82d Congress, 1st Session - - - - - - - - - - House Document No. 96, Vol. I

Annual Report

OF THE

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

FOR THE YEAR

1950

✦

VOLUME I

✦

Proceedings

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Washington, D. C.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Letter of Submittal

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1951.

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 1950.

Respectfully,

ALEXANDER WETMORE, *Secretary.*

Letter of Transmittal

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1951.

SIR: As provided by law, I submit herewith the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for the year 1950. This consists of two volumes.

Volume I contains the proceedings of the Association for 1950 and the report of the secretary-treasurer for the Pacific Coast Branch for 1950.

Volume II contains the *Writings on American History* for 1948.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Editor.*

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D. C.

Contents

	Page
Organization and activities of the American Historical Association	vii
Act of incorporation	xi
Constitution	xiii
Officers and members of the Council for 1951	xvii
Committees and delegates for 1951	xx
Ad interim appointments	xxi
Pacific Coast Branch officers for 1951	xxiii
Proceedings of the American Historical Association for 1950:	
Report of the sixty-fifth annual meeting	3
Minutes of the meeting of the Council, December 27, 1950	19
Minutes of the business meeting, December 29, 1950	22
Minutes of the executive committee meeting, December 29, 1950	24
Report of the Executive Secretary and Managing Editor for the year 1950	25
Report of the Treasurer for the fiscal year 1949–50	29
Report of the auditors	36
Report of the Board of Trustees	38
Draft budgets, 1950–51, 1951–52, unrestricted funds	42
Statistics of membership	43
Committee reports for 1950	45
Other reports	72
Report of the Pacific Coast Branch	81

Contents

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 interest of American history, and of history in America.* There are at present 5,772 members.

It is a society not only for scholars, though it has for the last half century included in its membership all the outstanding historical scholars in America, not only for educators, though it has included all 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 loved history for its own sake and who wished 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, Charles M. Andrews, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Breasted, James Harvey Robinson, Carl Becker, and Charles Beard.

ANNUAL MEETING

It meets in the Christmas week in a different city each year to accommodate in turn members living in different parts of the country. The formal programs of these meetings include important contributions to every field of historical scholarship, many of which are subsequently printed. The meetings also afford an excellent opportunity for maintaining contacts with professional friends and for exchanging ideas with others working in the same field.

PUBLICATIONS

The publications of the Association are many and their scope is wide. The *Annual Report,* usually in two volumes, is printed for the Association

by the United States Government. It contains *Proceedings* and valuable collections of documents, generally in the field of American history. 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 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.

Besides these regular publications, the Association controls a revolving fund donated by the Carnegie Corporation out of which it publishes from time to time historical monographs selected from the whole field of history. It has as well two separate endowment funds, the income from which is devoted to the publication of historical source material. The Albert J. Beveridge Fund 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, the principal of which amounts to about $100,000, is applied to the publication of material relative to the history of the United States, with preference given to the period from 1800 to 1865. The Littleton-Griswold Fund was established by Alice Griswold in memory of her father, William E. Littleton, and of her husband, Frank T. Griswold. The income from this fund, the principal of which amounts to $25,000, is applied to the publication of material relative to the legal history of the United States.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

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

The Association maintains close relations with state and local historical societies. It has also organized a Pacific Coast Branch for members living in the Far West.

The Association participates in the work of the International Committee of Historical Sciences which holds an International Historical Congress every five years. The ICHS also publishes annually an international bibliography of books and articles. The American Historical Association with the support of the David Maydole Matteson Fund prepares the section on scholarly production in the United States. Membership in the International Committee is underwritten by the Andrew D. White Fund established by the National Board for Historical Service at the close of the First World War.

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 sound knowledge. It commands the resources of the learned world, but it also recognizes the necessity of bringing the fruits of learning to the average American. It needs to be supported. Its endowment funds, amounting to about $349,000, are carefully managed by a Board of Trustees composed of men prominent in the world of finance. Most of the income from this endowment is, however, earmarked for special publications. For its broader educational purposes it has to depend chiefly upon its membership dues.

MEMBERSHIP

The American Historical Association welcomes to its membership any individual subscribing to its purposes. The annual membership, including subscription to the *American Historical Review,* is five dollars. The life membership is one hundred dollars. Membership application blanks may be secured by addressing the Executive Secretary, Study Room 274, Library of Congress Annex, Washington 25, D. C.

PRIZES

The Association offers the following prizes:

The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize, without stipend, is awarded biennially in the even-numbered years for a monograph, in manuscript or in print, in the field of European history.

The George Louis Beer Prize of about $200 (being the annual income from an endowment of $6,000) is awarded annually for the best work on any phase of European international history since 1895. Competition is limited to citizens of the United States and to works in the English language. A work may be submitted either in manuscript or in print.

The John H. Dunning Prize of about $100 is awarded biennially in the even-numbered years for a monograph, either in print or in manuscript, on any subject relating to American history. In accordance with the terms of the bequest, competition is limited to members of the Association.

The Watumull Prize of $500 is awarded biennially, beginning with 1949, for the best book originally published in the United States on any phase of the history of India. All works submitted in competition for this prize must be in the hands of the committee by July 1 of the year in which the award is made. The date of publication of the books submitted must fall within the 2-year period ending December 31 of the year preceding the award.

The Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize of $100 is awarded every five years, beginning with 1951, to the author of the best work of scholarship published

during the preceding five-year period in the field of modern British and British Imperial and Commonwealth history since the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth exclusive of American colonial history before 1783. Textbooks and elementary narratives are not eligible. The author must be an American citizen, and the books must have been originally published in the United States. This prize is made possible by the Taraknath Das Foundation.

All works submitted in competition for the above prizes must, unless otherwise stated, be in the hands of the proper committee by June 1 of the year in which the award is made. The date of publication of printed monographs submitted in competition must fall within a period of 2½ years prior to June 1 of the year in which the prize is awarded.

The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship, established at the annual meeting in 1945, is awarded annually, beginning in 1946, for the best original manuscript, either complete or in progress, on American history. By American history is meant the history of the United States, Latin America, and Canada. The fellowship has a cash value of $1,000, plus a royalty of 5 percent after cost of publication has been met. The winning manuscript in each annual competition is published without cost to the author in the series of Beveridge Fund publications; other manuscripts also may be so published at the discretion of the committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund, which is charged with the administration of the fellowship. As small a part as one-half of the manuscript may be submitted at the time of application, but it must be accompanied by a detailed outline of the balance. The deadline for the submission of applications and manuscripts is July 1.

Act of Incorporation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Andrew D. White, of Ithaca, in the State of New York; George Bancroft, of Washington, in the District of Columbia; Justin Winsor, of Cambridge, in the State of Massachusetts; William F. Poole, of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; Herbert B. Adams, of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland; Clarence W. Bowen, of Brooklyn, in the State of New York, their associates and successors, are hereby created, in the District of Columbia, a body corporate and politic by the name of the American Historical Association, for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history, and of history in America. Said Association is authorized to hold real and personal estate in the District of Columbia so far as may be necessary to its lawful ends to an amount not exceeding $500,000, 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.

[Approved, January 4, 1889]

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 $5 a year or a single payment of $100 for life. Annual dues shall be payable at the beginning of the year to which they apply and any member whose dues are in arrears for one year may, one 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 one 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 twenty 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 three years, and shall be eligible for reappointment. 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 four 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 two 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 two or more names, including the names of any persons who may be nominated by a petition carrying the signatures of twenty 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 make 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 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 five 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 liability 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 twenty 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 1951

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

ROBERT L. SCHUYLER
Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

VICE PRESIDENT

JAMES G. RANDALL
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

TREASURER

SOLON J. BUCK
Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND MANAGING EDITOR

GUY STANTON FORD
Study Room 274, Library of Congress Annex, Washington 25, D. C.

COUNCIL

EX OFFICIO

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

FORMER PRESIDENTS

HERBERT E. BOLTON
University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

MICHAEL I. ROSTOVTZEFF
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

CHARLES H. McILWAIN
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

GUY STANTON FORD
Study Room 274, Library of Congress Annex, Washington 25, D. C.

949541—51——2

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

WILLIAM L. WESTERMANN
Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

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.

CONYERS READ
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

SAMUEL E. MORISON
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Elected Members

THOMAS A. BAILEY
Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. (*term expires 1953*)

A. E. R. BOAK
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (*term expires 1952*)

LEO GERSHOY
New York University, New York, N. Y. (*term expires 1953*)

PAUL KNAPLUND
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (*term expires 1951*)

DEXTER PERKINS
University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (*term expires 1954*)

MAX H. SAVELLE
University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. (*term expires 1952*)

JOSEPH R. STRAYER
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (*term expires 1954*)

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (*term expires 1951*)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

ROBERT L. SCHUYLER
Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

CONYERS READ
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

SAMUEL E. MORISON
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

SOLON J. BUCK
Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

GUY STANTON FORD
Study Room 274, Library of Congress Annex, Washington 25, D. C.

Committees and Delegates

FOR 1951

Board of Trustees.—W. Randolph Burgess, 55 Wall Street, New York City, *Chairman*—term expires 1951; Stanton Griffis, Hemphill, Noyes & Co., 15 Broad Street, New York City—term expires 1955; Shepard Morgan, 18 Pine Street, New York City—term expires 1953; A. W. Page, 195 Broadway, New York City—term expires 1954; Thomas I. Parkinson, 393 Seventh Avenue, New York City—term expires 1952.

Board of Editors of the American Historical Review.—Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex, *Managing Editor;* Gray C. Boyce, Northwestern University—term expires December 1952; Carl Bridenbaugh, University of California, Berkeley—term expires December 1954; F. C. Dietz, University of Illinois—term expires December 1951; James B. Hedges,[1] Brown University—term expires December 1955; Robert J. Kerner, University of California, Berkeley—term expires December 1953; J. A. O. Larsen, University of Chicago—term expires December 1952.

Committee on Committees.—Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky—term expires December 1951; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (*ex officio*); T. Walter Johnson,[1] University of Chicago—term expires December 1953; David E. Owen,[1] Harvard University—term expires December 1953; Edgar E. Robinson,[1] Stanford University—term expires December 1953.

Committee on Honorary Members.—Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Department of State, *Chairman;* E. Malcolm Carroll, Duke University; John K. Fairbank, Harvard University; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (*ex officio*); Lewis Hanke, University of Texas; Waldo G. Leland, Washington, D. C.; Geroid T. Robinson, Columbia University; Raymond J. Sontag, University of California, Berkeley.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize.—Sidney Painter, the Johns Hopkins University, *Chairman;* Henry Cord Meyer, Pomona College; A. William Salomone,[1] New York University.

Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize.—Howard M. Ehrmann, University of Michigan, *Chairman;* Richard W. Leopold,[1] Northwestern University; Howard McGaw Smyth,[1] Department of the Army.

Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize.—Lawrence A. Harper, University of California, Berkeley, *Chairman;* David Potter, Yale University; Francis B. Simkins,[1] Louisiana State University.

Committee on the Publication of the Annual Report.—Philip M. Hamer, The National Archives, *Chairman;* Solon J. Buck, Library of Congress (*ex officio*); Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (*ex officio*); St. George L. Sioussat, Washington, D. C.; A. Curtis Wilgus, George Washington University.

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship.—Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania, *Chairman;* Philip Davidson, Vanderbilt University; Dorothy Burne Goebel, Hunter College; Henrietta Larson, Forest Hills, N. Y.; C. Vann Woodward, the Johns Hopkins University.

Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications.—Ray A. Billington, Northwestern University, *Chairman;* Harold W. Bradley,[1] Claremont Graduate

[1] New member this year.

School; Lynn M. Case, University of Pennsylvania; Paul W. Gates, Cornell University; Raymond P. Stearns, University of Illinois.

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund.—Richard B. Morris, Columbia University, *Chairman;* Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard University; John Dickinson, University of Pennsylvania; William B. Hamilton, Duke University; George Haskins, University of Pennsylvania; Mark deW. Howe, Harvard University; Leonard W. Labaree, Yale University; Richard L. Morton, College of William and Mary; Arthur T. Vanderbilt, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

Committee on the Watumull Prize.—Taraknath Das, Columbia University, *Chairman;* Merle Curti, University of Wisconsin; David E. Owen, Harvard University.

Committee on Documentary Reproduction.—Edgar L. Erickson, University of Illinois, *Chairman;* Cornelius W. de Kiewiet, University of Rochester; Austin P. Evans, Columbia University; Milton R. Gutsch, University of Texas; Lawrence A. Harper, University of California, Berkeley; Louis Knott Koontz, University of California, Los Angeles; Easton Rothwell, Stanford University; Loren C. MacKinney, University of North Carolina; Warner F. Woodring, Ohio State University.

Committee on Government Publications.—Jeannette P. Nichols, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, *Chairman;* James H. Rodabaugh,[1] Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio; Joseph G. Tregle, Jr.,[1] Loyola University of the South.

Committee on the Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize.[2]—Paul Knaplund, University of Wisconsin, *Chairman;* John B. Brebner, Columbia University; George W. Brown, University of Toronto.

Delegates of the American Historical Association.—American Council of Learned Societies: Joseph Strayer, Princeton University—term expires December 1952. *International Committee of Historical Sciences:* Donald C. McKay, Harvard University—term expires December 1955; Philip E. Mosely, Columbia University. *National Historical Publications Commission:* Julian P. Boyd, Princeton University—term expires December 1953; Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex—term expires December 1952. *National Records Management Council:* Thomas C. Cochran, University of Pennsylvania—term expires December 1952. *Social Education:* Guy Stanton Ford, Library of Congress Annex (*ex officio*); Chester McArthur Destler, Connecticut College. *Social Science Research Council:* Shepard B. Clough, Columbia University—term expires December 1951; Elmer Ellis, University of Missouri—term expires December 1952; Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania—term expires December 1953.

The following ad interim appointments were made in 1950: Professor Helmut G. Callis of the University of Utah was representative at the celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the founding of the University of Utah on February 27 and 28. Dr. Dominic de la Salandra of the University of Dayton was representative at the Centennial Convocation of the University of Dayton on March 16. Junius P. Fishburn of the Times-World Corporation in Roanoke, Virginia, was representative at the inauguration of H. Sherman Oberly as president of Roanoke College on April 14. Professor Arthur C. Bining of the University of Pennsylvania was delegate at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia on April 14 and 15. Dr. Theodore H. Jack of Randolph-Macon Woman's College was representative at the inauguration of Orville W. Wake as president of Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, Virginia, on April 25. Professor Charles J. Parker of Winston-Salem Teachers College was representative at the inauguration of Dale H. Gramley as president of Salem Academy and College on April 22. Professor Paul H. Beik of Swarthmore College was representative at

[1] New member this year.
[2] New prize this year.

the inauguration of Dr. Sankey Lee Blanton as president of Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania, on May 8. Professor James L. Hayes of St. Bonaventure College in New York was representative at the convocation for the formal presentation of the University Charter to Saint Bonaventure College on October 4. Professor Burke M. Hermann of Pennsylvania State College was representative at the inauguration of Milton S. Eisenhower as president of Pennsylvania State College on October 5. Professor E. Malcolm Carroll of Duke University was representative at the inauguration of Gordon Gray as president of the University of North Carolina on October 9 and 10. Dr. Richard W. Lykes of Petersburg, Virginia, was representative at the inauguration of Robert Prentiss Daniel as president of Virginia State College on October 14. Leslie V. Brock of the College of Idaho in Caldwell was representative at the inauguration of Paul Marsh Pittman as president of the College of Idaho on October 14. Professor Charles S. Campbell, Jr., of the Johns Hopkins University was representative at the inauguration of Richard Daniel Weigle as president of St. John's College in Annapolis on October 28. Professor John W. Oliver of the University of Pittsburgh was representative at the inauguration of John Christian Warner as president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology on October 27 and 28. Professor Joel E. Ricks of the Utah State Agricultural College in Logan was representative at the installation of Dr. Louis Linden Madsen as president of the Utah State Agricultural College on November 3. Professor Theodore A. Wiel of Springfield College in Springfield, Massachusetts, was representative at the inauguration of Spencer Miller, Jr., as president of the American International College in Springfield on November 8. Professor Ralph S. Bates of Findlay, Ohio, was representative at the ceremonies and convocations commemorating the One Hundredth Anniversary of the founding of Heidelberg College in Tiffin, Ohio, on November 11. Professor Milton R. Gutsch of the University of Texas was representative at the inauguration of William C. Finch as president of Southwestern University in Georgetown, Texas, on November 13 and 14. Dean Elmer Louis Kayser of George Washington University was representative at the Second National Conference on the Occupied Countries in Washington, D. C., on November 30 and December 1. Professor Paul H. Clyde of Duke University was representative at the inauguration of Harold W. Tribble as president of Wake Forest College in North Carolina on November 28.

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OFFICERS FOR 1951

PRESIDENT

JOHN J. VAN NOSTRAND

University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

VICE PRESIDENT

W. STULL HOLT

University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JOHN A. SCHUTZ

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

COUNCIL

The above officers and—

HAROLD H. FISHER

Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

T. A. LARSON

University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.

RAYMOND MUSE

Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.

RICHARD W. VAN ALSTYNE

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Proceedings

OF THE

AMERICAN HISTORICAL

ASSOCIATION

FOR

1950

The Mid-Century Meeting

I

The American Historical Association held its sixty-fifth annual meeting at the Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, December 28–30, 1950. Seventeen affiliated societies and groups met concurrently with the Association. One third of the convention's fifty-seven sessions were joint meetings arranged by affiliated societies in co-operation with the American Historical Association. In addition, several of the affiliated organizations held conventions of their own, at the Stevens and elsewhere.

With 1,239 registered, this was the second largest meeting in the Association's history, and the largest held in Chicago. (Some 1,332 registered in Washington in 1948.) In spite of late trains, nearly 1,000 were at the first (Thursday morning) sessions; and, notwithstanding the usual tendency to leave early, nearly as many were present at the Saturday morning gatherings. The Friday afternoon sessions drew 1,100, those on Thursday afternoon 1,200, those on Friday morning more than that. Although there were more sessions than usual, and although the sessions were crowded into two and a half days, instead of the usual three, the average attendance per session exceeded one hundred.

A heavy load rested on the Committee on Local Arrangements, which was headed by Stanley Pargellis of the Newberry Library. Of those who assisted Dr. Pargellis, special mention should be made of Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago, who spent most of the convention at the information desk; Ray A. Billington of Northwestern University, who handled publicity with the aid of several students from the Northwestern School of Journalism; and Paul M. Angle of the Chicago Historical Society, who arranged a tea at his society building for those attending the convention. The staff of the Hotel Stevens, and especially James C. Collins, helped in many ways. Guy Stanton Ford and his co-workers at Association headquarters in Washington did much to make the convention a success.

The program was planned by a committee consisting of Fred Harvey Harrington of the University of Wisconsin (chairman), Charles C. Griffin of Vassar College, Fulmer Mood of the University of Texas, and R. John Rath of the University of Colorado. The Program Committee received generous assistance from David Owen of Harvard University, who was program chairman for the Boston meeting in 1949; from the persons who arranged programs for the affiliated societies; from all those who participated in the sessions, formally and informally; and from many other members of the Association.

There was no effort to bring all sessions into a single pattern. The effort rather was to provide a program that would appeal to many different groups and call attention to as many as possible of the fields in which significant research is in progress. There were, however, several points of focus. A number of sessions centered on American foreign policy. Several and parts of others were given over to subjects relating to the history of Russia and adjacent countries. The key question of imperialism was considered in general, and there were special sessions on significant areas long under the control of colonial powers. Many of the papers considered the impact of one government or one culture on another. Here and elsewhere an effort was made to call attention to opportunities for future research. In addition, several sessions treated specific problems of the profession: graduate training, access to research materials, publication, teaching.

II

The annual dinner was held in the Grand Ballroom of the Stevens, on Friday, December 29. Stanley Pargellis, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, introduced the toastmaster, Ralph Budd, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority. Mr. Budd, long a friend of the historical profession, introduced the President of the Association, Samuel Eliot Morison of Harvard University. Professor Morison's presidential address, "The Faith of a Historian," has been published in the January issue of the *American Historical Review.*

Before presenting his address, President Morison read a letter from the President of the United States. This communication is here reproduced in full:

December 22, 1950

DEAR DR. MORISON:

As the American Historical Association assembles for its sixty-fifth annual meeting, I wish to extend to its members my best wishes for another year of constructive work. I regret that I am not able to extend these greetings in person, as I had hoped to do. You are aware of the circumstances which prevent my being at your meeting.

In the critical effort which the free nations of the world are now making to preserve peace, the work of American historians is of the utmost importance. Communist countries are distorting history and spreading untruths about our achievements, our traditions, and our policies. We must keep the record clear, so that all the world may know the truth about what we have done and what we are continuing to do to build a peaceful and prosperous family of nations.

Since the Federal Government's activities are of central importance in our national defense effort, and since historians of the future will wish to probe deeply into the Government's activities, I am directing that a Federal historical program be instituted, with a primary purpose of recording the activities which the Federal Government is undertaking to meet the menace of communist aggression. Such a program will need the advice and assistance of the American Historical Association. The Government will need your help in defining the objectives of the program, obtaining qualified historians, and insuring that its work meets the high standards of the historical profession. I shall be pleased to receive the views and advice of the American Historical Association on these matters.

Communist imperialism has made falsehood a dangerous weapon; but truth can be a far more potent weapon. American historians can contribute to the cause of the free nations by helping the Government to record and interpret the policies our Nation is following to secure peace and freedom in the world.

Very sincerely yours,

(Sgd) HARRY S. TRUMAN

The executive secretary of the Association, Guy Stanton Ford, announced the award of prizes. The Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship was won by Reynold M. Wik of Bethel College and the University of Minnesota. Professor Wik's manuscript, "Steam Power on the American Farm: A Chapter in Agricultural History, 1850–1920," will be published in the Beveridge Series. Miles Mark Fisher's manuscript of a book on "Negro Slave Songs in the United States" was chosen by the Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications. The Herbert Baxter Adams Prize went to Professor Hans W. Gatzke of the Johns Hopkins University for his volume *Germany's Drive to the West* (Baltimore, 1950). Henry Nash Smith of the University of Minnesota was awarded the John H. Dunning Prize for his study *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

III

Several sessions were devoted to key problems that face the historical profession today. The basic issue of academic freedom was the topic chosen for the Mississippi Valley Historical Association dinner, presided over by Elmer Ellis of

the University of Missouri. The speaker, John W. Caughey of the University of California at Los Angeles, gave an address entitled "Trustees of Academic Freedom." Professor Caughey discussed the general question of academic freedom, and talked about pressures exerted on professors during a crisis situation. He drew many of his illustrations from the present controversy at the University of California. There was great interest in Professor Caughey's speech. It may be noted, too, that the American Historical Association took a strong stand at its business meeting on the basic issue involved (see p. 23 below).

Harry J. Carman of Columbia University presided at the session on "What's Wrong with Graduate Training in American History?" Fred A. Shannon of the University of Illinois pointed out that professors in graduate schools too frequently permit mediocre students to complete work for the doctorate. William B. Hesseltine of the University of Wisconsin stressed the research character of the Ph.D. Ralph W. Haskins of the University of Tennessee felt that those in charge of graduate instruction inadequately prepare students for their later work. Frederick H. Jackson of the University of Illinois claimed that graduate training should be pointed toward preparation for teaching.

At its 1949 business meeting, the Association stated its interest in historical activities of the Federal Government, and called for appointment of a committee to improve co-operation between scholars and the Government. Because of this action and the importance of the subject, a session was organized on "The Historian and the Federal Government." Harvey A. DeWeerd of the University of Missouri was chairman. G. Bernard Noble, chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research of the State Department, outlined the policies of his department as to the accessibility of manuscript records. Kent Roberts Greenfield, Chief Historian, Department of the Army, discussed the opportunities for private scholars in Army records. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, called attention to the rich resources of the National Archives, with its many untapped collections awaiting the interest of scholars. Philip M. Hamer of the National Archives, in "A National Program for Documentary Historical Publications," indicated that the future might see the Federal Government helping to make basic research materials available on a large scale.

Closely related to the problem of the accessibility of material is that of the "Evaluation of Historical Manuscripts." Paul M. Angle of the Chicago Historical Society dealt with this subject at the joint luncheon session of the American Historical Association and the Society of American Archivists. Dr. Angle urged administrators not to buy or accept as gifts manuscripts of no historical importance; and he favored weeding out useless items from existing collections. He also discussed the criteria involved. In the floor discussion, some questioned the legal or moral right and the expediency of disposing of materials accepted as gifts; but all recognized the seriousness of the space problem. Solon J. Buck, chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, presided at this session.

In the meeting devoted to the freshman history course, Sydney H. Zebel of Rutgers University analyzed existing offerings. He felt that most history of civilization courses left out or gave insufficient time to vitally important areas of knowledge, e. g., primitive man and the Far East. Thomas C. Mendenhall of Yale University emphasized the value of source materials. Alan Simpson of the University of Chicago showed how a freshman course stressing the history of ideas could be fitted into an interdepartmental general education program. All three speakers felt that the elementary course should help students understand the present age. In the discussion, Stebelton H. Nulle of Michigan State College said that interest in the present should not rule out adequate consideration of the direction of historical development. Dwight C. Miner of Columbia University welcomed experimentation,

but warned against overloading the freshman course. Eugene N. Anderson of the University of Nebraska was chairman of this session.

Teaching problems were also considered in the joint session of the Association and the National Council for the Social Studies. This meeting, presided over by Erling M. Hunt of Columbia University, dealt with *American History in Schools and Colleges,* a report prepared by a committee of the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the National Council for the Social Studies. Both speakers—Edgar B. Wesley of the University of Minnesota and W. Francis English of the University of Missouri—felt that the report had had less influence than was desirable. Professor Wesley noted that influence had been greatest on elementary school texts; next, on junior high school texts; third, on senior high school books. Dean English observed that college survey courses had changed little, and deplored the continuing tendency to rely on lectures and a textbook almost exclusively. The discussion leader, Wesley Roehm of the Oak Park, Illinois, High School, believed that the report had been useful, and more influential than the speakers thought. He suggested similar reports in other fields, such as world history and civics. The floor discussion brought forth praise of the growing use of documents and literary materials; and there was disapproval of the tendency to entrust the basic college course to junior staff members. Several speakers felt that, while state legislatures of course have the power to establish requirements in the teaching and study of American history in schools and colleges, nevertheless, it is unfortunate and perhaps dangerous to have legislation which deals specifically with the content and organization of courses.

Carter Harrison of the Houghton Mifflin Company was chairman of the session on "The Publication Problem." M. M. Wilkerson, director of the Louisiana State University Press, described the selection and editing of manuscripts by university presses. He pointed out that, since subsidies are limited, university presses had to bear in mind the marketability of manuscripts. Frequently, however, popular titles can carry part of the cost of scholarly works of limited appeal. Alfred A. Knopf, the New York publisher, outlined some of the difficulties involved in publishing scholarly books in a period of rising costs. He indicated, however, that commercial publishers were by no means hostile to professional historians, and suggested that many scholars could, if they tried, reach a larger audience. Henry M. Silver of the American Council of Learned Societies talked chiefly about limited-market titles. For these, he proposed cheaper methods of publication, since neither commercial publishers nor university presses could afford to handle many such items.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the Association for State and Local History was devoted to the problem of "Bringing History to the Public." S. K. Stevens, state historian of Pennsylvania, presided. The central problem, and various new approaches, were treated in a panel discussion, by Ronald F. Lee, chief historian of the National Park Service; H. Bailey Carroll, director of the Texas State Historical Association; and AnnaBelle Lee J. Boyer, executive secretary of the Detroit Historical Society. Their statements, and the floor discussion, indicated the great progress made in this field during the past decade. Among the points stressed were the importance of historic restorations; reaching high school students; securing newspaper and radio publicity; and the tasks ahead.

