



Ohio Academy of History Newsletter

March 1971

Published Semi-Annually

Vol. 2, No. 1

World History and the Comparative Approach

By Frank F. Wong, Antioch College*

There is one truism about world history and the comparative approach that finds easy acceptance among the majority of academic historians. It is not usually dignified by elaborate argumentation. Rather it is usually expressed by a wince, a grimace, a sigh, a groan, or perhaps a bemused and indulgent smile. For many, in the profession, the world historian or the comparative historian, conjures up the image of easy prey. The specialist in colonial America or medieval Spain or ancient China eagerly awaits the opportunity to dispute the generalities of the world historian or the comparative historian by demonstrating that his factual data in his field (which is often as selective as his prey's) cannot be subsumed under those glittering generalities. Indeed, one could say that there are few subjects on which there is more nay saying among academic historians than world history and the comparative approach.

Yet, for all this nay saying, it is equally evident that both world history and the comparative approach are receiving ever increasing attention within the historical profession. A few years ago, when I was a graduate student, I recall how Toynbee was scorned by my teachers for his presumptuous perspective. Today, at a historian's meeting, I participate in a panel entitled "The Emergence of World History." Last December, at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, John King Fairbank, President of the organization, appealed for collaborative study of American-Chinese relations in a time of world crisis saying "Comparative history is a field of great promise."¹ Recent publications also indicate the trend. The popularity of William H. McNeill's *The Rise of the West*, a kind of revisionist Toynbee approach to world history, is one example. In American history, where resistance to world history and the comparative approach has been strong, a recent book, *The Comparative Approach to American History*, edited by C. Vann Woodward, compared selected aspects of American life to other parts of the world. Among many younger scholars, especially those with New Left sympathies, Barrington Moore's study in comparative history, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, is regarded as a work of major significance. For those with more establishment tendencies, there is C. E. Black's book, *The Dynamics of Modernization: A Study in Comparative*

History. There is even a journal, published since 1958, entitled *Comparative Studies in Society and History*.

The current reluctant acceptance of the importance of world history among academic historians is perhaps an indication of the fact that contemporary history has caught up with the historians if the historians have not yet caught up with contemporary history. It perhaps reflects the gut realization that many of us have that we today no longer live in an American-centered world or a European-centered world or a western-centered world but rather we live in a world-centered America where what happens in Viet Nam has much wider impact upon the life of our nation than what happens in Columbus, Ohio, or London, England. This gut realization is more deeply felt by the young than by those who did not have their formative years conditioned by television bringing Viet Nam and Biafra into the living room or jet airplanes that changed mountains and oceans from geographical barriers to momentary inconveniences. One needs only to observe how the student of today selects his readings and his heroes to understand this point. Today's student is as likely to be inspired by Zen Buddhism as by Meister Eckhardt and to be as impressed by Che Guevara and Mao Tse-tung as by Winston Churchill and Dwight Eisenhower. Nor would it be irrelevant to note the growing impatience of students with conventional academic history, so neatly compartmentalized by geography and period. It does not seem relevant to their world.

So let me argue that world history, as objective phenomena, is with us, even if we are not yet with world history, as recorded narrative. Then the question becomes, how should we, as historians, approach the fact of present world history and the need to re-interpret past history in terms that are consonant with this condition. There are, of course, numerous precedents for universal or world history before those of recent vintage like Toynbee and McNeill. Hegel, Marx, Buckle, and Spengler all in their own ways attempted to synthesize an historical framework that would apply to all men in all times. Each in their own way also failed, sometimes gloriously and sometimes ingloriously. We, with our wonderful historical hindsight, can smugly observe their shortcomings and glaring deficiencies. The 19th century historians in particular, with attempts to emulate the sciences by discovering immutable laws which govern human behavior are proven especially vulnerable by the history that followed them. Even Marx, the

* (Adjudged the best paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Ohio Academy of History, Columbus, Ohio, April 12, 1969)

most durable of them all, proved to be badly in error when he argued that communist revolution would inevitably result in advanced industrial societies; instead communism found its greatest success in undeveloped peasant societies. Spengler's predictions that the West would decline in the ashes of World War One proved to be highly misleading. The West arose from these ashes to create the greater holocaust of World War Two. And out of the ashes of World War Two, the material recovery of the West has been so great that a contemporary world historian, William H. McNeill, could dare to write a book entitled *The Rise of the West*, a not so subtle denial of the Spengler thesis.

