623.73</u>	<u>\$16,623.73</u>

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

A "working party," under the chairmanship of Professor Ray A. Billington (Huntington Library) and including Professor Charles L. Mowat (University College of North Wales), Mr. C. P. Hill (University of Exeter), Professor Charles F. Mullett (University of Missouri), and Dr. Angus J. Johnston II (New Trier Township High School), began a trial analysis of history textbooks used in American and British schools. Following this preliminary survey, the "working party," together with the chairman of the Committee, met in Washington, D.C. during the week of August 26, 1963, to compare their findings and formulate detailed plans for the completion of the study. During 1963-1964 the analysis of additional textbooks will be carried forward, and in August 1964 the group will meet again in London to consolidate and review its findings preparatory to drafting a final report.

November 5, 1963.

RICHARD P. McCORMICK, Chairman.

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

A year ago it was anticipated that the Committee would probably complete its work and offer a report during 1963, but unforeseen difficulties forestalled completion of the general survey of pressures exerted by special interest groups on the writing, publication and use of history textbooks. It is now expected, however, that the work of the Committee will be pushed forward fairly rapidly during 1964, hopefully it will be pushed forward to completion.

December 15, 1963.

VERNON CARSTENSEN, Chairman.

## OTHER REPORTS

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

[The delegate served as chairman of the Association's ad hoc Committee on the Humanities, which made a report to the Commission on the Humanities. The Commission is sponsored by the ACLS, United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, and Council of Graduate Schools.]

On behalf of the Committee appointed by the American Historical Association to represent the Association in a discussion of the possibility of a National Humanities Foundation, may I submit the following progress report?

Your Committee was appointed by Boyd C. Shafer by letters of 15 July 1963. During the summer it proved difficult to secure responses from the appointees and impossible to hold a Committee meeting. In September, however, the Chairman of the Committee undertook to draft a brief of a report, which was circulated to all the members and to the Executive Secretary. The revision and enlargement of this draft has been proceeding; and a second draft, hopefully not far short of a final report, will be considered by the Committee at a meeting on 10 November. This proposed report is now divided into four parts:

- I. A definition of the Humanities and a consideration of their place in American life.

- II. An analysis of the character, functions, and present situation of the discipline of history.
- III. General review of some of the major needs of history, as seen by your Committee.
- IV. A Summary and specific Table of Needs for which government help and tax-supported financing are desired, if historians are to meet their responsibilities and history is to make its contribution to the welfare of the country.

November 5, 1963.

GEORGE W. PIERSON.

#### REPORT OF A REPRESENTATIVE TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF SOCIAL EDUCATION

Likely the most significant problem faced in Social Education, the official journal of the National Council for the Social Studies published in collaboration with the Association, during 1963 was the revision of the social studies curriculum. The April issue was devoted largely to articles on this topic. Subsequent issues have continued the discussion. The editor, Dr. Lewis Paul Todd, has expressed the hope that the magazine will become the sounding board for all significant developments in the revision of the social studies curriculum. Social Education has already made a good start in this direction.

In May members of the Executive Committee of the Executive Board of the magazine met with National Council leaders to discuss ways to improve the magazine. Among the suggestions coming from that meeting which the editor plans to incorporate in subsequent issues of the journal are a listing of significant articles from scholarly publications; annual commentaries on curriculum guides, replacing the monthly listings; and an annual presentation of recent research in the field. Hopefully these annual annotated listings will be able to winnow the chaff more effectively than the monthly reports have done. The space saved in the columns of the magazine can then be devoted to more substantive matters.

The editor keenly realizes the need for Social Education to carry more articles of scholarly content, as distinguished from those of a methodological nature. Those historians who realize the need for furnishing secondary school teachers with respectable intellectual fare, and who feel some responsibility for the status of history in the schools, would do well to submit products of their research for publication in Social Education. The editorial office is at 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

November 1963.

WALTER RUNDELL, JR.

#### REPORT OF A DELEGATE TO THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

During the past year, I have been impressed with the number of historians who are not fully acquainted with structure and operation of the Social Science Research Council. The Council is essentially an organization for fostering research in the social sciences, controlled by a board composed of three representatives each from learned societies and scholars elected at large by the board. It is administered by the unremunerated services of these representatives and a small professional staff. Aside from the necessary administration of reports and funds, the staff sees that the plans and ideas submitted by scholars, from any place or discipline, receive proper consideration.

The Council as an operating organization is administered by an Executive Committee, made up of five elected members of the board. The President and Vice President, who are members of the staff of the Council, attend the meetings of the Executive Committee.

Aside from appointing members of the various committees, the Executive Committee takes such actions as are necessary between the semi-annual meetings of the full board.

The central agency for considering proposals for conferences or new committees is the Committee on Problems and Policy. This is composed of nine members representing all the disciplines included in the Council. Its decisions are normally implemented by the staff and the Executive Committee.

For certain continuing functions, such as making various types of grants, the Council has standing committees. Normally each of these committees includes one member from each major discipline, but these scholars do not have to be members of the board of the Council. The committees make autonomous decisions on matters connected with carrying out their specified duties.

Special committees on areas of research report from time to time to the Committee on Problems and Policy, which decides on plans for further investigation. If substantial funds are needed, the Executive Committee may authorize an appeal by the staff to an appropriate foundation.

The Council, therefore, is primarily a shifting aggregate of scholars from the various disciplines. It helps to develop the research plans of scholars and to make worthy projects known to donors of funds. The Council does not have official attitudes or "points of view" regarding intellectual issues within the disciplines. In so far as it has general policies, these must meet the approval of the scholars elected by the learned societies voting as individuals.

December 1963.

THOMAS C. COCHRAN.

---

---

REPORT  
of the  
PACIFIC COAST BRANCH  
OF THE AMERICAN  
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

---

---

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

The sixtieth anniversary of the Pacific Coast Branch was commemorated at the San Francisco State College on August 27, 28 and 29, with a meeting that broke attendance records and a new format for the Annual Program that was a departure from tradition. More than six hundred Pacific Coast historians attended the sessions, and many high school teachers of history in addition accepted the joint invitation of the Service Center for Teachers of History and the Pacific Coast Branch to hear David Potter of Stanford University speak on "Interpreting the New Deal." About fifty historians from the East crossed over the Great Divide to participate in the sessions.

The new format for the Annual Program was appropriately bound in golden color paper and designed in Gold Rush antique print. Seventeen commercial and university publishers accepted invitations to advertise in the program; the program was forty-two pages long. Co-operating with the Pacific Coast Branch in holding sessions were the American Studies Association, the Conference on British Studies, the Society for French Historical Studies, and the Service Center for Teachers of History.

The 1963 meeting had twenty-seven sessions, six of them general sessions that considered such issues as history and fiction, the international aspects of the Gold Rush, the origins of World War II, and the legacy of the Middle Ages in the American West. James H. Stone of San Francisco State College presided over the session devoted to history and fiction in which John William Ward of Princeton University spoke on "The structure of the novel and the historian's use of fiction" and David Levin of Stanford University analyzed the methods used by William Faulkner to re-create history in *Absolom, Absolom*.

Besides the usual sessions in each major historical field, three sessions were particularly unusual and noteworthy. Neil J. Smelser of the University of California at Berkeley spoke on the effects of the Industrial Revolution on the family in Great Britain, 1770-1840, and comment was offered by David S. Landes and Cresap Moore. In a session presided over by Peter F. Sugar of the University of Washington, Professors George Barany of the University of Denver, Stephen Fischer-Galati of Wayne State University, and Ivo J. Lederer of Yale University analyzed the development and characteristics of East European nationalism in Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Gunther E. Rothenberg of the University of New Mexico provided the commentary. A session entitled "Agricultural History" had three papers analyzing technical invention (particularly the tractor) and agricultural progress in Egyptian, Soviet, and American economies. Robert L. Tignor of Princeton University, Dana G. Dalrymple of the United States Department of Agriculture, and Reynold M. Wik of Mills College presented the papers.

At the annual dinner John A. Schutz introduced the President of the Pacific Coast Branch, Richard W. Van Alstyne, who delivered an address on "History and the Imagination." President Van Alstyne urged his colleagues to challenge the interpretations of history, become seekers after truth, and to maintain an agnostic position towards one's own conclusions. Preceding the address, John W. Caughey announced that the Louis Knott Koontz Memorial Award for 1963 was given to Merze Tate of Howard University for her "Great Britain and the Sovereignty of Hawaii," which was published in the November 1962 issue of the *Pacific Historical Review*. Caughey also announced that the Koontz Award was now fully endowed and that it was an appropriate award for the Branch to give. Louis Knott Koontz was the second editor of the *Review* and its guiding spirit during a trying period of responsibility. John D. Hicks, the chairman of the Pacific Coast Branch Committee on Awards, announced that Martin Ridge of San Diego State College won the 1963 prize for his *Ignatius Donnelly: The Portrait of a Politician* (University of Chicago, 1963).

