

The  
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO

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

Most of the sessions were held at the University of Chicago, in the Reynolds Club House and in the Leon Mandel Assembly Hall adjoining, which were well adapted to the purposes and gave facilities not only for the stated programme but for committee and board meetings, and for social intercourse, which after all is the most important feature of these gatherings. The American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association held meetings at the same time and place, and there were three joint sessions; at the first the chief paper was the address of the president of the Political Science Association; at the second, the addresses of the presidents of the Economic Association and the Historical Association were read; at the third, topics in industrial history were discussed by the economists and the historians. The attendance was large and representative, more numbers being registered and probably many more present than at any previous meeting. As was the case at New Orleans, nearly all sections of the country were well represented. Though not so many came from the Pacific coast or the south

Atlantic states as were in attendance a year ago, New England and the middle states were largely represented, as were nearly all of the states of the Mississippi basin.

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

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

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

After these addresses had been delivered before the three societies, two papers were read in a joint meeting of the Historical and Political Science Associations. Professor William M. Sloane, of Columbia University, in a paper entitled "The Contrast of Political Theory and Practice in France under the Convention", examined critically the French government under the Convention from 1793 to 1795. He declared that an assembly chosen to make a constitution usurped the sovereign power without excuse, and that the plea of necessity was invalid. The coalition against France was not formidable, because it had no solid basis and no consistency. The internal affairs of France gave the Jacobins no monopoly in saving the country, for there was already a constituted executive, and the boundless resources of the country were just as available for the republicans as a whole as they were for one faction of the party. The Convention was not merely a usurper, it was irregular and illegitimate in both its membership and its organization. Surrendering its power to two committees, the Executive Council and that of Public Security, it devoted itself solely to party ends. Its earliest effort in arrogating sovereignty to an oligarchy by the Committee of General Defense was a failure. Thereupon it deliberately sacrificed for its own ends the entire Girondin party and created the Committee of Public Safety, which took advantage of the public disorders to create a Jacobin autocracy. The most efficient organ of this shameless tyranny—the Revolutionary tribunal—steadily declined into a factional committee of assassination. Any effort to judge the "Terror" even as a means justified by the end is foredoomed to failure; for France has been saved several times in moments quite as critical: but it was done by sane men, and the success did not deliver her bound to governments like the disreputable Directory and an eventual military despotism.

Mr. Jesse S. Reeves read a paper on the Napoleonic Confederacy in the United States, an organization by the French refugees in

America having for its purpose the placing of Joseph Bonaparte upon the throne of Mexico. In the summer of 1817 G. Hyde de Neuville, the French minister at Washington, obtained possession of certain letters sent by Joseph Lakanal to Joseph Bonaparte. These letters disclosed a conspiracy among French refugees in America, but, though the attention of the State Department was called to the matter, no steps were taken to apprehend the leaders. In the spring of 1818, a company of two hundred men, under General Lallemand, left Philadelphia, landed at Galveston, and proceeded up the Trinity river. A settlement called Champ d'Asile was founded, but its existence was short; menaced by the Spanish, and suffering for want of food, the wretched Napoleonic soldiers abandoned their settlement and returned to Galveston, where they were found by General Graham, who had been sent by Monroe to investigate the purposes of the expedition. Inasmuch as Lallemand's plans came to naught and there was no proof that Joseph Bonaparte had any part in the undertaking, the government of the United States did not think it best to take further notice of the purposes and plans of the conspirators. Mr. Reeves's narrative was based on the correspondence on file in the Department of State.

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

The session of Thursday morning, when the round-table con-

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

by the state in an evident public duty, can collect and care for historical documents and also arouse popular interest as a public officer cannot. Mr. C. M. Burton, of Detroit, president of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, and well known as a devoted collector of historical materials, spoke earnestly of the need of coöperation to the end that unnecessary duplication of work might be avoided and more thorough work accomplished. He advocated the preparation of a general index to the publications of historical societies, a task which would be easily performed if the historical societies of the country would be willing to work together. Professor B. F. Shambaugh, of the University of Iowa, spoke briefly of the proper division of the field between the state society and the local societies within the same state, and pointed out the value of local societies in preserving documents and in aiding the state society in the task of collection.