It is, perhaps easy to criticize such world histories on methodological or philosophical grounds; that a civilization is not a realistic unit of study or that man does not live by modes of production alone. But there is another shortcoming that often marks these ambitious works. Even the most learned of these historians do not fully succeed in escaping from their western-centered assumptions, and this prevents them from fully or fairly comprehending the dynamics of non-western societies. In this respect, perhaps they accurately reflect a period of history when western civilization has been dominant in world politics and in the creation of an unprecedented technological society. But does it help us to better understand and deal with our contemporary world-in-crisis if we suggest or imply that western civilization is the dominant mode of present and future world history? Or is this merely a more cosmic way of expressing the assumption of John Foster Dulles' Christian crusade against communism and Dean Rusk's insistence that compromising with Hanoi would be another Munich and Lin Piao's rhetorical patriotism is another *Mein Kampf*? And if it is, is that what the world today is all about?

Now what I am trying to say amid all of this rhetoric is that we need to be concerned about studying and teaching world history even though previous efforts to write world history have fallen short. I am also suggesting that perhaps we could reach a sounder basis for world history if it were not, initially at least, attempted on such a cosmic scale; if it were attempted instead on a more limited basis of comparative studies of discreet topics (e.g., Barrington Moore's book, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*). To establish a claim for using the comparative approach in world history is certainly no brilliant insight since comparison is implicit in nearly all world history whether universal or limited in its claims. But I think it is worthwhile to note that much of the same visceral resistance to comparative history in many academic historians comes from the same source as their resistance to world history; namely, the implications and extensions of historicism.

In pointing an accusing finger at historicism, one should not fail to mention that von Ranke, usually considered the father of that tradition, believed in the Ideal of Universal History and in his 86th year embarked on a lifelong ambition to write world history. Thus, it was not von Ranke himself who created barriers to world history and the comparative approach. Rather there were certain assumptions and implications from his work which became shib-

boleths in modern historical scholarship and discouraged an open minded consideration of world history and the comparative approach. There are three such assumptions which I would like to briefly discuss here: 1) the reverence for the irreducible particularity of historical facts and the belief that what is unique is what is most important; 2) the belief that a historian's primary task is to establish the distinctive characteristics of a particular age, culture, or nation, in terms that derive only from that age, culture, or nation itself; 3) the belief that the significance and character of historical phenomena are fully explained when the historical origins of that phenomena are determined.

It would be folly to argue that the contemporary historian should not be concerned with the particularity of facts, the distinctive features of the period and country with which he is most concerned, and the effort to establish the origins of historical developments. But it is also folly to allow such assumptions to blindly lead historical study down the dark alleys of irrelevance when there is before us a generation of young minds quite frankly estranged and alienated from what their elders regard as tradition. The effect of the first assumption is often to assert the priority of information and data over synthesis, generalization, or value judgment. This in turn leads to the unnecessary conclusion that one *cannot* make generalizations beyond those inherent in a particular body of facts and that one certainly cannot make value judgments. Such comparisons would violate the uniqueness of particular facts and since world historians almost always make value judgments, a negative conclusion is inevitable.

In a similar way, the historicist's desire to establish the distinctive characteristics of, say the Jacksonian period in American history or the Victorian period in England, often leads to discouraging interest or sympathy toward world history and the comparative approach. Again, this is not a necessary conclusion but a frequent one. It leads to the view that we can learn little or nothing about the Black revolution in America today by studying African history because American history had a separate development from Africa. A colleague of mine recently told me that he felt more comfortable talking to sociologists or political scientists about their fields than he did talking to other historians about their fields. It is not an uncharacteristic or unrepresentative feeling and perhaps it helps to explain why world history and the comparative approach are more talked about than done among academic historians.

The historian's concern for origins, or what is sometime called "the germ theory of truth," is natural and fitting to his craft but if pursued too rigidly, it results in a kind of narrow tunnel vision that uses nothing but a rear view mirror as a guide. If one is obsessed only with finding the antecedents of a particular historical event, his selective search will take him in a straight line back into time and the generalizations which emerge from such a study will tend to be very narrowly based because of the linear emphasis. We all know the kind of monograph which this leads to, for example, "The History of the Ming Tea Trade on the Northern Frontier 1502-1580." This is not to imply that such monographs are totally use-

less but if they condition an historian's perspective so that he sees only connections stretching across time and none stretching across space, it clearly becomes an impediment to considering world history and the comparative method. Actually there are not a few text book world histories that are written more or less on this basis and they are really little more than a catalogue of separate national histories.