Presiding at the annual business meeting, President Richard Van Alstyne called first upon John A. Schutz, the Secretary-Treasurer, for his report. Schutz noted that the six hundred people attending the sessions represented almost half of the membership of the Pacific Coast Branch and that Annual Programs were now being sent to 2500 historians across the nation. This year's format, though long desired by the Association, represented a considerable contribution in time and raised questions whether the Branch officers could afford such luxury in giving their time. The finances of the Pacific Coast Branch continued in excellent condition. A surplus of \$1666.21 was on hand before the receipts of the San Francisco meeting were banked. (The profit was \$706.84.) Much of this favorable balance, it must be added, is the result of the generous subsidies of host colleges which provide secretarial services and the costs incidental to holding meetings.

Caughey, as managing editor of the Pacific Historical Review, then reported on his responsibilities. He announced that the length of the Review was slightly cut to give it a smaller appearance, but additional space was provided for a larger review section and articles. The number of unpublished articles on hand was kept purposely low to encourage prospective authors to submit their papers, and he urged authors of superior articles to give the Review first chance on their publication. Caughey also presented the report of the business manager, August Frugé, who was satisfied with the increased number of subscriptions over the years and signified the continuing pleasure of the University of California in its role as publisher and guarantor of the Pacific Historical Review. Robert Hine, as the representative of the Board of Editors, announced that Caughey has been re-elected as managing editor of the Review and Frugé as business manager.

President Van Alstyne then called upon George P. Hammond of the University of California at Berkeley to present the report of the Resolutions Committee (Lloyd Moore and Glenn Price were associate members of the committee):

Be it resolved that the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association expresses to San Francisco State College, to Paul Dodd, its president, to the Department of History, and to Glenn S. Dumke, former president of this college and now chancellor of the California State Colleges, its warm appreciation for their hospitality in this stimulating environment, on the occasion of the 56th Annual Meeting;

Be it further resolved that the Pacific Coast Branch expresses its thanks to Richard H. Wilde of Long Beach State College, chairman of the Program Committee, and to his eleven associates, for providing a varied and interesting intellectual fare for our enjoyment;

And be it further resolved that the Pacific Coast Branch extend to Eldon L. Modisette, chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, and to his colleagues of San Francisco State College, an expression of our gratitude for making such very comfortable arrangements for our stay at this Association meeting;

And be it further resolved that the Pacific Coast Branch expresses its appreciation to Boyd C. Shafer for his many years of service as Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association and Managing Editor of the American Historical Review, and for his generous attitude and assistance toward the Pacific Coast Branch in solving problems of mutual concern;

And be it further resolved that the Pacific Coast Branch extends its best wishes to W. Stull Holt, a former president of this Branch, in his appointment as Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association and as Managing Editor of its Review;

And be it further resolved that the Pacific Coast Branch expresses its sense of loss to the scholarly community in the deaths of four of its distinguished members with whom we have shared intellectual interests and educational ideas, namely, Charles M. Gates, University of Washington; Ralph S. Kuykendall, University of Hawaii; Arthur L. Throckmorton, Lewis and Clark College; and Waldemar C. Westergaard, the University of California at Los Angeles. Westergaard was the thirty-fifth president of the Pacific Coast Branch and served in 1940 and 1941;



And be it further resolved that the members of this Association pay tribute to these colleagues, honoring them for their achievements, their years of service to their institutions and to the young men and women who came under their influence; and be it resolved that we record in the proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch this testimonial of our respect and affection.

The resolutions were unanimously approved.

President Van Alstyne then called upon Frederick H. Soward of the University of British Columbia to present the report of the Nomination Committee, for himself as chairman and his colleagues, W. N. Bischoff, S.J., Wilbur Jacobs, Dorothy Johansen, and C. Bickford O'Brien. The committee nominated for president, Abraham P. Nasatir; vice president, John S. Galbraith; secretary-treasurer, John A. Schutz; for three-year terms to the Council, Leonard Arrington, John E. Pomfret, and Kenneth M. Stamp; for a three-year term as member of the Awards Committee, W. Henry Cooke. The committee also nominated as members of the Board of Editors of the Pacific Historical Review Charles A. Campbell, Robert Wayne Smith, and William Steckel. The report was unanimously accepted.

Van Alstyne announced that the Council had changed the meeting schedule for 1964 and 1966 because the national Association would be meeting in San Francisco in 1965. The 1964 meeting of the Branch will be held at the University of California at Los Angeles on August 25, 26 and 27, and the 1966 meeting will be held in the Pacific Northwest, probably in Portland. The Council had also voted to co-operate in every possible way with the national Association in making the San Francisco meeting a success.

President-elect Abraham Nasatir announced that Martin Ridge of San Diego State College had accepted the appointment of Program Chairman for 1964 and Mortimer Chambers was in charge of local arrangements for the UCLA meeting.

March 1, 1964.

JOHN A. SCHUTZ, Secretary-Treasurer.

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1963

Balance, January 1, 1963.....	\$1,881.66
Income:	
American Historical Association subvention.....	300.00
1963 Meeting, San Francisco State College.....	706.84
Advertising in 1963 Annual Program.....	1,026.50
Donations.....	50.00
Total.....	\$3,965.00

Expenditures:	
Program printing.....	\$1,130.55
Mailing of Annual Program.....	185.74
Program design.....	20.00
Expenses of Program Committee.....	47.00
Program, 1964.....	30.00
Secretarial Assistance.....	53.77
Insurance.....	5.00
Travel.....	30.00
Binding of PHR.....	3.66
	<u>\$1,605.72</u>
Balance, December 31, 1963.....	\$2,359.28

#### THE LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ MEMORIAL FUND

Balance, January 1, 1963.....	\$2,431.89
Income:	
Interest of all Branch funds.....	<u>198.79</u>
Total.....	\$2,630.68
Expenditures:	
Award for 1963.....	<u>\$100.00</u> 100.00
Balance, December 31, 1963.....	\$2,530.68

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

March 1, 1964.

JOHN A. SCHUTZ, Secretary-Treasurer.

TEN YEARS, 1953-1963, OF THE ASSOCIATION AND REVIEW

By the middle of the twentieth century the Association had acquired sound traditions and won a deserved reputation for solid, scholarly work. Jameson, Leland, Read, Schuyler, Ford, Buck, and others had built stable rock foundations, but the house was yet small and unfinished. The Association's standards were high, its functions relatively few. The Review was large and scholarly, though a bit stiff and austere. During the depression thirties and World War II the Association's finances were never adequate for more than a few modest activities. Even in 1953 these were limited to the Review, the annual two-and-a-half day meeting, the awarding of several prizes for scholarly publications, and general statesmanlike support for historical scholarship in the academic world and in government.

When a new Executive Secretary and Managing Editor came to the Association and Review in September 1953, he began to evolve what he later called a "five or ten year" plan to promote the study of history in the United States. Unlike some of our Russian colleagues he was never too serious either about the years or the plan; he never officially formulated a complete plan, never established priorities, never regarded any ideas, even his own, as sacred. His notes are scattered, often were in the form of letters to someone who, he hoped, would take an interest. Yet the objectives were always there. What he wanted was action to improve the study of history and, once having read Browning, he thought it better to set high goals and fail than low and succeed.

What follows here is an informal and prosaic account of what happened during ten years. As he writes the resigning Secretary and Editor is aware of Theodore Sorenson's observation about Washington memoirs: their inaccuracy is surpassed only by their immodesty. But he offers no apologies. Members of the Association know that the general policies of the Association and the Review are established by the traditions, the membership, the Constitution, the Council, and the Board of Editors, and that the Secretary and Editor often initiates action suggestions to the Council as he carries out these policies, supervises the work of the Association, and edits the Review.

We needed much, or so the new Secretary and Editor thought in 1953: goals, plans, imaginative ventures, a headquarters, personnel, money, and more loyal supporters who would actually carry on the ventures. Our capital funds in 1953 amounted to about \$500,000, our total annual income ran about \$50,000, our dues bringing in \$33,000 of this total. We had about 5000 paid members, most of them residing north of the Potomac and east of Ohio. For quarters we had four small overcrowded study rooms in the Library of Congress and in these four rooms five people, as they worked, bumped into each other, books, desks, and lamps. He thought how wonderful it would be if our funds amounted to a \$1,000,000, our income to \$100,000, our membership to 10,000 (a game of 10's). The meanings of the "curse of bigness" as well as of relative affluence were not as real to the Secretary then as they were later.