IV

Several of the sessions that touched on American history dealt also with the history of other areas. No less than four sessions linked American and British history. One of these dealt with Puritans and Quakers, another with British migration to the United States, a third with the Canadian and American plains, the fourth with foreign policy.

William L. Sachse of the University of Wisconsin was chairman of the session on the Atlantic community in the seventeenth century. Speaking on "Puritanism and Absolutism in Old and New England," George L. Mosse of the State University of Iowa saw the English and American sections of the Atlantic community drifting apart in political thought late in the century, as Parliament adhered to, and New England departed from, certain Renaissance political concepts, notably "reason of state." Marshall M. Knappen of the University of Michigan suggested that many Puritans were less concerned with theory than with practical problems, and felt that the origin of some Puritan theories might be Calvinistic rather than Machiavellian. In a paper on "Transatlantic Quakerism," Frederick B. Tolles of Swarthmore College and the Friends Historical Society noted that there was a standardized Quaker outlook on both sides of the Atlantic. Migration and travel helped explain this fact, and Quaker ideas and schisms spread rapidly from one side of the Atlantic to the other. Samuel C. McCulloch of Rutgers University supported this thesis, and pointed out several problems in Quaker history that need investigation.

British migration to the United States was considered in a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Economic History Association. Chester W. Wright of the University of Chicago presided. Herbert Heaton of the University of Minnesota used a special State Department census to analyze "British Migration to the United States, 1788–1815." He found that migration varied with business conditions; that the newcomers (half of whom came from Ireland) were young and engaged in widely scattered pursuits. Charlotte Erickson of Carthage College described "The Recruitment of British Immigrant Labor by American Industry, 1850–1900." She noted the methods used by American employers, and the abandonment of the program, as new machinery decreased the need for the more skilled workers and when Congress repealed the contract labor law in 1885. She also described and analyzed British employer and labor attitudes. Oscar Handlin of Harvard University and Daniel B. Creamer of the National Bureau of Economic Research led the discussion, which centered around the general character of immigration at different periods.

The session on "Canada and the United States: The Northern Great Plains," was presided over by A. L. Burt of the University of Minnesota. This program represented an effort to examine the possibilities of applying the regional approach on an international level. In a paper entitled "The Northern Great Plains: A Study in Canadian-American Regionalism," Paul F. Sharp of Iowa State College noted that the Canadian and American westward movements had both similarities and differences; and he stated that historians could learn much by studying both interdependence and contrasts. W. L. Morton of the University of Manitoba explored the problem from the point of view of one common element in his paper on "The Significance of Site in the Settlement of the West." He stressed the importance of the competition for site, particularly in the early period of settlement. He found Canadian and American experience different before 1870, but found that contrasts tended to disappear after that date. Donald F. Warner of Macalester College, as discussion leader, endorsed the international approach to regionalism, suggested new research topics, and proposed applying the approach to such other regions as the Pacific Northwest and the Maritime-New England area.

In a joint session of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the American Historical Association, Marshall M. Knappen of the University of Michigan spoke on "The United States as Britain's Heir." He said that the United States, as the leading Great Power with a democratic-liberal form of government, had inherited the world role formerly played by Great Britain. He found the

quality of our performance about the same as that of democratic-liberal Britain after the Reform Bill of 1832, but felt that aristocratic-liberal Britain before 1832 had handled diplomacy more capably. The basic problem of the satisfied liberal "have" power is the containment of aggressive, dictatorial rivals; and dependence on the wishes of a mass electorate put democracies at a disadvantage in competition with dictatorships. He proposed work in adult education and pressure-group activity as a way out. The discussion leaders, Selig Adler of the University of Buffalo, and W. Stull Holt of the University of Washington, disagreed to some extent with Professor Knappen.

In the same session, Jeannette P. Nichols of Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, read a paper on "The Dollar as Tool and Hindrance in Modern Diplomacy." She found that the State Department had tried to direct investment abroad into productive channels between the world wars, but that depression had brought defeat. Renewed efforts to use the dollar after 1945 had also failed, largely because of the weakness of political and military policies.

John S. Curtiss of Duke University presided over a session on Russian-American relations. William A. Williams of Washington and Jefferson College gave a paper entitled "New Light on Russian-American Relations, 1917–1933." He stressed the efforts of Raymond Robins and William Boyce Thompson to keep Russia in the war in 1917, and to keep the Bolsheviks out of power. After the October Revolution, Robins still hoped to keep Russia in the war, and later, he, Thompson, William E. Borah, and others worked for the recognition of Soviet Russia, only to meet with State Department opposition, and defeat, for a decade and a half. Harold H. Fisher, director of the Hoover Institute and Library, stated that the Soviet regime is a despotism based on exploitation, in his paper, "No Peace, No War." He denied Soviet claims to a new system of diplomacy based on the abolition of exploitation and aggression, and said that the Soviet Union, like the states of the sixteenth century, used sabotage, espionage, and subversion as adjuncts to diplomacy. There was an active floor discussion. Dr. Fisher answered several questions; and Professor Williams, when challenged on certain of his conclusions, indicated the hitherto-unexploited manuscript collections on which he had based his statements.

The session on "American Entry into World War II" attracted the largest audience of the convention. Samuel F. Bemis of Yale University was the presiding officer. Charles C. Tansill of Georgetown University gave the first paper, on "Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan, 1931–1941: the Pacific Road to War." Professor Tansill said that Franklin D. Roosevelt "gave his ultimatum to Japan, November 26, 1941, with a complete understanding of the fact that it was a battle cry." Reviewing Japanese-American relations since Theodore Roosevelt's day, the speaker was critical of American efforts to check Japan, particularly in view of the fact that Japan was opposing Russia. Professor Tansill condemned Stimson's nonrecognition doctrine, and termed the Chicago quarantine speech of 1937 "really an invitation to war with Japan." Dexter Perkins of the University of Rochester took a very different view in his paper on "The Rooseveltian Foreign Policy and Public Opinion, with Some Commentary on Revisionist History." Using the evidence of polls, he said that Roosevelt's foreign policy was on the whole geared to the public opinion of the period. Congressional votes on the repeal of the arms embargo, lend-lease, and the arming of merchant ships, he said, pointed in the same direction, as did the nomination of Wendell Willkie in 1940. Less conclusive evidence, he added, indicates the movement of public opinion along lines coincident with administration policy in the Orient. In the discussion that followed, Harry Elmer Barnes, of Cooperstown, New York, took a revisionist position, while Ruhl J. Bartlett of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy spoke on the other side.

Two sessions dealt with the military history of the Second World War. Kent Roberts Greenfield, chief historian of the Department of the Army, presided over the first of these, a joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Military Institute, which considered "The Tactical Use of Air Power in World War II." Henry M. Dater of the Department of the Navy traced the development by the United States Navy of doctrine and procedures for the use of aircraft to increase the striking force of its fleet, cover amphibious assaults, and support ground forces ashore. Thomas J. Mayock of the Department of the Air Force showed how the model furnished by the co-operation between the Royal Air Force and Montgomery's Eighth Army helped resolve the conflict set up by the aspirations of the United States Air Forces for independent command and the need of the United States Ground Forces for air strikes in the "isolation" of the battle area and in the battle area itself. James A. Huston of Purdue University reviewed the doctrines by which this conflict was resolved, and pointed out the continuing defects of tactical co-operation with ground troops. He attributed these to the low priority given to tactical co-operation in competition with strategic bombing. Mr. Mayock stressed the War Department's 1943 announcement of the principles of air power. Professor Huston, however, felt that procedures worked out in combat were more important that officially stated doctrines in bringing about the tactical co-operation finally achieved by the Air and Ground Forces in 1944–1945.

A session on "Command Decisions in World War II" was presided over by Bell I. Wiley of Emory University. All three speakers were from the Historical Division of the Department of the Army. In "The Decision to Withdraw from Bataan," Louis Morton stated that MacArthur's decision of December 23, 1941, delayed the Japanese timetable of conquest for four months and kept large Japanese combat forces tied up in the Philippines. Hence, in the larger sense, the decision was wise, although the forces involved endured much suffering. George F. Howe maintained, in "Allied and Axis Command in the Mediterranean," that Allied forces in the Mediterranean were more effectively employed than those of the Axis, largely because of the respective command structures. Treating "Logistics and Tactical Decisions in Europe," Roland G. Ruppenthal showed how logistic limitations can dominate military movements. Tactical decisions made in August, 1944, brought an accelerated rate of advance, which made the supply situation so bad that the Supreme Allied Commander had to halt most offensive operations. Both commentators—James L. Cate of the University of Chicago and Richard W. Leopold of Northwestern University—stressed the importance of the war history projects, and deplored the failure of the profession to make greater use of materials thus made available.

Another World War II session, dealing with Axis documents, will be noted in the section on European history.

V

Wesley M. Gewehr of the University of Maryland served as chairman of the session on Negro slavery in the United States. Kenneth M. Stampp of the University of California presented a paper on "Negro Slavery in American History." He stated that subjective judgments had colored historical works on the institution. Professor Stampp suggested that more use be made of slave testimonials, and that the old approach based on the assumption of Negro inferiority be abandoned. He further said that it is dangerous to assume that slavery was either necessary or inevitable. In a paper entitled "The Measure of Freedom in the Slave States," Richard B. Morris of Columbia University argued that neither freedom nor

949541—51——3

bondage were absolute, and that "mechanisms of compulsion" often made indistinct the lines between free-white labor, slave labor, and bonded labor. He noted the deterioration of the position of white laborers and free Negroes in the South on the eve of the Civil War. In the discussion, Clement Eaton of the University of Kentucky called attention to neglected source materials; and John Hope Franklin of Howard University, while stressing the need for a continuing re-examination of slavery, warned against the danger of reading the present into the past.

The American history sessions included also a notable meeting on the frontier, with Colin B. Goodykoontz of the University of Colorado as chairman. In "The Fallacy of New Frontiers," Walter Prescott Webb of the University of Texas said that there is no frontier in sight comparable in magnitude to the "Great Frontier," i.e., the whole of the Americas, which for four centuries could be regarded as the frontier of Europe. As this vast region was settled, people began to search for substitutes: new geographic frontiers, as in Alaska and Africa; social-economic "frontiers," as in opening new markets; scientific "frontiers" linked to new discoveries. Professor Webb considered these substitutes inferior to the real frontier. Lee Benson of Cornell University gave a paper on "The Historical Background of Turner's Frontier Essay." Mr. Benson noted that Turner's formative years fell in the era of the "communications revolution," when the world shrank into a single market with tremendous consequences for American farmers. In searching for reasons for the agricultural depression of the 1870's and 1880's, C. Wood Davis and others stressed the impending disappearance of free land. This view was then used by those who wanted to restrict immigration. "Closed-space ideas" were in the air, and Turner was influenced by them. James C. Malin of the University of Kansas said that Mr. Benson's studies had again demonstrated that it was in Europe, not America, that basic thinking was done about social organization. Although agreeing with most of Professor Webb's points as to substitutes for the frontier, Professor Malin took issue with the Great Frontier theory, and argued that each cultural age produces its own unique opportunities.

The biographical approach was featured in the joint session of the Southern Historical Association and the American Historical Association. Frank Owsley of the University of Alabama was the presiding officer. All the speakers dealt with individuals active in the era of sectional conflict—one from the deep South, one a border-state figure, one a northerner. Margaret L. Coit of West Newbury, Massachusetts, read a paper on John C. Calhoun. E. B. Smith of Youngstown College dealt with Thomas Hart Benton. Glyndon G. Van Deusen of the University of Rochester spoke on Horace Greeley. Robert Athearn of the University of Colorado was the discussion leader.

Another biographical session was devoted entirely to Franklin D. Roosevelt. The session was presided over by Herman Kahn, director of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library at Hyde Park, New York. Frank Freidel of the University of Illinois spoke on Roosevelt in the Wilson era, describing Roosevelt's work as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, his close connection with the admirals, and his training in politics under Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Josephus Daniels, and Louis Howe. Martin P. Claussen of the National Archives dealt with "Roosevelt's Training in International Politics, 1920–1939," starting with the League of Nations fight, and stressing Roosevelt's growing interest in diplomacy during his presidential years. David M. Potter of Yale University discussed "The Memoir Writers: FDR as Seen by His Associates." Indicating the merits and faults of the works that have appeared to date, he noted that the memoir writers picture Roosevelt as a sociable, practical-minded individual, attentive to detail, able to act with firmness and competence, but sometimes politically inept.

The sessions on technology, university history, and urban history centered on subjects frequently neglected by historians. Abbott Payson Usher, emeritus professor at Harvard University, now lecturing at the University of Wisconsin, presided over the session on the history of technology. Louis C. Hunter of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces read a paper on "The Place of Technology in History." He pointed out that social scientists commonly underestimate the effect of technological change, a basic factor in cultural development. Calling for a new synthesis, he noted that the great-man theory obscures many features of the actual processes of change and leads to false emphasis on particular items. Discussing "Opportunities for Research in Technological History," Rudolf A. Clemen of Princeton, New Jersey, mentioned the need for monographs on particular industries, on branches of science and engineering, on the process of invention, on entrepreneurship, and on fundamental research. Richard N. Current of the University of Illinois related technology to promotion with respect to the typewriter, showing how close co-operation between Sholes (the inventor) and Densmore (the promoter) made possible this machine.

Arthur C. Cole of Brooklyn College was chairman of the session on "The History of American Colleges and Universities." Ernst Posner of the American University opened the session with a paper on "University Archives." A modern archives program, he said, was an administrative necessity as well as a service to the historian. He urged that the university archives be established through formal action of the governing body and have a clearly defined status as an independent agency or unit of the library, with authority to dispose of useless papers. Earl D. Ross of Iowa State College spoke on "Social Involvements in the History of Land-Grant Colleges." He urged historians to relate the history of land-grant colleges to changing social and economic trends and to the history of science and technology. Ollinger Crenshaw of Washington and Lee University noted the faults of many college histories, and discussed problems of sources and interpretation encountered in writing the history of his own institution. Thomas Le Duc of Oberlin College criticized earlier histories of individual colleges for emphasis on persons and property and for neglect of intellectual history. He favored suspending production of these works until more is known about the "unnoticed intellectual revolution of the nineteenth century—the massive revision of premises in every branch of learning." He felt, however, that individuals or teams could make useful contributions by studying special periods in the history of single institutions or unit ideas as they occurred in several institutions.

Bayrd Still of New York University presided over the session on "New Approaches to Urban History." Blake McKelvey, city historian of Rochester, New York, surveyed the historical production of two decades in "The Present Status of Urban History Writing in the United States," and called attention to the historian's increasing recognition of the significance of urbanization in American life. In "New Approaches to the Study of Urban Growth," Wyatt W. Belcher of the State Teachers College, Superior, Wisconsin, stressed the economic forces that have stimulated the growth of American cities. Gerald Capers of Tulane University, in the discussion, suggested the importance of special factors, such as epidemics, on urban development; and Frederick D. Kershner, jr., of Ohio University, warned against emphasizing economic factors to the exclusion of political and other forces.

In a session devoted to Alexander Hamilton, James O. Wettereau of New York University read a paper on "The Historical Reputation of Alexander Hamilton." The discussion was led by Broadus Mitchell of Rutgers University, Robert E. Reeser of the University of Arkansas, and John C. Miller of Stanford University. Curtis P. Nettels of Cornell University was the presiding officer.

"Innovation and Management Policies" were treated at a joint meeting of the Business Historical Society and the American Historical Association. John E. Jeuck of the University of Chicago presided. Harold F. Williamson of Northwestern University talked about "The Winchester Repeating Arms Company: A Case Study," discussing the effort of that firm to sustain the expanded production facilities developed during World War I by expanding product lines. The merchandising decision generated new financial arrangements, and a radical change in distributive channels, which turned out to be ill-adapted to the new product lines. In his paper on "The Textile Machinery Industry: Influence of the Market on Management," Thomas R. Navin of Harvard University found the pattern of limited innovation explained largely by the peculiar matrix of customer relationships and demands, and partly by the traditional trade-school (as opposed to engineering) training of industry personnel.

The Lexington Group, devoted to the study of railroad history, held two joint sessions in co-operation with the American Historical Association. Under the chairmanship of Lucian C. Sprague, president of the Minneapolis and St. Louis Railway, the morning meeting opened with a paper by William G. Rector of the University of Minnesota on railroad logging in the Lake States. Since the common carriers could not or would not arrange to bring out timber from areas back from the streams, the lumbermen themselves had to provide transportation. The cost was high, but some logging railroads developed into common carriers. In the discussion, inaugurated by John H. Poore, vice-president of the Northern Pacific Railway, the consensus was that, although the construction of railroads was a financial burden to lumbermen, the effect was to hold down over-all costs. In a paper on "Railroad Administration in World War II," Duncan S. Ballantine of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology paid tribute to the railroad and government officials whose co-operation enabled the industry to rise to the demands of the war without the need of highly centralized governmental direction. He emphasized the problems of plant capacity, and control of traffic on the coasts. The discussion was led by Ralph Budd of the Chicago Transit Authority, formerly president of the Chicago Burlington and Quincy, and an active participant in the Office of Defense Transportation.

The luncheon session of the Lexington Group honored the Illinois Central Railroad on the occasion of its centennial. Wayne A. Johnston, president of that railroad, presided. Robert M. Sutton of the University of Illinois gave a paper on the southern connections of the Illinois Central, described the steps by which Chicago was linked to the Gulf, stressing delays caused by war, lack of capital, and the character of the country traversed. Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, and Carlton J. Corliss of the American Association of Railroads (and the official historian of the Illinois Central) discussed the paper.

The Agricultural History Society also held two joint sessions with the American Historical Association. In the first of these, Rodney C. Loehr of the University of Minnesota presided. Weymouth T. Jordan, Florida State University, described "Noah B. Cloud's Activities on Behalf of Southern Agriculture." Cloud was a soil builder who tested fertilizers, favored crop diversification, and had much influence in the middle of the nineteenth century, particularly as editor of the *American Cotton Planter*. Gilbert C. Fite of the University of Oklahoma read a paper on "George N. Peek, Farm Lobbyist of the 1920's." Peek and Hugh S. Johnson wanted American farmers to have a protected market at home, while they dumped their surplus abroad. Peek effectively promoted his ideas, which were embodied in the McNary-Haugen bills. The papers were discussed by James C. Bonner of the Georgia State College for Women, and by Paul F. Sharp of the Iowa State College. Everett E. Edwards of the United States Department of

Agriculture then presented a report on teaching and research in agricultural history. Robert G. Dunbar of the Montana State University, and Malcolm C. McMillen of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute discussed the report. It appears that an adequate text is needed, and that research covers a very wide range of topics.

Herbert A. Kellar of the McCormick Historical Association presided over the luncheon session. Edward N. Wentworth of Armour's Livestock Bureau spoke on "A Livestock Specialist Looks at Agricultural History." Livestock herds, he said, tend to reflect the personality of their creator; and improvement is the work of gifted individuals rather than the result of mass action. In turn, certain important modern strains of livestock trace back to unusual animals who have transmitted their special qualities to their offspring.

The Newberry Library acted as host for a joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Civilization Committee. The Newberry Library had arranged special exhibits for the occasion. Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania was chairman of the session. Arthur E. Bestor, jr., of the University of Illinois gave the paper, entitled "The Study of American Civilization: Scholarship or Jingoism?" Professor Bestor said that the scholarly study of American civilization, viewed in its broadest sense, could be the foundation of a genuinely liberal education. David Donald of Smith College was the discussion leader. In a floor discussion of the future of the American Civilization Committee, it was decided not to organize on a formal basis at this time.

VI

The Program Committee made a definite attempt to organize sessions on regions that have received relatively little attention at historical conventions. Several of the areas selected are or have been under control of colonial powers. In consequence, it seemed logical to have a session on imperialism at the very beginning of the convention. At this session, Joseph J. Mathews of Emory University was presiding officer, and Lowell J. Ragatz of Ohio State University read a paper on the topic, "Must We Rewrite the History of Imperialism?" His answer was Yes, and he called for a completely recast treatment in general works, country and area studies. The subject, he said, had been dealt with almost entirely from the viewpoint of western white men; and historians had neglected the findings of other social scientists, as well as many historical source collections. The discussion leaders agreed with the demand for new studies, but felt that Professor Ragatz had been too sweeping in his condemnation of existing studies. William C. Askew of Colgate University defended existing studies of diplomatic rivalries in colonial areas. Rayford W. Logan of Howard University pointed to excellent studies by Negroes, and other writings. Henry R. Winkler of Rutgers University emphasized the need for studying the effects of imperialism on subject peoples, and the need for studies by the subject peoples themselves.

Burr C. Brundage of Cedar Crest College was chairman of the Near East session. A. O. Sarkissian of the Library of Congress surveyed nationalism in the Near East, this ranging from the almost complete lack of nationalistic feeling among the Kurds to the strong nationalism of the Egyptian and Turkish peoples. The Armenians, Iranians, and various Arabic-speaking peoples were covered. Nowhere in the Near East, however, has nationalism appeared in such complex and integrated form as among Euro-American nations. John G. Hazam of the College of the City of New York, in his paper, "Soviet Russia Eyes the Arabs," described Russian efforts to penetrate the Near East, by commercial activity before World War II, by political activity during the war, and by working against western powers since the war. Communist parties and the Orthodox Church played impor-

tant roles. C. Ernest Dawn of the University of Illinois, the discussant, stressed the lack of political cohesion in the Arab world.

A session on Indonesia was held under the chairmanship of George McT. Kahin of the Johns Hopkins University. Professor Kahin noted the sad and untimely death of Professor John F. Embree of Yale University who was to have read a paper at this session. Jan O. M. Broek of the University of Minnesota discussed "East Indonesia: Economic Problems and Prospects." He noted that eastern Indonesia was "on the periphery of the Asiatic culture sphere, the transition zone between the Malay-Moslem and Melanesian-Papuan realms." It is less blessed by physical resources than the western part of the archipelago, and the resources have been much less developed. The Netherlands Indies regime launched an economic "new deal" after the war, and it is hoped that the new predominantly Moslem Indonesian regime will maintain this policy and refrain from discriminating against the large Christian minority in East Indonesia. Justus M. van der Kroef of Michigan State College talked on "Indonesia and the Reconstruction of the Netherlands Empire," discussing the period of colonial occupation (to 1815); the period from 1815 to 1922, characterized first by economic self-interest, then by a growing recognition of Indonesia's national self-worth; and the years since 1922, with the trend toward autonomy.

An American possession was treated in an Alaska session, with Carl L. Lokke of the National Archives in the chair. Leland H. Carlson of Northwestern University described "The Great Nome Stampede of 1900," with its many disappointments. He closed with a survey of the judicial controversy, engineered by Alexander McKenzie of North Dakota, to secure and exploit several of the richest claims in the Cape Nome Mining District. In his paper on "The Problem of Permanent Settlement," Kenneth Björk of St. Olaf College noted that fishing has maintained more permanent residents than mining, farming, and trapping combined. The Territory still suffers from a shortage of "the three F's of settlement: females, families, farmers." Obstacles include land-title problems, transportation deficiencies, a housing shortage, and long-range bureaucratic control.

Harry R. Rudin of Yale University presided over the session on nationalism in Africa. Dorsey E. Walker of Bethune-Cookman College covered "Needs and Opportunities for Research on Certain Areas of Africa," noting some of the subjects and sources that should receive attention in this neglected field. Arthur N. Cook of Temple University shed light on the subject by the case-study approach, describing and analyzing the rise of nationalism in Nigeria. Raymond W. Bixler of Ashland College was the discussion leader.

Harold S. Quigley of the University of Minnesota presided over the panel discussion on "Recent Developments in China." Derk Bodde of the University of Pennsylvania discussed the failure of American policy-makers to appreciate Chinese ideology, a failure that has helped the Communists to convince the Chinese that we are imperialist. Robert C. North of the Hoover Institute and Library characterized the Chinese Communists as dialectical materialists who plan for a long period. Donald F. Lach of the University of Chicago explained the Chinese view that recognition should precede negotiation, and noted that seventeen states had recognized Peking. In his opinion, challenged during the discussion, American recognition of foreign governments has usually implied approval. Knight Biggerstaff of Cornell University described anti-Communist elements in China as scattered and at present of little significance. There was a lively floor discussion.

A session on Meiji Japan was under the chairmanship of John W. Hall of the University of Michigan, who pointed out the world significance of the events that transpired in Japan during the Meiji period. Nobutaka Ike of the Hoover Institute and Library discussed "Democracy versus Absolutism in Meiji Japan," touching on

the potentially democratic element in the fluid conditions of the early Meiji era. He emphasized the rural landholding and entrepreneurial class. The new leaders of Japan, however, soon crushed dissension and established an authoritarian government. Hyman Kublin of Brooklyn College dealt with "The Japanese Socialist Movement in the Meiji Period." Tracing the origin, course, and eventual suppression of the movement, he observed that Japan alone of the Asiatic nations had a tradition of a third movement between absolutism and communism. Commenting on Dr. Ike's paper, John A. Harrison of the University of Florida questioned the validity of the use of the word "democracy" in describing the anti-government movements of the Meiji period, and stressed the continuity of Japan's political and social tradition from the Tokugawa regime into the Meiji. Ardath W. Burks of Rutgers University, discussing Professor Kublin's paper, added information on the socialist thinkers of Meiji Japan.

There were two Latin-American sessions. The luncheon of the Conference on Latin-American Studies had George P. Hammond of the University of California as presiding officer, and Isaac J. Cox, William B. Greenlee, and William S. Robertson as guests of honor. Charles C. Griffin of Vassar College reported on the meeting in Santiago of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History. Manoel Cardozo of the Catholic University presented a paper on "Manoel de Oliveira Lima and the Writing of History."

Ruth Lapham Butler of the Newberry Library was chairman of the afternoon session on Latin America. A paper on "Indian Caste in Peru, 1795–1940," by George Kubler of Yale University was read in his absence by Charles E. Nowell of the University of Illinois. As isolation and economic decline affect a region, the Indian caste is the first to disperse beyond control of the state, and is replaced by resident mestizos until some prosperity returns. Evidence of passage from Indian to non-Indian caste suggests that the composition of the Peruvian population is a social and not a biological process. Treating "The Condition of the Chinese Coolie in Peru," Watt Stewart of the New York State College for Teachers, Albany, New York, described as unenviable the lot of the 90,000 Chinese who entered Peru between 1849 and 1874. The Peruvian *hacendados,* guano operators and others who brought them in were interested in profits, not in humane treatment. The discussant, Howard Cline of Northwestern University, sought to amplify rather than to criticize the themes stated.

VII

Modern European history was considered in several of the sessions already noted—for example, those on technology and imperialism. In addition, there were a dozen sessions specifically devoted to modern European questions.

The luncheon conference of the Modern European History Section had Frederick B. Artz of Oberlin College as presiding officer. Arthur P. Whitaker of the University of Pennsylvania reported on the International Congress of the Historical Sciences, held in Paris in the summer of 1950. Raymond P. Stearns of the University of Illinois then gave a paper on "The Royal Society of London: Retailer in Experimental Philosophy, 1660–1800." The activities of the society were a guide to the intellectual interests of the time, and shed light on the process of disseminating knowledge.

English history was also treated in a session on the Atlantic community in the seventeenth century (already noted) and in a meeting devoted to "The Government and Economic Life." Helen Taft Manning of Bryn Mawr College served as chairman. Mildred Campbell of Vassar College reported on the Anglo-American conference of last summer. The papers were by Conyers Read of the University of Pennsylvania, and Charles Mowat of the University of Chicago, both of whom

discussed the relationship of government policy to the English economy. The papers covered widely separated periods, Professor Read speaking on "The Tudor Version of the Welfare State," while Professor Mowat handled the last century in his paper, "One Hundred Years of the Welfare State." Goldwin Smith of Wayne University led the discussion.