Although it is not immediately apparent, there is something ironic about these three assumptions posing barriers to the study of world history and the comparative approach. Because on closer examination, it would seem that there is no necessary reason why one could not respect the principles embodied in them and at the same time pursue both comparative study and world history. They are not mutually exclusive. Concern for the particularity of events, in fact, rarely is wholly devoid of some kind of generalization. As Louis Gottschalk persuasively argues, even the most zealous practitioner of "the school of the unique," the editor-compiler of documents, engages in some form of generalization as soon as he decides not to include all of the extant documents. According to Gottschalk, there are six categories of generalizations ranging from those who do not admit they make them to those who propound philosophies which explain the destiny of mankind. (The comparative historian ranks fourth in his ascending scale of generalization makers from the most concrete to the most abstract).² The issue, therefore, is not whether one generalizes, but to what degree does one generalize and to what purpose. Certainly the world historian or the comparative historian generalizes more than "the school of the unique" but the real question is whether their generalizations contribute to a better understanding of the problems which our present poses to our past.

Those who fear that comparative history is a threat to the study of the distinctive characteristics of a nation or a period should be reassured. As the distinguished French historian, Mark Bloch, once observed, "It is too often supposed that the method has no other purpose than hunting out resemblances . . . correctly understood, the primary interest of the comparative method is, on the contrary, the observation of differences."³ There is, of course, an obvious fallacy in assuming that comparability means only similarity; in fact, comparisons can yield both similarities and differences. The volume previously cited, *The Comparative Approach to American History*, demonstrates that the application of the comparative method in some areas of American history destroys the myth of uniqueness while in other areas it affirms it. In a similar way, historians who wish to jealously guard the uniqueness of their field may find that they are in fact justified when they consider it within a world framework. And then again they may not.

Much of the reluctance of historians to engage in the broad generalizations required by comparative and world history reflects the suspicion and tension that has long existed between academic historians and academic social scientists. Economists, political scientists, and sociologists have engaged freely in wide ranging comparative studies, many of which seem facile and remotely abstract to the historian. Quite properly, historians have criticized the static

nature of such comparisons and the absence of any sense of development in time. But the historian is under no compulsion to emulate the comparative method of the social scientists. There is no reason why the historian cannot establish comparative relationships in time, define the entities to be compared with care and precision, scrupulously and critically examine the evidence supporting these entities, and then formulate comparative generalizations which do not do violence to the particularity of facts, the uniqueness of an age, or the development of a process. The historian, in short, does not need to lose the individuality of his craft while pursuing world history through the comparative method.

As I review what I have written, I realize that it is little more than nay saying to some of the characteristic nay saying in the profession. This does not seem like much but perhaps one could argue that two nays make a yea. In any case, let me close with a more affirmative statement by the Princeton historian, C. E. Black: "In an age in which mankind as a whole is for the first time being taken seriously as a basis of political, economic and social organization—and also as a basis of organized destruction—one cannot fail to accept the challenge of making the broader generalizations that depend for their validity on comparisons."⁴

Footnotes:

1. John K. Fairbank, "Assignment for the 70's", *The American Historical Review*, LXXIV No. 3, (February 1969), 871.
2. Louis Gottschalk, "Categories of Historical Generalizations", in Louis Gottschalk, ed., *Generalizations in the Writing of History* (Chicago 1963), 113-129.
3. Quoted in C. Vann Woodward, ed. *The Comparative Approach to American History* (New York 1968), 16.
4. C. E. Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization: A Study in Comparative History* (New York 1966), 39.

Interlibrary Loan Service Improved for History Researchers

Since July 1, 1969, all incoming interlibrary loan requests from the Inter-University Library Council (IUCL) member institutions have been turned over to IUCL-RAILS (Reference and Interlibrary Loan Service). The IUCL-RAILS was established to increase the availability of the collections of the Ohio State University Libraries to students and faculty at other state-assisted universities. RAILS is an addition to IUCL's existing interlibrary loan channels which provides 24-hour processing of interlibrary loan requests and other previously unavailable services. The other improved services include simplification of forms and record-keeping, attention to subject requests as well as known-item requests, extensions of interlibrary loan privileges to undergraduates, greater use of the telephone to expedite loans, verification of incoming requests when necessary, provision of other locations for items not available at O.S.U., and assisting faculty and students of member institutions visiting the O.S.U. campus in using the collections of the O.S.U. Libraries.