The funds of the Association now total over \$1,000,000 (thanks in part to a rising stock market); its income last year (1961-62) ran about \$135,000, in part because our members were willing to pay higher dues (\$10 now, \$7.50 in 1953); and the membership (paid) is over 11,000. The Association now has a satisfactory (not luxurious--historians are neither scientists or businessmen) headquarters building of its own which ought to be sufficient for another five or ten years. And during these years foundations (though they have a yen for the behavioral rather than the historical) have given the Association slightly more than \$1,000,000 for special projects. Most of this million has been spent and well spent and if members yearn for more they must remember that this million is a million more than that provided in the 1940's.

More important than material resources and size is what is done with them. The Secretary thought the Association should initiate studies and start action, whenever the Council would approve, on any work which would benefit historians and the study of history. This was, of course, so general an objective that no one could possibly object and also so general that it meant little. The specific objectives, as he haltingly and slowly tried to formulate them, out of the traditions of the Association, the expressed

views of the Council, and discussions with members on many campuses, were to maintain the traditional high scholarly standards of the Association and Review and

- I. Improve teaching in the schools, colleges, and graduate schools.
- II. Establish a job register to assist young historians (this was 1953).
- III. Assist scholarly research in money and in materials.
- IV. Provide bibliographies where needed.
- V. Enrich the Review through more broad and interpretative articles and more critical reviews.
- VI. Deepen and widen freedom of expression.
- VII. Strengthen weak fields of history.
- VIII. Establish an institute of historical research in Washington.
- IX. Expand the Association so that it would become a truly national organization.
- X. Enhance international relationships among historians.

Most of these objectives were not new. Someone, most often Jameson, had thought of each of them before, though the idea of a "Job Register" seemed a little shocking to some older members who regarded it as too materialistic and a bit *infra dig*.

The Secretary expected no revolution and hence, as a historian, little reaction from anyone. There were a good many members, he suspected, who expected little action. What he really hoped for was quiet, solid preparation on a number of fronts, while he came to know the varieties of the species historian and learned how to help historians make the past meaningful.

The Association and Review in 1953 had a small staff, just five (nine now). The new Executive Secretary (depression-conditioned and influenced by sharp-eyed Solon Justus Buck who demanded the most careful accounting and devoted Miss Patty Washington who saved not only pennies but string) thought he ought to guard every cent and do every possible task himself in order to protect the money of low-salaried, dues-paying members. The staff worked hard, especially Catharine Seybold, the Assistant Editor, and Miss Patty who, as Assistant Treasurer, kept the books. Miss Patty, who came to the Association in 1907 and retired in 1956, knew all the old members, everything that ever happened in the Association, and felt personally responsible not only for every voucher but also for every dues payment. With the temporary aid for one month of an old friend, Miss Patty did all the billing (of the 5000-6000 members) by hand. Miss Seybold edited and proofread all the copy, kept track of all contributions, offered intelligent, sharp, and constructive advice not only to authors but to the Editor and Executive Secretary. The staff made plans, hoped for the best, settled unhappily for a little less, and even dreamed a little.

The Executive Secretary wasn't allowed to dream much. Miss Patty's as well as the older members' hero was Dr. Jameson and Miss Seybold worshipped Mr. Ford. Those two gentlemen could do no wrong and the new young man (he was in 1953 but 46) could seldom measure up. He remembers with elation and nostalgia a day in September 1953, when Miss Patty brought in his professor's letter (1932) recommending him for membership in the Association and then Miss Patty saying she had done the same in 1940 for Mr. Ford (joined 1897) and that he, too, had had a bad cold "just like you, Dr. Shafer, when he came as Executive Secretary." At least all the comparisons were not invidious.

The hopes the Executive Secretary brought with him were, as might have been expected, shattered a little from the very beginning. The McCarthy year of 1953-1954 was a fall, winter, and spring of scholarly discontent. Soon after the Executive Secretary arrived he encountered the Reece (Carroll) Committee which was hunting reds in foundations and learned societies and forgetting those around the Volga. For the Committee an Austrian emigré of the 1930's investigated the Association, demanding that he see all its records and ordering the office to prepare lists of all sources of income, publications, prize awards, etc., from 1920. He saw and we complied, though we had to spend weeks gathering information and had but hours for our real work. The Association was accused, with a spider web chart to demonstrate, of being a subversive group (second in subversiveness only to the American Council of Learned Societies) whose purpose was to socialize American education. The chief evidence presented against it was a sentence, written probably by Charles Beard, in volume 16, Conclusions and Recommendations (1934), of the Report of the Commission on Social Studies, which had been sponsored by the Association during the late twenties and early thirties. The sentence, which, of course, was jerked from context, read "... the age of individualism and laissez-faire in economy and government is closing and ... a new age of collectivism is beginning." This statement was not a "recommendation" as the Committee investigator claimed. Plainly labeled a "conditioning factor," it was one of several descriptive statements about the society in which American education would have a place.

The Executive Secretary, being a historian and knowing something of Beard's omnivorous reading habits, thought he ought to find out whom Beard was reading and paraphrasing. He spent two days in the Library of Congress Jefferson Room, searching until he found a sentence in Herbert Hoover's American Individualism (pp. 10-11), "Laissez-faire has been dead in America for generations except in the books of economic history."\* In his required sworn statement to the Reece Committee the Executive Secretary quoted this pronouncement by Hoover and another sentence to show the danger of quoting out of context. He asked the Committee what happened to the meaning if the first seven words were eliminated from the Biblical saying: "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God."

Whether the Reece Committee would have been influenced by his lessons in history and logic he never knew, for the Committee broke up because of internal political fighting, not because of his teaching. The Executive Secretary had had his Washington baptism; he was unhappy about the whole affair but proud that he had stood firm.

The Association had more important and positive tasks to do, if the staff could do the work, the Council would approve, and money could be found.

The most important single service of the Association was and continued to be the editing and publishing of the American Historical Review. The Review in 1952-53, volume LVIII, contained in its 1090 pages, eleven articles (one in two parts), six "Notes and Suggestions," and 434 book reviews and notices. The 1230 pages of the 1961-62 Review, volume LXVII, contained sixteen articles, four "Notes and Suggestions," and 720 reviews and notices. Because smaller type and double columns were introduced in certain sections of the Review, the increase in print totaled the equivalent of about 200 pages per volume. In 1952-53 the Review received about 95 articles, in 1961-62 about 176 (225 in 1960-61). This meant that the percentage of articles rejected went up a bit. During the same span the number of books received about doubled but about the same percentage were being reviewed. Other rubrics of the Review, lists of articles and news, expanded, but the Review stopped publishing the authors and titles of all books received and now lists only those new publications which might be of interest to historians, and in the fall of 1962 the news sections became shorter (and other sections proportionately longer) when the Association began to publish a Newsletter.

---

\*The sentence was quoted approvingly by Hoover in his 1932 speeches, see Challenge to Liberty (1934), p. 51.

To arrive at qualitative judgments of the content of the Review is difficult, at least the present writer, an interested party, has difficulty. Systematic and unsystematic sampling of readers revealed that they wished "more of the same," hoped for and approved of the broadly interpretative articles the Review was trying to obtain, and thought the reviews were more critical than they had been. In general they seemed to believe that the Review showed new vigor, was less conservative, and as one commentator put it, "less stodgy." Probably American historians were becoming more thoughtful and sophisticated. Possibly the Editor's new emphasis on suggesting to and requesting articles from scholars brought in more good articles than had come voluntarily to the Review during earlier years. From 1954 through the summer of 1963 about a fourth to a third of the published articles were suggested or requested by the Editor. Among these he likes to remember, though it's not easy to choose, those by Bailyn, Bainton, Campbell, Curti, Ford (Franklin), Hughes, Hammond, Kennan, Kirkland, Langer, Masur, Potter, Schorske, Shyrock, and Woodward. After ten years the Editor thought the "average" quality of the articles had improved; perhaps no greater number of brilliant papers were published but fewer of the pedestrian variety were. If the literary quality of the articles seldom attained the ideal, it may have been because some historians do not always write noble prose. The Editor offered many suggestions and recast many sentences. But he was always aware that editing might change meaning and he was seldom satisfied either with the authors' writing or his own editing.

