

THE FIFTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION

BY CHARLES GRIER SELLERS, JR.



Reprinted from THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW
Volume XLIX, No. 2, September, 1962

The Fifty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association

BY CHARLES GRIER SELLERS, JR.

Attendance at the annual meeting, held this year in Milwaukee, April 26-28, passed the one thousand mark for the first time, reaching a total of 1,080. By a happy accident the program committee had instituted some experimental innovations that resulted in more sessions than usual. Even so, meeting rooms were usually filled to capacity and often overflowed—except that the historian's traditional indisposition to arise and hear papers on Saturday morning asserted itself, despite efforts to schedule enticing fare at this hour. The host institutions, through the good offices of Local Arrangements Chairman Frederick I. Olson and his committee, sponsored pleasant receptions for members and their wives at Milwaukee-Downer College and at the Milwaukee Public Library, while Milwaukee's celebrated breweries offered daily hospitality to thirsty historians.

This year the program committee decided to reserve the customary nineteen sessions (four each in the morning and afternoon on Thursday and Friday and three on Saturday morning) for programs arranged by the committee itself. In place of the former joint sessions, the committee invited groups meeting together with the Association to arrange their own sessions in addition to the nineteen committee-arranged sessions, and five groups did so. A third segment of the program was the ambiguously named Alternate Program, consisting of whatever sessions individual members or groups of members wished to arrange for themselves. It was hoped that this device would provide an occasion for less formal interchanges by small groups of historians with specialized interests; and despite inadequate publicity, seven such alternate sessions were scheduled.

Thus there was a total of thirty-one sessions, as well as a luncheon meeting and two dinner meetings. The 140 scheduled participants came from 81 institutions in 34 states, the District of Columbia, Great Britain, and Canada. The Midwest contributed 47 participants, the Northeast, 40, the South, 29, and the Rocky Mountain and Pacific states, 20.

Geographical and institutional balance, however, was not the aim of the program committee. Rather we simply sought to enlist those historians who had the most interesting things to say to their colleagues. While we did not try to set any general theme for the meeting, we did arrange one group of sessions devoted to analysis of recent individual works of major importance in American history. A second group of sessions in the committee-arranged part of the program featured approaches to, and subfields of, American history that are being newly explored. A final group of sessions presented new findings and new interpretations about more traditional subjects. In an effort to keep sessions integrated and to allow full consideration of the matters raised, we scheduled five one-paper sessions and only one with more than two papers.

The sessions dealing with recent important works in American history were among the most heavily attended. A capacity ballroom audience gathered under the chairmanship of George W. Pierson to hear two historians and a political scientist address themselves to Louis Hartz's *Liberal Tradition in America*. Marvin Meyers began by making clear Hartz's symbolic use of Locke and pointing out that Hartz was analyzing the unconscious mind of America to make clear a useful contrast with Europe. Yet, he concluded, Hartz had so assimilated everything to the Lockean assumptions that his interpretation seemed less varied and useful than Tocqueville's similar but more pluralistic perceptions. Political scientist Harry V. Jaffa echoed the charge of a too monolithic interpretation. Contrary to Hartz, Jaffa insisted that fundamental disputes had broken out within the liberal consensus and that the Lost Cause had not been without impact on American thinking. In effect, he said, southerners and abolitionists, sinning in a common faith, had carried the paired ideas of equality and self-government to such discordant lengths that they had brought on a Civil War. The third critic, Leonard Krieger, proposed a framework of analysis that distinguished between various parts of Europe, in place of Hartz's oversimplified distinction between America and Europe. All areas of the Western world,

Krieger thought, had known a third way: (1) of liberty from government; (2) of government; and (3) of competition between individuals and power groups. The third way, he suggested, was one of timing: the loss of civil liberties from government and the restoration of them afterward tended to be pragmatic and not ideological. By contrast European thought had been so delayed as to allow authoritarianism to take over. Louis Hartz repeated his statement of his purpose in the introduction to his *Liberal Tradition in America*. The germ of the idea, Adams, he thought, had emphasized the American experience, but had failed to see the broad and narrow and had neglected the social and political. Beard, in reaction, had interpreted the American experience as a series of conflicts among Americans, ignoring the broader context. Hartz himself wished to insist on the American experience without eliminating the American context. The American experience has a meaning in a wider perspective of both indebtedness and variation.

More than 150 persons attended the sessions. Growth: A New Departure for America, which was devoted to a critical examination of the recent book, *The Economic Growth of America, 1860-1980*. Chairman George Rogers Taylor, who has attended similar meetings in the distant past, perhaps the most surprising feature of the unchallenged acceptance of the assumptions of the at least limited and tentative theoretical change are highly useful. In his paper Stuart Bruchey praised North's book as "a brave effort," and raised two related questions: (1) if so, provide a suitable conceptual framework for the history? and (2) if so, is North's book a burden? Both Bruchey's paper and Thomas C. Cochran (read in his absence) and Harold F. Williamson gave affirmative

ons, as well as a luncheon
40 scheduled participants
the District of Columbia,
contributed 47 participants,
Rocky Mountain and Pacific

, however, was not the aim
mply sought to enlist those
things to say to their col-
ny general theme for the
sions devoted to analysis of
nce in American history. A
tee-arranged part of the
fields of, American history
p of sessions presented new
ore traditional subjects. In
to allow full consideration
one-paper sessions and only

portant works in American
ended. A capacity ballroom
ip of George W. Pierson to
ntist address themselves to
rica. Marvin Meyers began
Locke and pointing out that
id of America to make clear
e concluded, Hartz had so
assumptions that his inter-
than Tocqueville's similar
cal scientist Harry V. Jaffa
interpretation. Contrary to
l disputes had broken out
ie Lost Cause had not been
n effect, he said, southerners
faith, had carried the paired
to such discordant lengths
: The third critic, Leonard
is that distinguished between
artz's oversimplified distinc-
areas of the Western world,

Krieger thought, had known a three-step liberal development: (1) of liberty from government; (2) of liberty to share in power and government; and (3) of competition among the various liberty-using individuals and power groups. The major distinction of America, he suggested, was one of timing: Americans, alone, had achieved civil liberties from government and rights in government at the same moment and after a sufficient social preparation, so that their disputes afterward tended to be pragmatic arguments between these balancing liberties. By contrast European theorists had been "over achievers," and ahead of the social preparation, which in central and eastern Europe had been so delayed as to postpone realization until totalitarianism took over. Louis Hartz responded to his critics with a vigorous statement of his purpose in the light of competing traditions in American historiography. The germ-theory school of Herbert Baxter Adams, he thought, had emphasized the relation of American to European experience, but had failed because it had been too legalistic and narrow and had neglected the American variations. Parrington and Beard, in reaction, had interpreted American history on the basis of conflict among Americans, ignoring the European perspective. Hartz himself wished to insist on a comparative method which, without eliminating the American conflicts, would give them diminished meaning in a wider perspective. What was needed was recognition of both indebtedness *and* variation.