Robert B. Holtman of Louisiana State University was the presiding officer at the session on "National Propaganda in the French Revolution." Cornwell B. Rogers of Wiscasset, Maine, in his paper on "National Propaganda as Expressed in French Revolutionary Songs and Hymns," discussed two phases of nationalism as expressed in the songs: the righteousness of the revolutionary cause as opposed to the evil of its enemies; and the universal humanitarianism of the revolution. In his paper on "National Propaganda as Reflected in the Art of the French Revolution," David L. Dowd of the University of Florida considered painting, engraving, and sculpture, arts especially important because of the illiteracy of the masses. Revolutionary leaders used these arts a great deal, and they helped promote the official cult of the "fatherland," which served as the means of restoring the psychological unity of France. The discussion leaders, Paul H. Beik of Swarthmore College and Gordon McNeil of Coe College, called attention to some of the problems involved in using this sort of material in studying nationalism.

The session on "Recent Trends and Approaches to Early Nineteenth Century Austrian History" was under the chairmanship of Friedrich Engel-Janosi of the Catholic University of America. In his paper, "New Views on Metternich," Peter Viereck of Mount Holyoke College pleaded for a re-evaluation of the Austrian chancellor's position. He felt that, while Metternich's ideas had shortcomings, they were basically opposed to totalitarianism and influenced such contemporaries as Disraeli. Jerome Blum of Princeton University, in his paper on "New Views on the Austrian Nobility," analyzed the reformist movement in agriculture led by Austrian nobles in the pre-March period. In the discussion, Golo Mann of Claremont Men's College asked if Professor Blum's economic interpretation of the period might not be replaced by a political one. Arthur J. May of the University of Rochester spoke of the influence on the American mind of the trends noted in the papers. The chairman suggested that a critical new edition of Metternich's papers might throw new light on his views.

John A. Hawgood of the University of Birmingham, England, was chairman of a session on nineteenth century German economic history, centering around the history of the *Zollverein*. Louis L. Snyder of the College of the City of New York spoke on "The Role of Friedrich List in the Establishment of the *Zollverein*." He stressed the fact that List's contribution to German unification was that he brought the economic factor into German nationalism, and he maintained that the national idea was basic to all of List's thinking. Oscar Hammen of Montana State University gave the other paper, on "The *Zollverein* as an Instrument of Retorsion." Professor Hammen pointed out that an important incentive to the formation of the *Zollverein* was the necessity to protect German industry against the products of other countries. The discussion was led by Arnold H. Price of the State Department, and William O. Shanahan of the University of Notre Dame.

A session on "The East and West in Early Modern Times" was presided over by Waldemar Westergaard of the University of California at Los Angeles. Walther Kirchner of the University of Delaware spoke on "Russia and Europe in the Sixteenth Century." He showed how western Europe (e.g., the Holy Roman Empire) made it difficult for Russia to communicate with the West. Dimitri von Mohrenschildt of Dartmouth College discussed the parallel development of the Enlightenment in East and West in his paper on "Russia and Europe in the Eighteenth Cen-

tury." The discussion was led by C. Leonard Lundin of Indiana University and Robert R. Palmer of Princeton University.

C. E. Black of Princeton University presided over a session on "Eastern Europe." In a paper on "The European Significance of the November Rising," Charles Morley of Ohio State University stressed the relationship of the Polish revolt to the tense international situation resulting from the French revolution of July, 1830. Tsar Nicholas I planned an armed intervention in western Europe, with the Polish army as a spearhead, and did not definitely change his plan until the Polish army uprising. Otakar Odlozilik of Columbia University surveyed "Recent Trends in Czechoslovak Historiography," recalling the pioneer work of the Palacký and the controversy between the critical school of Goll and the more nationalistic view of Pekař. He noted the stagnation of historical scholarship under the Communist regime. Charles Jelavich of the University of California described "Present Trends in Yugoslav Historiography, 1945–1950," noting the strict control which the Communist regime had established over historical scholarship, with resulting concentration on nationalism, using the ideology of socialism to overcome separatist tendencies. S. Harrison Thomson of the University of Colorado, in leading the discussion, pointed out parallels between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Poland's position and in Russia's sense of mission. He also drew on personal experiences to describe conditions of historical work in Poland and Czechoslovakia since 1945.

Stuart R. Tompkins of the University of Oklahoma was the chairman of the session on "The Fate of Historiography at Russian Hands." Paul H. Aron of Sarah Lawrence College gave a paper on "M. N. Pokrovsky and the Soviet Historiography during the First Five-Year Plan." He noted how this chief Communist historian purged the research and teaching institutions of nonconforming historians; and how he maintained his positions by adjusting his theories to the shifting party line, as when he changed his interpretation of pre-1917 Russia to fit the first five-year plan. There were three discussion leaders: Michael Karpovich of Harvard Univerity, Jesse D. Clarkson of Brooklyn College, and Oswald P. Backus of the University of Kansas. Professor Clarkson took issue with Professor Aron as to the significance of Pokrovsky's abandonment of the theory of "commercial capitalism," and claimed this was merely a matter of semantics. Professor Karpovich maintained that from the beginning of the revolution there had been an inherent contradiction between Marxist doctrine and the role of strong personal leadership.

In the session devoted to World War II documents, Harold C. Deutsch of the University of Minnesota was in the chair. John Huizenga of the Department of State described and analyzed the German documents which became available at the end of the war, and Thomas C. Smith of Stanford University treated the Japanese documents. E. Malcolm Carroll of Duke University led the discussion.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Society of Church History was presided over by Ray C. Petry of Duke University. William M. Landeen of the State College of Washington read a paper on "Gabriel Biel and the Brethren of the Common Life in Germany," tracing Biel's background to the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life founded by Gerard Groote and later scattered over western Europe. L. J. Trinterud of the McCormick Theological Seminary, in a paper on "The Problem of Puritan Origins," traced the beginnings of the Puritan conception of "Covenant" to Continental sources and to the indigenous religious spirit in England.

The joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Catholic Historical Association dealt with European confessional parties in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Raymond J. Sontag of the University of California presided. Robert F. Byrnes of Rutgers University analyzed "The Failure of the French Catholics in Politics," noting that, socially, Catholic

leaders represented groups which were suspect by those who had won power during the revolution; and, culturally, faith in progress and in science affected the situation. John K. Zeender of the University of Massachusetts considered "The German Center Party and Some National Issues, 1890–1906." He explained why this party held a position of decisive importance, and showed how it used its position to secure removal of restrictions placed on religious organizations by Bismarck. Francis A. Arlinghaus of the University of Detroit led the discussion.

Harold J. Grimm of the Ohio State University was chairman of the joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Society for Reformation Research. George W. Forell of Gustavus Adolphus College read a paper on "Luther's Views concerning the Imperial Foreign Policy," and T. A. Kantonen of Wittenberg College spoke on "The Finnish Church and Russian Imperialism." This was followed by discussion from the floor.

VIII

Tom B. Jones of the University of Minnesota presided over the ancient history session. In his paper on "The Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire," Chester G. Starr, jr., of the University of Illinois maintained that the subjects of the Roman emperors realized autocracy of their government, but that some concluded that this autocracy was a perfect democracy inasmuch as it distributed to each man or class what was deserved. This concept came into full flower in the second century A. D. In the discussion James E. Seaver of the University of Kansas pointed out that more attention might have been paid to the Greek background of Roman imperial thought. Joseph F. McCloskey of LaSalle College, Philadephia, found similarities between the equestrians as supporters of the Roman autocracy, and the bourgeoisie who supported European absolutism in the early modern period.

The session on medieval education had Gray C. Boyce of Northwestern University as chairman. George B. Fowler of the University of Pittsburgh discussed "Learning in Austria about 1300," showing the positive cultural developments of post-Hohenstaufen times and insisting that decline and confusion were not apposite for all German lands of that age. Commenting on this paper, John R. Williams of Dartmouth College agreed that decline was not the correct description, but stressed the presence of conservative tendencies when comparison is made with trends in France and Italy. In a paper on "Extra-Curricular Activities of Orléans Students," Dorothy Mackay Quynn of Frederick, Maryland, showed how these students, while pursuing legal studies, also received training in the *ars dictaminis* and the *ars notaria,* in vernacular French and the magical arts. In the discussion, Canon A. L. Gabriel of the University of Notre Dame and the Institute for Advanced Study emphasized the natural character of the language study, and noted also interest in music and the dance.

Palmer A. Throop of the University of Michigan presided over a session devoted to the "Twelfth Century Renaissance." The first paper, by Urban T. Holmes, jr., of the University of North Carolina, was on "The Idea of a Twelfth Century Renaissance." This was followed by a paper by Eva Matthews Sanford of Sweet Briar College, on "The Twelfth Century: Renaissance or Proto-Renaissance?" J. C. Russell of the University of New Mexico led the discussion.

The annual dinner of the Medieval Academy of America had Joseph R. Strayer of Princeton University as the presiding officer. Kenneth M. Setton of the University of Pennsylvania presented the paper, on "The Archaeology of Medieval Athens."

FRED HARVEY HARRINGTON,
Chairman, Program Committee.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council

Hotel Stevens, Chicago, Ill.

December 27, 1950, 2 P. M.

Present: Samuel E. Morison, *President;* Robert L. Schuyler, *Vice President;* Solon J. Buck, *Treasurer;* Guy Stanton Ford, *Executive Secretary;* A. E. R. Boak, Leo Gershoy, Paul Knaplund, J. G. Randall, Max H. Savelle, A. P. Whitaker, *Councilors;* Kenneth S. Latourette, Conyers Read, former Presidents; W. Stull Holt, Pacific Coast Branch.

President Morison called the meeting to order.

The minutes of the 1949 Council meeting were approved as published in the April, 1950, issue of the *Review* (pp. 764–69).

Mr. Ford summarized his report as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor. (See p. 25.)

The Treasurer, Dr. Buck, reviewed the financial statement for the fiscal year 1949–50 which he later summarized at the business meeting. The financial assets of the Association on August 31, 1950, amounted to $402,504.34 of which $166,145.44 is unrestricted and $236,358.90 restricted. The disbursements of unrestricted funds exceeded receipts by $8,005.75. However, the disbursements include a contribution of $10,000 toward editorial expenses of *Writings on American History* and other nonrecurring items.

Dr. Buck reported for the Finance Committee, submitting an amended budget for the current year and a proposed budget for the next fiscal year. After some discussion and explanation these were approved with certain adjustments in salary to the staff (excluding the Executive Secretary) for the increased cost of living.

The Executive Secretary reported that following the directions given by the Council a year ago he had closed out the accounts of the Radio Committee with the balance of $194.10 and the Committee on Americana with the balance of $543.29. Funds of the latter committee already in the treasury of the Association amounted to $2,026.65. These funds will be transmitted to the trustees for investment. Both committees were formally discharged.

The Council reaffirmed as a general policy the limitation of membership on committees to three years. It recognized that in certain committees there might be justifiable exceptions to this general rule.

The committees and delegates of the Association were approved by the Council. (For list see p. XX.)

On behalf of the Albert J. Beveridge Committee its chairman, Professor Arthur P. Whitaker, stated that after a five-year experimental period the committee has agreed to make permanent the plan on which it has been operating. It will continue its award under the name of fellowship and the amount hereafter will be $1,000. During the year the chairman with the approval of the Executive Secretary has concluded a new and satisfactory contract with the University of Pennsylvania Press, which will continue to publish manuscripts accepted by the committee.

The Committee on Honorary Members reported that the quota of fifteen members was full and it, therefore, made no recommendations.

The Executive Secretary reported that the ad hoc Committee on the Archival Treatment of Personal Papers had completed its work and submitted its final report. As this report was detailed and somewhat lengthy, no attempt was made to summarize it. It will be printed in the *Annual Report* and perhaps in some appropriate journal earlier. Its work being completed, the committee was discharged.

The report of the ad hoc Committee on Historians and the Federal Government had been reproduced and circulated in advance to the members of the Council. This report was made the subject of a somewhat extended discussion. The request of the committee for a small fund from the Association treasury, in addition to the Rockefeller Foundation grant of $1,000, was declined by the Council. The Council further affirmed its opinion that the committee should discontinue its list of corresponding members and not add any additional members to its present roster. The Council continued the committee until the annual meeting of 1951 giving the chairman authority to solicit funds in an amount not to exceed $2,000 for the committee's meetings during this year. It was agreed that the work of the committee would be reviewed at the 1951 meeting of the Council and that, if the committee were continued, the determination of its membership should come under the regular procedure of the Association, namely, nomination by the Committee on Committees, and that at all times the committee should keep in close touch with the office of the Executive Secretary.

Professor Conyers Read, chairman of the above committee, presented a letter from Mr. G. Bernard Noble, chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research of the Department of State. Mr. Noble pointed out that the recruitment of historians through civil service procedures has been unsatisfactory to several of the major departments, such as State and Defense, and to the Civil Service Commission itself. He suggested a committee of historians who would join in a conference of the interested government departments to see whether a more effective and discriminating procedure could be set up to select and enlist historians in Government service. The choice of the committee was referred to the incoming president. (President Schuyler later appointed Frederic C. Lane of the Johns Hopkins University, Thomas C. Cochran of the University of Pennsylvania, and Gordon A. Craig of Princeton University.)

The Managing Editor of the *American Historical Review* informed the Council that Professor Lawrence H. Gipson was retiring after his five-year term on the Board of Editors and that Professor James B. Hedges of Brown University had consented to accept appointment as his successor. The Council indicated its approval of this selection.

As delegate to the Social Science Research Council for a three-year term the Council elected Professor Roy N. Nichols, as delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies for a two-year term, Professor Joseph R. Strayer. In each case these delegates are their own successors. In a general discussion the Council indicated that in its opinion, although the terms of these delegates were a reasonable exception to the general rule of tenure (see above), there should be such a rotation as would not diminish the value of our delegates to these councils or to the Association itself.

The Executive Secretary then presented the substance of the new law reorganizing the National Historical Publications Commission under the act amending the functions of the office of General Services Administration. In addition to two members appointed by the President, one by the Archivist, one by the Librarian of Congress, one by the presiding officer of the Senate, one by the Speaker of the House, one by the Chief Justice, one by the Secretary of State, one by the Secretary of Defense, two were to be elected by the Council of the American Historical Association. The Council then elected Julian P. Boyd of Princeton University and Guy Stanton Ford.

Professor W. Stull Holt of the University of Washington reported briefly for the Pacific Coast Branch on its membership and sound financial condition. The Executive Secretary was directed to send a telegram of good will and good wishes to the Branch, which was meeting on the campus of Occidental College in Los Angeles, December 27–29.

The Council after full discussion decided that the issues involved in the controversy between the Board of Regents and the faculty of the University of California touched issues which could not be passed in silence by an association deeply concerned with freedom of teaching, learning, and security of tenure for scholars. It was agreed that the matter should be referred to the annual business meeting in terms of a resolution which the Council then agreed upon. (See p. 23 below.)

The Council approved the budget for *Social Education.* Professor Chester McArthur Destler of Connecticut College was re-elected to serve with the Executive Secretary on the Board of *Social Education.*

The Council confirmed the action of the Executive Secretary in securing Professor Sherman Kent of Yale University as chairman of the Program Committee for 1951 and Professor Henry F. Graff of Columbia University as chairman of the Local Arrangements Committee, each chairman being authorized to complete the roster of his committee. (Since this action, summons to public service has made it impossible for Professor Kent to serve and Professor William H. Dunham, jr., of Yale University has been appointed in his place.)

The Council accepted with appreciation and an expression of gratitude the offer of Professor Taraknath Das in behalf of the Taraknath Das Foundation to establish the Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize of $100 to be given every five years "to the author of the best work of scholarship published during the preceding five-year period in the field of modern British and British Imperial and Commonwealth history, since the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, exclusive of American colonial history before 1783. Textbooks and elementary narratives will not be eligible—the author must be an American citizen and the book must have been originally published in the United States. The first award is to be made in 1951." The Committee on Committees was authorized to appoint a committee to act in 1951. (The following committee has been chosen: Professor Paul Knaplund, University of Wisconsin, chairman, Professor John B. Brebner, Columbia University, and Professor George W. Brown, University of Toronto.)

The Executive Secretary, having duplicated and circulated to the Council a letter from the executor of the Matteson estate, was authorized to negotiate and, if necessary, to litigate the fixing of a reasonable fee for the executor's services.

Dr. Buck reporting for the Library of Congress indicated that the funds given by the Association to prepare the *Writings on American History* for 1948 and, if possible, for 1949 would be expended by approximately the first of March. As the copy for the 1948 volume has been sent to the printer, the failure of the expiration of the funds would leave unfinished the task of proofreading and of completing copy for the 1949 volume. The administration of the Library of Congress had indicated that it would make every effort to find the necessary funds in the sum of $3,600 to continue the services of Dr. Masterson and his assistant to the end of the fiscal year of the Library, June 30. The Library is including in its budget request the sum of $10,000 annually for the continuation of the preparation of the *Writings.* It was the sentiment of the Council that its members and the members of the Association should do everything they reasonably could to support this request before the appropriate committees of Congress. The incoming president of the Association was authorized to appoint a committee which would stimulate and direct these expressions of interest.

The Executive Secretary reported that he had been very fortunate in securing in Mrs. Esther Murphy a competent person to recopy and reorganize the mass of entries for the index of the *Writings on American History* left by Mr. Matteson. The income from the Matteson estate so far transferred was sufficient to support this work. Volume I, A–K, is now ready, except for the front material, to go to the printer. Mrs. Murphy will continue with the more difficult entries, L–Z. Printing

of these volumes will depend in large part upon the availability of funds through the allotment to the Association from the appropriation of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Council authorized the Executive Secretary to dispose at bargain prices several separate *Papers* of the American Historical Association which have for years been stored in the Smithsonian Institution. An announcement of this offer is found in the news section of the April 1951 issue of the *Review*.

The Council voted to hold the 1953 meeting of the Association in Chicago. The meeting in 1951 will be in New York and in 1952 in Washington, D. C.

The Council elected the following members of the Executive Committee: Robert L. Schuyler, chairman; Conyers Read; Samuel E. Morison; Arthur P. Whitaker; Solon J. Buck (ex officio); Guy Stanton Ford (ex officio).

The Council appointed Professors James G. Randall, Leo Gershoy, and Max H. Savelle as members of the Committee on Resolutions.

Under the head of new business the Executive Secretary reported that the Director of the Census has indicated that he would welcome a committee of historians to advise on historical studies in the field of American immigration. Mr. Ford said that it seemed appropriate to make this essentially a joint committee with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and he was authorized to proceed with the appointment of such a committee. (The committee as finally constituted is O. Fritiof Ander, chairman, Augustana College, Theodore C. Blegen, University of Minnesota, Oscar Handlin, Harvard University, Frank L. Owsley, University of Alabama, Carl Wittke, Western Reserve University.

There being no further business, the Council adjourned.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary.*

Minutes of the Business Meeting

HOTEL STEVENS, DECEMBER 29, 1950, 4:15 P. M.

President Samuel E. Morison called the meeting to order with about two hundred members present. It was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the last meeting as printed in the April 1950 issue of the *American Historical Review* (pp. 769–71).

Mr. Ford read his report as Executive Secretary and Managing Editor. (See p. 25.)

The Treasurer, Dr. Buck, presented a summary of his report, copies of which had been distributed to the members. The motion was made and passed to accept the report and to place it on file. (See p. 29.)

Mr. Stanton Griffis was unanimously reelected to the Board of Trustees.

A brief statement on deceased members was given by Mr. Ford reporting the deaths of eight life members and thirty-three annual members since December, 1949.

The chairman, Professor Robert R. Palmer of Princeton University, gave the report of the Nominating Committee. As a result of the mail ballots cast, the committee announced the election of the following:

Members of the Council—Dexter Perkins of the University of Rochester and Joseph R. Strayer of Princeton Univeristy.

Members of the Nominating Committee—Carl Bridenbaugh of the University of California, Berkeley, Miss Beatrice Hyslop of Hunter College, Robert L. Reynolds of the University of Wisconsin, and Richard H. Shryock of the Johns Hopkins University.

For the Presidency of the Association for the year 1951, the committee nominated Professor Robert L. Schuyler; for the Vice Presidency, Professor James G. Randall; and for the office of Treasurer, Dr. Solon J. Buck. On motion, the Executive Secretary was instructed to cast one ballot for all nominees, and they were declared elected.

Mr. Ford reported on the following actions taken by the Council at its meeting (see minutes of the Council meeting, p. 19):

The report of the Committee on Committees; the appointment of Professor James B. Hedges as the new member of the Board of Editors; the reelection as delegate of Professor Roy F. Nichols to the Social Science Research Council, of Professor Joseph R. Strayer to the American Council of Learned Societies, and of Professor Chester McArthur Destler on the Board of *Social Education;* the election of Dr. Julian P. Boyd and Guy Stanton Ford to the National Historical Publications Commission; the announcement of the program chairman, Professor Sherman Kent,[1] and the local arrangements chairman, Professor Henry F. Graff, for the 1951 meeting; the place of the 1951, 1952, and 1953 meetings; the membership of the Executive Committee; the report of the ad hoc Committee on Historians and the Federal Government; the disposition of the balance held for the Radio Committee ($194.10) and for the Committee on Americana ($543.29); the changes in the terms of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship; the acceptance of the offer of Professor Taraknath Das to establish the Robert Livingston Schuyler Prize; progress of the preparation of the *Writings on American History;* the present status of the Matteson bequest; the report of the ad hoc committee on the handling of manuscripts, chiefly personal papers received by depositories; the appointment of a committee of five to advise the census director on possible studies and publications by the Bureau of Census in the field of American immigration.

From various sources, including the membership of the Association, the attention of the Council and the executive officers has been called during the last year to the situation which has arisen on the campus of the University of California. After discussion of the interests and responsibilities of this Association as a learned society, it was determined by the Council that the controversy in the University of California came within the purview of the interests of the American Historical Association. Thereupon the Council formulated the following resolution which is submitted for the consideration of the Association:

During the past year the American scholarly world has watched with mounting concern the actions of the Board of Regents of one of our great universities, the University of California. This institution has in the past attained an enviable reputation as a leader in research, teaching, and service to the state and nation. The relations between its governing board and its staff have contributed much to create the atmosphere in which free scholarship can work with security based on the fundamental right to tenure for faithful service, and the observance of procedures long accepted at California for the appraisal of academic fitness. By a series of steps the Board has undermined the good feeling hitherto existing between it and the faculty. By replacing tenure with an annual appointment as an overhanging threat, academic freedom has been imperiled. The American Historical Association at its meeting in Chicago, December 29, 1950, records its concern at the effect of these policies on the University of California and on higher education everywhere. It authorizes its secretary to transmit this expression of concern to the members of the Board of Regents of the University of California together with its hope that the Board will find it possible to review its recent actions dispassionately and find a solution in keeping with its past creditable record in the conduct of the university's affairs.

---

[1] Professor Kent has been summoned to public service and finds it impossible to serve.

The resolution was approved.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch was presented by Professor W. Stull Holt.

The following resolutions were submitted by Mrs. Jeannette P. Nichols:

Whereas the Department of State long since embarked upon a scholarly and authoritative edition of *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States,* which has proved a valuable and well-nigh indispensable adjunct to historians, international lawyers and practicing diplomats: and

Whereas the publication of this series has proceeded no further than the date 1858 and now is in a status of doubtful continuance:

Resolved, That the American Historical Association urge the Secretary of State to resume the necessary editorial work and publication of this series.

Whereas essential source material for sound historical study of American diplomacy is furnished by *Foreign Relations of the United States*—a series in the publication program of the Department of State: and

Whereas a number of volumes of *Documents on British Foreign Policy* and *Documents on German Foreign Policy* already have been published, presenting the records of those foreign offices for the crucial pre-1939 years while the corresponding records of the Department of State remain unpublished:

Resolved, That the American Historical Association hereby commend the Department of State for its efforts in presenting the German records and urge that this project be continued actively, but also urge, most strongly, that the *Foreign Relations of the United States* no longer shall be allowed to fall in arrears and shall, in fact, be brought much closer to date.

On motion made and carried, the above resolutions were approved.

Professor Leo Gershoy submitted the following resolution for the Committee on Resolutions:

Resolved, That the American Historical Association express its appreciation to all those whose co-operation made possible the sixty-fifth annual meeting. In particular, its thanks go to Dr. Stanley Pargellis, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, and to the other members of the committee; to Professor Fred Harvey Harrington, chairman of the Program Committee, and his associates, whose careful planning has produced this rich and diversified program; to the directors and the staff of co-operating institutions, such as the Newberry Library and the Chicago Historical Society, which have hospitably extended their facilities for the edification of the members of the Association; to the Chicago Convention Bureau for clerical assistance; to the students from the department of journalism of Northwestern University for their aid with publicity; and, not least, to the Stevens Hotel in general and, in particular, to Mr. James Collins of the Convention Bureau, for its excellent services and its many courtesies.

This resolution was unanimously approved.

As there was no further business, Professor Frank M. Anderson moved that the meeting be adjourned.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary.*

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, HOTEL STEVENS, DECEMBER 29, 1950

Present: Robert L. Schuyler, chairman; Conyers Read; Samuel E. Morison; Arthur P. Whitaker; Solon J. Buck (ex officio); Guy Stanton Ford (ex officio).

Mr. Ford as Executive Secretary presented the results of conferences he held that afternoon with members of the ad hoc Committee on Historians and the Federal Government. The Executive Committee also had before it the letter of the President which had just been read by President Morison. On behalf of the Association the Executive Committee accepted the implied commission in the President's letter. It recognized that, first, an important appointment would be that of the person in charge of the historical program dealing with current activities and agencies. It was understood that this person would be located in the Bureau of the Budget. The Executive Committee approved the appointment of Messrs. Wayne Grover,

Conyers Read, and Guy Stanton Ford as a committee to offer suggestions to the Director of the Budget, if requested, as to a possible appointee. This service rendered, the committee would dissolve. The incoming President and the Executive Secretary were authorized to offer to the head of the historical program, when appointed, the advisory services of a committee of historians to aid in recruiting its staff and to be helpful in any other way the director deemed useful to the success of the program. The President and Executive Secretary were to appoint this second larger committee after consultation with such other members of the Council as were available.

There being no further business, the Executive Committee adjourned.

GUY SANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary.*

Report of the Executive Secretary and Managing Editor

FOR THE YEAR 1950 [1]

Nine years ago to a day, and in this room, I made my first brief report as your executive officer of four months' standing. Then, as now, the nation and the whole world was facing a critical situation. Less than three weeks before, "the day of infamy" had brought us into a full-fledged world war in which we already had been tentatively engaged. Now nothing short of an all-out effort could save us and our allies from the threat of the fascist alliance. The prospect, win or lose, was dark for all our accustomed ways of life and especially for the cultural interests that led and lightened those ways. Among these were such voluntary organizations of scholars as this association of historians and citizens of like interests, at that time a group of some thirty-six hundred. One could not forefend the thought that in an all-out effort of total war this Association would be one of the not so minor casualties along with the colleges and universities where so many of our members had spent their lives in the tasks that opened the minds of the next generation to the strength we derived from our past and the broadening prospects for a better future. In the classrooms of all levels open to the children of all creeds and infinitely varied nationalities those of us who were teachers had revealed the possibilities of the common man and strove to make of one faith all manner of men. The nation, or rather the congeries of nations, thus united in a great experiment stood the test. Does anyone doubt that in even more trying times it will stand it again?