The attempt to obtain sharper and more critical reviewing was but partly successful. In 1955 the Review began to send out to every reviewer a printed form, "Suggestions to Reviewers." These as well as the many appeals of the Editor in lectures throughout the country and in notes in the Review seem to have had some effect. It may be, too, that the Editor's strenuous search for new reviewers (over 1,500 were added to the file while some were dropped) was not without result. By 1963 the Editor's office contained systematic information on the qualifications of about 2,000 possible reviewers and some of the new ones were excellent. But American reviewers were seldom as critical (in the best sense) as the Editor believed they should be. And this was true of the Review's reviewers. Sometimes we, the Board of Editors and the Editor, thought that the Review could set higher critical standards for all reviews by an increase in the length of a few. But alas, space limitations never permitted. Again and again we also considered reducing the number of books to be reviewed and increasing the length of the reviews. But always we decided, as the founders of the Review had originally planned, that we should try to be as catholic as possible in our choice of books to be reviewed. This meant we could not give much greater space to any one review, though during the last three years it has been possible to publish a few longer reviews (1000 words and up) by reducing the length of some notices (to 100 words).

Because of the pressure of space the Editor now and then questioned the use to which every page of the Review was put, especially the thirty to forty pages of each issue devoted to lists of articles currently published elsewhere. He often asked the Board of Editors and the readers for comment. Of the first seventeen historians who came to the office one week, sixteen, with varying enthusiasm, thought the lists valuable, one saying they constituted the most useful part of the Review. The seventeenth historian said, "Oh! does the Review carry lists of articles?" Members of the Board generally counselled retention. The Review retained them, expanded them into new areas. But the query still remains. Are the lists so valuable that thirty to forty pages of Review space each issue should be devoted to them? In several cases, as Ancient History and American History, they are the fullest and best current listing of articles, but all the lists, because they must be hurriedly compiled (every three months a deadline), because foreign journals often arrive late or irregularly, because the section editors have space requirements, and because these editors have different criteria for selection, are less than complete. To compile full lists of current articles for each issue of the Review several months' time and three times the space would be necessary. One phenomenon always surprised the Editor: some authors and editors of other magazines were offended when their articles were not listed. Perhaps the lists were read.

Whatever else was true about the Review, it became the largest and most inclusive in the world and perhaps this was a positive gain. Still it is quality that counts. If the quality was maintained or a bit improved, a large debt is owed the members of the Board of Editors who gave counsel, upheld standards, and critically evaluated many articles. Credit must also be given the many critics or referees who read those articles which the Editor believed, after a first reading, should be seriously considered for publication. They must remain anonymous, but without their donation of time and knowledge, the Review could not have been published. The Review covers all fields of history. No editor or Board of Editors could alone judge the quality or contribution of the submitted articles. In rendering a first (and sometimes) last judgment, the Editor did follow a rule of thumb: "If he knew about or much about it, it wasn't worth publication." But only specialists, the men who know more and more about less and less, can really judge the contribution of an article; an editor of a general journal such as the Review, comes to know less and less about more and more. His general judgment may be good, but he must have the advice of experts.

Many times the Board of Editors and the Editor asked another question. If the Review is so pressed for space, should not the number of issues be increased to say six a year? The answer was usually, "Yes, but this means personnel and money, the addition of a staff member or two, and \$15,000 or more annually." Whether the Review then went to six issues would depend upon the membership's willingness to pay more dues. If they were, the Board of Editors did not know it. If they are and want six issues, the Review could well use six hundred additional pages a year.

Many serious or amusing stories could be told about the editing of the Review as we tried to make it as perfect as we were able. A professor in a southern state, who declared himself a master of style, protested violently the addition of a comma required by Review style. Two historians in two great universities of the northeast resented bitterly the rejection of articles they submitted; they were authorities, whatever they wrote was publishable, how could the editor fail to perceive how good they were. Two or three authors, with some justification, protested the "over-editing" of their manuscripts; they were satisfied with the final product but for moments the air was thick. Once a dignified, serious, famous member of the Board of Editors failed to appear at the Board of Editors' breakfast meeting (held every December 30), though he had twice said he was coming. The Editor knew that he was in the hotel and wanted to come. The Editor's wife went out to find him and, recognizing him by the back of his bald head, found him in one of the crowded front rows at one of the scheduled sessions of the meeting. She sent him a note saying, "the coffee's on in suite ---." He came.

The Editor remembers one sad story of 1954 with particular poignancy. He so wanted one issue of the Review to be perfect (a vain dream). In addition to the office's customary six or eight readings of proof, he read the copy four or five times more, thought that he had caught all the typos. When the advance copy of the Review arrived, he took it home, went to bed, read straight through it until 11:00 p.m., suddenly screamed, swore. The printer had dropped the type and transposed three lines at the end.

If this Editor told representative stories, they would be less amusing. The printers at the William Byrd Press which printed the Review were craftsmen and Messrs. Wilson and Ellis there were masters. Most authors were happy to be published, grateful for suggestions, thankful for editing which improved (usually) their essays. One fine young historian who was an emigré told the Editor that acceptance of his article meant not only that he was accepted as a scholar but as an American. But stories arising out of routine editing seldom are as intriguing.

For the Association staff the Annual Meeting, always held December 28-30, is the busiest, most exciting, and most wearing period of the year. For members it is the time that they hear their colleagues read scholarly papers and hope (sometimes vainly) to refresh their knowledge, while they meet old friends and acquire new ones. For young men it is a time to "make contacts" and get a new or another job, for department heads a time to interview candidates, and for wives a time for shopping. For those from

small towns it may provide an opportunity just to get away from home and for grandfathers a chance, as one told me, to get "away from Christmas and the grandchildren."

The Annual Meetings, like the population, have exploded. In 1953 at Chicago not quite 1300 registered, in each of the last three years about 3000 did. The pre-1954 two-and-a-half day meetings of about thirty-five sessions became three day meetings of forty-eight sessions. But again did growth mean anything more than larger quantity? There was no way of knowing.

Were the papers any better? Did more historians come away with deepened knowledge of their subject and their profession? The Executive Secretary, too occupied with Association business, local arrangements, and individual conferences, seldom attended a session and cannot judge. Comments from members again indicated that the "average level" was higher. Only occasionally did one hear of a poor paper, as one at Chicago in 1962 in which a historian inflicted a rehash of a previously published mediocre article upon his audience. But only occasionally did a meeting have a great session, as the opening one in Chicago in 1959 in which three brilliant papers (those by Berlin, Woodward, and Hughes) were delivered. On the whole the discussions which followed the papers, if not the papers themselves, became more animated, more learned, more critical. In general, those meetings which rumor had forecasted as controversial attracted the biggest crowds. Perhaps the spectacle of one bright intellectual attacking another was worth the inconvenience of crowded elevators. But whether the discussions were animated or the controversies sharp, thousands pushed their way through the corridors and jammed into elevators to go to the sessions. And if paper-hardened veterans, forgetting the days when they could learn from their elders, seldom had a good word to say, some younger members always sought out the Secretary to tell him what a wonderful experience it was to see and hear the "names" and come to know their colleagues.

As the meetings became larger three critical cries grew louder. These, echoed in a silly and inaccurate New Yorker article about the meeting of 1960, were not new; they were simply louder or shriller. "Nobody goes to the sessions, they are all in the corridors and bars." This was simply not true as any historian who examined the facts, as historians might, could see. In New York in 1960 when the registration totaled about 3000, over 3000 (by actual count) attended the eight second-afternoon sessions, though still others did clutter the corridors and bars. A second cry, uttered chiefly by older members, was, "The meetings are too d---ed big, I never see my friends." The meetings were likely too big (they were in the 1920's, too), but friends did meet and if they did not, it was because they did not try very hard. A member could not just walk around the lobbies and see all his friends--neither in the Mayflower's jammed Peacock Alley nor the wide spaces of the Hiltons of Chicago and New York. And if historians thought their meetings big they should have attended meetings of scientists--spread over many hotels with perhaps 10,000 in attendance. The third cry was old, too. "The meetings have become nothing but 'slave markets' where hundreds seek and a few hire." Ever since this Secretary started going (1933) to meetings, young men have gone to them in hope of getting a job and department heads in hope of interviewing likely men.

To regularize the "slave market" and to bring candidates from about the nation to the attention of department heads throughout the nation, the Secretary started the Job (now Professional) Register in 1954. This, at least, did take some of the seeking and hiring out of the corridors. But he sees no way to avoid job hunting. The meetings will be used for the materialistic purposes: historians will want jobs or to change jobs; departments will be trying to fill new jobs or obtain replacements. What better place than the Annual Meeting?