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

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

schools and for the introduction of the study in institutions other than theological. When colleges afford an outline of knowledge, the instruction in theological schools can use more intensive methods and yield higher results.

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

Dealing with the problem of the fostering of independent research, Professor Shailer Mathews, of the University of Chicago, held that a theological school aims at practical efficiency in a profession, and that the general body of its students should not be expected to accomplish special research. The seminary must first teach the body of things and then in the senior year give some discipline in the use of sources, not for the production of technical historians, but to show the difference of opinion and fact and to teach the method of construction. On the other hand, students preparing to teach must be given a separate technical training, and the instructor must pursue research for his own good. Professor Mathews advocated the systematic editing and publication of documents of American church history by instructors, with the collaboration of advanced students, and a project of coöperative historical writing after the model of the *Cambridge Modern History*.

On the theme of church history in colleges and graduate schools, Professor Carl Russell Fish, of the University of Wisconsin, made a stimulating and suggestive speech with special regard to American history. Although churches have had a great influence on the growth of our civilization, the attention given to them in general courses is slight and confined to the bizarre and the picturesque. Vital problems are seldom handled. As the multiplication of college courses forbids the average student to take a special course in church history, it is necessary to correlate the subject with general history. The advantage of this is seen in the broadening and consequent simplification of the whole view of history. An illustration is the



growth and the history of united organizations in the churches and the political union of the country. If college teachers are to have the basis for such correlation, it must be furnished by the specialists in church history and by those who have made a comparative study of the several churches, as well as of religious and civil institutions. This is the most profitable field for the graduate student, who will find whole series of problems by simply placing side by side the ascertained facts in these several subjects and observing the relationships and the discrepancies which there appear.

The conference on the teaching of history in the elementary school was likewise interesting and profitable. Professor J. A. James, of Northwestern University, who acted as chairman, opened the meeting with a few words concerning the importance of the problems that were to come up for discussion. He showed that there is at the present time no agreement in practice or in theory; there are few indications of any tendency to uniformity in the schools. Occasionally men competent to speak with wisdom have been called to plan a course of study for the grades, but expert recommendations have in the past been of little use. The time, however, may now have come for a thorough and, if possible, authoritative study of the whole situation. Professor H. W. Thurston, of the Chicago Normal School, read a paper on "Some Suggestions for an Elementary Course of Study in History." The aim of history teaching is to help the child to understand in a true sense what his American fellows are now doing and to help him to intelligent voluntary action in agreement or disagreement with them; a course of study with this general aim would begin with the child's problems in his social environment and carry on from grade to grade the examination of such contemporary social problems as are within the child's comprehension. This study would embrace likewise attention in every grade to genetic problems in the past. The events studied should be in the industrial, political, social, and religious fields, and be chosen primarily from direct physical and psychical ancestry of Americans. Different "unit topics" should not, the speaker said, be presented in chronological order, but rather in such a way that there will be the strongest tendency in the child to relate the past to himself, that he may feel that the ways and thoughts of the present are the product of development and evolution.

In continuing the discussion, Dr. George O. Virtue, of the Winona State Normal School, Minnesota, said he did not think that in choosing material for preparatory work stress should be laid on the interest of the child; the safer guide is the child's future needs. A proper course would not be very different from that now followed



in many American schools. It gives a prominent place in the seventh and eighth years to American history, which might well be preceded by ancient and English history. The momentary interests of such a course might be made to conform roughly to the demands of those holding to the culture-epoch theory and be fitted to the needs of children of varying experience and abilities; it is rich in possibilities for developing the imagination, rousing the enthusiasm, and building standards of personal and civic conduct. The mental training from the study of history, which some persons assert to be only a by-product of history study in the lower schools, could be made really valuable and significant if proper attention were paid to conditions of preparation, to the time employed, and to securing skilled instruction. Miss Emily J. Rice, of the School of Education, University of Chicago, spoke briefly on the preparation of the elementary teacher. She emphasized the fact that new ideals in education are making new demands on the teacher; her task is not to compel her pupils to commit a few pages or to memorize a few meaningless details; she must help to bring the subject-matter of history home to the child and to relate it to his experience. Stress should be laid on industrial history and the development of the arts. The test of a teacher's success is to be found in the habits of study which her pupils acquire under her guidance and inspiration.