It is but a footnote to the story of the years since the long ago of 1941 that this Association survived. It not only survived but grew in membership by over two thousand since my first report. Its organ, the *American Historical Review,* helped keep scholarship alive against the day when the young scholars drawn into service should return to civil life. Partly as the result of the crippling or extinction of similar periodicals, it carried and still carries the responsibility for keeping the world of scholarship in touch with current activity in all historical fields. The rising flow of articles submitted this last year, 103 in all categories, is proof that historical research is again at normal. Indeed, if one adds to this the sixteen hundred doctoral theses in preparation, one's satisfaction may be shaded by concern for all the young people who are counting on an academic career. It is an irresponsible department of history that does not protect these candidates by making them eligible for teaching in schools other than colleges, and, under state require-

[1] Read at the business meeting of the Association, December 29, 1950.

ments, for positions often better paid than any but the higher ranks in the college group.

Let me turn now to the business affairs that an executive officer must summarize annually for the information of the membership. Many items of importance I shall report later on behalf of your governing board, the Council. All of this work has been carried on by committees chosen from the membership. The main burden is necessarily borne by the chairman in any committee with a dispersed membership. For meetings and conferences he must in all but two of the endowed committees substitute an extended interchange of opinion by correspondence. That this procedure works is due this year, as in the past, to the energy of the several chairmen and the response of the members to their letters. Some day the Association should be in a position to support an occasional meeting of some of these committees, particularly the Committee on Nominations and the Program Committee. To keep committees distributed geographically and yet workable is an annual problem for the Committee on Committees and the Council.

Five committees award prizes. Of these the Watumull Prize for the best book in Indian history written and published in the United States is awarded biennially and in odd-numbered years. The awards of the Adams, Beveridge, and John H. Dunning committees will be announced this evening at the annual dinner. (See p. 4 above.) The George L. Beer Prize again goes unawarded for want of competition.

The Beveridge Committee through its chairman reports that at the end of a five-year experimental program in which the amounts and terms of the award have been varied the award will henceforth be called a fellowship and will be in the amount of one thousand dollars with the same generous arrangements for publication both of the winning manuscripts and, where possible, of other meritorious studies. The rising cost of printing is a constant concern of the committee. The steady sale of its selections published by the University of Pennsylvania Press is a gratifying ratification of its choices. A new contract has been negotiated with the press, which takes account of new conditions, but is not to the disadvantage of the committee's freedom in determining the content and editorial treatment of manuscripts. The work of this committee and its handling of its finances merit special commendation.

The same may be said of two other publishing committees with independent funds, the Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund under Professor Ray Billington of Northwestern, and the Littleton-Griswold Committee under Professor R. B. Morris of Columbia University. The slow and exacting work of the latter committee in transcribing and editing colonial judicial records has gone ahead satisfactorily in the past year. The work of this committee has been possible because of the personal scholarly interest and devotion of its chairman. It is to be hoped that the committee will remain intact until it has given us a volume for each of the thirteen colonies. It will then be time for the committee and the Council to determine on future activities. The selection of a manuscript by the Carnegie Fund Committee will be announced this evening. (See p. 4 above.) Chairman Billington reports that the arrangements for publication of its choices by the Cornell University Press continue to be mutually satisfactory. The Association thus adds its testimony to the growing reputation of the university presses as agencies for the publication and distribution of scholarly works.

The chairman of the Committee on Documentary Reproduction, Professor Edgar L. Erickson of Illinois, reports that Professor Rice has completed his microfilming task on unpublished inventories of the Archives Nationales. Professor Nasatir is microfilming material in Paris on the American Revolution, Professor Peter Topping is at work in Greece on bibliography and, later, microfilming of selected records on Greek history, and Professor Robert Reynolds is in Genoa with

a similar project for medieval trade. Fulbright grants to scholars will supplement the committee's program. The microprint of the British House of Commons Sessional Papers has resumed and since May, 1950, monthly deliveries have been made to subscribing libraries. The devotion and competence of Chairman Erickson is making an enviable record for this committee.

The Committee on Government Publications through its chairman, Mrs. Jeannette Nichols, reviews its past in sustaining the publishing activities of the Federal Government, especially the series sponsored by the State Department. This year Mrs. Nichols surveyed the many departments and agencies of the Government that had had publication programs of a historical character during the war. Responses to her questionnaire came from thirty-two units. The result showed the effect of postwar economy in limiting or liquidating such programs even when they were in manuscript form. It showed, equally, the willingness in many cases to make available unpublished studies and to open unexploited archives to qualified research students including those seeking topics or material for doctoral dissertations. The events of the few weeks since the chairman reported make the outlook much darker for the completion of official histories that would have given us the distilled experience of one national crisis to guide us in facing another. In all this Mrs. Nichols has co-operated as a member with the ad hoc Committee on Historians and the Federal Government authorized at Boston last year. The work of this latter committee and its relation to the standing committee was considered at the Council meeting on Wednesday and will be reported later in reviewing the work of that session. Mrs. Nichols for her committee will present later today certain resolutions for your approval.

The Committee on the *Annual Report* finds itself without an agenda. In past years it solicited and chose manuscripts to be published as part of the *Report*. The funds then available through the Smithsonian Institution are now pledged to their limit to produce the volumes of the *Writings on American History* so long as funds can be found to prepare the manuscript, and thereafter, or coincidentally, to publish the Matteson index of previous volumes. I can add to this for your information that the manuscript for the *Writings on American History* covering 1948 has been sent to the Government Printing Office and the copy for the 1949 volume is well advanced in preparation. All this was made possible by the $15,000 given by this Association to the Library of Congress for the salary of Dr. Masterson and his assistant. Also, the membership list with addresses as reported up to October 5 will be part of the slim official volume printed annually as a report to Congress. As only two thousand copies of this volume are sent to a long-standing list of members out of nearly six thousand, the Superintendent of Documents has been asked to stock and sell separates, probably at a price of thirty cents.

The report of the ad hoc Committee on Archival Treatment of Personal Papers authorized in December, 1948, has been submitted by Miss Katharine Brand on behalf of the chairman, Professor Thomas C. Cochran. It is so long and detailed that I shall not attempt to summarize it. It is, however, so important for those who are interested in the management of personal manuscripts as archival material that it will be published in full in the *Annual Report*.

Our representative on the American Council of Learned Societies, Professor Strayer, reports that in addition to its usual program the Council has pointedly concerned itself with the development and preservation of the individual scholar. To that end a grant from the Markle Foundation has enabled it to add a few fellowships for assistant professors to its program for assistance to graduate students in the humanities. All efforts by the director to get even an explanation of the rigid passport procedures of the State Department in the matter of exchange of scholars have failed completely. Fulbright fellows recommended last June and now on leave without salary are still waiting clearance.

Professor Shepard Clough reports that the Social Science Research Council has an active committee on historiography which is preparing a volume on the relation of the social sciences to history and that the committee on economic history is actively publishing the results of studies it has supported. This last year saw the initiation of a series of faculty research fellowships giving half-time support over a three-year period. Of the forty-five area fellowships nine have been given to appointees in history, and of the twenty-five grants-in-aid nine have been given to support historical studies. In the category of research training fellowships eight of forty-three granted are in history. The attention of young scholars and their sponsors in the field of history is called especially to the possibilities of financial support by these two bodies which the association through its delegates is an active member.

Professor Donald McKay has been our efficient and influential member of the executive committee of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. The meeting of the Congress, the first since World War II, was held in Paris, August 27 to September 2, and was well attended. Austria, Spain, and Israel were fully accredited and Germany on principle awaiting only proof of the representative character of the new German historical association. No countries behind the iron curtain attended, although two paid their dues. The announced program of some 230 papers was followed and reported reasonably successful. The major papers of the morning sessions have been published. The new president for the next five years is Professor Robert Fawtier of France. The next Congress will be held in Rome in 1955 and Stockholm was placed in line for the meeting in 1960. The American attendance was not as large as had been hoped. (See report, p. 76 below.)

Professor Destler reports for *Social Education* a continuing improvement in content under the editorship of Dr. Lewis Paul Todd. The editor has accepted an appointment in New York University. It is hoped his new duties will not prevent his continuing editorship.

The results of the work of the Program Committee and the Committee on Local Arrangements for this session need no summary by me. The attending membership is their debtor, especially to the two chairmen, Professor Fred Harrington of Wisconsin, and Dr. Stanley Pargellis of the Newberry Library in Chicago.

The labors of the Committee on Nominations was embodied in the ballot you received and the results of your voting for members of the Council and next year's Committee on Nominations will be announced later by the chairman, Professor Robert Palmer. (See p. 45.)

To the chairmen and committee members who alone realize how drastically I have summarized their reports I can offer only an apology and the pressure of time at these sessions. The reports will be printed in full in the next *Annual Report*.

It is to be hoped that you will return to your tasks after this meeting with a heightened sense of the value of history in steadying the decisions we must make as a nation. You as individuals fortified by a knowledge of the past and with a longer perspective on the future will have your courage and good sense tested in many ways by outcroppings of national and international tensions. Public life, like the depths of the ocean, is the habitat of strange and wonderful creatures. Unlike those in the ocean, it takes only a surface agitation to throw political unknowns into unpredictable activity. No living creature in their vicinity, however, peaceful and blameless, is safe when they strike out blindly. In human terms the headline hunter's most defenseless victim is often the teacher, writer, or public servant. The abler the latter is, the more violent is the effort to bring him down to the level of the demagogues. Soon the outcry will be raised against teachers and textbooks. Most of us have seen this kind of blackmail, not once, but several times in the last few decades of war and social legislation. It will come again

and I think I could spot on a map a few places where it is endemic. I will venture to say that when it starts, the District of Columbia will be near the front of the procession. There is in all this an indication of a certain immaturity and the confusion and uncertainty of little minds. During the recent conference between Mr. Attlee and Mr. Truman and their advisers in an effort to reach decisions for which the whole world waited, one could not but contrast the way in which the English Parliament and press and people closed ranks behind the leader of the moment and the redoubled attacks in our own country on our responsible leaders. It appeared almost as though we were fighting a future political campaign when national unity was imperative. I mention these things only to enforce the obligation laid doubly upon us as historians and citizens to keep our people sane and firm while we face a national and international crisis whose resolution no man can now predict with assurance. If any group can keep the dust raised by demagogues out of our eyes as we peer into the future, it should be the historians and the teachers of history. I for one have confidence that they will realize their responsibility and summon their courage to match their intelligence in meeting their opportunity.

GUY STANTON FORD, *Executive Secretary.*

Annual Report of the Treasurer

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1949–50

The financial assets of the American Historical Association on August 31, 1950, amounted to $402,504.34. Of that sum, $349,207.55 constitute the capital funds of the Association, which are in the custody of the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York and are managed by it under the direction of the Board of Trustees. Of that amount $191,659.75 are credited to various special funds, leaving $157,547.80 the income from which is unrestricted. The cash on hand in checking and savings accounts amounts to $53,296.79 of which sum $44,699.15 is restricted, leaving $8,597.64 available for general purposes. The total of unrestricted funds, including both capital and expendable sums, amounted to $166,145.44, and that of restricted funds amounted to $236,358.90.

The increase in the value of restricted invested funds of the Association has come from securities valued at $47,539.75 received from the estate of David M. Matteson. These securities are held in a special fund known as the David M. Matteson Fund. The unrestricted invested funds have been increased by $15,506.03 through exchange in securities and additional investments from the general funds of the Association.

The expendable funds of the Association are administered through a general account, five special accounts, and three operating accounts. The general account includes, however, a number of special funds and grants, which are segregated from the unrestricted funds only by bookkeeping. The balances in this account are kept partly in a savings account and partly in a checking account, and transfers are made from one to the other as occasion arises. The balances in the special accounts are separately deposited, four in savings accounts and one in a checking account. The operating accounts are not administered by the Treasurer, but the funds for them are supplied from the general or special accounts and, as a rule, their receipts are transmitted to the Treasurer for deposit in the appropriate accounts.

The following tables present a condensed exhibit of the financial transactions of the Association during the year. The statement for the general fund is broken

down into unrestricted funds and the various special funds and grants, and for the unrestricted funds the items for 1948–49 are included for purposes of comparison. Statements for the special accounts and the operating accounts follow, and there are a number of summaries. The disbursements of unrestricted funds exceeded receipts by $8,005.75. The disbursements, however, include a contribution of $10,000.00 toward editorial expenses of *Writings on American History.*

The Treasurer's accounts have been audited by F. W. Lafrentz & Co., certified public accountants, and their report is on file in the Washington office of the Association, where it may be examined by any interested member. There has been no audit of the operating accounts of the Committee on Americana as its activities have been suspended and no report has been submitted. Liquidation of the funds of this committee has not been accomplished as of August 31, 1950. It will be reported next year. Funds of the operating account of the Radio Committee, amounting to $194.10, were transferred during the year to the general account of the Association for investment. The operating account of *Social Education* has been audited by Paul O. Carr and Eber W. Jeffery, and the report of this audit is also on file and available for inspection in the Washington office.

The report of the Board of Trustees for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1950, which was submitted by W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of the Board, is also on file and available for inspection in the Washington office.

SOLON J. BUCK, *Treasurer.*

GENERAL ACCOUNT

Comparative statement for 1948–49 and 1949–50 of receipts and disbursements of unrestricted funds

	1948–49	*1949–50*
Receipts:		
Cash on hand	$22,087.06	$16,603.39
Annual dues	24,488.31	25,324.60
Registration fees	1,441.87	1,176.00
Interest	5,845.10	6,277.69
American Historical Review	7,467.70	6,143.64
Royalties	227.47	103.11
Advertising	1,330.00	1,242.50
Miscellaneous	370.59	203.50
	63,258.10	57,074.43
Disbursements:		
General administration	20,105.80	22,312.44
Council and Council committees	873.15	899.16
Annual meetings	388.77	457.55
Review—copies for members	14,119.40	13,610.69
A. C. L. S.—dues	100.00	100.00
Pacific Coast Branch	200.00	200.00
International Com. of Hist. Sciences	767.59	896.95
Council for Preservation of Historic Sites and Buildings	100.00	.....
Investments	5,000.00	.....
Writings on American History	5,000.00	10,000.00
Total	46,654.71	48,476.79
Balance	16,603.39	8,597.64
	63,258.10	57,074.43

Statement of receipts and disbursements for 1949–50 of special funds and grants included in the general account

	Receipts	*Disbursements*
Endowment fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	$113.25	
Contributions	238.50	
Life membership dues	600.00	
Transferred for investment	.....	$900.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	51.75
	951.75	951.75
Andrew D. White Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	23.16	
Interest	42.00	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	65.16
	65.16	65.16
George Louis Beer Prize Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	1,630.25	
Interest	224.00	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	1,854.25
	1,854.25	1,854.25
John H. Dunning Prize Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	178.29	
Interest	73.50	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	251.79
	251.79	251.79
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	52.53	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	52.53
	52.23	52.53
Watumull Prize:		
Contribution from Watumull Foundation	500.00	
Prize of 1949	.....	500.00
	500.00	500.00
Writings on American History Index:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	2,000.00	
Transferred to Jameson Fund	.....	2,000.00
	2,000.00	2,000.00

Statement of receipts and disbursements for 1949–50 of special funds and grants included in the general account—Continued

	Receipts	*Disbursements*
J. Franklin Jameson Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	$521.18	
Interest	84.70	
Transferred from *Writings on American History* Index	2,000.00	
From sales of "Lists of Doctoral Dissertations"	337.10	
Editorial work on 1949 "List"	.....	$100.00
Printing 1949 "List"	.....	356.24
Other expenses	.....	5.65
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	2,481.09
	2,942.98	2,942.98
David M. Matteson Fund:		
Received from Matteson estate	8,000.00	
Interest	1,260.00	
Expenses settling estate	.....	148.27
Preparation of *Internat. Bibliog. of Hist. Sciences, American Section*	.....	150.00
Work on *Writings* index	.....	1,041.70
Investments	.....	8,000.00
Other expenses	.....	11.65
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	91.60
	9,260.00	9,260.00
Radio Committee:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	33.00	
Transferred from operating account	194.10	
Investments	.....	227.10
	227.10	227.10
Mexican-American Historical Congress:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	72.99	
Refund	16.00	
Travel and committee expenses	.....	88.99
	88.99	88.99
Committee on Historians and the Federal Govt.:		
Grant from Rockefeller Foundation	1,000.00	
Committee expense	.....	507.34
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	492.66
	1,000.00	1,000.00
Special Accounts:		
Interest	4,620.00	
Transfers	.....	4,620.00
	4,620.00	4,620.00

Summary statement for 1949–50 of receipts and disbursements of funds in the general account

		Receipts	*Disbursements*
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949:			
Unrestricted funds	$16, 603.39		
Special funds and grants	4, 624.65		
		$21, 228.04	
Income:			
Unrestricted funds	40, 471.04		
Special funds and grants	12, 569.90		
		53, 040.94	
Expenditures and transfers:			
Unrestricted funds	48, 476.79		
Special funds and grants	12, 036.92		
		.....	$60, 513.71
Balances, Aug. 31, 1950:			
Unrestricted funds	.....	.....	8, 597.64
Special funds and grants	.....	.....	5, 157.63
Total	.....	74, 268.98	74, 268.98
Interest received and transferred to special accounts	.....	4, 620.00	4, 620.00
Grand totals, general account	.....	78, 888.98	78, 888.98

SPECIAL ACCOUNTS

Statement for 1949–50 of receipts and disbursements

	Receipts	*Disbursements*
Americana for College Libraries:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	$2, 026. 65	
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	$2, 026. 65
	2, 026. 65	2, 026. 65
Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	12, 363. 41	.....
Interest	119. 45	.....
Royalties	1, 706. 41	.....
Editorial and publication expenses	.....	3, 560. 48
Committee expenses	.....	20. 30
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	10, 608. 49
	14, 189. 27	14, 189. 27
Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	21, 316. 45	.....
Interest	3, 681. 88	.....
Royalties	840. 14	.....
Editorial and publication expenses	.....	6, 200. 12
Committee expenses	.....	275. 45
Membership dues for contributors	.....	270. 00
Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fellowship	.....	775. 00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	18, 317. 90
	25, 838. 47	25, 838. 47

Statement for 1949–50 of receipts and disbursements—Continued

	Receipts	*Disbursements*
Littleton-Griswold Fund:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	$7,229.38	.....
Interest	1,177.80	.....
Contribution toward publication costs	250.00	.....
Sales of publications	1,298.00	.....
Editorial and publication expenses	.....	$4,767.99
Committee expenses	.....	227.75
Membership dues of contributor	.....	5.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	4,954.44
	9,955.18	9,955.18
Social Education:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	4,569.48	.....
Interest	41.50	.....
Royalties	774.84	.....
Subscriptions and advertising	4,165.74	.....
Royalty payments to authors of report of Commission on the Social Studies	.....	186.07
Transferred to operating account	.....	6,230.99
Miscellaneous	.....	2.00
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	3,132.50
	9,551.56	9,551.56
Summary of Special Accounts:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	47,505.37	.....
Income including transfers	14,055.76	.....
Expenditures and transfers	.....	22,521.15
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	39,039.98
	61,561.13	61,561.13

General Summary

Summary statement for 1949–50 of funds in the general account and the special accounts

		Receipts	*Disbursements*
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949:			
General Account	$21,228.04		
Special Accounts	47,505.37		
		$68,733.41	
Income:			
General Account	53,040.94		
Special Accounts	14,055.76		
	67,096.70		
Less duplication	4,895.00		
		62,201.70	
Expenditures and transfers:			
General Account	60,513.71		
Special Accounts	22,521.15		
	83,034.86		
Less duplication	4,895.00		
		.....	$78,139.86

Summary statement for 1949–50 of funds in the general account and the special accounts—Con.

Balance, Aug. 31, 1950:	*Receipts*	*Disbursements*
General Account	.....	$13, 755. 27
Special Accounts	.....	39, 039. 98
Totals	$130, 935. 11	130, 935. 11

Operating Accounts

Statements for 1949–50 of receipts and disbursements of accounts not handled by the treasurer

Social Education:	*Receipts*	*Disbursements*
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	$569.01	.....
Transferred from special account	6, 230.99	.....
Advertisements and subscriptions	4, 165.74	.....
Salaries	.....	$6, 211.98
Office expenses	.....	482.32
Travel	.....	147.45
Transferred to special account	.....	4, 165.74
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	—41.75
	10, 965.74	10, 965.74
Radio Committee:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	194.10	.....
Transferred to special account	.....	194.10
	194.10	194.10
Committee on Americana for College Libraries:		
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	543.29	.....
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	543.29
	543.29	543.29

Financial Assets

Securities as appraised Aug. 31, 1950		$349, 207. 55
Credited to—		
Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund	$100, 000. 00	
Littleton-Griswold Fund	32, 000. 00	
Andrew D. White Fund	1, 200. 00	
George Louis Beer Fund	6, 400. 00	
John H. Dunning Fund	2, 100. 00	
J. Franklin Jameson Fund	2, 420. 00	
David M. Matteson Fund	47, 539. 75	191, 659. 75
Unrestricted		157, 547. 80
Cash in checking and savings accounts		53, 296. 79
Credited to—		
Special accounts	39, 039. 98	
Special funds	5, 157. 63	
Operating accounts	501. 54	44, 699. 15
Unrestricted		8, 597. 64

Summary

	Receipts	*Disbursements*
Unrestricted funds:		
Securities	$157, 547. 80	
Cash in custody of the Treasurer	8, 597. 64	$166, 145. 44
Restricted funds:		
Securities	191, 659. 75	
Cash in custody of the Treasurer	44, 197. 61	
Cash in operating accounts	501. 54	236, 358. 90
Total		402, 504. 34

Report of the Auditors

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

OCTOBER 26, 1950.

DEAR SIRS: We have examined the recorded cash receipts and disbursements of the general and special accounts of the American Historical Association for the period from September 1, 1949 to August 31, 1950. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion the accompanying statements of cash receipts and disbursements of the American Historical Association present fairly the results of its recorded cash transactions for the year, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

The statements of cash receipts and disbursements are presented herewith together with schedules of securities held and security transactions during the year as presented to the Association by the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York.

CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

A summary of the cash receipts and disbursements covering the general account, general account—special funds and grants, and special accounts, as detailed in Exhibits A, B, and C is shown below: [1]

	Total	Exhibit A, General Account	Exhibit B, Special Funds and Grants	Exhibit C, Special Accounts
Balance at Sept. 1, 1949	$68, 733. 41	$16, 603. 39	$4, 624. 65	$47, 505. 37
Receipts	73, 716. 70	40, 471. 04	19, 189. 90	14, 055. 76
	142, 450. 11	57, 074. 43	23, 814. 55	61, 561. 13
Disbursements	89, 654. 86	48, 476. 79	18, 656. 92	22, 521. 15
Balance at Aug. 31, 1950	52, 795. 25	8, 597. 64	5, 157. 63	39, 039. 98

[1] The exhibits and complete schedules are on file in the office of the Executive Secretary and may be examined by any qualified and interested person.

Recorded cash receipts were accounted for in bank deposits, and cash disbursements as shown by the records were supported by cancelled checks or withdrawals noted in the passbooks and properly approved vouchers.

The cash on deposit with the Union Trust Company to the credit of the accounts and funds listed below, amounting to $52,795.25 was reconciled with the bank statements and passbooks and confirmed by correspondence with the depositary.

A summary of the account is as follows:

General account and Special Funds and Grants:		
Checking account—general	$12,667.36	
Savings account—general	1,087.91	
		$13,755.27
Special Accounts:		
Savings account #5	18,317.90	
Savings account #6	4,954.44	
Savings account #7	3,132.50	
Savings account #8	10,608.49	
Checking account—special	2,026.65	
		39,039.98
Total		52,795.25

INVESTMENTS

Statements of the cash and investment transactions by the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York for your account from September 1, 1949, to August 31, 1950, is shown on Schedules No. 1 and No. 2.[1]

Securities in the hands of the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York as of August 31, 1950, are shown in accordance with their report as confirmed directly to us. These securities are detailed on Schedules No. 3 and No. 4.

The market value of securities held in the regular account as of August 31, 1950, was $301,532.00 and of securities held in the Matteson Fund was $46,878.00.

During the year the Association was the beneficiary of a bequest from the estate of David M. Matteson. The Association has thus far received $8,000.00 from a savings account of the deceased, plus $140.00 interest accrued thereon, and the securities noted on Schedule No. 4 which were appraised by Fiduciary Trust Company as of June 14, 1950, at $38,982.00. According to the terms of the will, the corpus of the fund is to be determined by valuing the assets received at the date of transfer to the Trustees of the American Historical Association. According to a copy of the executor's appraisal, which was presented for our inspection, there will be further transfers to the Association of cash and securities, the exact amount of which is not determinable at this time.

INCOME FROM INVESTMENTS

Income on investments was accounted for during the period under review. Amortization of bonds owned by the Association as of August 31, 1950, was computed in accordance with amounts shown by the Fiduciary Trust Company. Payments to the Association by the Fiduciary Trust Company amounted to $12,425.54 as set forth in Schedule No. 1.

[1] The exhibits and complete schedules are on file in the office of the Executive Secretary and may be examined by any qualified and interested person.

General

Dues received during the year are shown in accordance with the cash records without further verification by us. A summary of dues received indicates that such dues are applicable to the following years:

Dues year ending:	*Amount*
1952	$56.00
1951	16,046.43
1950	9,164.67
Prior years	57.50
	25,324.60

If any additional information is required, we will be glad to furnish same upon request.

Respectfully submitted.

F. W. Lafrentz & Co.
Certified Public Accountants.

Report of the Board of Trustees

December 1, 1950.

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, 1950.

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

Regular Section

	Aug. 31, 1950, approximate		Estimated annual income
	Price	Value	
U. S. Government bonds:			
$45,000 U. S. A. Treasury Notes D, 1951, 1¼ percent, due July 1, 1951	100	$45,000.00	$563
$5,000 U. S. A. Savings bonds, Reg. Defense G, dated May 1, 1941, redeemable for lesser amounts, 2½ percent, due May 1, 1953	[1]100	5,000.00	125
$4,000 U. S. A. Treasury bonds of 1951–53 .2 percent, due Sept. 15, 1953	101	4,040.00	80
$8,000 U. S. A. Savings bonds, Reg. Defense G, dated Feb. 1, 1942, redeemable for lesser amounts, 2½ percent, due Feb. 1, 1954	[1]100	8,000.00	200
$8,000 U. S. A. Treasury bonds of 1952–54, 2½ percent, Mar. 15, 1954	102	8,160.00	200
$12,000 U. S. A. Savings bonds, Reg. Defense G, dated June 1, 1942, redeemable for lesser amounts, 2½ percent, due June 1, 1954	[1]100	12,000.00	300
Railroad bonds: $10,000 Virginian Ry. Co., first lien and refunding mortgage B, 3 percent, due May 1, 1995	99	9,900.00	300
Utility bonds:			
$26,000 American Tel. & Tel. Co., convertible debenture, 2¾ percent, due Dec. 15, 1961	108	28,080.00	715
$10,000 Detroit Edison Co., convertible debenture, 3 percent, due Dec. 1, 1958	113	11,300.00	300
Preferred stocks:			
100 shares E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., $4.50 cumulative preferred, no par, rate $4.50	125	12,500.00	450
40 shares U. S. Rubber Co., 8 percent, non-cumulative, first preferred, par $100, rate $8	139	5,560.00	320
100 shares U. S. Steel Corp., 7 percent, cumulative preferred, par $100, rate $7	147	14,700.00	700
Common stocks:			
60 shares American Can Co., par $25, rate $4	95	5,700.00	240
75 shares Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., par $25, rate $5	77	5,775.00	375
80 shares Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc., par $5, rate $3.75	50	4,000.00	300

[1] Cost.