More than 150 persons attended the session on "Economic Growth: A New Departure for American Economic History?" which was devoted to a critical examination of Douglass C. North's recent book, *The Economic Growth of the United States, 1790-1860*. Chairman George Rogers Taylor comments that, for anyone who has attended similar meetings of historians in the not very distant past, perhaps the most surprising aspect of the session was the unchallenged acceptance of the assumption that attempts to develop at least limited and tentative theories of economic growth and historical change are highly useful. In the central paper of the session, Stuart Bruchey praised North's book as an "impressive, pioneer effort," and raised two related questions: (1) does economic growth provide a suitable conceptual framework for American economic history? and (2) if so, is North's analytical structure adequate for that burden? Both Bruchey's paper and the prepared comments by Thomas C. Cochran (read in his absence by Arthur Dudden) and Harold F. Williamson gave affirmative answers to these questions,

though with significant qualifications. In rebuttal North stoutly defended his thesis of the central role of the developing market economy as strategically influenced by the export and carrying trade before 1812 and by cotton exports in the following decades. Needless to say this did not altogether satisfy those who insist on the crucial importance of such factors as the rising spirit of entrepreneurship and the major role of various governmental agencies in promoting the vast internal improvements of the period. These and many other interesting questions were raised in a lively general discussion. On the whole, the chief result of the session was to bring home the relative ease of listing the so-called important factors in our early economic growth, but to underline the difficulty of appraising their comparative and strategic importance and of weaving them into a useful explanatory framework.

The session on "The American Revolution and the Age of Revolution," with Louis Gottschalk in the chair, was devoted to a critique of Robert R. Palmer's recent work on *The Age of the Democratic Revolution*. In the principal paper of the session, J. Steven Watson expressed doubts that Palmer's view of the last four decades of the eighteenth century as an age of democratic revolutions fitted the England of George III. Watson was more willing to grant the validity of the characterization for France, but questioned whether the French revolutionary spirit had as much affinity with or indebtedness to the American precedent as it had to French circumstances and Rousseau's *Social Contract*. Commentator Douglass Adair conceded that a reliable full-length biography of George III was needed before his reign could be adequately assessed, but argued that in the minds of the American revolutionaries of 1776 the British monarch was a symbol of despotism that ought to be displaced. Yet Adair did not fully accept Palmer's description of the American revolutionary spirit. Palmer defended his documentation of particular points that had been questioned by Watson and Adair, as well as by reviewers, but insisted primarily upon the validity of his general thesis and the importance of the similarities, along with the differences, among the experiences of various countries. Many members of the audience of some three hundred persons were manifestly anxious to participate in the debate, but time did not permit comment from the floor.

Eight sessions reflected relatively new interests and approaches among American historians. The recent convergence of interests among historians and anthropologists concerned with "The Ac-

culturation of the American Indian" was a session chaired by Allan G. Hoffer's paper on "Protestants, North American Indians, 1760-1800: recurring patterns in white-Indian mission work among whites; (2) division of the Indian and the traditional approaches; (3) an attempt at political integration; and (4) the place of factions in a tribe already highly acculturated." Anthropologist Fred W. Voget and American Indian Adjustments: a sequence of acculturative stages. Indians found old organizations of a type of protective custody, was marked by the rise of prophets and manifestations. Following these phases, in which religion acted to cementator William T. Hagan discussed co-operation between anthropologists and the difficulty of fitting "into neat boxes" of several hundred widely varying types. Mary E. Young, similarly typologized at the expense of the peculiar. In closing she entered a plea against confessed sympathy for plain Man. "hypothetical member of a 'local in-group.'" J. Cutler Andrews, contributed from the floor before

Some eighty historians assembled in Savelle to consider "Education on the Colonial Frontier." Timothy J. Minchin, the Child, and the Congregational movement and adjustment to frontier conditions, along with religion, became a question of psychological security. In a second paper, "Government

substantial North stoutly
 the developing market
 port and carrying trade
 following decades. Need-
 those who insist on the
 ing spirit of entrepre-
 nmental agencies in
 the period. These and
 d in a lively general
 he session was to bring
 mportant factors in our
 difficulty of appraising
 d of weaving them into

and the Age of Revo-
 , was devoted to a cri-
The Age of the Demo-
 the session, J. Steven
 of the last four decades
 cratic revolutions fitted
 ore willing to grant the
 : questioned whether the
 ity with or indebtedness
 ench circumstances and
 ouglass Adair conceded
 ge III was needed before
 gued that in the minds of
 tish monarch was a sym-
 Yet Adair did not fully
 an revolutionary spirit.
 rticular points that had
 vell as by reviewers, but
 , general thesis and the
 the differences, among
 members of the audience
 festly anxious to partici-
 comment from the floor.
 interests and approaches
 convergence of interests
 acerned with "The Ac-

culturation of the American Indian" attracted eighty-five persons to a session chaired by Allan G. Bogue. Historian Robert F. Berkhofer's paper on "Protestants, Pagans, and Sequences among the North American Indians, 1760-1860" described a sequence of four recurring patterns in white-Indian relations, as illustrated in Protestant mission work among Indians: (1) absolute rejection of whites; (2) division of the Indian village to reflect the Christian and the traditional approaches to life among the Indians; (3) an attempt at political integration of the tribe, in lieu of cultural integration; and (4) the placement of missionaries into existing factions in a tribe already highly fragmented from acculturation. Anthropologist Fred W. Voget followed with a paper on "Religion and American Indian Adjustment," in which he likewise sketched a sequence of acculturative stages. The Directed Stage, when Indians found old organizations shattered and themselves under a type of protective custody, was followed by a Restorative Stage, marked by the rise of prophets and intertribal or regional revivalistic manifestations. Following these developments came a Reformatory Phase, in which religion acted to stabilize Indian personality. Commentator William T. Hagan described some of the difficulties of co-operation between anthropologists and historians, and especially the difficulty of fitting "into neat concepts and theories the activities of several hundred widely varying cultures." The second commentator, Mary E. Young, similarly thought the two papers overgeneralized at the expense of the peculiarities of different Indian societies. In closing she entered a plea against "terminological torture" and confessed sympathy for plain Moshulatubbee as opposed to today's "hypothetical member of a 'localized face-to-face culture-bearing in-group.'" J. Cutler Andrews, Henry Fritz, and Muriel Wright contributed from the floor before it was necessary to end the session.

Some eighty historians assembled under the chairmanship of Max Savelle to consider "Education versus Social Disorganization on the Colonial Frontier." Timothy L. Smith discussed "The Family, the Child, and the Congregation in Early America" from what might be called a sociological point of view. In a context of social movement and adjustment to frontier conditions, Smith argued, education, along with religion, became a mechanism for social adjustment and psychological security. Commentator Sidney E. Mead questioned whether the evidence presented justified Smith's thesis. In a second paper, "Government and Education on the Massachu-

setts Frontier," Robert Middlekauff presented the thesis that there was probably not as much "decline" in education on the colonial frontier as hitherto supposed. Commentator Rena Vassar suggested other evidence that might be considered before Middlekauff's thesis could be considered as established.