IUCL-RAILS accepts requests by mail, telephone, teletype, or in-person. Those requests which can be filled with items from the collections housed in the O.S.U. Main Library are generally processed within one working day of receipt. When items are in one of the department libraries, at least one additional day is needed for delivery of the item to IUCL-

RAILS. Use of the telephone rather than campus mail for such requests has helped to expedite the final processing of the requests.

For those requests that cannot be filled because items are in use, missing, or not owned by the Ohio State Libraries, an attempt is made to find other locations where the requesting library might borrow an item even to the point of teletyping a query to the Library of Congress, Union Catalog Division. Responses are then communicated to the requesting library.

The demand for these services expanded until the campus disturbances decreased efficiency, but it is hoped that budget allotment of student hours will help to alleviate the problem.

One of the most interesting and rewarding aspects of the IUCL-RAILS services is the flexibility which it affords special requests. Because an attempt has been made to keep the units as unstructured as possible, particular attention can be given to urgent requests and also to those falling outside the usual confines of interlibrary loan activity. This capability to give service where most needed is the essence of the system.

Hartje Heads A.A.S.L.H. Bicentennial Project

In the late spring of 1970 the National Endowment for the Humanities awarded a major grant (\$37,050) to the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH) for a study of how local historical societies could best develop effective programs to commemorate the Bicentennial of American Independence. Professor Robert Hartje, Chairman of the Wittenberg University History Department and a long-time member of the Ohio Academy of History, was named Project Director. Hartje and eight other historians form a committee which is to work out a publication for use by historical societies in planning bicentennial observances.

The committee has decided to have four major divisions in the manual. The first section will cover the philosophy and meaning of the Revolutionary period in American History. In the second chapter, centennial celebrations of the past will be reviewed in depth with emphasis on the long-range success or failure of each project. The third part of the book will suggest projects, publications, or television programs which would help communities to commemorate the period of the Revolution. The fourth section is still under study, but it will deal with projects for high school students.

In addition to library research, field work is underway to gain an impression of centennial preparations in various states. A questionnaire is being sent out to some 350 state and local historians to help gather details for the manual.

The entire project is intended to define ways in which existing historical organizations can best utilize their collections in commemorative events and to realize educational benefits from the national celebration. It is hoped this commemoration will be especially meaningful on the local scene and involve many Americans.

New Course in Quantitative History at B.G.S.U.

Bowling Green State University's History Department began a new course entitled "Introduction to Quantitative History" in the Spring of 1970-71. Taught by Drs. James Graham and Don Rowney, it is open to advanced majors and interested graduate students who wish to familiarize themselves with some of the new trends in historical methodology.

The first half of the course is devoted to a critical examination of the theoretical and conceptual foundations of the quantitative approach to historical study. While the overall emphasis is placed on the general relationship between history and the other social sciences, opportunity is provided to review some of the more recent work in the areas of elite and social mobility studies, content analysis, historical demography, and legislative and electoral voting behavior.

The second part of the course is organized around a laboratory experience in which students have an opportunity to apply quantitative methods to the analysis of a limited range of concrete historical problems. Students are introduced to some of the simpler statistics currently used in quantitative historical inquiry. They are also invited to become more familiar with some of the packaged programs used in the computer analysis of historical data. Professors Rowney and Graham see the course as providing a unique blend of theoretical and practical experience in a rapidly growing area of historical training.

Deaths

Miami University
William E. Smith, Emeritus

Retirements

University of Cincinnati
Joseph E. Holliday, Professor of History and Associate Dean, Arts and Sciences, July, 1970
Kent State University
Leon S. Marshall, English and History

Leaves of Absence

University of Akron
Howard S. Reinmuth, Jr., Spring quarter in England
University of Cincinnati
Herbert Shapiro, Fall quarter
James Laux, Fall quarter in France
Donald Bradeen, Fall quarter
University of Dayton
Edward J. Gorie
Raymond J. Maras
Miami University
Ronald E. Shaw
Wittenberg University
Robert Hartje, two years at American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, Tennessee

