PROCEEDINGS.

SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 26, 1899, AT THE HALL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, BOSTON.

THE meeting was called to order by President STEPHEN SALISBURY, and an abstract of the report of the previous meeting was read by the Recording Secretary.

The following members were present:

Edward E. Hale, George F. Hoar, Nathaniel Paine, Stephen Salisbury, Samuel A. Green, Edward L. Davis, Egbert C. Smyth, Edward G. Porter, Charles C. Smith, Edmund M. Barton, Charles A. Chase, Samuel S. Green, Henry W. Haynes, Solomon Lincoln, Andrew McF. Davis, J. Evarts Greene, Henry S. Nourse, William B. Weeden, Reuben Colton, Robert N. Toppan, Henry H. Edes, James P. Baxter, George W. Cable, G. Stanley Hall, John McK. Merriam, William E. Foster, Charles P. Bowditch, Edwin D. Mead, Calvin Stebbins, Francis H. Dewey, Henry A. Marsh, Edward F. Johnson, William De Loss Love, Jr., Rockwood Hoar, James L. Whitney, Thomas C. Mendenhall, Francis C. Lowell, William T. Forbes, Edwin A. Grosvenor, Arthur Lord, George H. Haynes, Waldo Lincoln, John Noble.

The Report of the Council was submitted by Mr. WILLIAM B. WEEDEN, who also read a paper entitled, "The Development of the American People."

The Recording Secretary read a paper giving the different places in which the Boston meetings of the Society had been held, showing that it was now the guest of the American

Academy of Arts and Sciences for the fifty-second and last time. The paper included entertaining extracts from the diary of Christopher Columbus Baldwin, who was librarian of the Society from 1831 to 1835, describing his journeys to Boston to attend the meetings.

President SALISBURY, in behalf of the Council, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary convey to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences the gratitude of the Society for the kindness and hospitality which for so many years has given us the use of the rooms of the Academy for the semi-annual meetings in Boston."

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

The Report of the Librarian was read by Mr. EDMUND M. BARTON.

The Report of the Council was accepted and referred to the Committee of Publication.

On recommendation of the Council, the following new members were admitted to the Society:

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS, of New Haven, Conn.

GEORGE GRENVILLE BENEDICT, of Montpelier, Vt.

ABBOTT LAWRENCE LOWELL, of Boston.

GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP, of Providence, R. I.

ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS, A. M., presented a paper touching on the subject of "Ignominious Punishments."

An essay entitled, "What caused the Deportation of the Acadians?" was read by Hon. JAMES P. BAXTER, of Portland, Me.

Prof. EDWIN A. GROSVENOR, of Amherst College, presented a paper on "American Diplomacy."

Alluding to the extracts from the diary of Librarian Baldwin, Rev. EDWARD G. PORTER said: "It might be interesting to the members to know that the old Mather house is

still standing. It has been the 'Azorean' boarding-house for some time. A fruiterer occupies the ground floor. It is a two-story wooden house, with dormer windows. It was built by Increase Mather immediately after the fire of 1676, which drove him out of his old house in North Square. That house stood where Paul Revere's house now stands. Mather built this house over in Hanover Street, on the west side, just beyond North Bennett Street, and he had quite an extensive garden and orchard around the house. The building has undergone many changes, and you might pass it by without noticing it, as it is overshadowed by larger brick buildings, and occupied by the children of the alien. I have had a very good water-color made of the house, and I should be glad to show it to any member interested in the subject. There were four or five generations of old divines living in this famous parsonage."

Vice-President GEORGE F. HOAR, at the request of Prof. E. Harlow Russell, Principal of the State Normal School at Worcester, presented to the Society a manuscript sermon of the Rev. Dr. Aaron Bancroft, one of the founders of the Society, father of George Bancroft, delivered in the early part of this century, on the occasion of the death of Francis Blake, an eminent leader of the Worcester bar.