An animated session on "The American Press in the Nineteenth Century" was chaired by Wallace E. Davies. James L. Crouthamel analyzed "The Newspaper Revolution, 1831-1861," during which the older, conservative, mercantile newspapers were challenged by the popular penny papers, such as James Gordon Bennett's New York *Herald*. The penny papers succeeded, Crouthamel argued, not so much because of their sensationalism as because they provided the same coverage as the older papers more extensively and more attractively. The mercantile papers and their popular challengers reacted reciprocally upon each other to produce by the 1850's a moderate penny press, typified in New York by the *Tribune* and the *Times*. Frederick Marbut's paper on "James Gordon Bennett and the Development of Washington News Coverage" emphasized the innovating importance of Bennett's *Herald* as an excellent (if sensational), non-partisan (if opinionated) newspaper, which nevertheless had great success in developing official sources of exclusive information in Washington. With the decline of journalistic competition since 1900, Marbut felt that syndicated columnists like Drew Pearson and Joseph Alsop come closest to the practices in which Bennett pioneered. Commentator Louis M. Starr compared Bennett's era with the two later eras of Pulitzer and the tabloid, claiming that all three of these efforts to reach a wider audience were closely related to developments in immigration. Each new approach made considerable use of sex and was denounced by the older press, he pointed out, but each time the conservatives had to adopt some of the new methods, while the innovators themselves eventually calmed down somewhat. A lively general discussion, whose participants included Frederick Merk, Patrick Hazard, and Julius Bloch, debated several points: whether it was justifiable to focus so exclusively on New York innovators; and whether Bennett's anti-Catholic comments indicated that he was nativist or simply congenitally anxious to shock.

Edward Lurie's paper on "The Institutionalization of Cultural and Intellectual Life in the Late Nineteenth Century" attracted a standing-room-only audience of over one hundred to a session

chaired by John William W. The dramatic rise of institutions (1) the influence in all areas of (2) the auspicious environment intellectual leaders—the organization named "The Captain of Erudition" unlovely consequences of the also suggested gains: professional and others. But he emphasized standing the interaction between environment. Both commentators Greene, stressed the importance of European experience. Fleming's nineteenth-century intellectual life: the traditional scholar's function of collaboration lay behind the specialization of ample, by the introduction of which questioned the adequacy of Lurie's emphasis on the biographical approach to reform, and the definition of the went on.

An overflow audience of over 100 "Folklore, Mythology, and the American History," Richard M. Mayo presiding. In a paper on "Folklorist and historian. Insisting on a flexible to rigid handling as the dull, meticulous set of rules for dealing with the Indian, the Negro, and the to the historian, Dorson maintained able records for the beliefs and groups of obscured Americans." "Preface to Nationality: The Mythology," Keith B. Berwick declared with its preoccupation with synthesizing of our recovery from the history." Today's historian may find Bancroft in their "quest for a national ethos that could be called an American demigod." After d

the thesis that there
 tion on the colonial
 ena Vassar suggested
 e Middlekauff's the-
 ess in the Nineteenth
 James L. Crouthamel
 1861," during which
 s were challenged by
 rdon Bennett's New
 Crouthamel argued,
 because they provided
 extensively and more
 c popular challengers
 e by the 1850's a mod-
 the *Tribune* and the
 Gordon Bennett and
 rage" emphasized the
 s an excellent (if sen-
 paper, which neverthe-
 sources of exclusive in-
 f journalistic competi-
 columnists like Drew
 practices in which Ben-
 rr compared Bennett's
 e tabloid, claiming that
 dience were closely re-
 h new approach made
 by the older press, he
 ad to adopt some of the
 ves eventually calmed
 , whose participants in-
 l Julius Bloch, debated
 focus so exclusively on
 tt's anti-Catholic com-
 ly congenitally anxious
 onalization of Cultural
 h Century" attracted a
 hundred to a session

chaired by John William Ward. Lurie suggested two reasons for the dramatic rise of institutions in all fields of intellectual endeavor: (1) the influence in all areas of the culture of "the idea of science"; (2) the auspicious environment for a new "personality type" among intellectual leaders—the organizer, the bureaucrat, the type Veblen named "The Captain of Erudition." While recognizing some of the unlovely consequences of the bureaucratization of intellect, Lurie also suggested gains: professional standards, support for research, and others. But he emphasized mainly the importance of understanding the interaction between personality and institutional environment. Both commentators, Donald Fleming and John C. Greene, stressed the importance of comparing the American with the European experience. Fleming suggested that the emphasis in nineteenth-century intellectual life on originality, rather than the traditional scholar's function of conservation and synthesis of wisdom, lay behind the specialization of scholarship as exemplified, for example, by the introduction of the laboratory into teaching. Greene questioned the adequacy of Lurie's use of "personality type," his emphasis on the biographical approach to understanding institutional reform, and the definition of the importance of science for all that went on.

An overflow audience of one hundred attended the session on "Folklore, Mythology, and the American Historian," with Bernard Mayo presiding. In a paper on "The Uses of the Oral Tradition in American History," Richard M. Dorson deplored the rift between folklorist and historian. Insisting that oral traditions "are as susceptible to rigid handling as the dullest document," he laid down a meticulous set of rules for dealing with such materials. Oral traditions of the Indian, the Negro, and the immigrant are especially valuable to the historian, Dorson maintained, for they "offer the chief available records for the beliefs and concerns and memories of large groups of obscured Americans." In a provocative paper entitled "A Preface to Nationality: The Mythic Imagination in American History," Keith B. Berwick declared that "the new historical writing" with its preoccupation with symbol and myth "may mark the beginning of our recovery from the self-induced myopia of scientific history." Today's historian may find affinities with Weems and Wirt and Bancroft in their "quest for nationality" through discovery of "a national ethos that could be embodied in a single mystic figure—an American demigod." After discussing the qualities that qualified

or disqualified Franklin, Washington, Jackson, and Lincoln for this symbolic role, both in the earlier era and in our own, Berwick speculated about the possible qualities of the "new mythic figure—perhaps a Lincolnesque figure in a button-down shirt" who may emerge from the efforts to define the national purpose. All three commentators, William W. Abbot, Merrill D. Peterson, and William Appleman Williams, thought that Dorson had described skillfully the ways of getting at oral tradition, but questioned whether it had great use for historians beyond a deepened understanding of "large groups of obscured Americans." The commentators similarly found Berwick's paper elegant and suggestive, though perhaps extravagant in places. Peterson, however, sharply rejected Berwick's contention that the recent interest in symbol and myth is akin to the work of Weems and Bancroft. The so-called new historians, he maintained, "do not continue the mythic imagination; rather, they penetrate it, and dissect it."