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

study for the grades, if the task is entered upon seriously and intelligently. That the subject might secure the requisite attention, the conference asked the Council to appoint a committee similar to the Committee of Seven, which should recommend a history course for the elementary schools.

At the conference which considered the doctoral dissertation in history and the doctor's degree there was a large attendance. The room where the session was held was too small to contain all who sought admission, and the discussions were of unusual interest. There was a general feeling that the problems under consideration are vital and important. In opening the discussion, the presiding officer, Professor George B. Adams,<sup>1</sup> of Yale, said that in following German practice in this country we had, in his opinion, followed the wrong road; by granting the degree freely to every one completing a required course, and by demanding as a dissertation a piece of original work, we are likely in the end to magnify the importance of little things and run the risk of creating the impression that what is only the beginning is the real end; we shall fall also into a state in which process seems the only thing, without regard to the value of the result. For the first of these conditions the thesis is largely responsible; for the student—and sometimes the instructor—labors under the impression that the product of the student's minute toil is really an important contribution to knowledge, whereas in the majority of cases, certainly in medieval history, these laborious theses merely cumber the shelves and are but impediments in the way of the really creative scholar. Professor Adams called attention to the number of men who do nothing after compiling their dissertations, and fall back with an undeserved and unnecessary feeling of failure into the work of the secondary schools. As a remedy, he advised the establishment of two doctorates, the first of which should stand for about the amount and kind of training now required for the doctorate. For this degree the thesis need not be an original contribution to knowledge, and there should be no requirement that it be printed; the more advanced should be similar to the French degree, obtainable only by mature scholars after a searching examination and on the presentation of a dissertation indicative of real scholarship and creative ability. If it were possible, he said, to advance our present master's degree to about our present doctor's degree, and the doctor's to the point of the French doctorate, the arrangement would be altogether desirable. By agreeing on an advanced degree, American universities would gain the advantages of both

<sup>1</sup> Professor Adams's paper introducing this discussion, rewritten and enlarged, will appear in an early number of the *Educational Review*.

German and French practices; they would not lose their influence on the secondary schools; we should avoid conveying to the student a wrong impression of his own attainments and prospects, and should escape a barren and desolating flood of printed dissertations of no substantial value, which threatens to be a burden to every branch of knowledge.

Professor D. C. Munro, of the University of Wisconsin, spoke of the various kinds of students who seek the doctorate; the training given those who are to be writers of history should be different from that offered those who are seeking only a broad scholarship and a fuller knowledge than can be acquired in the undergraduate course. If the former class is to be properly prepared, training in the technique of history requires so much time that no thesis fairly worth printing can as a rule be written. In this respect history stands, perhaps, on a different plane from that of the physical sciences, where it is not impossible for the comparatively immature student to make a serious contribution to his science. Professor Munro could not agree with Professor Adams as to the usefulness of the proposed second doctorate. Professor James Harvey Robinson, of Columbia, said that the doctor's degree might be taken too seriously; certainly for some purposes the master's degree is more useful. There are great differences, he said, in the capacities of students, some of them reaching their limit by the end of the first year of graduate work. To obtain an elaborate literary production would be very difficult in these days when so few can write the English language in accordance with accepted usage. Perhaps a translation might prove an agreeable substitute for a thesis in some cases, for it requires the intelligent use of two languages and a knowledge of the subject in hand. Professor George E. Howard, of the University of Nebraska, on the other hand, pleaded for the retention of the doctorate as a scholar's degree, declaring that the last decade has seen a decided improvement in the standard, that the present thesis is creditable, and that in American and English history it is better than the typical German thesis. He could not see the wisdom of establishing a new degree, but he did believe that the master's degree should be given more meaning, for it has a distinct academic function. The main thing is to keep the standards high. Professor N. M. Trenholme, of the University of Missouri, considered the present doctor's examination too severe for the students who have had no preparation for such an ordeal, and advocated making an examination for the master's degree a preliminary training for the doctor's examination. Professor J. M. Vincent spoke of the value of the work on the thesis in the intellectual development