Regular Section—Continued

	Aug. 31, 1950, approximate		Estimated annual income
	Price	Value	
Common stocks—Continued			
18 shares Swedish Match Co., B shares, 25 Swedish crowns, par with coupons No. 24/51 incl. & talon and Swedish Bank affidavit No. 2294, attached, rate $3.91, paid July 7, 1950	6	$108.00	
200 shares E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., par $5, rate $4	78	15,600.00	$800
150 shares Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., no par, rate $2	45	6,750.00	300
100 shares Continental Oil Co., par $5, rate $4	74	7,400.00	400
200 shares General Electric Co., no par, rate $2.50	48	9,600.00	500
100 shares Westinghouse Elec. Corp., par $12.50, rate $1.60	31	3,100.00	160
60 shares Ingersoll Rand Co., no par, rate $4.75	68	4,080.00	285
100 shares Inland Steel Co., no par, rate $3	47	4,700.00	300
170 shares Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., par $10, rate $1.75	34	5,780.00	297
100 shares Kennecott Copper Corp., no par, rate $4	64	6,400.00	400
240 shares Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co., par $8.50, rate $1.80	30	7,200.00	432
240 shares Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., no par, rate $2.40	40	9,600.00	576
200 shares Middle South Utilities, Inc., no par, rate $1.10	16	3,200.00	220
200 shares Public Service Elec. & Gas Co., no par, rate $1.60	22	4,400.00	320
200 shares Columbia Gas System, Inc., no par, rate $0.75	12	2,400.00	150
200 shares Northern Natural Gas Co., par $10, rate $1.80	31	6,200.00	360
200 shares Oklahoma Natural Gas Co., par $15, rate $2	28	5,600.00	400
200 shares United Gas Corp., par $10, rate $1	18	3,600.00	200
30 shares Guaranty Trust Co. of N. Y., par $100, rate $14	292	8,760.00	420
74 shares Insurance Co. of No. America, par $10, scrip void Dec. 29, 1950	109	8,110.00	259
Securities value		302,303.00	
Principal cash balance		1,364.80	
Total Principal		303,667.80	
Total Estimated Annual Income			11,947

Statement of transactions during the period from Sept. 1, 1949, through Aug. 31, 1950

Regular Section

	Price	Principal
SUBSCRIPTION		
40 shares Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co	28	$1,120
RIGHTS RECEIVED		
200 rights Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co., rights to subscribe for 40 shares common stock at $28 per share. Void after Apr. 7, 1950.		
200 rights Northern Natural Gas Co., rights to subscribe for 25 shares common stock at $31.50 per share. Void after May 22, 1950.		
80 rights Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc., rights to subscribe for 13⅜ shares common stock at $48 per share. Void after June 5, 1950.		
80 rights Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc., rights to subscribe for 5 5/15 shares, 3.90 percent cumulative preferred stock at $100.75 per share. Void after June 5, 1950.		
SECURITIES RECEIVED BY EXCHANGE		
18 shares Swedish Match Co., "B" shares, 25 Swedish Crowns par, Coupons No. 23/51 inclusive and talon attached together with $2.34 received in exchange for 6 shares International Match Realization Co., Ltd., V. T. C., par £1.		
$45,000 U. S. A. Treasury notes, D-1951, 1¼ percent, due July 1, 1951, received in exchange for $45,000 U. S. A. Treasury C/i, E-1950, 1¼ percent, due June 1, 1950.		
STOCK DIVIDEND RECEIVED		
12 shares Insurance Co. of North America, 20 percent stock dividend to holders of record Dec. 1, 1949.		
SALES		
200 rights Northern Natural Gas Co	15/32 net	93.63
80 rights Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc., rights for common stock	10/16 net	49.98
80 rights Philip Morris & Co., Ltd., Inc., rights for preferred stock	1/128 net	.36
Total sales		143.97

Statement of transactions during the period from Sept. 1, 1949, through Aug. 31, 1950—Con.

Matteson Fund

	Aug. 31, 1950, approximate		Estimated annual income
	Price	Value	
Railroad bonds:			
$2,000 Union Pacific Rwy. Co., deb., 2⅞ percent, due Feb. 1, 1976	104	$2,080.00	$58
Industrial bonds:			
$2,000 National Steel Corp., first collateral mortgage, 3 percent, due Apr. 1, 1965	104	2,080.00	60
$3,000 Standard Oil Co. of N. J., deb., 2¾ percent, due July 15, 1974	103	3,090.00	82
Preferred stock:			
20 shares American Felt Co., 6 percent, cumulative preferred, par $100, rate $6	98	1,960.00	120
Common stocks:			
25 shares Boston Herald Traveler Corp., no par, rate $1.60	18	450.00	40
240 shares American Tel. & Tel. Co., par $100, rate $9	154	36,960.00	2,160
6 shares Consolidated Natural Gas Co., par $15, rate $2	43	258.00	12
Securities value		46,878.00	
Principal cash balance		661.75	
Total principal		47,539.75	
Total estimated annual income			2,532

Statement of transactions during the period from Mar. 15, 1950, through Aug. 31, 1950

Matteson Fund

	Price	Principal
SECURITIES RECEIVED		
240 shares American Tel. & Tel. Co.		
25 shares Boston Herald-Traveler Corp.		
20 shares American Felt Co., 6 percent cumulative preferred.		
6 shares Consolidated Natural Gas Co.		
PURCHASES		
$2,000 Union Pacific Rwy. Co., deb., 2⅞ percent, due Feb. 1, 1976	103¾	$2,085.00
$3,000 Standard Oil Co. of N. J., deb., 2¾ percent, due July 15, 1974	102¾	3,094.50
$2,000 National Steel Corp., first collateral mortgage, 3 percent, due Apr. 1, 1965	104½	2,100.00
		7,279.50

The securities of the Association are in the custody of the Fiduciary Trust Company of New York, and are managed by it subject to the approval of the Trustees.

During the year the *Bond Account* and the *Special Account* have been consolidated and set up as the *Regular Section,* and a new account, the *Matteson Fund,* has been set up with securities and cash received from the estate of David M. Matteson. For the *Regular Section* securities at a cost price of $1,120 have been purchased, and securities at a sales price of $441.09 have been sold. The estimated value of securities for the *Matteson Fund* is $47,539.75 including securities at a cost value of $7,279.50 purchased from $8,000 in cash received from the Matteson estate. There have been no sales for this account. A list of purchases for both accounts and sales for the *Regular Section* is given above.

The holdings of the American Historical Association as of August 31, 1950, compare with its holdings of August 31, 1949, as follows:

	Value of principal	Income		Value of principal	Income
REGULAR SECTION			MATTESON FUND		
Aug. 31, 1949	$286,161.77	$11,186	Aug. 31, 1949		
Aug. 31, 1950	303,667.80	11,947	Aug. 31, 1950	$47,539.75	$1,120.00

As will be noted from the foregoing figures, the market value of the securities held in the *Regular Section* for the Association increased from a total of $286,-161.77 on August 31, 1949, to $303,667.80 on August 31, 1950, an increase of about 6.12 percent. This increase reflects conditions general in the securities markets for the respective dates. The income basis, figured as of the same two dates, increased from $11,186 to $11,947, an increase of 6.8 percent. The securities and cash from the Matteson estate were received during the year, and the interest of $1,120 represents income for only part of the fiscal period. The estimated income for the coming year is $2,532.

In accord with accepted principles, the Trustees have given instructions to the Fiduciary Trust Company to set aside out of each year's income such an amount as is applicable for that year toward the amortization of the premiums on bonds purchased above the redemption price. The charge upon income on this account for the fiscal year was $297.12.

During the fiscal year, the Trustees received from the Association for investment $1,127.10.

Charges made by the Fiduciary Trust Company for the management of securities amounted during the fiscal year to $1,490. The brokerage charges on purchases and sales amounted to $400.56. The Board of Trustees incurred no other expenses.

Very truly yours,

For the Board of Trustees of the
American Historical Association,
W. Randolph Burgess, *Chairman.*

949541—51——5

Draft Budgets, 1950–51, 1951–52

UNRESTRICTED FUNDS

(Approved by the Finance Committee and the Council, Dec. 27, 1950)

	Actual 1949–50	Original 1950–51	Revised 1950–51	1951–52
RECEIPTS				
Annual dues	$25,324.60	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000
Registration fees	1,176.00	1,000	1,000	1,000
Interest	6,277.69	5,500	6,000	6,000
Royalties	103.11	25	25	25
American Historical Review:				
Macmillan, editorial expense	2,400.00	2,400	2,400	2,400
Profits	3,743.64	4,500	3,700	3,700
Advertising and exhibit space	1.242.50	1,300	1,500	1,500
Publications and miscellaneous	203.50	50	50	50
	40,471.04	38,775	38,675	38,675
DISBURSEMENTS				
General Administration:				
Salary, Executive Secretary and Editor	6,000.00	6,000	6,000	6,000
Salary, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer	3,708.00	3,780	3,900	3,900
Salary, Editorial Assistant	3,926.72	4,000	4,120	4,120
Salary, Clerk-Stenographer	2,936.00	3,000	3,120	3,120
Clerical assistance	1,483.71	2,500	2,700	2,700
Bonding Assistant Secretary-Treasurer	25.00	25	25	25
Auditing	200.00	150	200	200
Travel	278.90	300	300	300
Office expenses (including stationery, supplies, equipment, postage, telephone and telegraph)	3,235.07	3,000	3,000	3,000
Notes contributed to *Review*	347.50	350	350	350
Contingent and miscellaneous	171.54	500	500	500
	22,312.44	23,605	24,215	24,215
Payments to the Macmillan Company for copies of the *Review* supplied to members of the Association	13,610.69	14,500	14,500	14,500
Historical Activities and Other Expenditures:				
Pacific Coast Branch	200.00	200	200	200
Council and Council Committees	899.16	875	900	900
Program committees				
1949	9.49			
1950	200.00			
1951		75	75	50
1952				75
Local arrangements committees	200.00	200	200	200
Nominating committees:				
1949	48.06			
1950		50	50	
1951		25	25	50
1952				25
Dues in A. C. L. S.	100.00	100	100	100
International Committee of Historical Sciences (Membership and bibliography)	896.95	1,000	300	300
Council for Preservation of Historic Sites		100	200	100
Writings on American History	10,000.00			
	12,553.66	2,625	2,050	2,000
Investments (unrestricted funds)				
Summary of Disbursements:				
General Administration	22,312.44	23,605	24,215	24,215
Macmillan for copies of *Review* to members	13,610.69	14,500	14,500	14,500
Historical activities and other expenses	12,553.66	2,625	2,050	2,000
	48,476.79	40,730	40,765	40,715

Balance Sheet, 1950–52, estimated

Balance on hand, Sept. 1, 1950	$8,597.64
Receipts, 1950–51	38,675.00
Total available, 1950–51	47,272.64
Expenditures, 1950–51	40,765.00
Balance, Sept. 1, 1951	6,507.64
Receipts, 1951–52	38,675.00
Total available, 1951–52	45,182.64
Expenditures, 1951–52	40,715.00
Balance, Sept. 1, 1952	4,467.64

Statistics of Membership, Dec. 15, 1950

I. General

Total membership:			
Individuals:			
Honorary		15	
Life		[1] 397	
Annual		4,904	
Institutions:			
25-year memberships		5	
Annual		451	
			5,772
Total paid memberships, including life members		4,775	
Delinquent		1,017	
Loss:			
Deaths:			
Honorary	0		
Life	8		
Annual	33		
		41	
Resignations		81	
Dropped		264	
		386	
Gain:			
New:			
Honorary	2		
Life	6		
Annual	571		
		579	
Former members reentered		68	
		647	
Net Gain		261	

[1] During the year we have lost 8 life members; 9 life members have been added, and of these, 6 are new members and 3 are annual members who have taken out life memberships.

I. General—Continued

Membership, Dec. 15, 1949		5,511
New members and renewals	647	
Losses	386	
		261
Total membership	5,772	

II. By Regions

New England: Main, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut	689
North Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia	1,976
South Atlantic: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida	446
North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin	1,076
South Central: Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, West Virginia	206
West Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas	581
Pacific Coast Branch: Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, Western Canada	666
Territories and dependencies: Puerto Rico, Alaska, Haiti, Canal Zone	8
Other countries	124
Total membership	5,772

III. By States

	Total membership	New members and renewals		Total membership	New members and renewals
Alabama	33	5	New Hampshire	33	3
Alaska			New Jersey	186	29
Arizona	14	2	New Mexico	26	2
Arkansas	16	2	New York	910	103
California	410	62	North Carolina	116	16
Canal Zone	2		North Dakota	9	1
Colorado	30	1	Ohio	260	28
Connecticut	187	15	Oklahoma	39	4
Delaware	17	2	Oregon	43	5
District of Columbia	290	26	Pennsylvania	392	36
Florida	51	1	Philippines	2	
Georgia	46	4	Puerto Rico	6	1
Hawaii	10		Rhode Island	38	1
Idaho	8	3	South Carolina	40	10
Illinois	367	59	South Dakota	19	3
Indiana	160	15	Tennessee	78	8
Iowa	78	6	Texas	113	14
Kansas	61	5	Utah	12	
Kentucky	51	8	Vermont	18	1
Louisiana	30	5	Virginia	193	19
Maine	33	4	Washington	74	11
Maryland	181	9	West Virginia	31	1
Massachusetts	380	41	Wisconsin	119	19
Michigan	170	18	Wyoming	5	
Minnesota	100	10	Canada	49	4
Mississippi	13	2	Cuba	4	
Missouri	83	11	Latin America	9	1
Montana	19	4	Foreign	71	5
Nebraska	33	2			
Nevada	4			[1] 5,772	647

[1] This includes the 647 new members and renewals.

DEATHS REPORTED SINCE DECEMBER 15, 1949

Life Members:

Kathleen Bruce, The Forest, Virginia (April 26, 1950).
W. F. Charters. Miami Beach, Florida.
Clement S. Houghton, Boston, Massachusetts (August 21, 1949).
Edward Krehbiel, New York, New York (June 16, 1950).
Frank Edgar Melvin, Lawrence, Kansas (March 19, 1950).
Lessing Rosenthal, Chicago, Illinois (December 20, 1949).
Charles N. Thompson, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Henry O. Wright, Los Angeles, California (October 5, 1950).

Annual Members:

James Fosdick Baldwin, Poughkeepsie, New York (October 5, 1950).
Oliver R. Barrett, Kenilworth, Illinois (March 5, 1950).
Maryland Louise Bay, Indianapolis, Indiana (December 22, 1949).
Edward Corbyn Obert Beatty, DeKalb, Illinois (March 6, 1950).
Robert Pierpont Blake, Cambridge, Massachusetts (May 9, 1950).
Isaiah Bowman, Baltimore, Maryland (January 6, 1950).
Robert Diggs Wimberley Connor, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (February 25, 1950).
Earl W. Crecraft, Kent, Ohio (March 30, 1950).
Tyler Dennett, Hague, New York (December 29, 1949).
Rudolf Dolge, Caracas, Venezuela (March 12, 1950).
Stephen Duggan, Stamford, Connecticut (August 18, 1950).
Grace Gardner Griffin, Washington, D. C. (November 4, 1950).
Miecislaus Haiman, Chicago, Illinois (January 15, 1949).
John C. Hamilton, Fayetteville, Arkansas (January 12, 1950).
Amos Arnold Hovey, Lewiston, Maine (August 19, 1950).
Edwin C. Howe, Salina, Kansas (November, 1949).
Robert F. Hubbard, Cazenovia, New York (May, 1949).
C. D. Johns, Greensboro, North Carolina (August 9, 1950).
Tyler Kepner, Newton Center, Massachusetts.
Edward McMahon, Mercer Island, Washington (June 16, 1950).
Charles Ternay Neu, Commerce, Texas (May 8, 1950).
Harley A. Notter, Washington, D. C. (June 18, 1950).
Robert J. Parker, San Francisco, California (July, 1949).
Richard J. Purcell, Washington, D. C. (January 3, 1950).
Leigh Sanford, Reno, Nevada.
John Paul Selsam, State College, Pennsylvania (May 24, 1950).
Sister Mary Eunice, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (December 13, 1949).
Sister Regina Mercedes Rigney, New York, New York (April 23, 1950).
Alfred Henry Sweet, Washington, Pennsylvania (April 22, 1950).
Dixon Wecter, Berkeley, California (June 24, 1950).
Allen Cook White, Jr., Evanston, Illinois.
D. Fedotoff White, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (November 1950).
Robert B. Brown, Ann Arbor, Michigan (December 9, 1950).

COMMITTEE REPORTS FOR 1950

The Nominating Committee

As a result of the ballots cast, the chairman of the Nominating Committee announces that Dexter Perkins and Joseph R. Strayer were elected to the Council and that Richard H. Shryock, Carl Bridenbaugh, Robert L. Reynolds, and Miss Beatrice F. Hyslop were elected to the Nominating Committee.

For the Presidency of the Association for the year 1951, the committee nominates Robert L. Schuyler; for the Vice Presidency, it nominates James G. Randall; for the office of Treasurer, it nominates Solon J. Buck.

DECEMBER 18, 1950. ROBERT R. PALMER, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON HONORARY MEMBERS

Since the quota of fifteen honorary members is full, the committee makes no recommendations for further elections.

NOVEMBER 1950. BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON THE HERBERT BAXTER ADAMS PRIZE

The Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize agreed to award the prize for 1950 to Professor Hans W. Gatzke of the Johns Hopkins University for his volume, *Germany's Drive to the West,* published by the Johns Hopkins University Press in 1950.

DECEMBER 8, 1950. CLARENCE H. MATTERSON, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON THE GEORGE LOUIS BEER PRIZE

The committee recommends with regret that no award be made this year. Only one published work and no manuscripts were submitted for consideration. Although the committee is no longer restricted to books and manuscripts actually submitted, it solicited no works from publishers.

DECEMBER 21, 1950. HOWARD M. EHRMANN, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JOHN H. DUNNING PRIZE

After careful consideration of the four volumes submitted, the Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize unanimously recommends that the prize for this year be awarded to Professor Henry Nash Smith of the University of Minnesota for his study, *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth,* published by the Harvard University Press in 1950.

NOVEMBER 6, 1950. LAWRENCE A. HARPER, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON THE WATUMULL PRIZE

The committee has not been active during the current year since the Watumull Prize is offered biennially and in odd-numbered years.

NOVEMBER 1950. TARAKNATH DAS, *Chairman.*

THE COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE *Annual Report*

During the past year one volume of the Association's *Annual Report* was published. This was volume I of the *Report* for 1948 and consisted almost entirely of the proceedings of the Association for that year. Volume I of the *Report* for 1949, containing the proceedings of the Association for that year and the list of members, is in press. Compilation of the 1948 volume of the *Writings on American History* is expected to be completed before the end of the present calendar year and will be sent to the printer shortly thereafter. Work on the compilation of the 1949 volume is far advanced and is expected to be completed by March 1951. Mr. Matteson's cumulative index to the *Writings* is planned for publication as two vol-

umes of the Association's *Annual Report*. It has been found necessary to retype this index before sending it to the printer, and this retyping is now in progress.

The funds available for the compilation of the *Writings* are expected to be exhausted by March 1951, and no funds to continue the compilation of the annual volumes are now in sight. The Librarian of Congress is requesting an appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, but no action has yet been taken by Congress on this request. A similar request for the fiscal year beginning last July 1 was not allowed. It is greatly to be hoped that the Association and the Library of Congress can work out plans to have this valuable bibliographical activity continued.

The Association has continued to receive its pro rata allotment of printing funds appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution, and in recent years this has amounted to between ten and eleven thousand dollars each year. Printing costs have increased so greatly, however, being about double what they were ten years ago, that these allotments are not sufficient to print as many pages in the *Annual Report* each year as was the case some years ago. Two annual volumes, one for the *Writings* and a very thin one for the proceedings, are about all that can be expected for the future.

NOVEMBER 10, 1950. PHILIP M. HAMER, *Chairman*.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE MEMORIAL FUND

This report covers the period from the closing date of the preceding annual report, November 8, 1949, to November 4, 1950.

The only meeting of the committee during this period was held in Philadelphia on November 3, 1950. The only change in its personnel was the addition of one new member, C. Vann Woodward of the Johns Hopkins University.

The 1949 fellowship was awarded to Glyndon G. Van Deusen of the University of Rochester for the completion of his biography of Horace Greeley. Neill A. McNall of the Pennsylvania State College received honorable mention for his manuscript, "The Agricultural History of the Genesee Valley, 1790–1860."

1950 was the last year of the five-year experimental period for which this fellowship was established under authorization by the Council in December 1945. The number of manuscripts submitted (fourteen) was larger than in the two preceding years (eleven in 1948 and ten in 1949) but smaller than in 1947 (eighteen). There was no great change from those years in the general character of the manuscripts either as to subject matter or geographical distribution of the authors. The 1950 fellowship has been awarded by the committee to Dr. Reynold M. Wik of Bethel College, St. Paul, Minnesota, for the completion of his manuscript, "Steam Power on the American Farm: A Chapter in Agricultural History, 1850–1920."

It is expected that an announcement regarding the future of the Beveridge fellowship plan will be made at the annual meeting. The committee has nearly completed its study of the results of the experiment and will shortly submit its recommendations to the Executive Secretary for consideration by the Council in December. In drawing up its recommendations the committee will give careful consideration to the advice offered by the Council in response to the request of the chairman in December 1949.

Three volumes were published in 1950: Arthur E. Bestor's *Backwoods Utopias* (fellowship, 1946); Donald Fleming's *John William Draper and the Religion of Science* (fellowship, 1948); and Clement G. Motten's *Mexican Silver and the Enlightenment* (honorable mention, 1948). All three have been well received by the reviewers. Only two manuscripts, which have been given awards, still remain to be published. These are the two which won the 1949 awards, as stated above. Of these McNall's is virtually complete and will probably be sent to the printer

early in 1951; Van Deusen's is scheduled for completion in 1951. The publication of these two will bring to seven the number of volumes published under the fellowship plan, and the award announced this year will bring the total to eight for the whole five-year period of the fellowship experiment. The two volumes published before 1950—Fred H. Harrington's *Citizen Soldier: General N. P. Banks* (honorable mention, 1946) and Lewis Hanke's *The Struggle for Justice in the Spanish Conquest of America* (fellowship, 1947)—continue to win critical acclaim. The latter was not published until the late spring of 1949, and it is gratifying to be able to report that in its first year it sold so well that another printing will probably be necessary in the near future. The University of Pennsylvania Press continues to publish the Beveridge series under the contract made in 1943 and mentioned in previous reports.

The condition of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund is shown by the report of the Treasurer of the Association for the year from September 1, 1949, to August 31, 1950. It should be recalled, however, that this fund has a principal of $100,000 which does not appear in the report, although it is represented there by the item "Interest-Investments . . . $3,500." It will be noted that the cash balance was reduced by about $3,000 in the course of this year (from $21,316.45 on September 1, 1949, to $18,317.90 on August 31, 1950). This reduction was expected and is accounted for by the publication in 1950 of the three volumes mentioned above. All of these were published too late to bring in any income before the end of the fiscal year. It will be observed that none of them is listed under "Royalties" in the Treasurer's report. It is, therefore, too early to reach a final conclusion about the financial aspects of the experiment with the fellowship plan. Moreover, a separate fellowship account was not kept and it is, therefore, not easy to give exact figures. Tentatively, however, one may venture the following conclusions after studying the Treasurer's annual reports on the Beveridge Fund from 1945 to 1950:

(1) The cost of the fellowship plan has been kept within the limit proposed by this committee and approved by the Council when the fellowship plan was adopted in 1945. That limit included $7,500 from the cash balance in addition to current income. As close an estimate as the chairman has been able to make indicates that, when all the outstanding obligations incurred under the fellowship plan through this fifth and final year have been met, about $400 of this $7,500 will remain unused. Even if this expectation is not realized, it is certain that the limit will not be exceeded by more than a small amount. The committee finds some satisfaction in the fact that it has been able to carry out the original plan substantially within the budgetary limits set in 1945 despite the sharp rise in publication costs that has taken place since that time.

(2) On the other hand, this rise in costs, which is still going on, has created a situation very different from the one that existed when the fellowship plan was drawn up in 1945. This new situation should be carefully considered by all concerned in planning for the future use of the Beveridge Fund. The committee feels that, as an aid to scholarship, the present plan has been a distinct success. It has also been a financial success within the terms of reference of 1945; but the question now arises whether the maximum advantage to historical scholarship will be obtained from the Beveridge Fund if we continue to follow the line plotted under very different circumstances five years ago.

The plans for the coming year will not take definite shape until the committee has completed its study of the five-year experiment which is just coming to a close. It will then formulate recommendations for the future use of the Beveridge Fund, which, as stated above, will be submitted in the near future for consideration by the Council at its meeting in December, 1950. These recommendations will constitute the plans of the committee for the coming year.

In conclusion, the chairman wishes to express his deep gratitude to his colleague, Roy F. Nichols, for expediting the business of the committee during the chairman's absence in Europe from January to September, 1950, and to the other members

of the committee—Philip Davidson, Dorothy Burne Goebel, Henrietta M. Larson, and C. Vann Woodward—for the generous, untiring and invaluable co-operation which they have given him at all times.

NOVEMBER 7, 1950. ARTHUR P. WHITAKER, *Chairman.*

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE MEMORIAL FUND

Sept. 1, 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950

		Receipts	*Disbursements*
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949		$21, 316. 45	
Interest-Investments	$3, 500. 00		
Savings Account	181. 88	3, 681. 88	
Royalties:			
Dumond, *Southern Editorials on Secession*	21. 30		
Case, *French Public Opinion on the United States and Mexico*	26. 11		
Binkley, *Official Correspondence of the Texas Revolution*	10. 66		
Pargellis, *Military Affairs in North America*	25. 62		
Dumond, *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831–1857*	15. 99		
Kirby, *George Keith*	6. 40		
Perkins, *Northern Editorials on Secession*	21. 31		
Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*	55. 88		
Bernstein, *Origins of Inter-American Interest*	3. 90		
Easterby, *South Carolina Rice Plantation*	34. 32		
Pomeroy, *The Territories and the United States*	21. 88		
Harrington, *Fighting Politician: Maj. Gen. N. P. Banks*	209. 13		
Hanke, *The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America*	387. 63	840. 14	
Editorial and publication expenses:			
Bestor, *Backwoods Utopias*—manufacturing costs	2, 876. 13		
Motten, *Mexican Silver and the Enlightenment*—manufacturing costs	1, 175. 91		
Fleming, *John William Draper*—manufacturing costs	2, 148. 08	.....	$6, 200. 12
Beveridge Memorial Fellowship Award of 1949—first half	750. 00		
Reading and reporting on manuscripts	25. 00	.....	775. 00
Committee expenses			275. 45
Membership dues of contributors			270. 00
		25, 838. 47	7, 520. 57
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950			18, 317. 90
		25, 838. 47	25, 838. 47

N. B.: The Barnes, Labaree, Phillips, and Josephson volumes are out of print.

The Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications

The volume selected in 1949 for sponsorship by the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications, Robert S. Hoyt, *The Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History, 1066–1272,* will be published by the Cornell University Press in December, 1950. Four manuscripts were submitted to the committee this year, and after careful consideration the committee selected for publication the manuscript by Rev. Miles Mark Fisher of Durham, North Carolina, on "Negro Slave Songs in the United States."