New Faculty

- University of Akron
 Professor Raymond Maras, French Revolution
 Associate Professor Daniel Nelson,
 U. S. (Economic and Business History)
 Assistant Professor Roger H. Grant,
 U. S. (Populist-Progressive Era)
- Bluffton College
 Von Hardesty, Ph.D. Candidate at O.S.U.,
 Russian History
- University of Cincinnati
 Gary E. Geisler, 20th Century Spanish History
 Gary C. Ness, Recent U. S. History
- University of Dayton
 Charles VanTuyl, Mongolia
 Loren Gannon, American Military History
 George W. F. Hallgarten, President's Scholar,
 One year
- Kent State University
 Dr. George Balsama, Early Modern Europe
 Mr. Gerald Newman, 19th Century Britain
 Mr. Jerome Friedman, Reformation Era
- Miami University
 Maynard W. Swanson, African History
 Robert A. Gelwick, Europe (Middletown
 Branch)
 William Brinker, U. S. Diplomatic History
 Philip Swartz, U. S. Survey (Hamilton Branch)
 Robert DeGross, Western Civilization
 (Hamilton Branch)
- The Ohio State University
 Michael Benedict, U. S. Constitutional History
 Myron W. Hedlin, Soviet History
 Peter Hoffer, U. S. Intellectual History
 John Rothney, French History
 Merritt R. Smith, U. S. Technology
 Warren Van Tine, U. S. Labor History
- Wittenberg University
 Wade Wilkison, Far Eastern History
- Wright State University
 Dr. Victor Sutch, Tudor-Stuart England
 Dr. Harold Hollingsworth, American
 Constitutional

Promotions

- University of Akron
 David C. Riede to Professor
 J. M. Mushkat to Associate Professor
 J. W. Baker to Assistant Professor
- Baldwin-Wallace College
 Dr. George Grame to Associate Professor
- University of Cincinnati
 Daniel Beaver to Professor
 Gene Lewis to Professor
 Vsevolod Slessarev to Professor
- University of Dayton
 Gad Soffer to Associate Professor
- Miami University
 Herbert L. Oerter to Associate Professor
- The Ohio State University
 Robert Chazan to Associate Professor
- Wittenberg University
 Cynthia Behrman to Associate Professor
 Albert Hayden to Professor
- Xavier University
 Dr. Roger Fortin to Associate Professor

Notable New Library Acquisitions

- University of Akron
 Adams Papers (1639-1889), Microfilm edition
 Camden Society, New Series, Vols. 1-62, 1871-
 1901
 Catholic Historical Review, Vols. 1-17, 1915-1932
 Church History, Vols. 1-30, 1932-1961
 Church Quarterly Review, Vols. 1-40, 1875-1895
 Crisis, Vol. 1, 1910- inc. v. 47, 48, 50, 52, 53,
 56, 68, 71, 73
 Early American Imprints, 1st series, 1639-1800,
 Readex Microprint
 Early American Imprints, 2nd series, 1801-1819,
 Readex Microprint
 Glotta: zeitschrift fur griechische und
 lateinische sprache, Vols. 1-30, 1909-1943,
 indexes vols. 1-20
 Hermes: Zeitschrift fur Klassische Philologie,
 Vols. 1-79, 1866-1944
 Landmarks of Science, Readex Microprint
 Pacific Historical Review, Vols. 1-30, 1932-1961
 Revue des etudes grecques, Vols. 1-25, 1888-1912
 Studi Etruschi, Vols. 1, 3-10, 22, 23, 32-34
 Surtees Society, Publications, Vols. 2, 32, 38,
 112, 242
- Cincinnati Historical Society
 Zalka Peetruza and other poems by Raymond
 Garfield Dandridge (Cincinnati Negro
 poet), 1882-1930
 Mss., pamphlets, drawings, paintings, etc. from
 Melrose Pitman, including material of
 Elizabeth Nourse
 Letters and documents of Louis Reyfuss, cover-
 ing Cincinnati Horticultural Society, Ger-
 man Revolution of 1848, Cincinnati wine
 industry, 1847-1855
 Nast Family papers
 Little Miami Railroad Company, 1895 history
 of 200 pages
 William Howard Taft - Howard Hollister
 correspondence
 125 scrapbooks of The Cincinnati Conservatory
 of Music
- University of Dayton
 Judge Lester L. Cecil gift of 920 books on
 U. S. Presidents and Chief Justices
- College of Steubenville
 Loeb Classics, 444 volumes, in Greek and
 Latin with English translations
- Western Reserve Historical Society
 Newton D. Baker (1871-1937), Letters, 1891,
 1897, 1902-1904, 1906, 1915-1937, one linear
 foot
 Quincy A. Case Family, Diaries, 1864-1871,
 1903, 9 vols.
 Cleveland Development Foundation, Records,
 1954-1969, 120 linear feet
 John S. Ellen, Journal, 1861-1864, 1 vol.
 Euclid Innerbelt Assoc., Records, 1961-1968,
 ½ linear foot
 George Armstrong Garretson (1844-1916),
 Papers, ca. 1897-1916, 1½ linear feet
 Goodrich Social Settlement, Records, 1897-1960,
 6 linear feet
 Samuel Huntington (1765-1817), Letters, 1801-
 1817, 148 items

Independent Order of Good Templars, Collinwood Lodge No. 13, Cleveland, Records, 1880-1882, 3 vols.