W. Stull Holt chaired a session on "Equality and Excellence: Problems of the Professions in American History." Daniel H. Calhoun's paper on "1750 to 1850: Mediocrity Regained?" argued that this period began with a sharpening of professional standards but ended, as illustrated by developments among doctors, clergy, and lawyers, with a turning away from individual status and even individual achievement. He explained this reversal as arising in part from Jacksonian egalitarianism, but even more from conflict between personal leaders and the spokesmen for collective leadership. In a second paper, "Since 1850: Professional and Public Welfare," Robert W. McCluggage described the conflict between the desire to distinguish qualified professional practitioners from the unqualified and the desire of society to have the numbers required by a rapidly expanding population. This dilemma conditioned the organization of national federations of local professional societies, the establishment of professional schools, and struggles between the schools and the practitioners over the education of new members of the professions. Commentator Paul Beck, substituting for Thomas N. Bonner, contributed suggestions drawn from research on the medical profession. The second commentator, Corinne Gilb, emphasized the necessity of distinguishing between various groups within a profession, for instance, lawyers who entered politics as opposed to the lawyers who handled most of the private practice. She also stressed the need for a conceptual framework if the professions and their history are to be fully understood.

Some seventy historians assembled for the session on "The New Woman." Papers by Berwick and Lasch coincided in emphasizing the importance of women in changing the situation of women in the early twentieth century, contentions that the "new women," going back at least to the late eighteenth century. Lasch, asking "How New Women?" in the early twentieth century, contended that women in the past had been not "new women," he argued, were not seeking freedom but to escape the consequences of the industrial revolution. Commentator Carl N. Lounsbury implied definition of "freedom" were merely seeking to make a living, he said, whether by gainful employment or otherwise. This was prompted from the audience a number of questions about the proper role of women in the past, which would have been generally accepted as radical in 1962. Challenged by the difficulty of restraining the vigor of his remarks, he reports reassuringly, "that the new historians."

Fifty historians attended the session on "Urbanization and Regionalism in the West." E. Atherton presided. In a paper on "Urbanization in the American Westward Movement," he argued that frontier entrepreneurship and economics which related to the development of undeveloped frontiers. Nowhere else in the world metropolitan capitalism more important where it gave coherence and unity to geographically dispersed and composite communities. In kind and stages of development, Scheiber, centered on "Urbanization in the Old Northwest, 1820-1860," argued that programs, 1820-1845, resulted in the development of major urban centers and intrastate alignment of political forces that led to the rise of cities. In the surge of railroad p

ly, and Lincoln for this
 ur own, Berwick spec-
 w mythic figure—per-
 hirt” who may emerge
 se. All three commen-
 son, and William Ap-
 lescribed skillfully the
 d whether it had great
 nding of “large groups
 similarly found Ber-
 perhaps extravagant in
 rwick’s contention that
 to the work of Weems
 e maintained, “do not
 7 penetrate it, and dis-

uality and Excellence:
 story.” Daniel H. Cal-
 regained?” argued that
 fessional standards but
 g doctors, clergy, and
 l status and even indi-
 rsal as arising in part
 e from conflict between
 ective leadership. In a
 Public Welfare,” Rob-
 between the desire to
 s from the unqualified
 s required by a rapidly
 ned the organization of
 eties, the establishment
 en the schools and the
 bers of the professions.
 omas N. Bonner, con-
 the medical profession.
 mphasized the necessity
 ithin a profession, for
 sed to the lawyers who
 so stressed the need for
 nd their history are to

Some seventy historians assembled to take “A New Look at the New Woman.” Papers by Barbara M. Solomon and Christopher Lasch coincided in emphasizing the importance of industrialization in changing the situation of women, and also the continuing ambivalence of women about their roles. Mrs. Solomon focused her attention on “The New England Culture and the Nineteenth-Century Woman,” and insisted that the New Woman was really a “series of new women,” going back at least as far as the early nineteenth century. Lasch, asking “How New Was the New Woman?” of the early twentieth century, contended that the so-called slavery of women in the past had been more to their work than to men. The “new women,” he argued, were really trying “not to win their freedom but to escape the consequences of the freedom they already enjoyed.” Commentator Carl N. Degler took sharp issue with Lasch’s implied definition of “freedom” as the ability to do nothing. Women were merely seeking to make meaningful lives for themselves, he said, whether by gainful employment or otherwise. These remarks prompted from the audience a series of extremely animated statements about the proper role of women, ranging from some that would have been generally accepted in 1800 to some that might be considered radical in 1962. Chairman Robert E. Riegel had some difficulty restraining the vigor of debate—“which at least proves,” he reports reassuringly, “that sex remains a vital subject, even to historians.”

Fifty historians attended the Saturday morning session on “Urbanism and Regionalism in Western Development,” at which Lewis E. Atherton presided. In a paper on “The Concept of the Metropolis in the American Westward Movement,” Charles M. Gates argued that frontier entrepreneurs clearly understood the geography and economics which related evolving metropolitan complexes to undeveloped frontiers. Nowhere, he maintained, was frontier metropolitan capitalism more important than in the American West, where it gave coherence and unity to an economy that was geographically dispersed and composed of sectional elements divergent in kind and stages of development. The second paper, by Harry N. Scheiber, centered on “Urban Rivalries and Internal Improvements in the Old Northwest, 1820-1860.” The state internal improvement programs, 1820-1845, resulted from political alliances involving major urban centers and intrastate regions; and in turn caused realignment of political forces that expressed regional and local ambitions. In the surge of railroad promotion after 1845, urban objec-

efforts. The two com-
C. Wade, both noted
emphasized the anti-
a rational and efficient
the localist and politi-
wn and subregional ur-
to urbanism in western
ractory, while Lamar
ting urban studies with

nittee-arranged part of
which American his-
nial of the Homestead
"Landmarks in Amer-
y M. Robbins in the
Homestead Act: Vision
on land disposition in
the idea of an "incon-
y of the homestead sys-
attract floods of Euro-
l out that 287 million
was most prevalent in
ods of prosperity), and
llow larger homesteads
hem. John Y. Simon's
rill Act" was "not pri-
olitical deal." Coming
vided little financial aid
tant in challenging the
ntator George L. An-
Homestead Act into a
is kind of meticulous
ld be fully evaluated.
a that the Morrill Act
led that Morrill had a
mon had granted.

l the session exploring
' by remarking that the
g Radicals would have
further clarified. He

hoped that Harold M. Hyman's paper on Edwin M. Stanton and Hans L. Trefousse's paper on Ben Wade would develop a trend in this direction. Both Hyman and Trefousse rejected the characterizations of their subjects as opportunistic, violently partisan, or materialistic. Hyman admitted that Stanton's motives were complex, but insisted that as much as anything he unselfishly advocated a greater role for the national government in expanding civil liberties and closer co-ordination between the executive and legislative branches of the government. Trefousse similarly argued that Wade consistently advocated Radical doctrines, even when it was to his disadvantage to do so, and that he sincerely believed in the rights of labor and Negroes. Commentator Richard N. Current emphasized the diversity of background of the Radicals and questioned several specific points made by the speakers. Commenting from the floor, David Donald wondered whether the revision pendulum was not swinging too far toward whitewashing the Radicals. A discussion by the chairman and the speakers followed about the capacity of historians, limited by documents, to probe the inner lives of historical persons. Further questions from the capacity audience of at least two hundred pushed adjournment well beyond the noon hour.