of the student ; to work over old topics may be good, but to do something new is better ; the printing of theses is considered a reward of effort and industry. Professor C. M. Andrews advocated the maintenance of high standards for the degree. The result of not printing the theses would, he thought, be the cheapening of the degree ; both the instructor and the student need the stimulus, the check, and the encouragement that come from the knowledge that the dissertation is to be printed and must bear the inspection of others. Subjects for theses should be wisely selected and suited to the needs of the science. Professor F. M. Fling believed we should have no inflexible rule about printing, and that college students should be so grounded in the principles of historical method and so taught by continuing practice to express their ideas that, when the need comes, they will be able to prepare a thesis in intelligent and readable English. Professor F. H. Hodder and Professor F. M. Anderson both dwelt on the desirability of strengthening the master's degree. Professor J. F. Jameson said we should adjust our degrees to American needs ; the master's degree should indicate that its possessor has the scholarly preparation for teaching in secondary schools ; the doctor's degree that he is fitted for the college. The person who is to handle college classes should have experienced the pains and pleasures of discovery and have ascertained by his own trials how history is written. Three-fourths of all theses, he said, are in American history, and of these the larger portion is good. Like Professor Andrews he believed the certainty that the dissertation would be inspected by others is of salutary influence, but thought it might possibly be wise not to print the dissertation, in a given case, if it were judged good by a professor in another university. Professor A. B. Hart said he had not seen the evil of the doctorate, for the educational development of recent years was due to the desire for the degree of doctor of philosophy and to the fact that it is a good standard measure for professional purposes. The dissertations had, moreover, added considerably to our knowledge ; and he advocated that time be devoted to the study of topics that would yield positive and helpful results. Professor C. H. Haskins thought there had been a marked improvement in the real value of the doctorate, and that much more was asked than twenty years ago ; he believed that standards should be raised for both the master's and the doctor's degrees, the latter to be given only to students showing unusual promise and likely to follow a university, as distinguished from a college, career. In a word, without establishing a new degree, the universities might well provide for the type of man that Professor Adams had in mind. At present we are in a transitional stage ; and

while we provide fairly well for the future college professor, we do not do enough to develop the type of man who looks forward to a university career, and who should have the power and the training to conduct profitable investigation. At the end of the discussion, Professor Milyoukov, comparing the conditions in Russia with those prevailing here, said that the Russian degree of *magister* is as a rule obtained by men who are already too old, and that in his country the attainment of a degree is too difficult, and here too easy.

At the fourth session five papers were read on a variety of subjects. Professor C. W. Colby, of McGill University, characterized in an interesting manner the personnel and the work of the Historical Congress at St. Louis. Professor Ettore Pais, of the University of Naples, beginning with a tribute to the late Theodor Mommsen, and a reference to the marvelous breadth of his scholarship and the value of his contributions to Roman history, proceeded to point out the work that remains to be done. The soil of Italy still has many archæological treasures, and new discoveries will add new knowledge and raise fresh problems. The study of primitive life in other lands and the study of ancient law will throw light on the early development of Rome. Even for the study of the empire much remains to be done, for we know much more of the administrative system than of the real history of the people; we know more of their law than of their ideas, their moral movements, or their social development. Because of the similarity between the character and the history of modern America and those of ancient Rome, American scholars are especially called upon to study and interpret Roman life and history.