The big event at each meeting is the Presidential Address. For many years the President gave his addresses at the annual dinner and since 1907 it has always been published as the first article in the January Review. Because the hotels usually charged exorbitant prices for a mediocre meal and because the President in 1962 wanted a change, the dinner was abolished and the President delivered his address at an evening

meeting (this had also been done in the 1930's). The prizes of the Association were also awarded at this meeting instead of the dinner as had been done.

With occasional exceptions (as Langer's in 1957) the Presidents in their addresses sum up their lifetime thinking about research and teaching. Often, in spite of the American historian's distaste for professional education and for philosophy, the addresses take a philosophical and pedagogical bent--"This is what I have learned and wish to pass on to the younger generation." But a Russian was wrong when he wrote in the Voprosy Istorii that the Presidents of the Association laid down the line "for the following year." The Presidents speak for themselves; they have absolute freedom; everyone else is free to follow or not to follow. Historians in America honor their President as an outstanding scholar and as titular head of their profession. They follow when the words seem reasonable and wise. The Presidents themselves never laid down a "line," never expected they would be followed except as reason persuaded, and their words were subjected to the free critical evaluation characteristic of American scholarship. The subjects of the addresses varied widely as did the reactions. The most enthusiastically received (and reprinted) of the addresses, that of Dexter Perkins in 1956, concerned not the direction of research but the joy of teaching. When William Langer, through scholarly example, suggested the use of psychoanalysis as "The Next Assignment" in historical studies, his hearers and readers were impressed but paid little heed. A largely autobiographical address, that by Webb in 1958, inspired both "rave" comments and "digs" like: "The personal pronoun was certainly prominent." Two generalizations are possible: several Presidents have been critical of the addresses of several of their predecessors and successors. Most members think the addresses, major contributions to the discipline and to the profession.

From 800 to 1500 members and friends listened to each of the Presidential Addresses. But a fraction of this number attended the other official Association meeting, the Business Meeting, always held at 4:30 p.m. on the second day. To hear the careful accounting of the Treasurer, the report of the Secretary and Editor on the Association's affairs and state of history in America, and the summary of the Council's actions, and to participate in the discussion of Association affairs but one hundred to three hundred members appeared--among them a few of the faithful, as Frank Maloy Anderson who attended fifty consecutive meetings before his death in 1961, Lawrence Gipson, Samuel Flagg Bemis, and Jeannette Nichols. The 4:30 hour for the meeting is probably not the best time, for it is then that publishers and others schedule their cocktail parties. Probably the reports are dull. "Anyhow," the excuse runs, "you can always read them in the Review or the Annual Report and there's no use coming unless we're unhappy about something." Apparently few were unhappy; how many read the reports is not known; but few came to the Business Meetings. Up to 1963 the low attendance had no serious result, though if some members had attended they might have learned that something they wanted done was being considered or had been done. In the future, however, a serious problem could arise. A "rump group," smaller than a Cromwellian Parliament, could push through a motion which no one else wanted or could even be harmful to the interests of historical study. Ultimate authority in the Association rests in the full membership. By the terms of the Constitution it can "instruct the Council to discontinue or enter upon any activity." Even if this Constitutional provision did not exist, the business of the Association is the business of members, for by its Charter the Association exists to promote historical studies "in the interests of American history and history in America."

For years (though decreasingly) the Secretary heard his colleagues complain about the lack of outlets for publication and the slowness of historical journals in publishing articles. Whatever was true of other journals (the editor knew how exaggerated some of the stories were), the Review, during ten years, rejected or accepted articles in from two to six weeks. Though consideration of two, because of the summer holidays of readers, took three months, the average time was less than four weeks. And the Review always, during the ten years, published articles from six to fifteen months



after their acceptance, the average time being about nine months, with two being published in less than four months after reception.

Most historians have had, in recent years, little difficulty in obtaining publication if their articles and books were based on serious research, well written, and contributed new information or interpretation. There were more than eighty journals in the United States which published articles recognizable as history and some American historians published in foreign journals. Though commercial publishers (Knopf and a few other companies excepted) published little history other than textbooks, the rise of the university presses (some with subsidies from the Ford Foundation) meant that most authors could publish their books--though some should not have.

The Association has always tried, and not only through the Review but also through its prizes and awards, to assist in publication and to raise the standard of what was published. Hoping to reward outstanding published work, it offered during all or part of the ten years the Herbert Baxter Adams (\$300), George Louis Beer (\$200 and then \$300), Dunning (\$140 and then \$300), Littleton-Griswold (\$500), Robert Livingston Schuyler (\$100), and Watumull (\$500) prizes. To provide for publication it had the Albert J. Beveridge Award (\$1500 in addition to publication) and, until 1957, the Carnegie Revolving Fund which published 37 volumes during the thirty years of its existence.

Several times the Council of the Association, at the suggestion of the Secretary, questioned the worth of the prizes--whether they really did encourage outstanding publication. Again no definite answer was possible. Desirous of winning acclaim for their printed works, publishers and editors submitted many books for the Adams, Beer, Dunning, and Schuyler prizes in European, American, and English history, though few for the Watumull Prize in Indian history. For the other prizes not many manuscripts were entered. During ten years but from four to fourteen entries came to the Beveridge Committee each year, with the average being about six. During the three years, 1961-63, the Littleton-Griswold Prize was offered, the Committee did not find a single work which it could honor. When the Association, with the aid of the Cornell University Press, offered the Moses Coit Tyler Prize of \$1500 plus publication for a "best" work in American Intellectual History, so few manuscripts were submitted that the prize, after one award, was discontinued.

Were the Prizes worth the efforts of the Committees? Probably, but the number of manuscript submissions in recent years did not reveal that many good books were failing to find publishers. It may be that the ridiculously low financial rewards (in our era of inflation) of most of the prizes did not encourage quality. If the Association continues to offer prizes, the prize sums might be materially increased. The Council has recently ruled that no new prize funds with capital sums of less than \$5000 will be accepted and has favored prizes which bring publication. But were prizes now the best way to encourage outstanding publication?

Major regular and continuing activities of the Association (the Review and Annual Meetings) as well as the increased membership, capital resources, and annual income reflected the material growth of American society. So did other new or renewed ventures of the Association. Both the old and the new also evidenced the sharpened concern of the profession and Association for the well being of individual historians, for teaching and research, for freedom in historical work, and for exchange of ideas among the historians of the world.

In 1953 the Executive Secretary had made it a condition of his acceptance of the position that the Association pay more attention to the young historians, in concrete terms do something about jobs for them. After the bulk of the G.I.'s of World War II had obtained their education and after the Korean War, the expansion of colleges and universities slowed during the very time an increasing number of Ph.D.'s in history were seeking positions. A greater number of trained men were available while fewer positions were offered. The result was a surplus and unemployment. There was no way, at least immediately, to create additional jobs, but perhaps the Association could find a way to inform historians of possible openings. The Secretary proposed a Job Register,

not a placement agency, to do just this. The Council, with the qualification that the Register should be more or less self-supporting, approved. In 1954 member historians began to register with the Association by filling out a standard form and paying \$2 (later \$3). Institutions seeking candidates inquired and the Secretary, without recommendation, picked out and sent to the inquiring departments the registration forms of those whose qualifications seemed to fit the requirements--a time-consuming task but departments did not wish mass applications and they demanded quick action.

By the meeting of 1954 the Register contained the names of 145 historians and institutions had begun to make inquiries. By 1963 over 700 historians were currently registered and during the preceding year over 250 institutions asked for assistance in filling positions. During the nine years of the Register's existence the Secretary, with the advice of the Register Committee, introduced three changes. In the late fifties the Association staff began to maintain the Register at the Annual Meetings; hundreds of historians registered at each of the several meetings and at the 1962 meeting over 150 departments listed 188 positions and sought assistance in arranging interviews. In 1961 the name was changed to the Professional Register--a concession to those who thought the word "job" somewhat undignified. And in 1962 with the establishment of the Newsletter, the Association began to inform all members of openings. Registrants now simply indicated (by letter) the positions for which they wished their name to be considered and their "forms" (in considerable numbers) were forwarded by the Association office.

The Register never became fully self-supporting, the Executive Secretary and his secretary and later the Assistant Executive Secretary and his secretary doing most of the work. To the most important question, did institutions hire considerable numbers of historians through the Register, there was no exact answer. That they used the Register, that candidates were brought to their attention through the Register, and that the operation was both needed and heartily approved, both the number of registrants and inquiries as well as sampling of the opinion of the registrants and of departments attested.

No magic wand created jobs for historians in 1954 and the years following; economic abundance and the mounting interest of Americans in education did. In 1963 there were not enough Ph.D.'s in some fields of history to meet the demand, and increasing numbers of historians without the "union card" were going out to teach in the colleges and universities.