Indiana, Morgan Raid Commission, Journal, April 4-October 22, 1867, 1 vol.

Charlotte S. Lewis, Diaries, 1870-1891, 16 vols.

Hendrick E. Paine Family, Papers, 1788-1941, 4 linear feet

William Robertson and Sons, Utica, Licking County, Records, 1831-1833, 1838-1840, 5 vols.

U. S. War Department, Intelligence reports, 1917-1921, 18 vols.

Wheelock & Osborn, Bedford, O., Records, 1857-1862, 4 vols.

George Magoffin Humphrey (1890-1970), Papers, 1922, 1929, 1948, 1950-1970, 5 boxes

Wright State University

British Parliamentary Papers (Canada)

Diplomatic Correspondence, Dispatches and Instructions (U. S. and Latin America, 1810-present)

Informal B.G.S.U. Survey of Undergraduate and Graduate Student Attitudes

Multiple Choice: Encircle the letter preceding the answer with which you most closely agree. If you agree with more than one answer, mark only the one with which you agree most strongly.

- Of the following people, I most admire: a. Robert Kennedy, b. Jerry Rubin, c. Richard Nixon, d. Timothy Leary.
- Marijuana: a. is a dangerous drug, b. should be legalized, c. is part of a general radical plot to take over the United States, d. should not be legalized until more scientific information is collected about its side effects.
- Democracy: a. is the only form of government which is morally right, b. is an outmoded form of government which should be replaced as soon as possible, c. has its weaknesses as a form of government, but at the present it is the best available, d. places too much confidence in the uneducated masses.
- My attitude towards the term "free love" may best be characterized with the term (or phrase): a. disgust, b. indifference, c. acceptable for those who are mature enough for it, d. enthusiasm.
- The tragedy at Kent State University may largely be attributed to: a. repressive state government, b. nervous National Guard troops, c. radical agitators from outside Kent State, d. irresponsible students.
- The war in South Viet Nam is: a. necessary to prevent the spread of world Communism, b. a tragic blunder for which no one in particular is to blame, c. the natural result of Conservative rule in the nation, d. the result of the imperialism of the United States government.
- Our environment: a. is not a problem, b. is in poor shape, but we will gradually overcome the problem, c. is in critical danger, d. is doomed because of our highly industrialized and capitalistic society.
- Which of the following events do you feel has most shamed and embarrassed the United States?: a. the Woodstock music festival, b. the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago, c. the Viet Nam War, d. the fad of burning draft cards.
- Ohio House Bill 1219 is: a. a highly repressive document, b. a necessity in these times, c. the result of unwarranted panic on the part of the over-30 age group, d. a bill about which I am unfamiliar.
- The country most likely to bring on a third World War is: a. Russia, b. the Arabs and Israel, c. Red China, d. United States.

Survey Class	Sophomore Level		Total	Senior Level		Total	
	Class	Class		Class	Class		
1. A	47	13	60	6. A	11	0	11
B	0	0	0	B	36	9	45
C	11	4	15	C	2	2	4
D	0	1	1	D	11	7	18
Omit	5	3	8	Omit	3	3	6
2. A	5	0	5	7. A	0	0	0
B	17	8	25	B	13	8	21
C	0	0	0	C	47	9	56
D	41	13	54	D	3	3	6
Omit	0	0	0	Omit	0	1	1
3. A	2	0	2	8. A	1	1	2
B	1	1	2	B	17	3	20
C	55	18	73	C	36	13	49
D	2	0	2	D	7	0	7
Omit	3	2	5	Omit	2	4	6
4. A	13	1	14	9. A	7	8	15
B	10	8	18	B	11	3	14
C	37	11	48	C	32	6	38
D	1	0	1	D	8	2	10
Omit	2	1	3	Omit	5	2	7
5. A	8	5	13	10. A	2	0	2
B	23	12	35	B	26	5	31
C	17	0	17	C	30	12	42
D	0	1	1	D	3	1	4
Omit	15	3	18	Omit	2	3	5

"Sophomore Level Class" included about 25% Freshmen, Juniors and Seniors, 75% Sophomores.