Professor Henry E. Bourne made a report upon the work of American historical societies, a summary of impressions received from the inquiry for the general committee of the Association. Describing with considerable care the different forms of organization and effort, he dwelt on the desirability of coöperation, and especially on the need of good understanding between the local societies and the general association. The next paper, by Professor E. G. Bourne, was a clever and interesting effort to test the trustworthiness of the *Travels* of Jonathan Carver by an application of the principles of modern historical criticism. Even the conclusions, not to speak of the proofs, cannot be given here in a word; and we must content ourselves with saying that Professor Bourne demonstrated that the book ascribed to Carver has no standing as a piece of first-hand testimony, that in all probability he did not write it, and that while portions were probably written by adroit literary hacks from Carver's own statements, much was but a rehearsal of the sayings of Charle-

voix and other early explorers, including the mendacious Lahontan. In the last paper of the evening, Mr. Isaac J. Cox, of the University of Cincinnati, spoke of the explorations in the southwest by Hunter, Dunbar, Pike, and Freeman in the first three years after the purchase of Louisiana. Although these expeditions were much less comprehensive than originally planned, they furnished valuable information concerning the geography of the territory, marked the first step in deflecting the border Indians from their nominal Spanish allegiance, and were a material factor in the final assertion of American claims to large portions of the southwest.

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

Following these papers by distinguished European historians, three papers were read, all describing certain archives and the materials to be found in them of particular interest to historical investigators. Professor A. C. McLaughlin, of the Carnegie Institution, gave the results of his investigation of the diplomatic archives of the Department of State. Confining his description to the period from 1789 to 1845, he pointed out the amount, character, and apparent interest of the great quantity of unpublished materials, which throw light not only on our diplomatic history but on conditions in foreign states. Special attention was called to the despatches of William Short, John Quincy Adams, and Jonathan Russell, and to the papers bearing on our diplomatic relations with the old republic of Texas.

Professor C. M. Andrews, of Bryn Mawr, described briefly the character of the material relating to American history to be found in the leading British archives, especially the Public Record Office, where exist great masses of documents, of some of which little has hitherto been known. For the internal history of the colonies in the seventeenth century documentary evidence is scanty, though of the highest importance; on the other hand, for the study of British colonial policy and the development of the organs of administration the evidence is of great extent and of corresponding value. The materials bearing on British trade and revenue, on the cost of general administration, and on the expense of managing the military are enormous, especially for the years 1745, 1755-1763, and for the Revolution. Professor Andrews also spoke appreciatively of the Stevens index, which contains references to more than 160,000 documents in England, France, Spain, and Holland relating to the period 1763-1783. Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Library of Congress, briefly described the extent and condition of the public archives at Manila and the richness of the papers in their historical features. While the great bulk of them is concerned with questions of local administration, the large collection of royal decrees and orders distinguish the archives from those obtained in previous acquisitions of Spanish territory. The insular government has appointed a keeper of the archives, and is taking measures for preserving the papers from further loss and damage, even sending a special student to Europe to obtain additional matter relating to the history of the Philippines. The Guam records, few in number and much mutilated, have in part been transferred to the Library of Congress, Washington, where they can receive greater care and attention. The archives of Porto Rico probably contain some material of value for historical purposes; but the archives of no dependency are complete, having suffered much in the past from carelessness and from changes of sovereignty or from revolution. The history of the Spanish colonial policy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is closely related to that of the British colonies in America, and should be studied in connection with the attempt of Spain to maintain a trading monopoly in the face of rivalry from England, France, and Holland.

The last session—a joint meeting with the Economic Association—was held on Friday evening in the building of the Northwestern University in the center of the city. Professor E. F. Gay, of Harvard, read a paper on the significance of the inclosure movement in England, an important contribution to the subject of English industrial history, its conclusions being in some respects quite at variance with those commonly accepted. The distinction should be made, the



speaker said, between the inclosure of common waste and the depopulating of the common fields, the former being much older and more wide-spread, but less disquieting than the latter. The depopulating inclosures of the common or open fields, especially characteristic of the sixteenth century, were not so serious a matter as contemporaries believed and almost all modern writers think. These inclosures were mainly confined to the midland counties; even there, till late in the eighteenth century, they were in general small piecemeal affairs, and the whole movement was one of gradual and not of violent change. Professor Gay brought out with especial distinctness the conditions under which this great agrarian change was made—the strong economic and social motives that tended to hasten it, and the equally strong obstacles, likewise economic and social, that retarded it. In conclusion he said that the comparison of the inclosure movements of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries as usually made overlooks the continuity of the development in the different sections of England, and does not sufficiently take into account the differing social effects of the movements in the two periods.