Senator HOAR also said:—"I would like to say one word about the matter of our diplomacy. Of course there is no time to enter into that very interesting and broad subject which has been presented. We labor under one or two very serious difficulties, and those are difficulties which make it true that, in general,—I do not speak now of Dr. Franklin and John Adams and the Declaration of Independence,—but in general what we gain by diplomacy is gained not by the skill or energy of the minister abroad who represents us, but grows out of—what we call the logic of events—existing conditions which command the

assent of foreign nations to what we happen to desire. I do not think that astuteness or individual influence has been of much value in the last generation, certainly since I have been familiar with such things, for the last thirty or forty years. There is one other serious thing. England and Russia, and most of the foreign governments, keeping their diplomatic servants in their service without regard to political changes, can wait favorable opportunities to accomplish their diplomatic results. On the other hand, our Secretary of State or ambassador or minister abroad, who has entered with the knowledge of the world upon a negotiation on an important matter, feels that he has made a failure of it, and his brief term of diplomatic service is a failure, unless he sets his name to a treaty. For instance, take the matter now under the observation of all of us. Here is Great Britain who wants to have the Alaskan boundary, where we are entitled to a line of thirty-five miles from the sea, so interpreted as not to follow the coast as Russia has always claimed, and as everybody else has always claimed up to within the last twelve months or thereabouts, but to an artificial line so drawn as to bring her down to tide-waters, where great vessels can go. That is, a general line of that sort will come at some points further inward than our line, parallel with the curvings of the coast, and at other places will bring her out in the open water. What does she want that for? She wants another Halifax or another Esquimault, where she can have a great naval and military port threatening everyone on the Pacific Ocean, but particularly threatening the United States. Then she wants on the other hand, that her fishery industries shall have the advantage of our market in a way which will build up that great interest, and which will destroy our fishery industries, which is one of our greatest interests, and also our great naval school, being for the sailor all that Annapolis is for the officer. Now she comes here and she presses and presses and wants our diplomatic agents to

know that unless they come to something that the matter is going over, and is going to be renewed by England fifteen or twenty years hence, and the same English servants will be there to do it. That is one great difficulty we labor under, and unless we have got a condition of things like that which existed at the time of the great treaty of 1871, when we exacted reparation from England, and when she could not afford to wait any longer, had to send her men over here with instructions to go back with the thing settled somehow,—she gets this great advantage over us.

Then there is another thing which makes us inferior to foreign governments, of which we feel the difficulty in all our diplomacy, and that is the absolute power of our foreign competitors of preserving full confidence and secrecy in their transactions. The government can say what shall be done, and the two parties in England consult each other, stand by each other, and sustain each other in everything pertaining to diplomacy. Here, the President or the Secretary of State or the foreign minister has not only to encounter the jealous and unreasonable criticism of political opponents, but the thing has to be submitted to the Senate and has to get a two-thirds vote. I hope without offence, I will give a single illustration. We had an arbitration treaty negotiated with England a year or two ago, of which I was myself an earnest supporter. That treaty was submitted to the Senate. It was expected if it was adopted to be a model in like treaties between us and foreign governments. It provided among other things, that two justices of our Supreme Court, of whom we have but nine in all, should be members of the tribunal whenever its services were called into requisition. The result of that would have been that while these great international disputes might go on for months or years sometimes, the Supreme Court of the United States would be reduced to a working force of seven. There must be a quorum to support any decision, so that if illness or fee-

bleness from old age, or the death of a person in the family should disable two of the other judges, it would leave great constitutional questions to be decided by a majority of five, and three judges could have decided a constitutional question like that of the Income Tax for instance, if this proposition in that treaty had been adopted. Now there are several other things affecting the general principle of the thing, but I will not detain the Society by going into this matter at this late hour.