The session on "Continuity of Conflict from the Revolution to the Constitution," chaired by Elisha P. Douglass, featured two parallel papers: one on "The Democratic Tradition" by Jackson T. Main, and one on "The Nationalist Tradition" by E. James Ferguson. While Main conceded that the American Revolution was in part a conservative movement, he insisted that "the significance of the era lies not in what it preserved, but in what it created. One outstanding result was the growth of democracy." After describing the restrictions on majority rule during the colonial period, Main argued that these barriers were removed or modified under the first state constitutions, and that a preference for democracy was an important basis for political alignment during the period. Similarly Ferguson maintained that there was at the other end of the political spectrum a continuous conservative and nationalist tradition during the period, arising most immediately from economic considerations. Though the conservatives tended to fear unchecked democracy, their major objective was a constitutional revision which would enable the central government to repay the national debt. "Under Robert Morris," Ferguson concluded, "the nationalists merged constitutional reform with economic objectives that anticipated the Hamiltonian formula

in detail: debt payment, satisfaction of the creditor interest, enlargement of commercial capital, a national bank, and political centralization founded upon an appeal to economic self-interest." Both commentators, Stephen G. Kurtz and Clarence L. Ver Steeg, felt that the papers had exaggerated the undemocratic aspects of colonial America, the democratic impulses in the early republic, and the anti-democratic tendencies of the nationalists. Kurtz suggested that the leaders of the early republic were not democratic but whiggish, a very different thing. Ver Steeg agreed with much of Ferguson's description of the nationalists, but argued that they feared disunion more than democracy.

The session on "Judicial Decision-Making" was chaired by Don E. Fehrenbacher. In a paper on "Judicial Unanimity and the Marshall Court," Donald M. Roper argued that the remarkable unity of the Marshall court resulted more from the Chief Justice's skill as a compromiser and his willingness to submerge his own views in order to achieve unanimity than from his personal domination of the Court. Stanley I. Kutler followed with a paper on "Chief Justice Taft and the Delusion of Judicial Exactness." Drawing his illustrations primarily from labor cases, Kutler maintained that Taft's adherence to the analytical school of jurisprudence, with its vision of a received and precise law, robbed his opinions of any enduring value. Commentator William R. Leslie suggested that both papers paid too little attention to historical setting. The manner of delivering opinions in Marshall's time, for instance, owed much to the English legal tradition, and Taft's predilection for analytical jurisprudence was typical of his entire generation, including Oliver Wendell Holmes. The second commentator, Leonard Levy, declared that both papers lacked fresh insights and presented oversimplified views of complex subjects.

Ray Ginger's paper on economic overcapacity in the late nineteenth century attracted a capacity audience to the session on "The Age of Overproduction." With ample statistical evidence, generally from the behavior of prices, Ginger demonstrated that overcapacity existed in agriculture, in railroads, and in manufacturing among products as diverse as watches, sewing machines, iron and steel, petroleum, and cotton textiles. In keeping with the title of his paper, "Overproduction: A Key to American History, 1877-1898," he argued that this overproduction was responsible for the cutthroat competition of the era, the formation of trusts, the growth of advertising,

the aggravation of "materialism," the dalliance with the "assumption by private enterprise as to "capture" foreign markets," Chandler, acknowledged that it was a transient feature that disappeared as big business marketing organizations and as resources developed. We claimed that the fact of overproduction had produced no new evidence and that his argument was not new. In closing, Kirkland took issue with some of the explanations to explain historians' failure to do so.

Chairman Charles M. Wiener presided over the session on "Slavery Extension and the First Crisis"—close to one hundred years after the controversy that was still in the air after the meeting had adjourned, and the Missouri Crisis behind him half a lifetime or more when he led the Senate restrictionists. He failed to convince commentators that he was wholly disinterested in his opinion of the fact that King had freed himself of election to the Senate, and that the political alignment. In the session on "Martin Van Buren and the Subordination of Partisan Interests," the reporter of Jackson, Brown and Ritchie's Richmond Junto, with its southern views, as a means of reconciliation of North and South that had failed well. Commentator Joseph H. Sweeney's explanation was oversimplified. Van Buren's opposition to the rechartering of the United States Bank were born of a desire to see the

Louis Filler presided over the session on "Intellectual in Twentieth-Century America."

litor interest, enlarge-
and political centrali-
-interest." Both com-
. Ver Steeg, felt that
ic aspects of colonial
epublic, and the anti-
tz suggested that the
pratic but whiggish, a
uch of Ferguson's de-
they feared disunion

' was chaired by Don
animity and the Mar-
the remarkable unity
e Chief Justice's skill
erge his own views in
onal domination of the
per on "Chief Justice
Drawing his illustra-
tained that Taft's ad-
nce, with its vision of
ions of any enduring
ested that both papers
he manner of deliver-
e, owed much to the
on for analytical juris-
ncluding Oliver Wen-
onard Levy, declared
esented oversimplified

icity in the late nine-
o the session on "The
cal evidence, generally
rated that overcapacity
manufacturing among
nes, iron and steel, pe-
the title of his paper,
y, 1877-1898," he ar-
for the cutthroat com-
growth of advertising,

the aggravation of "materialism and status seeking," farm discon-
tent, the dalliance with the rule of reason in judicial decisions, and
the assumption by private business of the conduct of diplomacy so
as to "capture" foreign markets. The first commentator, Alfred D.
Chandler, acknowledged the existence of overcapacity, but argued
that it was a transient feature of wholesome and normal expansion;
it disappeared as big business enterprises developed improved mar-
keting organizations and as the urban market with its novel needs
and resources developed. William Miller, the second commentator,
claimed that the fact of overcapacity was commonplace, that Ginger
had produced no new evidence and dispensed with precise definition,
and that his argument was "frail." A short but spirited discussion
came from the floor. In closing the meeting Chairman Edward C.
Kirkland took issue with some "speculations" Ginger had offered
to explain historians' failure to pay proper attention to overcapacity.

Chairman Charles M. Wiltse reports that those who attended the
session on "Slavery Extension and Northern Statesmanship: The
First Crisis"—close to one hundred in all—were treated to a lively
controversy that was still in progress around the speakers' table long
after the meeting had adjourned. In a paper on "Rufus King, Slav-
ery, and the Missouri Crisis," Robert Ernst argued that King had
behind him half a lifetime of opposition to the extension of slavery
when he led the Senate restrictionists in the Missouri debate. Ernst
failed to convince commentator Shaw Livermore that King was
wholly disinterested in his opposition to slavery; Livermore stressed
the fact that King had freed his own slaves only on the eve of his
election to the Senate, and that he had much to gain from a sectional
political alignment. In the second paper Richard H. Brown argued
that Martin Van Buren subordinated the slavery issue to his own
partisan interests. In the Missouri controversy and later as a sup-
porter of Jackson, Brown maintained, Van Buren, abetted by Thomas
Ritchie's Richmond Junto, was going more than halfway to meet
southern views, as a means of reviving the old Jeffersonian alliance
of North and South that had earlier served the Republican party so
well. Commentator Joseph H. Harrison, Jr., led those who felt that
this explanation was oversimplified, noting by way of example that
Van Buren's opposition to both internal improvements and the
United States Bank were born in New York rather than the South.