After Professor Gay's paper, the rest of the evening was taken up with a discussion of the plan for preparing an Economic History of the United States. President Carroll D. Wright, head of the department of economics of the Carnegie Institution, who is responsible for the inception and the general management of the undertaking, briefly outlined the plans that have thus far been agreed upon. The whole field of American industrial history is divided into eleven main parts, and the general management of each one of these is in the hands of a competent person, whose duty it is to provide for the special investigation and the preparation of desirable monographs within his field. The divisions and the persons in charge of them are as follows: (1) Population and Immigration, Professor Walter F. Willcox; (2) Agriculture and Forestry, including public domain and irrigation, President Kenyon L. Butterfield; (3) Mining, Mr. Edward W. Parker; (4) Manufactures, President Wright; (5) Transportation, Professor B. H. Meyer; (6) Domestic and Foreign Commerce, Professor Emory R. Johnson; (7) Money and Banking, Professor Davis R. Dewey; (8) The Labor Movement, President Carroll D. Wright; (9) Industrial Organization, Professor J. W. Jenks; (10) Social Legislation, including provident institutions, insurance, and poor laws, Professor Henry W. Farnam; (11) Federal and State Finance, including taxation, Professor Henry B. Gardner. At the present time there are some seventy-five persons engaged in one capacity or another,

and it is expected that many more will soon be at work. It is plain from Colonel Wright's statement that his plan contemplates, at least for some time to come, the study of eleven or more parallel lines of industrial development, leaving any general scheme of coördination or combination to be dealt with at a later day. In the meantime, within these special fields where work is to be carried on by separate investigation, the work is to be in many, if not in most cases, decidedly monographic; and naturally the task must be that of collecting data, which at some future time can be properly arranged in chronological or logical relationships.

The general plan, as presented by President Wright, was commented on by several speakers, but the time was so limited that anything like a thorough discussion was impossible. The matter is one of such general interest, and the coöperation of historical scholars and economists so desirable, that it is regrettable that a thorough debate and interchange of views were impossible. Professor McMaster in a few luminous remarks called attention to the fact that real history in which events are brought out in their significant aspects cannot be written by following with precision any number of parallel lines. While such special treatment may be of much value, the investigator must remember that even in his choice of facts, as well as in their interpretation, much more must be considered than the changes taking place in one phase of human activity. In the period after the Revolution, for example, all social and industrial conditions had their bearing on Constitutional change and on the need of establishing a new political order. The ultimate effect of industrial conditions must affect the choice, arrangement, and presentation of facts. The next speaker, Professor C. H. Hull, of Cornell, fortifying his argument by the enumeration of various European and American examples, contended that among subsidized and coöperative undertakings of wide range, whether in ecclesiastical or in political history, those had proved on the whole most useful whose managers had confined their efforts chiefly to the editing of sources, and had left the production of coördinated narratives to the enterprise of individual writers and of commercial publishers. He maintained that this experience ought to have weight in planning the Economic History of the United States; and especially so because, unlike the official materials of ecclesiastical and political history, the materials of economic history do not become accessible after a few years as a matter of course. He therefore welcomed Colonel Wright's announcement that "the real and important work of the Department of Economics and Sociology of the Carnegie Institution is . . . to place the largest possible collection of