"Senior Level Class" included about 10% Juniors, 10% Graduate Students, 80% Seniors.

Minutes of the Annual Meeting Saturday, April 4, 1970, Columbus, Ohio

The meeting was called to order in the South Terrace of the Ohio Union at 1:05 P.M. by President Robert Twyman. Since the minutes of the annual meeting of April 12, 1969, were printed in the newsletter of the Academy, the reading of these minutes was dispensed with. The Treasurer's report was read and approved. This report showed a balance of \$566 on hand as of April 4, 1970. The Secretary-Treasurer also commented briefly on the Speakers' Bureau established this year and the availability of speakers via this bureau.

Professor Beauregard presented the report of the Membership Committee which showed a gratifying increase in membership due to the efforts of his committee both as to regular and graduate student memberships. Professor Dante presented a brief re-

port for the Committee on Standards. Professor Givens submitted for the Nominating Committee the following slate of officers for 1970-1971: President, Richard W. Smith (Ohio Wesleyan); Vice-President, George W. Knepper (University of Akron), and Secretary-Treasurer, Carl G. Klopfenstein (Heidelberg College). He moved that the nominations be closed and that the Secretary cast a unanimous ballot for the slate. This was so ordered by a vote of the membership.

Professor Arthur Steele announced for the Committee on Awards that the Academy Award for 1969-1970 went to Professor Warren F. Kuehl of the University of Akron for his book, *Seeking World Order: The United States and International Organization to 1920*.

President Twyman then introduced Professor Richard W. Smith who delivered the incoming presidential address, entitled, "The Ohio Democratic Press and Civil War Issues."

Following this address, President Twyman presented three proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Ohio Academy of History. Amendment I provided for the replacement of the Executive Committee with an Executive Council of seven members to consist of the officers of the Academy, the retiring president of the Academy, and three members elected by the membership at-large to serve staggered terms. The amendment also spelled out the duties and powers of this council. Amendment II provided for the distribution of the assets of the Academy in the event of its dissolution. Amendment III provided for the awarding at the annual meeting of an Award for Outstanding Historical Publication and an Award for Distinguished Service to the Historical Profession.

Following discussion on these amendments including some debate on the clause in the Constitution in re honorary memberships, the Academy adopted the three amendments by voice vote. The meeting was then adjourned.

The results of the balloting for the three elected members of the newly-constituted Executive Council of the Academy were as follows: James R. Rodabaugh (Miami University), one-year term; G. Wallace Chessman (Denison University), two-year term, and Eugene Murdock (Marietta College), three-year term.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl G. Klopfenstein
Secretary-Treasurer

The Treasurer's report is as follows:

Receipts

Balance on Hand—April 7, 1970	\$ 566.00	
Luncheons—151 @ \$3.00	453.00	
Registration—31 @ \$1.00	31.00	
Interest on savings account	12.72	
Sale of Books	240.12	
OAH membership—1 @ \$1.00 (completion of payment)	1.00	
OAH memberships—96 @ \$3.00	288.00	
OAH student memberships—6 @ \$1.50	9.00	
Joint OAH-OHS memberships— 106 @ \$2.00	212.00	
Total receipts	1,812.84	1,812.84

Expenditures

Zaner-Bloser (for plaque)	\$ 27.90	
Postage	18.96	
Ohio Union	500.50	
Wood County Printing	368.89	
Internal Revenue Service	194.91	
Good Office Supply	5.10	
Tiffin Savings Bank	.75	
Total expenditures	1,117.01	1,117.01
Balance on Hand—January 1, 1971		695.83

Program

Annual Spring Meeting

April 3, 1971

THE SHERATON INN

(Junction Interstate 71 and Route 161)
COLUMBUS-WORTHINGTON, OHIO

8:45 A.M.	Registration	Main Lobby
8:45-9:45 A.M.	Coffee Hour	Mezzanine
8:45-4:00	Book Exhibit	Mezzanine

MORNING SESSION

9:45 A.M.