Louis Filler presided over the heavily attended session on "The
Intellectual in Twentieth-Century Politics." Charles B. Forcey,

lt and Wilson," argued of Presidents in modern themselves have had on such leaders. Theodore d used intellectuals as . Forcey contended that ain their independence, ping their leaders up to ealing with "The New Kirkendall maintained om intellectuals as he fessors in the adminis- ustrate the uses of the nd reflected the "strong n American higher edu- mmentator Frank Freit- ation of the Presidents . The second commenta- marks were read in his se intellectuals, a small ted to practical politics, ervice and creating liai- ial community.

' was arranged in associ- cial Studies and chaired Council. David D. Van n, and the 'New Age of rk, 1929-1934, of the on the Social Studies commendations reflected istorians: objective test- eachers should have bet- s emphasis on methods. used violent reactions by ollectivism" was emerg- reserve the ideals of De- it that the Commission's hing, while it seemed to he schools; and he con- another major reassess-

ment." Two commentators who had been members of the Commission, George S. Counts and Erling M. Hunt, contended that the Commission's work was more useful than Van Tassel had granted. They thought that the Commission should have paid more attention to the world situation and to the non-Western world, and Counts agreed that the time for a reassessment of the social studies in the schools had arrived. The third commentator, John Higham, observed that the Commission's report reflected the enormous influence of Charles A. Beard on historians. Higham, too, called for a new assessment of history in the schools, but insisted that the greatest need was to communicate the value of history, the philosophical heart of historical feeling.

Paul W. Gates's presidential address, "Tenants of the Log Cabin," was presented at the annual dinner of the Association, and has been printed in the June issue of the *Review*.

In addition to the committee-arranged sessions, five sessions were offered by groups meeting with the Association. The Lexington Group in Railroad History scheduled a session on "Railroad History: New Light and a New Look," under the chairmanship of Howard F. Bennett. Ben H. Procter's paper on "A Step toward Progressivism: John H. Reagan's Fight for Railroad Regulation, 1875-1887," traced the ten-year congressional campaign waged by the ex-Confederate Texan to secure federal legislation that would curb evil railroad practices. Commentator Gerald D. Nash raised questions about Reagan's importance in this campaign, about his motives, and about the relative roles of such leaders and interest groups. The second paper, "Railroad History in the Past Twenty Years: An Appraisal," by Robert L. Peterson, examined the large number of significant scholarly books on railroad history that have appeared in the past decade. Commentator Richard C. Overton called upon historians to pay special attention to the recent and current scene, where fundamental changes in the transportation picture are occurring at almost breath-taking speed.

Arthur P. Dudden's paper, "Swallowing Politicians Alive," was the central feature of a session on "Native Political Humor" arranged by the American Studies Association. After calling the long roll of American political humorists, from Seba Smith to Will Rogers, Dudden asked why "the sustained writing of political humor in the United States is a suspended if not vanished art." "Fear and witch-hunting," he suggested, may have "inspired a conformism

detrimental to humor." Likewise destructive of the tradition, he thought, were "the decline of local individuality in newspapers," "the amalgamation of American speech patterns," and the consequent "waning of dialect comedy." Commentator Walter Blair offered a different explanation. The older humor, he argued, "was based upon the contrast between the way high-falutin educated people missed the truth and the way ignorant people found it by using their horse sense." Today, however, the complexity of the problems facing the country has "led large segments of our population to think far less highly of the insights, the wisdom, even the vernacular phrasings of rural folk." The second commentator, Arthur Link, thought that the tradition was actually dying by Mr. Dooley's day, and that Will Rogers was an anachronism. The chairman of the session, Arthur Bestor, questioned whether political humor was actually as moribund as Dudden thought, and suggested that there had merely been a shift to new forms of humor, especially caricature and cartoon.

Rembert W. Patrick chaired, for the Southern Historical Association, a session on "Controversy and Conflict" that attracted some one hundred auditors. Gerald M. Capers' paper on "The Historian and Morality: Some Recent Interpretations of the Sectional Conflict" appraised the important works on the coming of the Civil War and urged a more critical evaluation of the abolitionists. Malcolm C. McMillan gave a detailed account of "William L. Yancey and History: The Coming of the War," and scolded historians for neglecting this fire-eating author of the Alabama Platform. Commentator James W. Silver compared conditions in the South of 1860 with those of today, and chided the participants for presenting papers written in haste.

Studies on the Left, the radical journal of research and social theory, provided unusual sponsorship for a vigorous discussion of "Sources of Twentieth-Century American Foreign Policy." Warren I. Susman presided, and John W. Rollins read the single paper, on "The Anti-Imperialists and Twentieth-Century American Foreign Policy." In Rollins' view, the anti-imperialists were laissez-faire liberals, who had "molded the ideology of industrial capitalism in the Gilded Age," and who realized that expansion was necessary if the system were to survive. However, they rejected colonialism, realizing that "increased production for an ever-widening mar-

ket was . . . the only solution that would minimize aggressive democratization of liberal expansionism of Kinley until the depression following which it became a part of foreign policy. Both J. McCormick, charge d'affaires, vaguely and unhistorically "legacy" of anti-imperialism warned against confusion of what relevance the League had to American development on the stimulating quality of artificial and unsubstantiated participation in the ensuing effort to clarify American.

An overflow audience session on "Biography and Local Figures," arranged by the American Historical Association and chaired by James L. and Local Figures," was a study of the biographical approach of "grass-roots history" for local affairs. In the company of that biographies "Of glimpses of state and local sources were indispensable." Commentator John A. G. portrayed the family and local that local influence could be related to the larger setting.

Two groups scheduled for E. Worcester presided at the ward Younger spoke on describing his own experience with the American spirit and edge of American civilization.

of the tradition, he
 ality in newspapers,"
 rns," and the conse-
 tor Walter Blair of-
 or, he argued, "was
 falutin educated peo-
 ple found it by using
 exity of the problems
 of our population to
 m, even the vernacu-
 entator, Arthur Link,
 by Mr. Dooley's day,
 e chairman of the ses-
 tical humor was actu-
 gested that there had
 pecially caricature and

ern Historical Associ-
 " that attracted some
 er on "The Historian
 of the Sectional Com-
 ming of the Civil War
 abolitionists. Malcolm
 illiam L. Yancey and
 led historians for neg-
 platform. Commentator
 e South of 1860 with
 for presenting papers

of research and social
 vigorous discussion of
 'oreign Policy." War-
 read the single paper,
 entury American For-
 perialists were laissez-
 of industrial capitalism
 expansion was neces-
 they rejected colonial-
 an ever-widening mar-

ket was . . . the only solution in the ideology of laissez-faire liberalism that would minimize government activity and promote the progressive democratization of society." Rollins maintained that the liberal expansionism of the anti-imperialists was ascendant from McKinley until the depression of the 1930's revealed its bankruptcy, following which it became a disastrous legacy to more recent makers of foreign policy. Both commentators, Harold Brown and Thomas J. McCormick, charged Rollins with defining "anti-imperialism" vaguely and unhistorically, and both questioned his claims about the "legacy" of anti-imperialism to later foreign policy. Brown further warned against confusing rhetoric with reality, and wanted to see what relevance the Lenin-Hobson concepts of imperialism might have to American developments. McCormick congratulated Rollins on the stimulating quality of his suggestions, but felt that they were artificial and unsubstantiated. Several members of the audience participated in the ensuing discussion between Rollins and his critics, in an effort to clarify the specific nature of anti-imperialism in America.