November 8, 1950. Ray Allen Billington, *Chairman.*

Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications

Sept. 1, 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950

		Receipts	*Disbursements*
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949	.....	$12,363.41	
Interest on savings account	.....	119.45	
Royalties:			
Heidel, *The Day of Yahweh*	.....		
Carroll, *French Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs*	$31.79		
Allyn, *Lords versus Commons*	15.96		
Shryock, *The Origin and Development of the State Cult of Confucius*	4.26		
Bruce, *Virginia Iron Manufacture in the Slave Era*	13.60		
Swann, *Pan Chao: Foremost Woman Scholar in China*	3.20		
Dietz, *English Public Finance, 1558–1641*	2.13		
Sydnor, *Slavery in Mississippi*	37.40		
Brown, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury*	14.91		
Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse*	.....		
Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question*	24.31		
Bemis, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution*	.....		
Garrett, *The Estates General of 1789*	6.40		
Hubbart, *The Older Middle West*	41.14		
Ranck, *Albert Gallatin Brown*	2.67		
Hoon, *The Organization of the English Customs System*	6.39		
Priestley, *France Overesas*	32.04		
Horton, *James Kent: A Study in Conservatism*	14.96		
Chitwood, *John Tyler, Champion of the Old South*	47.91		
Stafford, *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England*	8.00		
Jackson, *Free Negro Labor and Property Holding in Virginia, 1830–1860*	5.32		
	5.32		
Nute, *Caesars of the Wilderness*	27.69		
Hastings, *Court of Common Pleas in 15th Century England*	74.89		
Kraus, *Atlantic Civilization*	1,291.44	1,706.41	

CARNEGIE REVOLVING FUND FOR PUBLICATIONS—Continued

Sept. 1, 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950—Continued

		Receipts	*Disbursements*
Editorial and publication expenses:			
Jackson volume—binding	$65.44		
Kraus volume—manufacturing costs	2,495.04		
Hunter, *Steamboats on the Western Rivers*—manufacturing costs	1,000.00	.....	$3,560.48
Miscellaneous	.....	.....	20.30
		$14,189.27	3,580.78
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950	.....	.....	10,608.49
		14,189.27	14,189.27

N. B.: The Ragatz, Lonn, Sanborn, and White volumes are out of print.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE LITTLETON-GRISWOLD FUND

During the current year the committee published under the auspices of the Association volume VI of *American Legal Records* (*South Carolina Chancery Court Records*), edited by Anne K. Gregorie and former Dean J. Nelson Frierson, which has been accorded a heartening reception, particularly in South Carolina.

In the preparation of several other volumes for the press notable progress has been made. Transcriptions have been virtually completed of the court records of the General Court of North Carolina, of New Jersey Quarter Sessions for the Revolutionary period, of the Rhode Island Equity Court, and of the Boston and North Carolina Vice-Admiralty records. A transcript of the North Carolina General Court records from 1693 to 1727, totaling some 2,700 typewritten pages, is now being examined by the committee. It is expected that with some emendations, compressions, and further editorial work, particularly in collating file papers and minutes, this material can be reduced to the compass of two volumes of *American Legal Records* as originally planned.

The volume which is closest to the publication stage is the Prince George's County Court book of Maryland for which an introduction has now been completed by Dr. Philip Crowl. Some editorial progress has also been reported by Dr. Oscar Zeichner on the Connecticut Court of Assistants volume and by Professor Susie M. Ames, both on the introduction and the text of her edition of the court records of Virginia's Eastern Shore.

The committee's operations this year have benefited by grants of $450 from the Research Council of Duke University and $650 from Duke University Law School to complete the transcription of the massive collection of the records of North Carolina General Court and by a gift of $500 by Mrs. Frank T. Griswold for final work in transcribing the Rhode Island Equity Court material under the immediate direction of Professors Mark D. Howe and Zechariah Chafee of the Harvard Law School.

Numerous supervisory and editorial problems were explored at a meeting which the committee held in New York last spring.

NOVEMBER 8, 1950. RICHARD B. MORRIS, *Chairman.*

Littleton-Griswold Fund

Sept. 1, 1949, to Aug. 31, 1950

		Receipts	*Disbursements*
Cash on hand, Sept. 1, 1949		$7, 229. 38	
Interest:			
Investments	[1] $1, 120. 00		
Savings account	57. 80	1, 177. 80	
Proceeds of sale of publications:			
Bond-Morris, *Maryland Court of Appeals*	30. 00		
Morris, *Select Cases of the Mayor's Court of N. Y. City*	30. 00		
Towle-Andrews, *Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island, 1716–1752*	36. 00		
Farrell, *Superior Court Diary of William Samuel Johnson, 1772–1773*	51. 00		
Reed, *Burlington Court Book of West New Jersey, 1680–1709*	58. 50		
Gregorie, *Records of the Court of Chancery of S. Carolina*	1, 092. 50	1, 298. 00	
Contribution toward editorial expenses of *Rhode Island Court of Equity*	.....	250. 00	
Expenses in connection with:			
Bond-Morris volume	1. 15		
Morris volume	1. 15		
Towle-Andrews volume	2. 47		
Farrell volume	1. 52		
Reed volume	2. 02		
Gregorie volume:			
Editorial and other expenses	118. 45		
Manufacturing costs	4, 560. 93		
Volume on N. J. Quarter Sessions	80. 30	.....	$4, 767. 99
Committee expenses	.....	.....	227. 75
Membership dues of contributor		.....	5. 00
		9, 955. 18	5, 000. 74
Balance, Aug. 31, 1950		.....	4, 954. 44
		9, 955. 18	9, 955. 18

[1] Par value of invested funds, Aug. 31, 1947	25, 000. 00
Funds invested during 1948	7, 000. 00
Total available funds	32, 000. 00
Interest received for year ending Aug. 31, 1950 (3½%)	1, 120. 00

The Committee on Government Publications

The Committee on Government Publications always has been a group of three persons serving without budgetary aid. It has tilled the field assigned to it with such tools as were available. Its principal concern has been the maintenance of publication by the United States Government of materials useful to the historical

fraternity. As the Federal agency most active in this realm has been the Department of State, the committee's most direct collaboration has been with the divisions of the department entrusted with the publication of treaties, correspondence, and other records of foreign relations. For a long period it was the Division of Research and Publications; latterly its functions have been divided with amplifications of considerable significance between a Division of Publications and a Division of Historical Policy Research. Liaison has been maintained with these divisions and effective support has been extended to them in maintenance of their functioning, particularly when proposals to curtail appropriations have placed their programs in jeopardy. In these endeavors the committee has enjoyed the co-operation of various members of the Association who have manned their pens and typewriters in defensive deployments when advised by members of the committee of a critical situation. In passing, special mention might be made of the late Richard J. Purcell because of his long term of service with the present chairman (1941–50) during which his interest never flagged. Always he could be counted upon for resourceful suggestions and active co-operation.

During 1950 the Committee on Government Publications made a reassessment of the activities and product of the United States Government in both the preparation of historical material and the printing of it. The chairman sent a questionnaire on their historical activities to the most important Government agencies, and thirty-two of them replied. These replies indicate that, while much of the Government's "war history" activity has lapsed and many manuscripts have been left in a state of nonuse and of remote possibility of publication, yet a number of agencies are alive to the need for their historical functioning in peacetime as well as wartime attempt to keep some of it going, and would welcome the co-operation of scholars in the study and preservation of agency archives and the private preparation of manuscripts based upon them. They proffer abundant dissertation materials of a highly informative, less-hackneyed, and useful scope. In other words, narrow historical activities which merit broader development exist in agencies which have not yet established a program of Government publication of an historical character. These agencies need and deserve encouragement from this Association. A detailed digest of the information obtained through the replies to the questionnaire is printed herewith as addendum to this report (see p. 54 below); and this digest was furnished also to the ad hoc Committee on Historians and the Federal Government of which the chairman of the Committee on Government Publications was an active member. Also, there was collaboration in 1950 with an effort to obtain for the use of American historians microfilm copies of the papers of the German Foreign Office, 1867–1920. The chairman of the Committee on Government Publications was consulted by Dr. Lynn M. Case of the University of Pennsylvania in the preparation of an appeal to American historians to endorse this proposal; she presented the matter to the business meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Oklahoma City, and she garnered numerous endorsements of the proposition.

Today, the American Historical Association is faced with the opportunity to expand a mutually useful co-operation between the historical fraternity and many agencies of the United States Government. Evidences of the need for closer collaboration are multiplying in number and importance. Historical matters are emerging which should be under continuing surveillance by a committee of this Association, especially now that Congress in 1950 has provided for a rejuvenated National Historical Publications Commission with two of its members to be named by the American Historical Association and with its field of activity of interest to the members of the American Historical Association. It seems obvious that the needful work in liaison should be assigned to a committee larger than this one had been

heretofore and blessed with at least enough of an exchequer to permit further meetings and more than intermittent functioning.

On the publications of the Department of State this committee requests the American Historical Association to pass the following resolutions, anent the series on treaties and on foreign relations. (See minutes of the business meeting, p. 22).

November 10, 1950. Jeannette P. Nichols, *Chairman.*

Report to the Committee on Historians and the Federal Government

There follow, alphabetically arranged, my summaries of the replies sent to me by the Government agencies to which I sent some historical queries. The reply of the State Department is not summarized because we all received their data direct from the department before the committee meeting of May 9. The letters indicated especially rich fields of work in economic and social history, less in political history. . . .

One of the more active agencies is the Department of Agriculture where almost all of the work is in three divisions: the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which has a history section with three professional people, the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering. A Committee on Agricultural History was established in July 1941, and was reconstituted in December 1947. The department's publications were regrouped into eleven categories, or series, in 1949, as a result of which the Agricultural History series and the War Records Monograph series were discontinued; both of these had had seven titles. Much of an historical nature appears in the department's various periodicals and in its series of farm advice publications; many members of the department publish historical work outside of it and in the *Journal of the Agricultural History Society,* which receives much editorial and related service from the agricultural history section of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. A movement has been started to have some retiring employees write accounts of the work with which they have been associated.

The Air Force has approximately 1,000,000 documents, chiefly relating to World War II, and has published two volumes of a 7-volume history of the AAF in World War II. Also under preparation are a 2-volume history of the U. S. Army Air Arm, 1861–1941; a 1-volume history of the USAF, Sept. 1945–June 1949; a 4-volume history of the USAF in the Atomic Energy program, and a few special monographs. Four additional historians are desired to fill deficiencies in the program.

The Army's publication program is concerned mostly with a series of about 100 volumes on *The U. S. Army in World War II* of which Volume V will shortly leave the press. A 14-volume paper-bound series, *American Forces in Action,* has been published. A 1-volume narrative history, together with a 17-volume documentary *History of World War I,* is now being published. It appears that use of the Army's files is restricted to its historians in the main. To round out their publications as desired by Dr. Greenfield, he needs qualified historians to produce two additional histories: on personnel and administrative services.

The Civil Service Commission is not conducting any historical research programs but has published a *History of the Federal Civil Service, 1789–1941* and *Hatch Act Decisions.* While most of the materials and services of the Commission's library are available to research workers, no one but Commission personnel may have access to Commission letters.

The Department of Commerce reports "no historical research programs are being carried on" but adds, "Our research is mainly in economics as you know." Of the 10-volume study projected to cover the bureau's activities during World War II, each study was completed but only that of the Weather Bureau was published; it is available and the others can be consulted in the department. The year-date for

sending Commerce records to the National Archives varies with different divisions; from 1880 down to almost any date records may still be found in the department's various offices. Scholars who have delineated their projects and have prior approval may consult unclassified material; although the original census records are confidential, the analyses are available. Many of the department's publications do actually have a bearing on history, and it has published hundreds.

The Economic Cooperation Administration is convinced that a "well-thought-out" historical program is necessary, but planning is only in the early stages of development with no final decision yet reached. Numerous publications now under preparation will aid indirectly in preparing a history of ECA. The current list of publications on various aspects of the present work includes 61 titles. Release of unpublished materials to researchers would be subject to security clearance and "the limitations of ECA personnel who could collect, gather and sort such material."

The Export-Import Bank issues "no publications of an historical nature." The Bank conducts historical research programs only "insofar as it seeks data to illuminate the present status, and the probable future developments, of the economic and political life of other countries." Most of the Bank's records are confidential; but permission for the study of some of them has, on rare occasions, been given scholars.

The Federal Communications Commission neither publishes materials of a purely historical nature nor maintains an historical unit; but "a certain amount of historical background" is contained in its publications sold by the Superintendent of Documents. The "public issue" of its formalized reports, decisions and other announcements is available for consultation by researchers together with "other reference sources" at the Commission library.

The only publications of an historical nature by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are its annual report and semi-annual tabulation of the assets and liabilities of insured banks. It carries on no research programs as straight history, although it has discussed the need for research in banking history and in business fluctuations. Most of its materials of historical significance are still highly confidential and unavailable even to other government agencies.

The Federal Power Commission has not issued nor is it preparing any publications of an historical nature; but its past and current publications may interest students of electric utility and gas industries. Its list of publications classifies them under administrative forms, administrative publications, map series, rate series, statistical series and power series. It carries on no historical research programs, basing its publications on experience in the field and on the reports and questionnaires filed with it. Responsible scholars may have access to the records of the Commission, which consists of all the proceedings ever before it; and its library possesses historical materials relating to the legislative histories of the acts which it administers.

The Federal Security Agency "does not conduct any historical research programs for the purpose of compiling historical documents," although many annual reports, such as those of the scientific studies conducted by the Health Service, contain specialized historical materials. Available for reference in the law section of the library are "over fifty legislative histories dealing with the development of Agency programs."

The Federal Trade Commission "realizes that the development of a broad, historical research program for the Agency would be of lasting value to scholars and the public generally, as well as to its staff;" it "has not considered initiating such a program." Yet it has been exceptionally useful to researchers because of its collections and its policy of making them available. Its numerous economic reports and transcripts of formal hearings contain the results of much historical research, the legislative history of bills and statutes, and considerable scientific and medical testimony. Its library is a veritable mine of historical material on trade regulation

because it contains complete sets of hearings, reports, and monographs of agencies which most libraries find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain in complete form; its anti-trust files are exceptionally complete and date back to the Sherman Act, containing legislative histories, dockets of cases, decisions, decrees and judgments; its abundant materials on finance, on monopoly, and on the laws administered by the Commission are frequently used by attorneys and researchers of many other descriptions, including professors and students. Such of its publications as are available for purchase from the Superintendent of Documents are enumerated in a list published in June 1949.

The Department of the Interior has no historical project as such at the present time. Most of the periodicals and regular publications series deal largely with current matters, although pertinent historical matter is included where it bears on present activities. Much historical material is on file but unpublished for lack of funds or personnel to complete research or printing. Few limitations other than national security restrictions would be placed upon responsible scholars seriously searching the files. A brief history of the department is in press. Within the department, the National Park Service publishes numerous historical pamphlets for distribution at national parks, besides other little pamphlets on popular studies, fauna and flora, park planning, and miscellaneous subjects. A new "Historical Handbook Series" was recently inaugurated with nine items in view; the first of these "Custer Battlefield" is just off the press, a handsome slick-paper little book, very well illustrated and popularly presented. The more serious work of the Park Service includes emphasis on archaeological investigation and the Service feels "an acute need for resumption of the historic sites survey . . . perhaps 60 percent complete . . . and which should be completed to provide . . . a scientific basis for the formulation of a sound historical conservation program."

The Interstate Commerce Commission publishes no current periodicals or regular series but issues frequent monographs on technical subjects prepared by its staff. Apparently the library of the Commission, at least until 1941, was "the best in the world with respect to the history of railway regulation in various countries. . . . The statistical history of American transportation companies is more fully covered in the reports made by them, and by the enormous evaluation files, than in any other collection." The numerous dockets and files contain much historical material available to the public, a large part of which has gone to the National Archives.

The Department of Justice produces no historical publications; its only historical research program was an accumulation of reports from its various divisions on programs and policies connected with World War II. "We regret that we are unable to furnish you with more complete information."

The Department of Labor publishes numerous periodicals, pamphlets, and other items with reference value over a period of years; but it is not carrying on any historical research programs as straight history, either directly or indirectly. Its large research library, open to scholars, includes "a unique collection of labor newspapers from all parts of the country, some of which date back almost sixty years; constitutions, proceedings and reports of most of our American trade unions, in many instances being complete files; transcripts of many industrial arbitration cases which resulted from major industrial disputes; reports and publications of divisions and agencies formerly part of the Department . . . and a special collection on union-management cooperation, including some manuscript material, collected by the late Otto M. Beyer during a lifetime of interest in this field."

Marine Corps publications are not yet "in being." The present program concerns World War II and projects five volumes of studies on specific areas or campaigns, plus the preparation at Princeton of "an analytical study of Marine Corps contributions to World War II in the related fields of the development of amphibious

warfare and its execution." The records in the custody of the Marine Corps Historical Division consists of files relating to World War II and to various campaigns of the Marine Corps since 1914. The files are not in a condition easy to use and "security regulations, naturally, present the greatest obstacles to freedom of access."

The U. S. Maritime Commission "has done and may perhaps be doing . . . a number of histories of particular designs of ships. The Division of Public Information or office of the Secretary has and perhaps will do a certain amount of popularized history." F. C. Lane has finished "A History of Shipbuilding under the United States Maritime Commission during World War II." The agency has been very liberal in permitting use of its materials by responsible scholars, but its files are not in such shape as to make their use easy.

The National Archives publishes, besides its annual reports and other emissions on its own activities, items to facilitate use of its facilities, for which use they earnestly bespeak the co-operation of historians. The publications include guides and handbooks, preliminary inventories and check lists, and special lists; quarterly accession lists, reference information circulars, and file microcopies. National Archives does not carry on straight history work but encourages its staff to use the records for research purposes. Information upon the organizational and functional history of various government agencies is provided through analytical and descriptive work on records by the staff.

Of the Navy's publications on its part in World War II, five volumes have been published with nine more to follow, 1950–1954.

The Post Office Department publishes nothing other than the *Postal Laws and Regulations* and the *Postal Guides.* It does no historical research; its library retains certain historical files needed by the service from time to time.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has had no historical program other than the history of its wartime activities which has not been completed and is not available; their informational material concerning their functions and activities includes some historical data.

The Securities and Exchange Commission publishes a number of series including Decisions and Reports of the Commission, Judicial Decisions (in cases involving statutes administered by the Commission), Reports submitted by the Commission to Congress, Reports of Investigations, Acts, Rules, Regulations and Forms, and Compilations of Releases; one of their bibliographies is contained in a 28-page pamphlet, "The Work of the Securities and Exchange Commission." Their library contains complete legislative histories of the acts administered by the Commission, plus the material which companies subject to the Commission are required to file with it. "This wealth of financial information is available to the public at the Commission's Public Reference Room" and photocopying is done at nominal cost. Confidential material is not in this library. "The Commission is presently undertaking the compilation of an historical file containing copies of all publications and releases, the cataloguing and indexing of interpretative and reference memoranda, and the preservation of the ordinary administrative records of the Commission." They feel the need for expansion of their programs of historical research and of records.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has published annual technical, chemical engineering, budgetary, special and progress reports, besides bibliographies and news indices on its own and related fields of effort. These are produced "not primarily for their historical significance, but to fill some operating or administrative need." TVA has no program of historical research as such, but has done historical studies directly contributory to the conduct of TVA programs or administration. The object has been "not the production of a history but the orderly presentation of

facts for program planning." TVA files include much material, unworked from the historians' point of view, relating to both TVA and to the history of the Tennessee Valley, its institutions, economy and development. "We are glad to have scholars make use of this material. And we would enthusiastically welcome any advice and assistance the American Historical Association could give as to how best such data could be put to use by professional historians." Among the important collections are the records of Board meetings, project authorizations and completion reports, land transactions, legislative histories and statistical series. Limitations generally are few, and they vary with the type of data and the proposed use of it. Some byproducts of TVA operations in the form of collections of historical data have been deposited with appropriate institutions such as the University of Chattanooga and the University of Tennessee.

The Treasury Department has no special units devoted to historical research or to projects of that type, although histories of many activities during the two world wars are "available either in completed form or in certain stages of preparation . . . and arrangements could be made for portions of it to be reviewed." As there is no central filing system, records remain with the bureau or division to which they pertain until destroyed or transferred to the National Archives. "Responsible scholars recommended by the Committee" may study the materials available.

The publications of the U. S. Tariff Commission consist of the usual annual reports, summaries of tariff information, and reports on such things as synthetic organic chemicals and trade agreements. The Commission is anxious to bring its bibliographical series up to date. It has collected a large amount of factual data upon U. S. industries, exports and imports, and upon the trade and trade policies of foreign countries. The Commission has "the outstanding tariff library in the country," and responsible scholars may consult it and also the Commission's commodity experts "who may have on file unpublished information of interest."

The Veterans Administration has but one publication of an historical nature—a brief outline of veterans' benefits and of the agency itself, now in preparation, based solely on secondary sources and prepared only in response to demand, for this agency feels that it is of too recent a date to be evaluated dispassionately, as yet; it has conducted extensive research into veterans' benefits and agencies, 1789–1941.

The Library of Congress, of course, functions as an historical organization, for all its collections (currently estimated at some 29 million pieces) constitute materials for historical research, and few limitations (other than restrictions on particular collections of personal papers) curtail their use by responsible scholars. The Library's publications of an historical nature include numerous lists, catalogues and bibliographies of its holdings; and "a comprehensive listing of these lists" is being prepared by R. B. Downs (under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation) for publication in a guide to published lists. Many unpublished catalogues also are available and "partial access to incompletely catalogued material is frequently available" for historical research. A listing of printed, processed, and unpublished issuances of the Library appeared in the Librarian's annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, pp. 163–177. The only formal project of a straight historical nature currently under way is a history of its administrative organization and policy development, 1939–45; an outline history of the Library appeared as "The Story Up to Now," in the annual report of June 30, 1946. Miscellaneous historical output includes studies connected with reference work for Congress and other inquirers, treatment of special materials (such as Orientalia, maps, music) and centennial exhibit catalogues.

The only cumulative data of the National Labor Relations Board is that encompassed in its annual reports to Congress and in the individual case records

which it deposits periodically in the National Archives. The Board functions on a case to case basis, as a quasi judicial agency. It does not collate or survey the historical data in these individual cases, and undertakes no historical research as such.

Those publications of the National Mediation Board which are of an historical nature include (besides their annual report to Congress) a volume entitled *Determinations of Craft or Class of the National Mediation Board, 1935–48,* vol. I, and *The Railway Labor Act and the National Mediation Board* (August 1940, now being revised and brought up to date). These are basically consolidations of case records and a general outline of the Board's policies and experiences. The Board initiates only such historical research as is required to settle labor disputes on the Nation's railroads and airlines. However, historians of such disputes may be interested in the Board's library and files where they preserve the official records of presidential emergency boards appointed under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act and also of arbitration boards created under section 7 of that act.

MAY 23, 1950. JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS.

THE COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTARY REPRODUCTION

During the past year the activities of the committee have been concentrated on (1) the development of the joint American Historical Association and Library of Congress program to obtain microfilm copies of selected historical source materials in libraries of countries where Fulbright educational programs are in effect through the medium of Fulbright research scholarships; and on (2) the publication of the House of Commons Sessional Papers for the nineteenth century.

(1) With respect to the former the results of the committee's activities may be classified as (a) the accomplishment of research scholars who have now returned from a period of research abroad; (b) projects now in progress of scholars who are now abroad on research scholarships; and (c) applications for Fulbright research scholarships, endorsed by the committee and the Library of Congress, submitted for projects to be developed in 1951–52.

(a) Professor Howard C. Rice, Jr., Princeton University, screened and microfilmed large sections of the unpublished *Inventaires* of the Archives Nationales for the period since 1789, and has outlined a program for carrying forward the work he has so successfully begun. The master negatives of these films are on deposit with the Library of Congress and are available for use or purchase by scholars. Professor Rice is preparing for publication articles listing the specific acquisitions and explaining the way to use the *Inventaires* and the Archives Nationales. Professor Rice has also explored the catalogs and inventories of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* and has made specific recommendations to the special committee on France as to programs for obtaining microfilm copies of the bibliographical aids. In addition, he has done much to clear the way for future programs in France.

(b) Professor A. P. Nasatir, San Diego State College, who is now in France, reports that he is finding a wealth of materials in French archives relating to American history and that the microfilming of his findings is proceeding satisfactorily. Professor Peter Topping is in Greece compiling a bibliography of materials, relating to the medieval, Turkish, and independence periods in Greek history, preparatory to microfilming the selected portions thereof. Professor Robert Reynolds is in Genoa where he will both screen and film materials relating to medieval trade.

(c) Applications for Fulbright research scholarships, endorsed by the committee and the Library of Congress, submitted by scholars for projects in 1951–52:

(1) Professor Peter Cavarnos, Rutgers University, for a research scholarship to carry on the project being developed by Professor Topping in Greece and

for microfilming manuscripts needed for a critical edition of the works of Gregory of Nyssa deposited in the Mont Athos monasteries. The latter is for the Harvard Institute for Classical Studies.

(2) Professor Hilmar Carl Krueger, University of Cincinnati, for a research scholarship to carry forward the work in Italy initiated by Professor Reynolds.

(3) Professor Ralph H. Lutz, Stanford University, and Professor George B. Fowler, Pittsburgh University, for research scholarships to microfilm Austrian archival materials and inventories of Austrian monastic collections, respectively.

(4) Professor Samuel E. Thorne, Yale University, and Professor Benjamin N. Nelson, University of Minnesota, for selecting materials in English and Belgian libraries, respectively, relating to the development of law that may be used as the bases for microfilming programs of the Law Library of the Library of Congress.

I desire to acknowledge the excellent work of Professor Richard W. Hale, Jr., Wellesley College, chairman of the special committee for France; of Professor L. S. Stavrianos, Northwestern University, chairman of the special committee for Greece; of Professor Albert Hyma, University of Michigan, chairman of the special committee for Belgium; of Professor H. Donaldson Jordan, Clark University, chairman of the special committee for the United Kingdom for their co-ordination of the programs for the respective countries.

(2) The committee is happy to be able to announce that the resumption of the publication of the microprint edition of the British House of Common Sessional Papers for the nineteenth century after a lapse of several years. Since May, 1950, monthly deliveries have been made to the subscribers. Approximately 1,000 volumes, complete or in part, totaling 520,000 pages, for the years 1826–47 and 1851 have been published between May and October 31, 1950. It is hoped to complete the publication of the collection for the period encompassed by the project within three years time. The project has been resumed without increase in price to the pre-publication subscribers, namely, $5,000 for approximately 6,000 volumes estimated at 4,000,000 pages. I am in charge of the editorial work for this publication.

November 10, 1950. Edgar L. Erickson, *Chairman.*

The Ad Hoc Committee on Historians and the Federal Government

This committee developed out of a discussion of the subject at the meeting of the American Historical Association in December 1949. At the annual business meeting of the American Historical Association on December 29, in response to a motion by Professor Sydnor, the outgoing President of the American Historical Association, Conyers Read, was directed to appoint a committee "on historical activities of the federal government and to take other appropriate steps to attain greater co-operation between the federal government and private scholars." The committee as appointed consisted of the following:

Active Members:

Ray S. Cline, social science consultant, U. S. Government
Gordon Craig, Princeton University
Kent Roberts Greenfield, Department of the Army
Hajo Holborn, Yale University
Richard A. Humphrey, Department of State
Guy A. Lee, National Security Resources Board
Alexander Marchant, Vanderbilt University
Jeannette P. Nichols, Historian
Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester
Conyers Read, University of Pennsylvania

Corresponding Members:

Ray Billington, Northwestern University
Oron J. Hale, University of Virginia
Carlton Hayes, Columbia University
Ray Sontag, University of California

There have been one or two changes in the composition of the committee since it was organized. Professor Hale of Virginia was by action of the committee transferred from corresponding member to active membership. He has since been sent on government business overseas and has consequently been transferred back again to corresponding membership. Dr. Lee has also been assigned to service overseas and has been transferred to corresponding membership. Dr. Philip C. Brooks of the National Archives has been appointed to replace Dr. Lee and Dr. Kent Roberts Greenfield of the Department of the Army to replace Dr. Hale. It will be observed that the committee includes four members of the Federal Government.