During the decade no shortage of teachers of history for the secondary schools appeared, but informed critics agreed that there were too few qualified teachers in these schools and that many of the courses offered fell below scholarly standards. As far back as the 1920's scholars had questioned the quality of the offerings of the American schools, and from about the time of the Korean War and the Russian atomic breakthrough, the "intelligent public" began to do likewise. In the early 1950's some scholars, as Arthur Bestor, became angry enough to attack the "educational wastelands." In history this meant some of the teaching and courses in the tenth and eleventh grades in World History and American History, the two history courses usually offered in the high schools. Tired of and disgusted with education adjusted to the "whole child," the scholars demanded disciplined learning about subject matter. In 1952 Bestor, with many supporters among outstanding historians, presented strong resolutions to the Council of the Association, asking for action by the Association. The Council authorized a Committee to formulate policy, approach other groups, and discuss with these groups the establishment of an "interdisciplinary educational commission." Out of this authorization came an Association Committee which in statesmanlike language recommended action but did little more, and a second Committee headed by Professor Sidney Painter of Johns Hopkins University, a Committee on Teaching, which did make plans and did act.

The Secretary remembers a gloomy winter day of the winter of 1955 when he drove over to Baltimore to ask Sidney Painter to head the new Committee on Teaching. A medievalist, a scholar, and a gentleman with a seeming off-hand air, Painter seemed

a strange choice. But he, after the expected expression of reluctance and disillusion, said he would give it a try, just as the Secretary suspected and hoped he would. He and the Committee, Arthur Bestor, Erling Hunt, Joseph Strayer, Edgar Wesley, Agnes Meyer, and Boyd C. Shafer--with William Cartwright, Francis Keppel, and a high school teacher, Edith Starratt, soon to be added--not only made plans but set down concrete proposals. To assist high school teachers they asked for the establishment of a Service Center, (1) to prepare and publish pamphlets summarizing late research and providing readings, and outlines of good courses being given, (2) to provide conferences between teachers of history in the schools and professional historians so that both could learn--the first of the "content" of history, the other of the problems of the schools, and (3) to establish a consultant service for the schools through visits by historians to the schools. The purpose, always stated positively, was: "to bridge the gap between the teacher in the school and the historian."

In 1955 the Secretary carried a request to the Ford Foundation. To his and almost everyone's surprise the Foundation granted \$148,000 for a three-year experiment, and in 1959 an additional \$140,000 for another three years. The Service Center began operation in July 1956, when Dr. George Carson became its first Director. He continued to direct the Center for five years, until 1961, when he was succeeded by Dr. Walter Rundell, who became both Director of the Service Center and the Assistant Executive Secretary of the Association.

From 1956 to mid-1963 the Service Center published fifty-three pamphlets written by outstanding specialists and covering phases of most fields of history. Not only high school teachers but graduate students and even professors valued them as surveys of recent research and as guides to further reading. To bring the high school teachers and "professionals" together to talk about history, the Center also sponsored dozens of conferences (usually one to three days in length) in all parts of the country, but particularly in the middlewestern and plains states where interest proved strongest. The teachers, the professors, and the departments sponsoring the conferences all acclaimed them and asked both that they be longer and more numerous. The hoped-for consultant service, however, never developed. School teachers and administrators wrote to the Service Center for advice; few of them ever requested historians as consultants in the same way as they did "educators" or interior decorators. The Center did not possess funds or personnel to "promote" the consultant service and most administrators were apparently too busy either to learn about it or to plan far enough ahead to use it.

From its beginning the Service Center faced three major obstacles: (1) the opposition of professional "educators" to suggestions from "subject matter specialists," (2) the apathy of most teachers and professional historians, and (3) inadequacy of funds.

The opposition of the educators, never too vociferous, diminished as they were attacked from other quarters. A considerable number of teachers became interested as the services of the Center proved themselves, and a few more historians took an active part as a few departments recognized the need and gave some recognition to these who did participate. Still, relatively few teachers had the time or will to study "content," and too few historians took time away from their research, teaching, and status seeking to help the schools. The financial limitations were never overcome. When the funds from the second Ford grant were exhausted in July 1962, the Service Center had accumulated around \$55,000 from sales of pamphlets and it was with this sum plus expected royalties from a new publishing arrangement with the Macmillan Company that the Association hoped to and did continue the Center's operations on a reduced scale.

In the United States during the late fifties and early sixties the federal government and the foundations poured millions of dollars into improvement of education in the sciences, but little dribbled down to history. One year when the Service Center had \$7,000 to allot for conferences of teachers, the National Science Foundation had millions for similar work in the sciences. Probably the grantors of funds believed science important in the "cold war" and history relatively unimportant; probably

historians evinced too little interest in the schools; at any rate science appealed to the grantors of funds and history did not.

To the crucial question, was the teaching of history better as a result of the Service Center's activities, no certain answer was possible. Teachers bought and read the pamphlets in numbers--by mid-1963 the distribution of the pamphlets totaled about 660,000. Hundreds of teachers attended the conferences and applauded them. In Texas, Indiana, and a few other states the example of the Service Center stimulated history departments to "go and do likewise."

Helpful as the Service Center activities appeared to be they touched but some of the problems involved in teaching history to millions of young Americans. The Committee (now headed by another scholar, Joseph Strayer), the Secretary, and the Director of the Center all agreed that much more should be done. For the Center William Cartwright in 1962 prepared a useful brochure, "Preparation of Secondary-School History Teachers"; by 1963 over 15,000 copies had been distributed. Beginning in 1959 the Committee initiated plans for studies of the curricula, particularly of world history. Teachers were often ill-prepared to teach this course and the course itself in attempting to cover "everything that ever happened" often did just this in confusing and superficial ways.

In 1961-62 the Association went to two foundations to obtain aid for the preparation and testing of four or five experimental courses in world history. But the two foundations, intrigued by other proposed studies of the entire "social studies" curricula from "K through 12," or in one case beguiled by TV, refused assistance, at least until the results of "other studies" were known. In July 1963, one foundation, however, was apparently experiencing a "change of program" and there was hope.

The Association, with qualified teachers and historians willing to serve, was ready to make comprehensive studies and recommendations concerning history in the schools. This it had done, in differing ways, from 1895 to the 1930's and again from 1953. But whether foundations would support the necessary studies by qualified people remained to be seen. Historians believed that the teaching of history would be better if the teachers first of all knew more history; whether this approach would seem exciting enough to foundations was doubtful. Perhaps other approaches would succeed better, both with foundations and with government. In any case the Association, a tax-exempt organization, could not lobby, nor could it, following its traditions, do more than promote scholarly study of history.

Too often in learned societies, and like groups, projects are broached, a committee is appointed, and a report is made--with no further result. This has happened in the Association, but more often committee proposals have led to action. Because historians possessed little concrete information about their profession, the Secretary and Editor began, as soon as he arrived, to gather statistics on the numbers and kinds of historians, salaries, grants, and publications. The information that he obtained on his own was scanty and based on faulty sources. He sought and obtained two helpful articles for the Review, "A Survey of United States Historians . . . and a Forecast," by J. F. Wellemeyer (*AHR*, January 1956) and "Assistance Available for Post-Doctoral Historical Research and Publication," by Louise Wade (*AHR*, April 1957). But he soon concluded that much more research would be necessary if historians were to "know themselves." What was needed, he came to think and suggested to the Council, was a major study of the kind Flexner had done many years before on the medical schools, but with special emphasis on teaching. Then at the Annual Meeting in 1956 President Dexter Perkins gave his inspiring address, "We Shall Gladly Teach."

As the Council had been willing, the Secretary thought the time for action had come. One winter day in 1957, while accompanying Professors Dexter Perkins and Samuel Flagg Bemis on a walk near the Library of Congress, he asked Professor Perkins if he would head a "Committee on the Profession." Professor Perkins thought a study vital but his own commitments were so numerous that he hesitated for two weeks before agreeing to serve.

A working Committee (Jacques Barzun, Fred Harrington, Edward Kirkland, Leonard Krieger, and Boyd Shafer) was appointed, met, and outlined objectives that stressed the teaching function of the profession. For the Association Professor Perkins and the Secretary approached the Carnegie Corporation. The Corporation was unwilling to support a general study, but in June 1958, it granted \$49,000 for a survey of and recommendations concerning graduate education in history. Within a few months the study was under way, with Professor John Snell as its Director. Owing to the strenuous efforts of Professor Snell, in two years it was completed. Based on extensive correspondence, many interviews with members of graduate departments, and hundreds of detailed questionnaires directed to college and university departments, administrative officers, and students, The Education of Historians in the United States was a comprehensive report not only on graduate training but on the numbers and interests of American historians, on the quality and interests of students, on the fellowships and stipends available, and on the needs for the future when qualified teachers would be both much needed and scarce. Some members of the profession disagreed with the "Recommendations" of the Committee concerning "standards," but all who commented agreed that for the first time the profession had solid information and that minimum standards, at least, were established for the numerous institutions just beginning doctoral work. Even a few well established institutions revised their graduate offerings to meet these standards.