An overflow audience of some eighty people was attracted to the session on "Biography as an Approach to State and Local History," arranged by the American Association for State and Local History, and chaired by James L. Bugg, Jr. Speaking on biography "Of State and Local Figures," Walker D. Wyman described the advantages of the biographical approach to historical study and the value of "grass-roots history" for testing generalizations about national affairs. In the companion paper, Homer E. Socolofsky maintained that biographies "Of National Figures" might provide only glimpses of state and local history, but that state and local historical sources were indispensable in the preparation of such biographies. Commentator John A. Garraty noted the biographer's obligation to portray the family and local background of his subject, but warned that local influence could be overdrawn and that it must always be related to the larger setting.

Two groups scheduled meal sessions with single speakers. Donald E. Worcester presided at the dinner of Phi Alpha Theta, where Edward Younger spoke on "The American Specialist in India." After describing his own experiences in this capacity, Younger outlined the qualities the American specialist should possess: thorough knowledge of American civilization, a willingness to learn all he can about

the host country's civilization, an appreciation for the values of other societies than his own, and the ability to remain affable even under surprising and trying circumstances.

At the luncheon of the Agricultural History Society, with James C. Olson in the chair, a large gathering heard Thomas H. LeDuc discuss "Public Policy, Private Investment, and Land Use in American Agriculture, 1825-1875." LeDuc argued that public land policies, by seeking to transfer the public domain to private ownership as rapidly as possible, operated to retard the development of the interior. Land was placed in private hands more rapidly than it could be utilized, much of it remaining idle in the hands of speculators; capital was diverted to speculative land acquisition; and this locking up of both land and capital seriously retarded a rational application of labor and capital to agricultural development of the magnificent resources of the interior.

The final segment of the program, the alternate sessions arranged by individual members or groups of members, consisted of seven sessions covering various areas of specialized interest.

Morton Borden's paper on "The Antifederalist Mind in American History" was the central feature of a lively alternate session chaired by Robert A. Rutland. Borden argued that faulty interpretations have overlooked the oscillation of the Antifederalists between two mutually incompatible extremes and the continuity of their kind of mentality in American history. On the one hand, he said, they were never quite sure that Americans were unlike the older Europeans whose vices condemned them to wars and anarchy, but at the same time they opposed the Constitution because it would crush liberty before their more optimistic hopes for America could be fairly tested. Borden found the Antifederalists and the radical right of the 1960's akin in their skepticism about secular paradises. Commentator Noble E. Cunningham, Jr., contended that the Antifederalists were consistent opponents of a strong federal structure, and that Borden had "confused the main issue by drawing a picture of extremists wavering between two positions." Furthermore, Cunningham thought that Borden's parallelism between John Randolph and Russell Kirk was "the leap of all time." Commentator Forrest McDonald observed that "while there never was Antifederalism such as Mr. Borden has described it," the paper was nevertheless an interesting stimulus to further study of American political parties. One point at issue was the degree of political interest in the 1780's, with Borden

and Chairman Rutland spread, while Cunningham potential voters were apathetic to correct misunderstandings. Searches showed that Americans in local than national issues, that they did vote in substance, that state-by-state situations that are finally being

At an alternate session over by Jack P. Greene, "The Rise of Progressivism" the dominant intellectual progressive history as having institutions, and his ideas approach steering between distractions; an implicit and derivative from economic relativism which denied the utilitarianism which subjugated the moral and social utility of the conspiratorial process in the play of "real" historical forces in history which stressed the utilitarianism and capitalism. Crowe's characterization of exaggerating general environmental interpretations fail to explain differences between them, but also ignore such conditions, extent of research, and

Elmo R. Richardson presented the history of Conservation." The significance of Federalism in four relationships: between federal administrations and services, between the central services, and between federalized examples of the variety of administration that characterized the

n for the values of
remain affable even

Society, with James
l Thomas H. LeDuc
Land Use in Ameri-
that public land poli-
to private ownership
development of the in-
rapidly than it could
hands of speculators;
tion; and this locking
a rational applica-
ent of the magnificent

alternate sessions arranged
rs, consisted of seven
interest.

alist Mind in Ameri-
ively alternate session
d that faulty interpre-
Antifederalists between
continuity of their kind
ie hand, he said, they
unlike the older Euro-
nd anarchy, but at the
ecause it would crush
America could be fairly
the radical right of the
aradises. Commentator
he Antifederalists were
cture, and that Borden
ture of extremists wav-
Cunningham thought
dolph and Russell Kirk
Forrest McDonald ob-
alism such as Mr. Bor-
less an interesting stim-
l parties. One point at
he 1780's, with Borden

and Chairman Rutland arguing that interest was intense and wide-spread, while Cunningham and McDonald contended that many potential voters were apathetic. From the floor Robert E. Brown sought to correct misunderstandings of his position on this point. His researches showed that Americans in 1787-1788 were more interested in local than national issues, but when they were aroused by the latter they did vote in substantial numbers. Borden suggested, in closing, that state-by-state studies would help answer many of the questions that are finally being asked about Antifederalism.

At an alternate session on "American Historiography," presided over by Jack P. Greene, Charles R. Crowe presented a paper on "The Rise of Progressive History." Emphasizing the influence of the dominant intellectual climate on historians, Crowe characterized progressive history as having: a vivid sense of the place of man, his institutions, and his ideas in the stream of evolution; a pragmatic approach steering between "barren" empiricism and "grandiose" abstractions; an implicit anti-intellectualism which regarded ideas as derivative from economic and geographical forces; an epistemological relativism which denied the possibility of historical objectivity; a presentism which subjugated the past to the present; an emphasis on the moral and social utility of history; a tendency to see politics as a conspiratorial process in which dominant abstractions masked the play of "real" historical forces; and an interpretation of American history which stressed the conflict of agrarian interests with commercialism and capitalism. Commentator John Braeman commended Crowe's characterization of progressive history, but warned against exaggerating general environmental influences on historians. Environmental interpretations of historiography, he suggested, not only fail to explain differences between historians from the same environment, but also ignore such important factors as soundness of assumptions, extent of research, and quality of craftsmanship.

Elmo R. Richardson presided at an alternate session on the "History of Conservation." Lawrence Rakestraw delineated "The Significance of Federalism in Conservation History" with regard to four relationships: between national and state governments, between federal administrations and their "colonial empire" of resource reserves, between the central administrative bureaus and their field services, and between federal and state courts. In each case, he offered examples of the varieties of conflict, compromise, and co-operation that characterized the conservation movement. Gordon B.