You remember well, Mr. President, that when the Geneva treaty was made, there was a clamor all over England, which made it very doubtful whether England would go to Geneva at all. It was only the great skill of Mr. Evarts that got them to go to Geneva. If we had a like treaty with the other great nations of the world, and had arbitrations with three or four of them going on at once, what would become of the Supreme Court of the United States? Suppose we had adopted this treaty, as it was originally proposed, and the first great occasion for putting it in requisition had related to a question about which either nation had for years had intense feeling, that its national honor was at stake, and it had failed in the first attempt to apply it. So you see how important it was to get a clear description of the matters to be submitted. Yet before the papers that accompanied the treaty had been laid on the table of the Senate, three days after it had gone in in the first place, and before the treaty itself without the papers had got back from the Congressional printer, there was a clamor from the press, the pulpit, many humane people, and the peace-loving people of the North to ratify that treaty at once. That is an instance of our difficulty in dealing with diplomacy, and if we are going to enter upon the field of government or of national expansion, which requires us to deal as equals with the trained skill, and secret and quick-acting diplomacy of the great nations of Europe, we have got to have methods

like theirs. We have got to have trained diplomatic servants who know their business, who know the history of diplomacy, who know what is wanted. We have got to have an arrangement which will maintain the secrecy of the transaction until it is completed."

Dr. HALE said the members of the Society had already been reminded that Oliver Cromwell was born on the 25th of April, 1599. It is evidently desirable that a proper commemoration of this day shall be held in New England on the 5th of May, which in New Style represents the beginning of a new century since the birth of this great man. It is understood that our venerable sister, the Massachusetts Historical Society, proposes to summon on some proper day a representation from different historical societies of New England, who may put on record some appropriate testimony of the value of Cromwell's life to the world.

Dr. Hale said that at the proper moment he would move that at such a meeting the officers of the Society represent us, with such additional persons as the President may name for that purpose.

It is evident that on such an occasion we may say that that which will be for many years the standard authority on the life of Cromwell for readers of whatever nation is the book of our distinguished countryman, Mr. Samuel Harden Church, whose studies of the life of the Protector have been careful and accurate. It is to be hoped that Mr. Church may prepare some monograph on the beginning of the fourth century after his birth, on the lines of the article which he has already published. The popular life, by Dr. Clark of Hartford, has already placed Cromwell's name before the younger readers of this country in its proper significance. It is difficult to make such readers understand that their fathers and grandfathers were brought up in an atmosphere tainted by the preju-

dices of Clarendon and of Hume, so that even in an American school, boys and girls were taught that Cromwell was a liar, a blasphemer, a usurper, and everything else that is bad.

In the year 1895, Dr. Clark offered a large and handsome premium for a drama on the life and death of Cromwell which might be suited for the presentation of that hero and his time upon the stage. In the examination of the dramas which were written in this competition, no one of them seemed quite suited for public performance, and the prize, having been intended for that purpose simply, was not awarded. The recent death of one of the most spirited of our younger writers, Mr. Walter Storrs Bigelow, recalls to my own memory the fact that he wrote one of these tragedies,—a poem, as I think, well worth study and memory in any circle of readers who are interested in that great era of history. It is remarkable, indeed, that no dramatist has before this seized on the great experiences of this epoch to bring them before the world in that form which has proved to be the most durable method known to history.

The place of Cromwell in the history of New England is so important that it deserves special consideration. In the letter of John Cotton to him, written in acknowledgment of Cromwell's announcement of the great mercy of the victory at Worcester, Cotton intimates that there had been an early acquaintance between Cromwell and Hooker, the founder of New Haven.

In citing this passage, Carlyle says:

"There are traceable various small threads of relation, interesting reciprocities and mutualities, connecting the poor young infant, New England, with its old Puritan Mother and her affairs, in those years, which ought to be disentangled, to be made conspicuous and beautiful, by the Infant herself now that she has grown big; the busy old Mother, having had to shove them, with so much else of the like, hastily out of her way for the present!"