- European and American: *Religious Ferment* Parlor Two
W. M. Southgate (Denison University), Chairman
John C. Stalnaker (University of Cincinnati),
"Anticlericalism in German Protestant Territories during the Early Reformation Period: The Case of Hesse"
Don R. Gerlach (University of Akron), "Champions of an American Episcopate: Samuel Johnson of Stratford and Thomas Secker of Canterbury"
William H. Kenny III (Kent State University), Commentator
Harold Grimm (Ohio State University), Commentator
- American: *New Deal* Parlor One
Paul McStallworth (Wright State University), Chairman
John L. Nethers (Ashland College), "Simeon D. Fess: An Old Guard Republican Looks at the New Deal"
Ronald A. Mulder (Muskingum College), "The Insurgent Progressives in the United States Senate, 1933-1939: A Case Study of the Interrelationships Between Progressivism and the New Deal"
Bernard Sternsher (Bowling Green State University), Commentator
- Middle Eastern: *Diplomacy* Parlor Three
Gifford B. Doxsee (Ohio University), Chairman
William L. Shorrock (Cleveland State University), "France in Syria and Lebanon, 1900-1914: Pre-War Origins of the Mandate"
Gad Soffer (University of Dayton), "The Palestine Entity and the United States"
James B. Gidney (Kent State University), Commentator

4. American: *Revolution* Parlor Four
Virginia Platt (Bowling Green State University),
Chairman
Peter Hoffer (Ohio State University), "The True
Causes of the Late Rebellion: Loyalist His-
torians View the Causes of the American
Revolution"
Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State University),
"The Consensus of 1789: Jefferson and Hamil-
ton on American Foreign Policy"
Kenneth Keller (Ohio University), Commentator
5. European and Asian: *Revolution and Anarchism*
..... Parlor Five
Joseph D. Lewis (Central State University),
Chairman
Martin Berger (Youngstown State University),
"Engels, Armies, and the Tactics of Revolu-
tion"
Marilyn Kay McCullough (Antioch College),
"The European Origins of Chinese Anarchism"
Ivan Scott (University of Toledo), Commentator
6. American: *Moderation and Race*
..... Main Dining Room
Robert E. Bader (Mount Union College), Chair-
man
Richard J. Thomas (Baldwin-Wallace College),
"Whig Pleas for Moderation: Thomas B. Ste-
venson, Cincinnati Editor, 1847-1849"
Michael Les Benedict (Ohio State University),
"The Rout of Radicalism: The Election of 1867
in Ohio"
Larry Gara (Wilmington College), Commentator
- 12:00 Noon Luncheon Parlors One and Two
Luncheon Speaker
George W. Knepper (University of Akron)
"Burgoyne for the Prosecution"
- 1:00 P.M. Business Meeting and Presentation of
Awards
Presiding, Richard W. Smith (Ohio
Wesleyan University)

AFTERNOON SESSION

2:00 P.M.

1. European: *British* Parlor Three
Albert A. Hayden (Wittenberg University),
Chairman
Ronald Pollitt (University of Cincinnati), "Henry
VIII and the Founding of the Admiralty: A
Microcosm of the 'Tudor Revolution in Gov-
ernment'"
Clayton Roberts (Ohio State University), "Sir
Henry Neville and the Origins of Parliamen-
tary Undertaking (1600-1614)"
Barrett Beer (Kent State University), Commen-
tator
2. American: *Foreign Policy* Parlor Four
Robert Freeman Smith (University of Toledo),
Chairman
Alfred E. Eckes, Jr. (Ohio State University),
"Second Chance: Economic Dimensions of Am-
erican Post-World War II Planning"
John Gaddis (Ohio University), "The Past as Pro-
logue: The American Vision of the Postwar
World, 1941-1945"
Joseph May (Youngstown State University),
Commentator

Notice of Annual Fall Meeting

October 15-16, 1971

University of Cincinnati and Xavier University,

Cincinnati, Ohio

The Ohio Academy of History Newsletter

Vol. II March 1971 No. 1

Published semi-annually by The Ohio Academy
of History. Mail correspondence, manuscripts,
and news items to The Editor, Kenneth E. Davi-
son, Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio 44883.

OAH OFFICERS

President, Richard W. Smith, Ohio Wesleyan Uni-
versity; Vice-President, George W. Knepper, Uni-
versity of Akron; Secretary-Treasurer, Carl G.
Klopfenstein, Heidelberg College; Executive
Council: Robert W. Twyman, Bowling Green
State University; James R. Rodabaugh, Miami
University; G. Wallace Chessman, Denison Uni-
versity; Eugene Murdock, Marietta College. Sub-
scription to the OAH Newsletter is included in
the OAH membership fee.