materials in the hands of both" the economist and the historian. Professor Henry R. Seager, of Columbia, spoke in approval of the general plan, and said that the work was properly undertaken by economists because the historians have as yet taken so little interest in the writing of economic history. He believed, however, that there were certain omissions, notably in the failure to provide for the study of the growth of trade in the ordinary sense as distinguished from commerce and transportation. Professor Jacob H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, said that the description of economic status rather than the narrative of economic development is the urgent need of economic study in the United States. Descriptive investigation, as distinct from historical study and local inquiry, must bear the same relation to political economy that field-work does to geology and the clinic does to medicine. The immediate environment should first be utilized as an economic laboratory for the development of scientific spirit in economic study and sound method in economic research, and as the field from which bases of working hypotheses may be derived. Thereafter the investigator must extend the range of his inquiry by visits to representative localities and even residence in them with a view to collecting wider and more varied data and to testing tentative conclusions. Such a procedure involves two essentials: leisure and resources. The investigators for scientific inquiry must certainly not be unduly absorbed by the routine engagement of the student or the teacher. With respect to resources, the investigator must be in command of funds sufficient to enable him to visit, and upon certain occasions temporarily to reside in representative localities for the purpose of gathering additional evidence and of testing and verifying tentative conclusions. Here seems to lie the present prime usefulness of private or public endowment in economic research.

The business meeting, which was held Friday afternoon, showed that the affairs of the Association are in their customary prosperous condition, and that the various committees and commissions are working with zeal and success. In accordance with the desire of the round-table conference of state and local historical societies, a conference of such societies was appointed to be held in connection with the next annual meeting. Mr. Thomas M. Owen was appointed chairman, and Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh secretary. The request of the conference on the teaching of history in the elementary school was answered by a resolution favoring the appointment of a committee to investigate the subject and prepare a report on a course of history for elementary schools and the proper training of teachers for their work. The report of the treasurer, Dr. Clarence

W. Bowen, was not less gratifying than usual, showing the total assets of the Association to be \$22,477.69, an increase during the year, despite the heavy expenses incurred for the numerous activities of the Association, of \$1,243.99. The membership of the Association in 1904 was 2,163, an increase of 93 over the preceding year.

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

Professor E. G. Bourne, in behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, said that steps had been taken to edit and prepare for the printer the diplomatic correspondence of the republic of Texas. The editorial work is to be done by Professor George P. Garrison. In giving the report of the Public Archives Commission, Professor H. V. Ames said that the commission has representatives in thirty-two states and has already published one or more reports from eighteen states. Six additional reports will appear in the *Annual Report of the Association* for 1904, and other investigations are in progress. The work of the commission has helped the passage of laws in several of the states for the better preservation of the public records. Professor H. L. Osgood is editing the council journals of New York city, the proposed publication of which is directly trace-

able to his study of the records of the state in behalf of the commission. Dr. E. C. Richardson reported that the bibliographical committee had been engaged in making additions to the information collected by Professor W. H. Siebert concerning collections of material on European history in American libraries. At present the list is limited to special library collections and does not indicate individual books; but the committee intends to make up a list of two or three thousand of the great series, with indication of the libraries in which they may be found. The work of the General Committee consisted in preparing a list of persons eligible to membership in the Association, and of assisting the committee on the programme of the Chicago meeting in arranging for a conference of representatives of state and local historical societies. The success of the conference led to the appointment of a subcommittee, composed of Dr. R. G. Thwaites and Professors B. F. Shambaugh and F. L. Riley, with the special task of reporting at a further conference upon the best methods of organization and work on the part of state and local historical societies. The General Committee, in addition to its usual duties, will undertake the preparation of a list of those members who are engaged in research, classifying them according to the fields in which they are at work. The committee will also investigate, in connection with other historical societies, the extent to which historic sites have been marked or otherwise accurately determined.

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

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Professor John Bach McMaster, Philadelphia.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Judge Simeon Eben Baldwin, New Haven, Conn.

<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Professor J. Franklin Jameson, Chicago, Ill.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smith- sonian Institution, Washing- ton.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cam- bridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence Winthrop Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton St., New York.

*Executive Council* (in addition to above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew Dickson White, <sup>1</sup>	Henry Charles Lea, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
President James Burrill Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Goldwin Smith, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor George L. Burr,
James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor Edward P. Cheyney,
Professor George Park Fisher, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Edward G. Bourne,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor A. C. McLaughlin,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor George P. Garrison,
Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, <sup>1</sup>	Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.