Before the first meeting of the committee Dr. Read appealed to the Rockefeller Foundation for the modest grant to finance a series of committee meetings. Thanks to the good offices of Dr. Willits and Dr. Mosely, the Foundation granted $1,000 for the purpose to apply to a period terminating March 14, 1951. At the first meeting of the committee Conyers Read of Pennsylvania was elected chairman, and Richard A. Humphrey, Assistant Chief, Division of Historical Policy Research, Department of State, secretary. The committee has held five meetings, one of them in Washington, the other four in Philadelphia. There is still enough money left from the Rockefeller grant to finance a sixth meeting.

The problems with which the committee has dealt fall into two main categories: (1) problems arising out of the use of historians by the Federal Government, (2) problems arising out of the use of federal archives by historians.

In the first category the committee has interested itself in the efforts of various agencies of the Government to prepare histories relative to World War II. It has raised the question as to what progress has been made in these histories and has discovered that 54 wartime federal agencies started history-writing programs, but that at present not more than ten remain and that, outside the three military departments, the remnants are comparatively insignificant and largely inactive. A brief review indicates that, despite the historical programs financed by the Government at a cost of at least $10,000,000, it is now almost impossible to obtain a satisfactory account of the wartime activities of about twenty-six major independent agencies. In a great many cases substantial bodies of material have been compiled, but very little publication has been attempted and much of the unpublished material is not organized or indexed.

It has seemed to your committee that some definite attempt should be made to assemble and to make available the partial histories which have been compiled and which may still exist in departmental files, for example, those of war agencies like OWI and OSS, which played an important role in the war and which have since been dissolved. The first step should be an adequate inventory of what has already been done, some appraisal of its values, and wherever practicable, consideration of possibilities for continuance. In the pursuit of the first step mentioned, one of the members of your committee approached informally the Bureau of the Budget with the suggestion that it might initiate a project for assembling an inventory. The Bureau referred us to the National Security Resources Board as the more appropriate agency for that purpose. Your committee made informal approaches in that direction without result. Subsequently, your committee approached the Archivist of the United States and has sound reasons to believe that he will undertake the task.

Your committee considered also the question of the selection of historians for historical work by the Government. An examination of the civil service procedures has led us to believe that present procedures are inadequate to the purpose of obtaining for the federal service, or of retaining in it, the best qualified professional historians. It is agreed that the subject is of primary interest to the American Historical Association and to the profession and that the American Historical Association should explore ways and means of ascertaining the facts of the present situation and of registering its professional views with the proper authorities. As a preliminary step the chairman of your committee addressed a letter and a questionnaire to the chairman of the National Security Resources Board, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture, as well as to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Archivist of the United States and the Secretaries of State, Defense, and the Interior. Only one reply has been so far received, to wit, from the Bureau of the Budget and that to the effect that since the Bureau has no historian positions it has no acquaintance with the problem. Our object, of course, in addressing ourselves to the Bureau was to make it aware that there is a problem. We still await replies from the other agencies.

The question of the qualifications of historians employed by the Federal Government, though suggested by the war history project, has of course great relevance in connection with all historical work done by federal agencies. The Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, the Department of Commerce, the National Archives, and the Library of Congress are all conducting significant historical research of one sort or another. Many other departments express an interest in historical problems arising out of their fields of work, though they have not done anything about it. Since historical work of such importance is going on in government agencies, the need for trained historians in government cannot be overemphasized.

In this connection your committee has given some thought to the business of integrating the research programs in our graduate schools of history into the needs of the Government. Actually a great deal of research effort is being exerted in our graduate schools, primarily for the purpose of training young scholars in the techniques of research, which might well be directed to government needs. Outside experts on specific problems have often been utilized by different agencies of the Government. But nothing like as much use of outside historians has been made as could be made. Your committee is not prepared yet to suggest a concrete plan of action. Perhaps its most important service is to act as a liaison which in time may be able to inform scholars of government needs and to inform the Government of scholarly resources.

There is a considerable amount of documentary publication by the Government, which is of great significance to historians. We have in mind particularly the State Department series, *Foreign Relations of the United States,* and comparable documentary publications. It is obviously to the interest of all historians that this publication work should be done carefully, critically and dispassionately. It is definitely to the interest of historians that the selection of documents for publication should be prompted by a desire to reveal the facts and not simply to influence opinion. In the view of your committee the American Historical Association should continue to hold, as the Government Publications Committee of the American Historical Association has long wisely held, a watching brief over government publications of this sort. It should do everything possible to maintain a high standard of scholarship and everything possible to stimulate greater activity. Your committee believes that it should interest itself, on behalf of the American Historical Association, in insuring that competent historians participate in the critical reviews of government historical publications before they appear.

Your committee has interested itself in the recent legislation reconstituting the National Historical Publications Commission. It has on the whole approved of the legislation on the subject[1] and has expressed to the President of the United States and to the Archivist of the United States, the designated chairman of the Commission, the importance of appointing the right kind of people to serve on the Commission. Actually two members of the Commission are to be appointed by the American Historical Association. These two appointees are the only two professional historians specifically provided for on the Commission. Your committee feels that the selection of the American Historical Association representatives should be very carefully considered and men not only of learning but of vision, and particularly of vigor, should be chosen.

From the point of view of the research student of American history, one of the matters which interests him most is the accessibility of government records. The policy of the Department of State, the Department of the Army and the National Archives in this regard has been published, but the policy of other agencies is far from clear, and it has seemed to your committee that there should be greater clarification by all government agencies. They have accordingly, with the co-operation of the chairman of the program committee for the meeting of the American Historical Association in December, arranged for a panel discussion of the subject in which the State Department, the Department of the Army and the National Archives will participate. It was hoped to have also on the panel a member of the Navy Department and of the Department of Commerce, but this could not be arranged. Your committee hopes especially that those other agencies which have made no attempt to cope with the problem will be prompted to set their houses in order. In any case your committee feels that continuous pressure should be exercised in that direction by the American Historical Association. Your committee expects to be in a position soon to forward to the editor of the *American Historical Review* definite statements, from the Department of State, the Department of the Army and the National Archives, regarding the accessibility of their documentary collections. We strongly urge that these statements be printed in the *American Historical Review* for the guidance of scholars.

One special matter has been brought to the attention of your committee by Dr. Case of the University of Pennsylvania. It has to do with the German Foreign Office papers now in England. These papers from 1920 onward have been partially microfilmed and are in process of being published by a tripartite committee of the British, French and American governments. Nothing, however, is being done about the earlier papers which cover the period from 1867 to 1920 and which are a gold mine of material for modern European history. Increasing pressure is being exerted by the German Government to have its archives returned. Obviously they cannot be held indefinitely. The intelligent course of action would be to microfilm the lot of them and place this microfilm in the custody of the Librarian of Congress. The estimated cost is between $75,000 and $100,000. None of the governments involved are prepared to face this expense. Yet it seems to your committee a unique opportunity to make one of the richest sources of modern history available to American history students in Washington. Your committee feels that this matter is tangential to its main purposes, but its chairman has been instrumental in securing a grant-in-aid from the American Philosophical Society to assist in the publication of one important collection from this material and has approached the Ford Foundation with the hope of interesting it in the large microfilm enterprise. Of scarcely less interest are the surviving papers of the Japanese Foreign Office which are still accessible to the United States Government. Some of these are being microfilmed and placed at the disposition of scholars at the

[1] Public Law 754, title V, 81st Cong., 2d sess.

Library of Congress. It ought to be emphasized, however, that the microfilming program is a very modest one.

Your committee feels that its work up to the moment has been largely exploratory. It has attempted rather to define its problems than to solve them. Actually a part of its task has been to acquaint government departments and scholars with the fact that such a committee exists, is interesting itself in the whole problem, and is serving as a focal point and meeting place of government officials and historians for the discussion of common problems. It believes that it is performing a useful service and that its usefulness will increase as it becomes more widely known. It therefore respectfully suggests that it be continued and that it be instructed to appeal to the Rockefeller Foundation for a further grant-in-aid.

It has many times discussed the desirability of enlarging its membership in two directions: (1) by including a member from each House of Congress, (2) by including other academic disciplines, particularly those in economics and political science. Your committee is unanimously of the opinion that it should include a senator and a representative. It has deferred action in the matter until after the November elections. It now means to proceed as soon as possible to such appointments.

On the other question of enlargement by including other disciplines, your committee agrees and approves in principle. Your committee, however, feels that the problem can be approached more effectively by each discipline separately with constant contacts among the disciplines for the discussion of problems common to them all.

November 1950. Conyers Read, *Chairman.*

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Manuscripts

At Christmas 1948 an ad hoc committee on manuscripts was set up by the American Historical Association to study "the arrangement and use" of recent large collections. Since both users and guardians of such collections were involved, the committee was made up of three historians who work in recent materials and three archival experts who face the problem of handling these materials, preserving them, and making them available to the reader. The committee has studied the problem carefully. At one time it sent to about eighty administrators of manuscript collections and archives a detailed questionnaire concerning the practices of archives and libraries in regard to recent manuscripts. Forty-one of the eighty questionnaires were returned. If the failure of thirty-nine to return them indicates a certain lack of comprehension of the seriousness of the problem, the careful, thoughtful, and helpful replies of the forty-one who did answer indicate that many archivists who handle recent collections are well aware of the problem and are giving it careful consideration. The results of this questionnaire were carefully compiled in tabular form and digested by Alexander Clark of the Princeton Library in a 35-page analysis of current practices as revealed in the questionnaire.

The sheer mass of recent collections presents problems as to both care and use that scholars and repositories dealing with medieval or even colonial American materials do not encounter. The questionnaire asked, among other things, whether "large recent collections of correspondence ought to be handled differently from early smaller collections" and requested advice as to the date that should form the dividing line between "early" and "later" manuscripts. As might have been expected, there was no agreement as to the beginning of the "later" period, though the year 1900 came as near, perhaps, to being satisfactory as any. But there was some recognition of the fact that the invention of the typewriter and the gradual increase in its use has, by now, made necessary what amounts to a revolution in archival practice with regard to the handling of manuscript materials of recent origin. Older manuscripts are more nearly (though not wholly) gathered into repositories;

they are less voluminous; they are, piece by piece, more valuable, being more scarce, than much of the recent material; and they are undoubtedly well suited to the careful arrangement and individual indexing, cataloging, or calendaring to which they have ordinarily been subjected in the past.

While most archivists are considerate of the reader's time and energy and are generous, under handicaps of inadequate staff and funds, in making manuscripts easily available to readers, a few place unnecessary and irksome obstacles in the reader's way. And while most readers understand the problem archivists face in trying to give the best possible service on often pitifully inadequate budgets and in trying at once to make manuscripts easily available for the current user and to preserve them intact for future use, all too many, even the most well-meaning, fail to comprehend the archivist's problems. Others are thoughtless, or careless, or merely unaware of the value and fragility of old paper. This committee hopes to be helpful by making general good practice known to all. It hopes to emphasize the reader's point of view to archivists, who do not always appreciate how difficult it is to find time and energy and funds to use large recent collections. It hopes that knowledge of current good practice and understanding of the archivist's problems will make the reader more co-operative and more appreciative of what the archivist does for him. So, by mutual discussion of the problem, both guardian and user will contribute toward better use of the large recent collections.

I. *Arrangement of Manuscripts*

Any discussion of manuscript arrangement should be preceded by the statement that each group presents a separate case; that general principles can be recommended, but many exceptions will be found; that, in a word, judgment is constantly required, together with a proper respect not only for the needs and wishes of the research scholar but also for the hard limitations (time, money, personnel) of most manuscript repositories. With all this in mind, the following comments and recommendations are made.

1. *If any significant arrangement can be discovered in incoming groups of recent papers, the committee recommends that it be retained, at least through the preliminary processing stage.*[1] Various reasons for this appear at once. Such order as is discovered may be presumed to have been created for use and to have served users during the "live" or active period of the papers. It can be assumed that the same order will be of some value to scholars and others who approach the papers from the research point of view. When, moreover, indexes or other finding aids accompany the papers, they are valuable only so long as the existing order is preserved. From a practical point of view, even when eventual change in arrangement is thought advisable, it should be deferred until all work necessary to effect that change can be done with dispatch, and completed within a foreseeable time. Failure to bear this in mind has all too often resulted in utter chaos for the user of manuscripts. And again, speaking practically, the identification and perfection of existing arrangement, being less time-taking than complete reorganization, is more likely to lie within the realm of possibility. It therefore aids the archivist in his struggle to keep *all* holdings in some degree of control rather than spending disproportionate time on detailed processing of certain groups while permitting unwieldy backlogs in other quarters to accumulate.

2. If no order is found when manuscript groups reach a repository, a suitable arrangement must be decided upon after due consideration of the type, bulk,

[1] By preliminary processing is meant the work done on manuscripts as soon as possible after their arrival in a repository—usually boxing, labeling, shelving, and brief description—in order to make them usable. Preliminary processing should aim not at perfection, we feel, but at prompt availability.

provenance, etc., of the papers in question. All other things being equal, *this committee recommends, in such case, general chronological arrangement.* In order to increase the usability of papers in such general chronological order, *it is further recommended that within that arrangement papers covering relatively short time periods* (months, years, groups of years, depending on individual circumstances) *be treated as sub-groups, and within these groups be alphabetically arranged. Furthermore, when rearrangement of papers is necessary, it is recommended that certain large categories of letters, such as those dealing solely with patronage or pensions, be segregated so that readers who have no interest in this type of material will not have to go through it.*

3. *The committee recommends that recent manuscript material be evaluated as soon as possible after its receipt, and certain groups of little or no foreseeable use be segregated and in many cases permanently disposed of, either with or without the safeguard of microfilming, in order to make space for and assure proper processing and administration of papers of undoubted value.* To eliminate the unimportant calls for courage and critical judgment. The task is not one to be undertaken by the novice or delegated to the lowest-paid assistant. The word "useless" does not appear here, since practically any paper may conceivably be of some use to somebody at some time. But the archivist must recognize that certain ephemeral types of material ("house-keeping" files in the case of institutional records, perhaps, and in the case of personal papers, occasional social or financial trivia) are not, in the long run, worth the time it would take to put them in usable shape. Such papers, moreover, often bulk large, in a world in which space is now at a premium and is going to be more so; and they take an undue proportion of the archivist's time in processing them, and of the reader's in turning them over. It is felt, in a word, that a sense of proportion is here urgently needed, that the archivist must be wise enough, and bold enough, to take a calculated risk, and that the historian and the biographer must recognize the difficulties, assist with conferences and advice whenever possible, and, finally, accept the situation.

II. *Guides*

With the invention and increasing use of the typewriter and the resulting increase in the mass of paper produced by institutions and individuals alike in the carrying on of their daily concerns, the making of individual index or catalog cards for individual manuscript items has become more and more difficult, and is now, in many repositories, considered obsolete. Dictated letters, fifty or more in a morning, and duplicate copies of memoranda to be circulated to and annotated by twenty recipients—these and similar developments have not only swelled the bulk of manuscript holdings but have increased the time needed for individual indexing, or cataloging, or calendaring, out of all belief.

It is recommended that this situation be recognized by archivists and research scholars alike; that, in the case of large groups of recent materials, indexing of individual manuscript items, however ideally desirable, be considered for practical purposes the exception rather than the rule; and that there be substituted therefore descriptive sheets or memoranda (registration sheets, inventories, guides, etc.) which describe the arrangement of manuscript groups, give their bulk and scope and other pertinent information when available, and themselves serve as finding aids. These descriptions would have a further use as bases for entries in preparing published guides to manuscript holdings.

III. *Acquisition Policies*

Few who answered the questionnaire admitted competition with other repositories in the acquiring of collections. Yet anyone familiar with the field knows of cases where two or several repositories have vigorously sought a given collection for

their own instead of co-operating to get the collection into a safe and usable place. In some instances competition lessens the chances of all competitors by confusing the owner or giving him a false notion of the monetary value of such a collection. *The committee can only urge that the important thing is to bring valuable manuscripts into a safe place where they will be most available to the largest number of users.* Careful thought should be given, however, to deciding whether papers of a man of importance both in his own state and in the nation should be placed in a national repository like the Library of Congress or in a state repository. In the former case they could be used in conjunction with those of his contemporaries in the national scene; in the latter they would be available to those concerned with his state activities but less acceptable to students of his wider service. Perhaps some day, through the use of the microfilm, such papers can be made available in both places. The dilemma has been resolved in certain instances by dividing papers and putting those of local interest in a state repository and those of primarily national interest in the Library of Congress. This committee feels that the difficulties attending the logical division of a group of papers are so great that such a division merely forces the reader to go to both institutions; and that of all solutions such division is the worst.

IV. *Physical Protection of the Manuscripts*

One of the chief functions of the archivist is the protection for posterity of an important source of future historical and biographical writing. Yet the protection of the manuscripts, which presumably could best be served by locking them in a safe never to be used by anyone, must be balanced against the other important function of the archivist, namely, to make manuscripts as easily available to the user as is compatible with reasonable safety. Neither function should be completely overshadowed by the other.

Physical protection involves guarding against abuse, misplacing, or theft of manuscripts. A few repositories examine brief cases, but only a highly paid expert could do this effectively, and searching by ordinary guards only lends a false impression of security. Most repositories require that readers use manuscripts under some supervision, but few supervise carefully enough to be effective. A large number of repositories permit scholars well known to them to work with no supervision at all. Checking each individual manuscript in and out, as is done by one well-known repository, provides an effective safeguard, but is completely impossible for any but a little used, overstaffed institution and is so costly in time and nuisance value for the reader as to be unjustifiable. Certainly manuscripts should not, except in rare cases, be removed from the building.

Protection of manuscripts against abuse or even constant hard use is as important as protection against the rarer hazard of possible theft. Care is made especially necessary by the large masses in which recent papers have to be served to readers and the fragile quality of much contemporary paper. Therefore *the committee recommends that each reader be asked to sign a statement such as the following:*

I hereby agree that in using manuscripts in the ———————— I will abide by the following rules:

1. No smoking.
2. No use of open ink wells; caution in use of fountain pens.
3. No marking of manuscripts and no writing of notes on top of manuscripts.
4. Careful preservation of the existing order of manuscripts.
5. Notification to archivist of any manuscript apparently misplaced.
6. Extreme care in handling fragile material.
7. Obtaining, before publication, knowledge of libel law and literary property right law.

V. *Qualifications of Users and Restrictions on the Use of the Content of Manuscripts*

The difficulty in protecting and preserving manuscript material and still making it available for proper use comes when protection and preservation interfere with what seems to the individual to be proper use. Means must be found to manage the first two without interfering with that individual liberty so essential to the true scholar.

One reply that came with almost complete unanimity from archival institutions was: No survey of reader notes. Even the Library of Congress, which has for many years attempted this time-taking, laborious task, undoubtedly irritating to staff and user alike, is on the point of discontinuing the practice except when it is specifically required by donor restrictions.

Responsibility for making "proper" use of the contents of manuscripts reposes, then, in the user thereof—and rightly so in the view of this committee. It is up to the user to avoid the publication of libelous matter, for his own sake and for the sake of others, the more so since obvious misuse of donor-controlled papers may result in the complete closing of those papers for a period of time or the deterring of potential future donors. It is up to the user so to make his citations that those who come after can satisfy themselves as to his use of original sources. It is up to the user, too, and his publishers, before publication, to obtain the necessary permissions from owners of the literary property rights in unpublished material. The problem of literary property rights is proving a thorny one wherever its implications are fully understood. These rights are a matter of common law. Consequently, legal interpretations differ from time to time and from case to case. The principle is fairly well recognized that the writer of a letter or other paper retains the sole right to publish the contents of that paper, unless he parts with that right, and that the right descends to his legal heirs. But to what extent does this affect the repository, and, concomitantly, the user of manuscripts? There are many still unsettled questions in this connection—can public exhibition be considered publication, for example, or can photocopying be considered publication—which this committee cannot attempt to answer. *The committee does recommend strongly, however, that further study of these matters be undertaken by scholars, archivists, and legal experts,* to the end that some legally acceptable conclusions be reached and, if possible, some legal action be promoted to stabilize such conclusions; *and that, in negotiation for the acquisition of manuscripts, the archivist make every effort to secure in that connection a dedication to the public of literary property rights held by prospective donors in any unpublished letters or other writings.*

The very fact that responsibility is placed upon the user of manuscripts increases the necessity under which the archivist operates of screening in the first place those who request access to papers. It is evident from replies to the questionnaire that most repositories have struggled with this problem, and few have come to any satisfactory conclusion. "Scholars, writers, graduate students" may use the papers; those having "a reputation as a scholar"; "anyone having a good reason"; "anyone having a serious purpose." Even institutions reporting that all comers may use all manuscripts incline to contradict themselves sooner or later.

Some sort of screening of applicants for permission to consult recent papers is felt by this committee to be desirable. Part of a sentence or paragraph from a confidential letter written, perhaps, by someone still very much alive, if lifted out of context, spread on the front page of a yellow journal or quoted in false context at one of our more lurid public hearings, not only causes sober scholars to shudder, but may also, understandably, cause prospective donors of valuable papers to decline to become actual donors. And scholarship thereafter will suffer. Irresponsible persons, then, are not ordinarily qualified to use recent manuscript material.

The question remains: How can the hard-driven archivist separate the sheep from the goats in this difficult matter? In certain cases the responsibility is to some extent taken out of his hands by the fact that institutions must from time to time accept papers under donor restrictions. While there is a general feeling, in which this committee joins, that this is undesirable and should be avoided whenever possible, it is occasionally inevitable if papers are to be preserved at all. Such donor restrictions most often take the form of the requirement that names of applicants for permission to use manuscripts must be submitted to the donor (and sometimes, after his death, to his heirs) for decision. While this occasionally results in inequities, the situation can usually be guided by the archivist who is in a position to supply the donor with pertinent information and to recommend a course of action. Even in the case of donor-restricted materials, then, and in all other cases relating to recent materials, the archivist is confronted with the necessity of doing a screening job, and a difficult and thankless business it is.

With full appreciation of the problems involved, *this committee submits, as a partial basis for such screening, the following list of questions, answers to some or all of which might well be required of applicants for permission to use manuscripts of recent origin.* It will be seen at once that the questions are framed, not to discourage or disbar the beginner (though undergraduates are not ordinarily considered ready for work with recent papers), but to draw out information about the subject in which he is interested, his capabilities, his plans, etc.—information that will aid the archivist not only in passing upon his application, but later, if he is given the permission for which he asks, in advising him as to his manuscript work. It will be obvious also that certain of the questions are framed in order to elicit information on the general purpose and the publishing history of free-lance writers, and also of those who may conceivably have it in mind to consult manuscripts for other than scholarly purposes.

1. Name.
2. Address.
3. Institution with which connected, if any.
4. Status (undergraduate, candidate for A. M. degree, candidate for Ph. D. degree, professor, free-lance writer, etc.).
5. If student, name of and letter of introduction from principal adviser.
6. Subject of work on which engaged.
7. Publication plans, if any.
8. Prospective publisher, if any.
9. Pertinent books published, if any.
10. Newspapers or magazines in which pertinent articles have been published.
11. If not publication, other purpose for which permission is asked.

This information, together with a personal conference whenever possible between the applicant and the responsible archivist, should furnish, it is believed, a fair basis for objective judgment. In this connection, a brief quotation from one excellent response to the committee's questionnaire may be suggestive:

". . . all we require with reference to qualifications of prospective users is that we be convinced that they are trustworthy, intend to use the material for scholarly purposes, and are reasonably qualified to do so."

VI. *Facilitation of the Use of Collections*

Generally speaking, as has been said, archivists are considerate of a reader's time and energy. Where they are not, it is usually because of thoughtlessness or because rules and regulations for safeguarding papers are allowed to get in the way of use of papers, or in some instances because of requirements of law or other

limitation on a public institution that arise not from its own volition but from the fact that, as part of a public service system, it is bound by general regulations. Physical facilities provided are sometimes painfully inadequate, and for the reader who works long hours under pressure they are extremely important. Among these are good light, comfortable chairs, stands for volumes of manuscripts, adequate table space, and quiet. Occasionally other readers are thoughtless, but the worst offender is apt to be a well-meaning staff member who cannot resist talking at length with readers, sometimes ostensibly to provide help. Certain repositories forbid the use of the typewriter altogether with great resultant hardship to the reader who always uses one. A few repositories require noiseless machines, again a hardship, unless the repository itself provides the noiseless machine without loss of time and at nominal rental.

The committee wishes to emphasize the importance of sparing the reader time-consuming processes in getting materials out, reserving them for the next day, applying for permission to use restricted collections, and filling out forms. The practice of requiring readers to sign for individual manuscripts should be discouraged, the committee feels.

The limited time during which repositories are open for business constitutes one of the toughest problems for the out-of-town reader or the reader who works during the day in another institution. Many archivists offer to work late at night or on Sunday for the convenience of a single reader. Such individual sacrificial meeting of the problem should not be necessary, however. Some smaller institutions leave readers well known to them entirely unsupervised. This, however, can serve only an occasional reader and would be impossible in large public institutions. Moreover, an archivist is often estopped from such accommodation by the rules of his institution. The hours problem, it is felt, can be partially solved by staggering staffs, by getting manuscripts out ahead of time and providing only a skeleton supervisory staff in off hours, or even, in certain cases, by transferring manuscripts for a Sunday or a holiday or an evening to some safely guarded portion of the building that is open anyway. *The committee urges that readers try to understand the difficulties many repositories face in this matter of hours, and that repositories make an even greater effort to adjust their hours to the needs of readers who have come at great cost in time and money.*

Then there is the problem of photostating and microfilming. Some repositories give excellent and reasonable service for such work. Others make arrangements for photocopying outside. Still others provide no facilities at all. An occasional repository, even when facilities are close at hand, refuses to permit photostating or microfilming on the ground that the staff has not the time to prepare the material for photographing. *The committee feels strongly that photocopying is a modern service as important as providing good lighting and a staff to bring manuscripts from the stacks.* Two problems arise, however, that need further discussion. *First, there is great need for standardizing the cost.* Photostating seems to many to cost disproportionately in comparison with microfilming. The question arises how much of the overhead and the cost of staff to prepare the manuscripts and return them to their place should be charged to the reader? Second, where photo-reproduction is concerned, the question of literary rights often arises (see p. 68), and also the problem of control of restricted papers. The reader who takes away large amounts of manuscript reproduction may himself be a responsible person who has been carefully screened against abuse of the material, but it is hard to protect the material after he has taken the film or photostats away. This angle of the case makes some repositories rightfully reluctant to permit photo-reproduction. The Library of Congress and the Roosevelt Memorial Association have worked out a happy relationship whereby the Roosevelt letters in the Library of Congress may also be

used on film in the Harvard Library—but only after the Library of Congress, which permitted the film to be made, has screened the reader at Harvard. *The committee feels that the practice of requiring a reader who has paid for filming parts of a collection to return his film to the original repository is unfair to the reader; that proper screening of the reader as discussed on page 68 would serve most needs.* If, however, restrictions on papers require the deposit of the film, *the committee recommends that it be placed in an institution geographically near the reader, with a reciprocal arrangement whereby the parent-repository screens further applicants for permission to use the film.*

The committee suggests that it is of the utmost importance now and will be increasingly necessary in the future to permit the filming of large groups of manuscripts in order to make them available elsewhere. It seems important, therefore, to work out reciprocal arrangements between repositories whereby collections or parts of collections can be made available in two or several places with proper control retained by the original possessor whose responsibility it is to protect the papers against abuse.