The Education of Historians covered undergraduate work only insofar as it related to graduate work. The comparable study of undergraduate instruction, also much needed, is yet to be done.

The Association helped teachers in other ways. Requests for information came often to the office. If prolonged research was not necessary, the Secretary gave such assistance as he could, most often by indicating a better source. The Association embarked on one other venture to strengthen teaching, this in South Asian history, a field long neglected in the United States but becoming, because of world events, of great significance. With Holden Furber leading, an Association Committee composed of Robert Crane, Merle Curti, David Owen, Earl Pritchard, and the Secretary laid plans to bring outstanding historians from Asia and Europe to teach at those major graduate centers that had already shown direct interest, as Pennsylvania, Chicago, and Duke. The Rockefeller Foundation granted \$140,000 for a five (later extended to six) year program. With these funds the Association brought twelve South Asian specialists to the United States. There were two certain results: the level of instruction was raised and more young American students were trained to teach South Asian history. But the number of trained American historians in the field was still too few.

In 1961 the Association also took a first step to assist in an old but declining field, ancient history. Though the demand for ancient historians was light, the supply of qualified men was still lighter. Only a tentative plan was evolved by a Committee headed by Chester Starr, and, in any case, the essential outside funds to support students during the required long training were not in sight.

Most historians apparently believed teaching more important than publication. But the most professional of professional historians, those in the graduate departments of great universities, placed the emphasis on research and writing. And traditionally and actually the Association, in the Review and in other activities, has done likewise. Though the Association never had funds to support research by individual scholars, it could support or sponsor the preparation of those indispensable tools of research, bibliographies, guides, and indexes, and it could support agencies that offered research grants.

In some cases the bibliographies and indexes had long been contemplated; in others they were newly conceived to meet arising needs. For work of this kind the Association fortunately had the Matteson Fund, a bequest (originally \$67,000, \$94,000 in 1963) left the Association in 1947 by the well known bibliographer, David Maypole Matteson. Only the income from this Fund could be used; it was never enough to support any bibliographic project completely; but it did provide for subsidies sufficient to initiate

or complete work. Matteson himself had started work on an "Index to the Writings on American History, 1902-1940." He left cardboard boxes of bibliographical notations on narrow strips of wrapping paper for about half of the alphabet. Others, selected by the Executive Secretary, had carried the task on a bit further. The huge Index to indexes was finally completed and published in 1956, with much of the work being done during the preceding three years. Another long delayed Index, that to the Review for the years 1935-1955, was published in 1962 (by Macmillan). The regular ten-year index for the years 1935-1945 had not been done; the new twenty-year index was a major undertaking; at one or another time during the five years of preparation four people worked upon it, with Nathan Haverstock doing the final checking and editing of copy.

For historians bibliographies are indispensable. But few like to do them--they are not "creative"; still fewer are able to do them, for the work is tedious and exacting. For nearly twenty years before 1953 members of the Association talked about preparing a new or revised Guide to Historical Literature. The original Guide, published in 1931, was still useful and still sold, but it was far out-of-date. No plans had been formulated but individual historians, like the Secretary, thought a new Guide imperative for a new generation of historians, even though the vast mass of new historical writings and the great cost of compiling and editing made the task seem impossible.

The Council in 1953 authorized appointment of the usual committee. But the Committee was not "usual," for while it saw obstacles, it thought them surmountable. As is usual on Association Committees, it represented different fields of history: George Howe, the Chairman was in American history, Gray Boyce in medieval, T.R.S. Broughton in ancient, Howard Cline in Latin American, Sidney Fay (an editor of the old Guide) in modern European, Michael Kraus in American, Earl Pritchard in Chinese, and Boyd C. Shafer in modern European. But it was unusual for a Committee to seek and obtain advice from many scholars inside and outside the general field of history and still be able to agree on a concrete plan.

By 1956 the Committee's plans had progressed far enough so that the Association, represented by the Chairman and the Secretary, could approach the Rockefeller Foundation. The Rockefeller Foundation was more generous than expected, granting up to \$75,000 when the Committee actually hoped for \$50,000 (it spent \$48,000).

From the beginning the Committee planned to devote much more space than had the old Guide to the newer fields of history, Asian and African. This was done, seemingly at the expense of older fields such as British history where many books on old British colonies were now listed under the new rubrics. Actually the new Guide, nearly a 1000 pages long with 20,000 entries, was much larger than the old. It was not without its faults; scholars never agree on what should or should not be included in a bibliography. The Secretary, for example, thought that more of the works of old masters should have been included. But the work was not designed for specialists. Rather its editors hoped it would be "an instrument of education and general reference." Some historians must have liked it, for within two years sales (even at the exorbitant price of \$16.50) totaled over 7000 compared to the 5000 of the old Guide over thirty years. The new Guide, of course, will also be out-of-date in a few years. Probably the Association should provide now for five-year supplements. German historians are now doing lesser guides every two years.

Another bibliographical work, the well known series on British history, had also been long discussed, in fact also since the 1930's. All but one of the earlier volumes were out-of-date; new or revised volumes were much desired. Stanley Pargellis, an able bibliographer and librarian, was interested. He and the Secretary held many conversations, and the Secretary talked with H. Hale Bellot in London. The conversations resulted in joint sponsorship by the Royal Historical Society, the British Academy, the Mediaeval Academy of America, and the American Historical Association of a large project for a new edition of the Gross volume, new editions of Read and Davies, two new volumes to cover the years 1789 to 1900, and the preparation of the Writings on British History for the years 1901-1933.

Pargellis and the Secretary went to the newly established Humanities Division of the Ford Foundation, asked for \$98,000 for a ten-year period. One day in 1956 a Ford Foundation official called to report, "You have the first chicken and the first egg from the Humanities Division." Work began immediately, but by mid-1963 only one volume, that finished by Read just before his death, had been published. All the other editors reported progress, however, and by 1965 their volumes should be completed.

As documents and manuscripts piled up in repositories across the nation, these repositories and historians in increasing numbers turned to microfilming as a convenient way of preserving the sources of history and making them available to scholars in their own libraries and studies. Foundations, however, saw a "bottomless pit" in the scholars' demands for more and more photocopies and usually refused to aid individuals. First of all, or so it appeared, foundation officials wanted some kind of general plan so that they would not be bothered by requests for small grants. There was need, then, for a guide to photocopied materials, not only to meet foundation requirements but also to aid the individual historian in his search for materials scattered in many libraries and archives and often unknown outside these repositories.

The Editor of the Cornell University Press and the Secretary spent a lovely Vermont summer afternoon discussing ways and means. The Secretary asked the Association's Committee on Documentary Reproduction for recommendations. In October 1957 the Council on Library Resources granted \$58,100 and soon the Editor chosen by the Committee, Richard W. Hale, Jr., started work on the volume which was published as the Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials (Cornell University Press, 1961). From the beginning editorial and other difficulties arose. The volume itself was only a first step toward a larger and more comprehensive survey and the establishment of a center to locate and catalogue microfilms, to prepare want lists, and to assist scholars generally in their search for the sources their work demanded.

To this end the Secretary in 1960 approached the Council on Library Resources and the American Council of Learned Societies. The first Council made funds available to second, Lester Born, an expert, made a survey of needs and prepared recommendations. His study is being edited. If and when it appears, it could be the basis of an appeal for funds for the long needed center.

Even more than a guide to photocopy, scholars wanted a national union catalogue to manuscripts, most of which were not and would never be filmed. Here the United States had lagged behind other countries, was indeed, as the Secretary told a foundation, "underdeveloped." In the late 1940's an Association Committee on Manuscripts (Solon Buck) had made recommendations and in the early 1950's the Library of Congress had formulated very tentative plans. But there was no result. With other historians the Secretary called on the Librarian of Congress and he talked to the President of the Council on Library Resources. The latter foundation gave generous sums to the Library; the Library, with misgivings and hesitations, finally began to compile a giant catalogue. One volume is now in print. To complete the several, perhaps nine, volumes additional funds will be required, but they were not in sight in 1963.