*Committees:*

*Finance Committee:* Hon. James H. Eckels, Chicago, Ill., chairman, and Hon. Peter White.

*Committee on Programme for the Twenty-first Meeting:* Professor John M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University, chairman, Professors Charles M. Andrews, Francis A. Christie, Charles H. Haskins, and Andrew C. McLaughlin.

*Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the American Historical Association, American Economic Association, and American Political Science Association:* Theodore Marburg, Esq., Baltimore, Md., chairman, Professors Jacob H. Hollander, John M. Vincent, and Westel W. Willoughby (with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Twenty-first Meeting:* Mrs. Annie M. L. Sioussat, Baltimore, Md., chairman, and Miss Ida M. Tarbell (with power to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Professors H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, Albert Bushnell Hart, and Andrew C. McLaughlin.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-president.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Professor Edward G. Bourne, Yale University, chairman, Professor Frederick W. Moore, Reuben Gold Thwaites, Esq., Worthington C. Ford, Esq., Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, and Thomas M. Owen, Esq.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr College, chairman, Roger Foster, Esq., Professors Edward P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, and Williston Walker.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman, Professors George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James Harvey Robinson, and John M. Vincent.

*Public Archives Commission:* Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman, Professors William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, and Edwin E. Sparks.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Ernest C. Richardson, Esq., Princeton University, chairman, A. P. C. Griffin, Esq., George Iles, Esq., William C. Lane, Esq., Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., and Professor Max Farrand.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, chairman, A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professors Fred M. Fling, Samuel M. Jackson, Elizabeth K. Kendall, Anson D. Morse, and Earle W. Dow.

*General Committee:* Professor Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, chairman, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., President Lilian W. Johnson, Professors Charles H. Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, Frank H. Hodder, Franklin L. Riley, Benjamin F. Shambaugh, and Frederick G. Young (with power to add adjunct members).

*Committee on History in Elementary Schools:* Professor J. A. James, Northwestern University, chairman, Wilbur F. Gordy, Esq., Superintendent of Schools, Springfield, Mass., Miss Mabel Hill, Lowell Normal School, J. H. Van Sickle, Esq., Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, Md., E. C. Brooks, Esq., Superintendent of Schools, Goldsboro, N. C., Professors Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Julius Sachs, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Henry W. Thurston, Chicago Normal School.



## THE TREATMENT OF HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

BEFORE entering on my subject let me congratulate the Association and Americans generally on the striking progress made by the study of history here in the course of the last half-century. To the names of Bancroft, Hildreth, Prescott, and Palgrave have been added those of Henry C. Lea, Henry Adams, James Ford Rhodes, John B. McMaster, John Fiske, James Schouler, Moses Coit Tyler, W. M. Sloane, Charles Francis Adams, and Woodrow Wilson. The progress shows itself alike in style, in research, and in fairness of judgment. In the style even of Bancroft there lingers something rather too rhetorical, too much savoring of the Fourth of July. Conscientious research has advanced with great strides. It has perhaps been carried almost to the point of exaggeration by researches into the history of obscure municipal institutions. But the excess is infinitely better than the defect.

In fairness and candor also there has been a vast improvement, specially to be noted in the treatment of questions with Great Britain. The Revolution, the War of 1812, and relations with England generally receive far more equitable treatment now than they did of yore. The other day a cry was raised in England that the American school-histories are poisoning the minds of Americans against us. Somebody proposed to deal with the subject specially and to stanch the source of rancor. I sent for a number of school-histories and examined them. In those of forty or fifty years ago the angry spirit was manifest; but it decreased as the present time was approached, and in the school-histories of the present day little I believe will be found of which an Englishman could fairly complain. From the taint of national arrogance English histories would hardly be found free. Too much space is given to war. Too much space perhaps is given to war in all histories. War is still unhappily of all themes the most exciting. It is the best-suited for lively description; it strikes the imagination of itself without calling for much skill on the part of the writer. Genius perhaps may some day make the annals of peaceful and beneficent achievement interesting even to boys. If I found any special fault with the American school-his-

<sup>1</sup> The President's address to the American Historical Association, December 28, 1904.