The committee feels that the proper selection and training of staff members is of vital importance to the use of manuscripts. There are too many repositories on whose staff only one person is competent to be genuinely helpful to readers. The committee is not ready to recommend what kind of training or how much training should be required of staff members, but it urges that more attention be given to this matter, and in the meantime it deplores the custom in vogue in some localities of using archives or manuscript repositories as places for pensioning worthy but unqualified politicians or indigent relatives of trustees.

VII. *Protection of the Researcher*

In most cases the repository is not primarily concerned about protecting the reader. There are, however, four special problems that should be recognized. One concerns university libraries and the manuscript theses deposited in them before publication. In order to avoid hard feelings and injustices, *the committee recommends that such repositories of unpublished dissertations adopt the Harvard rule of permitting no one to use these without permission of the author for a five-year period,* after which it would be reasonable to throw them open for general use. The second concerns the policy, occasionally imposed by a donor, of restricting the use of papers to particular readers. *The committee recommends against giving any reader a monopoly in the use of papers.* The third concerns the practice—followed by very few institutions—of permitting faculty members or graduate students to earmark certain groups of papers and close them to scholars from other institutions. If this practice were followed widely, scholarship would shrivel up or be limited to the narrow confines of each little bailiwick. Those who answered the questionnaire are, like the committee, unanimous in feeling that no retaliation should be practiced against such institutions. *This committee does, however, deplore the practice of granting special privilege to members of the owner-institution.* Finally, *the committee feels that repositories can serve as important clearing houses of information useful to readers* by keeping and making available files that show who is using each group of papers and the purpose for which it is being used. Many an archivist has rendered invaluable service to readers by bringing together those who have interests in common so that they can discuss their subjects and exchange mutually helpful information and material.

THOMAS C. COCHRAN, *Chairman.*
HOWARD K. BEALE.
KATHARINE E. BRAND.
GEORGE E. MOWRY.
ALICE E. SMITH.

NOVEMBER 1950.

OTHER REPORTS

Report of the Delegates to the American Council of Learned Societies

While the American Council of Learned Societies abandoned none of its usual activities during the past year, it showed a tendency to concentrate on the problems of the origin, development, and preservation of the individual scholar. One staff member (Mr. Wellemeyer) is investigating questions of recruitment—where are scholars in the humanities trained, what persuades them to go to graduate school, do the humanities obtain a fair share of top-rank students? The director, Mr. Odegaard, has taken part in the discussions concerning deferment of college and university students from the draft. Both the director and the administrative secretary, Mr. Graves, have been members of the Conference Board Committee which advises on the Fulbright program and on the international exchange of scholars. A committee of the Council, of which your delegate was a member, investigated the existing aids to scholarship and came to the conclusion that the greatest need now exists at the assistant professor level. It is gratifying to report that a subsequent grant by the Markle Foundation has enabled the Council to create a few fellowships for assistant professors, which should help them to continue their development as scholars. Added to the previously existing fellowships for graduate students, this new program should help attract able young men to humanistic studies. There is still not enough support for such studies, and listing personnel problems does not solve them, but at least the Council now has a plan of operations for an important area.

The annual meeting devoted most of its time to a discussion of the activities described above. The director was asked to investigate a related problem—interference with exchange of scholars through the unpredictable behavoir of the passport and visa officials of the Department of State. He reported at the end of November that he had been almost completely unsuccessful in his efforts to obtain a statement or an explanation of the department's policy. The following officers were elected at the annual meeting: Cornelius Krusé, *chairman;* Carl H. Kraeling, *vice-chairman;* Frederick Burkhardt, *secretary;* Lewis Hanke, *treasurer;* Theodore C. Blegen, Julian Boyd, *directors.*

Mr. Burkhardt resigned as of September 1 in order to accept an appointment on the staff of the American High Commissioner in Germany. Mr. William R. Parker was elected by the Board of Directors to fill the unexpired term.

It may not be amiss to point out that of the eight members of the Board of Directors six are now historians, full or part-time.

November 6, 1950. Joseph R. Strayer.

Report of the Delegate to the Social Science Research Council

Many of the activities of the Social Science Research Council are of interest to historians and pertinent to historical investigation, although by its very nature the Council tries to steer its energies away from strictly disciplinary endeavor. The one committee of the Council that is specifically devoted to history is the Committee on Historiography, under the chairmanship of Ralph Turner of Yale University, which is preparing a volume on a social science approach to history. It is hoped that the committee's report will be ready by the summer of 1951.

The Committee on Economic History is still active. This committee has been instrumental in the appearance of *The Corporation in New Jersey: Business and Politics, 1791–1875* by John W. Cadman, Jr., and *Steamboats on the Western Rivers: An Economic and Technological History* by Louis C. Hunter. Historians will also find interest in Julian H. Steward's "Area Research: Theory and Practise," Bulletin 63, Otto Klineberg's *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A*

Survey of Research, David Novick and George A. Steiner's *Wartime Industrial Statistics.* Historians participate on the Committee of International Co-operation, Committee on Slavic Studies, Committee on World Area Research, and the Committee on Economic Growth.

During the last year the Council has inaugurated its Faculty Research Fellowships which will permit promising young scholars to devote three years to approximately half-time research. It has also established a system of inter-university summer research seminars which will allow students interested in a certain problem to meet for a summer of intensive research planning.

The academic disciplines of the forty-five new appointees to Area Research Fellowships are as follows: anthropology, 11; history, 9; political science, 9; economics, 6; geography, 5; sociology, 3; Oriental studies, 1; Slavic languages, 1.

The distribution of grants-in-aid by disciplinary fields follows the pattern of recent years: history, 9; political science, 6; sociology, 4; anthropology, 2; economics, 2; psychology, 2.

The distribution by disciplines of Research Training Fellowships is: sociology, 10; economics, 8; history, 8; psychology, 6; political science, 5; anthropology, 3; economics and demography, 1; geography, 1; human relations, 1.

The distribution of Faculty Research Fellowships is:

	Nominees	Appointees
Anthropology	5	.....
Economics	11	3
Government and political science	7	1
History	15	.....
Psychology	8	1
Sociology	8	.....
Other fields (philosophy, library)	2	.....
	56	5

November 1, 1950. Shepard B. Clough.

Report of the Representative on the Advisory Council of the *American Yearbook*

This past year has seen a crisis in the affairs of the *American Yearbook,* caused by the death of William M. Schuyler, and a change in the policy of Thomas Nelson & Sons, the publishers. From 1925 until the death of Albert Bushnell Hart in 1943 Mr. Schuyler served as associate editor of the *Yearbook* and, after that, as editor.

Thomas Nelson & Sons maintained the *Yearbook* on a profitless basis because it aided in gathering material for an encyclopedia. Having decided to discontinue the encyclopedia, they will not publish the *Yearbook* beyond the forthcoming 1950 edition.

Discussion at the annual meeting of the Advisory Council indicated that with additional promotion the *Yearbook* might become a self-sustaining publishing venture. The Council passed a resolution to the effect that the *Yearbook* should be continued, if possible, and authorized the president to appoint a committee to explore the matter of a publisher. This committee was appointed immediately with M. J. Ferguson of the Brooklyn Public Library as chairman. Two suitable publishers had already expressed an interest in the matter. It was decided useless to appoint a new editor, however, until a firm had been found that would continue publication.

Members of the Advisory Council have received no further information on the course of events since the above meeting on May 25, 1950.

November 7, 1950. Thomas C. Cochran.

949541—51——7

Report of the Representative on the Board of the National Records Management Council

The National Records Management Council has continued to expand its operations and is now completely self-sustaining. Funds beyond those necessary to insure meeting the running expenses of the Council will be used for research under the direction of a special committee.

The Council has granted training fellowships to several graduate students who are now working as staff members. In addition to records programs for business companies, the Council is engaged in large projects for the Air Force and the State of Michigan. The latter work is being assisted by the Kellogg Foundation.

At the annual meeting of the Board of Directors Arthur H. Cole of Harvard University was elected chairman and Emmett J. Leahy, formerly executive director of the Council, was made president.

November 2, 1950. Thomas C. Cochran.

Report of the Representative on the Editorial Board of *Social Education*

During the past year *Social Education* has exhibited a marked improvement in the quality and range of the articles and other services that it proffers to its clientele. The Council and the Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association will be interested to learn that from December 1949 to May 1950, inclusive, the journal published eleven articles on history. This compares most favorably with four on government and civics, four on economics, four on international relations, and a single article on sociology. Among the historians who contributed important historical papers were Thomas A Bailey, Shepard B. Clough, and John Hope Franklin. This development is the more encouraging inasmuch as the political scientists are assuming an active interest in the journal as a means of furthering the interests of their specialty.

For the first time in some years, also, articles appeared that were concerned with college instruction. Among these were bibliographical papers on modern European history and recent Far Eastern history and an article, "United Nations and World Affairs: A Teacher's Guide at the College Level." It is to be hoped that this trend in the journal's offerings will be further developed.

Social Education continues to present a varied bill of fare relative to the activities of the United Nations. Not the least interesting here was a caveat entered by a political scientist against "World Government" as it is at present envisaged.

Editorially, and in several important leading articles, *Social Education* has upheld courageously the proud liberal and constitutional tradition of the United States during a year of test oaths and carelessly drawn proscriptive legislation. Marked attention has been given in general articles to democracy and its problems, including the activities of civic organizations and the cultivation of improved democratic techniques.

The technical aspects of *Social Education's* program have likewise shown improvement during the year. Papers on curriculum developments and experiments have been coupled with monthly reporting of the latest developments in visual and auditory teaching aids. Pamphlets and government publications are regularly reported, a most valuable bibliographical aid. Book reviewing has been improved. Books of general interest, special treatises in history, texts on various educational levels received careful appraisal by a wide range of reviewers, among whom the members of this Association are well represented.

Much of this improvement may be attributed to the increasing experience of the editor, Dr. Lewis Paul Todd, and to the larger amount of time that he had available

during 1949–50 when he was on leave for private research and writing. It is to be hoped that, whatever arrangements may be made for the future housing of the editorial office of *Social Education,* Dr. Todd will be accorded ample time in which to develop his editorial program in which renewed interest in history and in college an duniversity teaching will occupy a continued position of importance.

NOVEMBER 6, 1950. CHESTER MCARTHUR DESTLER.

Financial Report for Social Education

Sept. 1, 1949 to Aug. 31, 1950

	Budgeted	*Expended*	*Difference*
Expenditures (1949–50):			
Salary—Editor	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	
Salary—Secretarial and Editorial Assistant	3,000.00	3,211.98	+$211.98
Office Expenses:			
Payments to business office for alterations in proof, killed type, copies of *Social Education* for editorial office (exchange, author and office copies)	.....	318.41	
Stationery and office supplies	.....	65.68	
Postage and Express	.....	90.31	
Multigraph Service	.....	5.83	
Telephone and Telegraph	.....	2.09	
Total Office Expenses	600.00	482.32	−117.68
Travel Expense (Editor)	200.00	147.45	−52.55
	6,800.00	6,841.75	+41.75
Income (1949–50):			
Sale of Advertising	.....	1,943.74	
Subscriptions (40 cents on each subscriber)	.....	2,222.00	
Total	.....	4,165.74	
Actual Deficit Met From Reserves (Excess of editorial expenditures over editorial income, but not including additions to the reserve from interest and royalties).	.....	.....	2,676.01
Reserves:			
Cash on deposit with NCSS, September 1, 1949	.....	569.01	
Cash on deposit with A. H. A., September 1, 1949	.....	4,569.48	
Interest on Savings Account	.....	41.50	
Net Royalties from A. H. A. Report	.....	586.77	
Receipts: Subscriptions and Advertising	.....	4,165.74	
Total Reserves and Income	.....	.....	9,932.50
Less: Expenditures, Editorial Office	.....	.....	6,841.75
Balance	.....	.....	3,090.75

Financial Report for Social Education—Continued

	Budgeted	*Expended*	*Difference*
Reserves—Continued			
Balance, September 1, 1950:			
Balance on deposit with NCSS *Deficit*....	.....	*$41.75*	
Balance on deposit with A. H. A.....	.....	3,132.50	
Total balance in Reserve Fund, September 1, 1950.....	.....	.....	$3,090.75
Net *Decrease* in Reserves (September 1, 1949–August 31, 1950).....	.....	.....	2,047.74

MERRILL F. HARTSHORN, *Business Manager.*

The undersigned have checked the above accounts and find that all receipts and disbursements are correctly listed. The expenditures are supported by proper vouchers. The balance in the editorial office fund account as of August 31, 1950, showed a deficit of $41.75.

EBER JEFFERY,
PAUL O. CARR, *Auditors.*

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

Paris was the scene of the first International Historical Congress to be held since the war under the auspices of the International Committee of the Historical Sciences (August 27 to September 2, 1950). Nearly 1,400 scholars were listed as participants, and of these there were more than 60 Americans. The Austrians were again present on an official basis. The General Assembly admitted the national committees from Spain and Israel, the latter with the explicit understanding that Arab historians would be accepted by the Israeli National Committee on the same basis as the Jewish historians who currently compose it. The General Assembly also admitted the Verband der Historiker Deutschlands on principle, with the understanding that the incoming Bureau would exercise its usual right to determine whether the German National Committee is fully representative. In the end, no delegates came from countries behind the iron curtain, although a telegram from the president of the Belgrade Academies arrived only at the last minute to send the regrets of the Yugoslav delegation that it could not attend. The Czech and Polish national committees, however, sent their annual dues on the same day, some three weeks before the Congress convened.

The meetings took place for the most part at the Sorbonne. They began with a meeting for all delegates in the Grand Amphitheater, addressed by the minister of education, M. Lapie, and various others. Thereafter the morning sessions were devoted to reports on key developments in different fields during the past decade. These were published in a separate volume, distributed in advance. The meetings themselves were reserved for discussion, and in the instances where rapporteurs had followed instructions closely the discussions were generally spirited and fruitful. The rapporteurs frequently indicated needs and directions for further development: the meeting on Slavic studies, for instance, decided to create an international commission on Slavic studies, in the tradition of earlier commissions under the aegis of the International Committee of Historical Sciences and accessible to scholars concerned with the full range of Slavic studies, from philology to history and economics.

The afternoon meetings were devoted to a wide variety of papers of the more conventional type. Some 230 papers of all kinds were listed on the Congress program.

Otherwise the Congress functioned much as did prewar meetings. Basic policy is determined by the Bureau (Executive Committee), subject to the approval in most cases by the General Assembly. The Bureau normally meets at least once a year, and met twice during the Congress. The General Assembly, which includes two representatives from each national committee, meets twice during each Congress, and as often as needed between Congresses. The Bureau, whose members are chosen for five years (the interval between Congresses) had the following members elected at Paris: *President:* Robert Fawtier (Paris); *Vice Presidents:* Sir Charles Webster (London), Nils Ahnlund (Stockholm); *Secretary General:* Michel François (Paris); *Treasurer:* Anton Largiader (Zurich); *Membres assesseurs (members at large):* Heinrich Felix Schmid (Vienna), Frans van Kalken (Brussels), Luigi Salvatorelli (Rome), Silvio Zavala (Mexico City), Donald C. McKay (Cambridge, Massachusetts); *Membres conseillers (former presidents of the Bureau)*: Halvdan Koht (Oslo), Waldo G. Leland (Washington, D. C.), Hans Nabholz (Zollikon-près-Zurich); M. Bosch-Guimpera, observer from UNESCO.

The International Committee has normally sponsored a series of special commissions. Certain of these have now been reactivated, notably those on bibliography, assemblies of estates, ecclesiastical history, military history, diplomatic history, history of social movements, iconography, numismatics, and publications. The Commission on Bibliography met under the direction of its new chairman, M. Julien Cain, the director of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with Solon J. Buck representing the United States. It was decided to publish the volume for 1950 of the *International Bibliography of the Historical Sciences* and then to determine what form the *Bibliography* might best take thereafter on the basis of suggestions from each member of the committee.

It was decided that the International Committee would not revive the *Bulletin* produced before the war but would report its activities and summaries of significant additions to historical knowledge in the *Bulletin* of the Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines, of which the International Committee of the Historical Sciences forms a part and which is supported by UNESCO.

The General Assembly accepted the invitation of the Italian National Committee to hold the 1955 Congress in Rome, and decided to give subsequent priority in its consideration to the invitation of the Swedish National Committee to hold the 1960 Congress in Stockholm. It was urged on the Assembly that the date of the 1955 meeting be fixed at such a time in September that American scholars could attend. The next meeting of the Bureau has been tentatively set for Stockholm in October, 1951, and a second concurrent meeting of the Bureau and the General Assembly in Brussels in 1952. It is hoped that a much larger representation of American scholars will be present at the Congress in Rome, and that our colleagues will make plans where possible to be in Europe that summer. Inquiries may be addressed to Donald C. McKay, 127 Littauer Center, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

The delegates agreed that they were deeply in debt to the French National Committee for the vigor which it had brought to the organization of the 1950 Congress in the face of very real financial and other difficulties. M. Robert Fawtier, the president of the French Committee and the new president of the International Committee, labored tirelessly and imaginatively in making the arrangements for the Congress.

November 13, 1950. Donald C. McKay.

Report

OF THE

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH

OF THE AMERICAN

HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Proceedings of the Forty-third Annual Meeting

The forty-third annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association was held on the campus of Occidental College at Los Angeles, California, on December 27, 28, and 29, 1950. The total registration for the meeting was 195. The program was arranged by a committee consisting of Russell Buchanan of the University of California, Santa Barbara College, chairman, William Bark of Stanford University, Glenn S. Dumke of Occidental College, Raymond Fisher of the University of California, Los Angeles, W. Stull Holt of the University of Washington, and Vernon J. Puryear of the University of California, Davis. Local arrangements were in charge of a committee consisting of Osgood Hardy of Occidental College, chairman, Rodman W. Paul of the California Institute of Technology, Donald Rowland of the University of Southern California, and Glenn S. Dumke of Occidental College.

The meeting opened of the evening of December 27 with an informal reception in Freeman Union, Occidental College. All meals during the meetings were served in Freeman Union, and sessions were held in Fowler Hall and Johnson Hall. Delegates were housed in Orr Hall on the Occidental campus.

On the morning of December 28 there were three concurrent sessions. One of these was devoted to Medieval History and was presided over by Carl F. Brand of Stanford University. Papers were presented by Bryce D. Lyon of the University of Colorado on "The Feudal Antecedents of the Indenture System," and by Mary N. Hardwicke of Stanford University on "The Extension of the Guelf-Ghibelline Struggle in the Kingdom of Jerusalem." Ihor Sevcenko of the University of California, Berkeley, acted as commentator on the latter paper. The second session was on the history of Latin America, and Theodore Treutlein of San Francisco State College presided. Papers were presented by Clifton B. Kroeber of the University of California, Berkeley, on "Maritime and River Navigation: An Approach to Platine History"; Fritz L. Hoffman of the University of Colorado on "Some Comments on the Expenses of San Martin's Andean Expedition"; John P. Harrison of the University of California, Berkeley, on "Tobacco Export and Colombia's Colonial Economy"; and Osgood Hardy of Occidental College on "El Ferrocarril Sud-Pacifico de Mexico, 1930–1950." The third session was devoted to American minorities, national and economic. Raymond Kooker of the University of Southern California presided. Papers were presented by Clarke A. Chambers of the University of California, Berkeley, on "California Farm Organization and Migrant Labor"; Jules Alexander Karlin of Montana State University on "The Anti-Chinese Outbreak in Tacoma, 1885"; and Thomas D. Murphy of the University of Hawaii on "The Nisei Win Trial by Combat."

At the luncheon on December 28 Harold W. Bradley of the Claremont Graduate School presided, and President J. E. Wallace Sterling of Stanford University presented an address, "To Climb Parnassus."

In the afternoon there were two simultaneous sessions. One was on the history of the Far East. Yu-Shan Han of the University of California, Los Angeles, presided. There were papers by Woodbridge Bingham of the University of California, Berkeley, on "T'ang Turk Negotiations in 617"; Marius Jansen of the University of Washington on "Opportunists in South China during the Boxer Rebellion: Japan and Sun Yat-sen"; F. Hilary Conroy of the University of California, Berkeley,

on "The Establishment of the Wang Ching-wei Regime: An Ideological Somersault"; and Richard W. Van Alstyne of the University of Southern California on "Japan and the United States: Immediate Origins of the War, July 26 to December 7, 1941." The other session was on the history of the West. Vernon J. Puryear of the University of California, Davis, presided. There were papers by Eugene Chamberlin of Montana State University on "Nicholas Trist and the American Failure to Obtain Lower California in the Mexican War"; Albert H. Clodius of Haynes Foundation on "The Ideal and the Practical in the Thought of Emerson and the West"; and John E. Caswell of Stanford University on "Materials for the History of Arctic America."

On the evening of December 28 the annual dinner of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association was held. Glenn S. Dumke of Occidental College presided. He introduced President Arthur G. Coons of Occidental College who extended the official greetings of the college to the association. For the various committees on awards the Secretary-Treasurer announced the awards for outstanding studies by young scholars made for the year 1950: In American History to William R. Steckel for "Pietist in Colonial Pennsylvania: Christopher Sauer, Printer, 1728–1758"; in European History to Florence M. Bourret for "The Gold Coast," with honorable mention to Frederick D. Schneider for "The First British Labour Government"; and in Pacific History to Giles T. Brown for "The Admiral Line and its Competitors." The subject of the presidential address by Walter N. Sage of the University of British Columbia was "Canada—The Neighbor to the North."

There were two sessions on the morning of December 29. One was on modern European history. John W. Olmsted of the University of California, Los Angeles, presided. The papers read were: "Russian Occupation of Berlin in 1760" by John Rodes of Occidental College; "A Chapter in European Historiography" by Henry Adams of the University of California, Santa Barbara College; and "Scandinavian Archival Material for Seventeenth Century Russian History" by Heinz Ellersieck of the California Institute of Technology. In the other session Robert G. Cleland of the Henry E. Huntington Library presented an address entitled "A Review of California's Century, 1850–1950." The address was discussed by Glenn S. Dumke of Occidental College and Raymond A. Rydell of Los Angeles State College. John H. Kemble of Pomona College acted as chairman of the session.

The annual business meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association was held in Freeman Union following a luncheon on December 29. President Walter N. Sage was in the chair. The reports of the Secretary-Treasurer, the Chairman of the Board of Editors of the *Pacific Historical Review,* the Managing Editor of the *Pacific Historical Review,* and the Business Manager of the *Pacific Historical Review* were presented and accepted.

The Committee on Resolutions consisting of Edward Hagemann, chairman, and Le Roy R. Hafen presented the following:

The Resolutions Committee proposes in behalf of members of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association and their friends, who have attended this annual meeting at Occidental College, that it be

Resolved, That our special thanks be extended to the Program Committee for providing an excellent program covering many fields of interest; that it be

Resolved, That our gratitude be expressed to Dr. Arthur Coons, President of Occidental College, official representative of the host institution, and to Dean Glenn S. Dumke and Dr. Osgood Hardy of the same college both of whom served so well on the Committee on Arrangements, for the gracious hospitality that has made all feel so much at home and enjoy their stay on the campus of the college; be it further

Resolved, That on the occasion of the resignation of Dr. John H. Kemble from the office of Secretary-Treasurer of our Association our deep gratitude be expressed

to him for the gracious and efficient manner in which during the last five years he has fulfilled the duties of that office; and, lastly, be it

Resolved, That we commemorate and express our esteem for those members who during the last year have been called from us by death: Henry O. Wright of Los Angeles—a life member; Edward McMahon of the University of Washington and former President of the Pacific Coast Branch; Leigh Sanford of Reno, Nevada; Dixon Wecter of the University of California, Berkeley.

These resolutions were unanimously adopted.

The Committee on Nominations consisting of Lawrence Kinnaird, chairman, Raymond Muse, H. Edward Nettles, Richard W. Van Alstyne, and John H. Kemble (ex officio) presented the following nominations: President, John J. Van Nostrand, Jr., University of California, Berkeley; Vice President, W. Stull Holt, University of Washington; Secretary-Treasurer, John A. Schutz, California Institute of Technology; Council, Harold H. Fisher, Stanford University, T. A. Larson, University of Wyoming, Raymond Muse, Washington State College, Richard W. Van Alstyne, University of Southern California; Board of Editors, *Pacific Historical Review* (terms ending 1953), Russell Buchanan, University of California, Santa Barbara College, Donald Rowland, University of Southern California, Earl Pomeroy, University of Oregon.

Committees on Awards: American History, Paul S. Smith, Whittier College, chairman; John S. Shideler, University of California, Davis College; Dorothy O. Johansen, Reed College. European History, Francis J. Bowman, University of Southern California, chairman; Giovanni Costigan, University of Washington; Arthur J. Marder, University of Hawaii. Pacific History, Lawrence Kinnaird, University of California, Berkeley, chairman; Yu-Shan Han, University of California, Los Angeles; Rufus K. Wyllys, Arizona State College.

These nominations were unanimously adopted.

It was announced that the 1951 meeting would be held at Stanford University on December 27, 28, and 29.

It was moved by Raymond Kooker, seconded, and carried that the Constitution be amended to provide that the retiring President of any one year be a member of the Council *ex officio* for the following year.

The following resolution was presented by Edwin R. Bingham:

WHEREAS three members of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association have been deprived of their teaching positions in the University of California by action of a majority of the Board of Regents because of their refusal to sign a loyalty oath made a condition of employment in the University, and

WHEREAS the question is one of discipline rather than of loyalty and, moreover, implies a threat to tenure: Therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Pacific Coast Branch affirm its confidence in John Caughey, Ernst Kantorowicz, and Charles Mowat as sound scholars, able teachers, and men of admirable courage and deep integrity.

It was unanimously adopted.

On the afternoon of December 29 there were two simultaneous sessions. One was devoted to the history of Great Britain and the Empire and was presided over by Frank J. Klingberg of the University of California, Los Angeles. There were papers by Reuben H. Gross, Jr., of the University of California, Berkeley, on "Uganda—Liberal Imperialism's Contribution to Empire"; Giovanni Costigan of the University of Washington on "Gladstone in Retirement: The Last Phase"; and John Sperling of the University of California, Berkeley, on "The Origins of the South Sea Company." The other session was on the history of the United States. George H. Knoles of Stanford University presided. The following papers were presented: "Edmund Atkin's Plan for Imperial Indian Control" by Wilbur Jacobs of the University of California, Santa Barbara College; "An Eighteenth Century

Concept of American History" by Raymond Muse of Washington State College; "Woodrow Wilson and National Defense, 1916–1917" by Edward H. Brooks of Stanford University; and "The Franklin D. Roosevelt Collection of John Valentine" by Albert S. Karr of El Camino College. The meeting closed with a tea in Freeman Union given jointly by Occidental College and Phi Alpha Theta, honorary historical fraternity.

MARCH 1951. JOHN H. KEMBLE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Financial Statement, 1950

Balance, January 1, 1950		$406.14
Income:		
American Historical Association subvention	$200.00	
Interest on savings account	5.31	
Sale of *Proceedings*	4.30	
Fees for book exhibitions, 1949 meeting	20.00	
		229.61
		635.75
Expense:		
Printing, stationery, supplies	24.20	
Postage	8.85	
Awards	100.00	
Secretarial assistance	5.00	
		138.05
Balance, January 1, 1951		497.70

MARCH 1951. JOHN H. KEMBLE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*