During the late summer of 1955 the Association office heard about the captured German war documents that had been flown to the United States and England during the airlift of 1948. The Foreign Office documents were stored in Whaddon Hall in England, and the military records in the Records Center at Alexandria, Virginia. Could these be filmed, indexed, prepared for general scholarly use? An aggressive New York public relations man, Sidney Wallach, and a Washington scholar, George Hallgarten, called on the Secretary. He, with a small grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to defray expenses, called a conference of interested scholars. Out of the conference came an American Committee for the Study of War Documents, with Reginald Phelps as Chairman. Phelps and the Committee envisioned and planned for one of the largest microfilming operations ever undertaken. The Secretary ascertained that the Defense Department and other governmental agencies would permit scholars to see the documents if they were microfilmed. The Ford Foundation gave an initial grant of

\$69,000. The National Archives agreed to share the actual cost of microfilming. Gerhard Weinberg became the first Director of the project.

Questions concerning administrative controls soon arose. Public relations and historical study do not mix. The Committee soon became an Association Committee. Lynn Case became Chairman for one year and then Oron Hale for the balance of the project. With Hale and the Secretary actively supervising, with the expert help of the subcommittee Chairman, Fritz Epstein, with several Directors (Gerhard Weinberg and Willard Fletcher being two) constantly pushing, with grants from various foundations totaling about \$300,000 and with large contributions in filming and personnel from the Archives, the work was virtually completed by 1961. In Alexandria the project's skilled team sorted over 17,000 linear feet of German war records, microfilmed over 10,000,000 pages, and prepared invaluable guides (38 with more to come). From Whaddon Hall came a huge Catalogue of Files and Microfilms of the German Foreign Ministry Archives, 1867-1920 (Oxford University Press, 1959), a comprehensive guide prepared under the direction of Howard Ehrmann. Historians of recent Germany used the guides and the catalogue. What is more important many of them based their research and publications on the microfilmed documents, sources for recent history unparalleled in any other field.

For outside financial support for their individual research historians went chiefly to the American Council of Learned Societies, to the Social Science Research Council, the Guggenheim Foundation, the American Philosophical Society, and the Fulbright Commission. The Association was a constituent member of the first two; it had no official connection with the next two; and was often asked for advice by the last. Through most of the 1950's (to 1957) the ACLS, because of financial stringency, had to struggle to stay alive. Though the Association had no funds to help, it remained a member and spoke in favor of the Council whenever it could. Through the 1950's the SSRC continued to give fellowships and grants-in-aid to historians and social scientists, and from 1957, when foundations again made funds available to the ACLS, that organization was able to offer similar assistance to historians and other humanists. Both the ACLS and the SSRC had their own selection committees, only on the travel grants of the ACLS to historians was the Association directly consulted. Throughout the ten years the Fulbright Commission, in spite of difficulties, offered fellowships and awards for lecturing and research abroad, but fewer and fewer able historians applied for them; grants that seemed generous in the early 1950's were too small to support both a family and travel as prices rose in Europe and Asia.

The number and amounts of grants available from all sources for historians always remained too small, especially when compared to those offered scientists. During the "cold war," at least, historical research did not appeal to foundations or to Congress as did that in physics and biology. The number of grants going to historians was not insignificant; one year a quick count by the Secretary revealed 136. But if historians in the United States were to engage in the significant work they both wished to do and their society needed, both number and size of the grants might well have been doubled. Except for a few authors of successful textbooks, historians were dependent largely on their salaries and these were below the "mean" in most academic institutions.

Partly for this reason the Secretary dreamed, though vainly, for the creation of an Institute of Historical Research, a center of historical studies like those in England and several European countries. As early as the beginning of the twentieth century J. Franklin Jameson had thought of the possibility and saw its partial realization in the Historical Division of the Carnegie Institution. But from 1928 when that Institution closed out its historical work, there was no center of historical studies in America and the idea was seldom if ever mentioned. In 1954, quite unofficially, the Secretary reopened the subject with a friendly official of the Ford Foundation who told him that an Association request would be considered but that it would be "far down" on the list of priorities. The Secretary did not try again but he was elated when the Committee on Research in 1963 resolved to ask the Council to consider the establishment of such an institute as a matter of first priority.



Research without freedom is not research. During the 1940's Guy Stanton Ford spoke forcefully and often in defense of historians' rights to examine the records and fully publish the results of their research. Freedom is always threatened, never secure. In 1953-54, as recounted above, the McCarthy crusade endangered even so scholarly an organization as the Association. The Association stood firm and emerged unscathed, but scholars were rightly frightened. One young historian under investigation by a Congressional Committee offered to withdraw his paper scheduled for the Annual Meeting. The Secretary wrote him that the law of the land still held, innocent until proven otherwise, and that the Association expected him to deliver his paper (he did). From time to time other historians asked for aid from the Association, especially those who wished to do research in "classified" materials of the State and Defense Departments. The Secretary wrote many letters, held long conversations with officials. The latter paid attention to Association communications, considered and reconsidered, and sometimes made concessions. The Secretary can only report that there would have been more restrictions had the Association not made its views known, but that no satisfactory solution has been found. All modern governments, for good or other reasons, keep their diplomatic and defense papers closed for thirty to fifty or more years. Sometimes a call from the Secretary did prevent censorship. One of the prized letters in the Secretary's file is a letter from a government historian whose volume was questioned by Congressmen; the volume was published without deletion of the offending material.

To defend freedom requires more than negative warnings or hints of public discussion. Because the Association's charter limits its activities to the promotion of historical studies and because of the Association's tax-exempt status as an educational organization, the Association could not act as vigorously to forward freedom as many members, including the Secretary, desired. When occasion arose the Secretary, the Committee on the Historian and the Federal Government, and other Committees, knowing that their colleagues would support them, spoke for freedom in research, publication, and teaching, and in a few cases the Association went further. With the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, it is now engaged, for example, in study of censorship in textbooks. One rule of the Association, established long before the current integration crisis, requires mention: its meetings (including the facilities of headquarters hotels) must be open to all members of the Association on the same basis.

Freedom in the United States is inseparable from freedom elsewhere and so it is in the study of history. The deeper and richer the studies of others, the deeper and richer are those of Americans. Knowledge knows no national or racial boundaries. Since the founding of the International Committee of Historical Sciences in the 1920's, members of the Association have represented the historians of the United States in this international organization. Indeed, Waldo Leland, once Secretary of the Association, was one of the founders of ICHS. Through the fifties and the early sixties the Association participated increasingly in the activities of the International Committee. With Waldo Leland as their counsellor, the American members of the Bureau and Assembly of ICHS, Donald McKay, Boyd Shafer, and Arthur Whitaker, tried not only to see that American scholarship was represented at the quinquennial Congresses, but also that American historians shared international responsibilities for historical study. More and more American historians attended the Congresses (those of Rome in 1955 and of Stockholm in 1960) to meet their colleagues, to hear historians from other countries deliver communications and reports, and themselves to give these.

The Association headquarters and the Association's Committee on International Historical Activities corresponded with historians about the world. The Review devoted more than half its space to the history of other parts of the world. The Association, with annual grants from the Asia Foundation, which the Secretary obtained, sent the Review to over 130 historians in "free" Asia. With the Historical Association (Britain), the Association obtained grants for a study of bias in the school books of Britain and the United States. Members of the Association represented American historians at

many international meetings, as those held in India and Pakistan. But were these international activities all the Association should contemplate?

International relationships in history are yet tenuous and, perhaps fortunately, somewhat unorganized. That the relationships should be closer and more continuous and could be more fruitful most historians agreed. How best to accomplish this end might be the subject of long discussions, much thought, and hard work.

A headquarters building at 400 A Street, S.E., is now the proud possession of the Association. In 1956 the Secretary was able to obtain from Congress a slight revision (the first) in the charter of the Association to provide for the acquisition of the property and the increase in the capital funds of the Association. But the real mansion of historians, the mansion of history, is yet unfinished, and until the end of man, it always will be. If the American mansion is more commodious than it was, the last ten years have not been without result. But the superstructure still lacked much. Even the Secretary's "five and ten plan" was unfinished.

Properly to care for their discipline and fulfil their obligations to their society, historians in the United States needed many studies and much action in the immediate future. They needed, for example, a study of salaries and status in the profession and then action. They needed a critical study of the school offerings in history and then action. They needed a thorough study of undergraduate teaching in history and then action. They needed an imaginative study of their many research needs and then action. They needed an institute of historical studies and funds to support it on a grand scale. And if and when their immediate needs are met, they will need much more--that is if they are to fulfil the promise of history in America and continue fruitfully to promote its study everywhere.

BOYD C. SHAFER.