Dodds reviewed "The Historiography of Conservation," identifying several themes that are still comparatively undocumented by scholars. Both speakers mentioned many early figures in the movement, especially colleagues and critics of Pinchot, whose roles need evaluation. Commentator J. Leonard Bates urged that conservationists and their opponents be studied with reference to the larger political and economic contexts in which they were involved, and referred to several additional figures, the forester Benton Mackaye and Secretaries of the Interior Walter Fisher and Franklin K. Lane, who need to be studied. From members of the small but room-filling audience came further suggestions about things that demand the attention of conservation historians: soil conservation, conservation in the eastern states, and the voluminous documents available in state archives.

A double alternate session was devoted to "The United States and Latin America." At the morning meeting, Warren K. Dean analyzed the economic troubles of "Cuba in an American Depression, 1926-1934," as arising from that country's one-crop economy and its dependence upon an industrial metropolis, the United States, for disposal of its sugar. In the second paper, Charles L. Stansifer examined the checkered career of "E. George Squier: Versatile *yanqui* in Central America," with emphasis on Squier's versatility. With due respect to Squier's contributions in the field of diplomacy, Stansifer felt that he should be best remembered for his voluminous writings on Central America. Calvin J. Billman, who acted as both chairman and commentator, complimented the speakers on the quality of their papers, and refereed an animated general discussion. Marvin Goldwert opened the afternoon meeting with a paper on "The German-Trained Argentine Army and United States-Argentine Relations during World War II." German influence in the Argentine army opened the way, after 1930, for Nazi ideas of Argentine domination of South America and, during World War II, for a policy of Argentine neutrality, imposed by the dominant military elements and in conflict with the United States policy of hemisphere defense. Chairman and commentator Alfred Barnaby Thomas urged greater attention to the internal political struggle, wherein the military sought to defend their privileged position against liberal and pro-Allied groups. The second paper, by Donald W. Giffin, examined "American Responses to German Economic Penetration in Brazil, 1934-1939." Describing the failure of the United States to

block or alter German American trade advantages in Brazil, while commenting on this paper points: the relation of espionage and smuggling in the United States in securing Brazilian airlines engaged in

A similar double alternate session was devoted to "The United States and Asia." The G. Raymond Nunn's paper dealt with "Opportunities." After describing the state of Asian studies, Nunn's research was American colonial bodies of source material at the University of Washington, the Washington sand reels of microfilm and the many obstacles to Asian administrators, the lack of the public schools, owing to ethnocentricity in scholarship. Commentator, Eugene Boardman, discussed developments in Asian studies. Chairman Ronald Anderson of the University of Illinois for high school teachers' meeting, which focused on missionaries and Asia. Cutcheon's paper dealt with the view that missionaries' economic and political between American missionaries of Wanghchia, the suppression of Confucianism, the missionaries' defense of Confucianism and Christianity, and their commentator Earl Swisher's series as Sinologists and teachers. The second paper, by Pa

nservation," identify-ly undocumented by figures in the move-hot, whose roles need ged that conservation-ence to the larger po-ere involved, and re-ster Benton Mackaye and Franklin K. Lane, the small but room-at things that demand nservation, conserva-s documents available

o "The United States ng, Warren K. Dean an American Depres-ry's one-crop economy olis, the United States, ; Charles L. Stansifer Squier: Versatile *yan-quier's* versatility. With e field of diplomacy, red for his voluminous ran, who acted as both e speakers on the qual- ed general discussion. eting with a paper on . United States-Argen- an influence in the Ar- r Nazi ideas of Argen- ng World War II, for the dominant military es policy of hemisphere Barnaby Thomas urged ggle, wherein the mili- ion against liberal and Donald W. Giffin, ex- conomic Penetration in of the United States to

block or alter German-Brazilian trade agreements that affected American trade adversely, Giffin argued that the situation brought Germany both economic advantages in Europe and political advantages in Brazil, while having adverse economic effects on Brazil. In commenting on this paper, Thomas suggested more attention to two points: the relation between German commercial activities and espionage and smuggling operations; and the interest of the United States in securing Brazilian airfields that had been used by German airliners engaged in German-Brazilian trade.

A similar double alternate session was devoted to "The United States and Asia." The central feature of the morning meeting was G. Raymond Nunn's discussion of "Research Needs and Opportunities." After describing the factors that have heretofore retarded Asian studies, Nunn suggested that the most practical area for research was American contacts with Asia, for which there are excellent bodies of source material: the Missionary Research Library, Tokyo University, the Washington Document Center, and five to six thousand reels of microfilm. Commentator Lawrence Battistini discussed the many obstacles to Asian studies: the disinterest of university administrators, the lack of foundation support, and the disinterest of the public schools, owing to teachers' lack of knowledge and a lingering ethnocentricity in school boards and textbooks. The second commentator, Eugene Boardman, described many promising recent developments in Asian studies at the college and university level. Chairman Ronald Anderson concluded the proceedings by describing the University of Hawaii's one-year program in Asian studies for high school teachers. Patrick Hazard presided at the afternoon meeting, which focused on the relations between American Protestant missionaries and American foreign policy in China. James McCutcheon's paper dealt with the nineteenth century, arguing against the view that missionaries were advance agents for American diplomatic and economic policies. McCutcheon cited the growing friction between American missionaries and diplomats following the Treaty of Wanghia, the support some missionaries gave the Taiping Rebellion, the missionaries' criticism of immigration exclusionists, their defense of Confucianism as a kind of halfway house on the road to Christianity, and their monopoly of Sinology in America. Commentator Earl Swisher emphasized the importance of the missionaries as Sinologists and their concern for Chinese welfare generally. The second paper, by Paul Varg, dealt with the missionary influence

on American China policy in the twentieth century. While the missionaries must share in whatever errors have derived from a moralistic foreign policy, Varg maintained that "the errors in our China policy, if they were errors, were not the errors of the idealists, who actually had very little voice, but they were the errors of the realists." Ronald Anderson, as commentator, observed that both papers indicated the dangers of ethnocentrism in diplomacy as well as in proselytizing. He noted with approval that even missionary schools are now turning out tolerant, sophisticated students, well trained in the culture and language of the areas where they will work.

The program in 1962, as always, would have been impossible without the hard work and co-operation of many people. Besides the participants and the members of the program committee—Selig Adler, John R. Alden, John M. Blum, John H. Kemble, William H. Masterson, David A. Shannon, and James M. Smith—special mention might be made of the session chairmen, who contributed more than may be readily apparent to the vitality of the sessions and who, without a single delinquency, provided promptly the synopses of sessions on which this report is based.

The growing size of our Association and the increasing variety of the specialized interests it embraces may suggest modifications in the nature of our annual programs. Certainly the increased number of sessions provided in 1962 did not prove excessive. It is harder to evaluate our experimental handling of joint and alternate sessions. The alternate sessions were certainly attended to the capacity of the smaller rooms for which they were scheduled, and they seem to have served a useful purpose for those who participated in them; but it is harder to judge whether they fill a widespread need, and they did not this year reach the level of informality that the program committee thought might be fruitful. Chairman Samuel P. Hays and his 1963 program committee plan to continue these experiments in modified form at the Omaha meeting. The thought and interest of the entire membership, as reflected in general comments and in concrete program proposals, will be needed if our programs are adequately to reflect and further stimulate the vitality of scholarship in American history.