Our own historians have not failed to refer to the interest which Cromwell always took in New England, and the phrase "The friend of New England," largely used in our own time, is borrowed from one of these writers. His personal connection with New England has not been quite so closely traced as one could wish. The open question whether he meant to come here himself is still undecided. The Prince Society has brought to light the interesting statement that he said he was more afraid of John Wheelwright at football when they were boys than he had ever been since in any of the exigencies of his life. The letter of Cotton preserved by Hutchinson, from an original then in the State House, seems to show that his intimacy with Cromwell dated back to the old days when the relations of the town of Huntington with the city of Boston were close. Cotton says:

"I received the other day a letter from my reverend brother Mr. Hooker of New Haven, who certifieth me that your Lordship made special mention of me in your late letters to him, with tender, loving, and more respectful salutations than I could expect. Withal he moved me to write to your Lordship, as believing that you would accept the same in good part. This is my excuse [for writing] such as it is."

When our distinguished friend Prof. Dexter discovers for us the original correspondence between Hooker and Cromwell, and edits it, with his notes, he will make a valuable addition, not simply to the history of New England, but to the period perhaps most interesting though least known, of the early life of the Protector.

In closing an address to the Historical Society on the 12th of February, 1869, I said:

As time has passed by, the Parliament of England has learned that Oliver Cromwell was never sovereign of that island. In the line of statues of English sovereigns in Parliament House, the eye first rests upon the vacant

space between the image of Charles I. and Charles II. There is no Cromwell there! Yet, if he were not sovereign of England for the ten years after the royal traitor died, it would be hard to say who was. He was not the sovereign of New England in those years. In those years, New England knew no sovereign but her people. But he was the friend of New England, and the friend of her rulers. They loved him, they believed in him, they honored him. He represented the policy which, for ten years, triumphed in Old England, and which has triumphed in New England till this time. Massachusetts is about to acknowledge her debt to Winthrop, which she can never pay, by erecting his statue in the National Capitol. There it is to stand, first among the founders of America; first, where Virginia Dare and John Smith and George Calvert, and even Roger Williams and William Penn, are second. When that obligation is thus acknowleged, Massachusetts may well erect in her own Capitol, face to face with Chantrey's statue of George Washington, the statue which England has not reared, of Oliver Cromwell. It may bear this inscription:—

OLIVER CROMWELL
THIS MAN BELIEVED IN INDEPENDENCE
HE WAS SOVEREIGN OF ENGLAND FOR TEN YEARS
HE WAS THE FRIEND OF NEW ENGLAND THROUGH HIS LIFE.
This statue stands here till the England which
we love, and from which we were born, shall
know who her true heroes were.

We have not yet erected our own statue to Cromwell. The English Parliament House has this year received an admirable bronze statue of him; and I am afraid, therefore, that we must own that for once the slow pace of their tortoise has outrun the swifter intentions of our hare.

It is pleasant to us here to know that in Judge Chamberlain's admirable collection of autographs in the Boston Public Library, is a note, in Cromwell's handwriting, to the Admiralty, in which he gives directions for the fitting out of a strong fleet of twenty vessels. This was in the period of the difficulties with Spain, which will readily be remembered. I am not particularly informed in such matters;

but, judging from Carlyle's book, this fragment must be the last written autograph of Cromwell now known.[1] There are but three later letters, which are the celebrated letters in Latin, written by Milton, with regard to the Piedmontese sufferers, and a letter to the King of France on the same subject. None of these seem to exist in autograph.

Dr. HALE's motion, outlined above, was put and carried.[2]

Upon motion of SAMUEL S. GREEN, it was voted that the papers presented at this meeting be referred to the Committee of Publication to be printed in the Proceedings.

The meeting adjourned at two o'clock, and the members from a distance were entertained by those living in Boston and its neighborhood with a collation at the Parker House.

CHARLES A. CHASE,
Recording Secretary.

---

[1] Since the meeting of the Society, I learn from Judge Chamberlain, that the paper referred to is probably a well executed fac-simile of the original, by Cromwell. E. E. H.

[2] The PRESIDENT subsequently appointed Mr. EDWIN D. MEAD, Mr. JOHN NOBLE and Dr. HALE, as this committee, and under their direction a crowded meeting was held in the First Church of Boston, in commemoration of the great Protector. The service was held on the evening of the 12th of May.