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ABSTRACT

John Franklin Jameson was one of the most important of American historians. As a writer, teacher, editor of the American Historical Review, Director of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, he had an impact on historical research and writing in the United States that is not yet fully appreciated. This dissertation focuses on one facet of Jameson’s activities, his attempt to enhance federal support of historical undertakings. Jameson’s work as a lobbyist for historical enterprises falls into two categories. First, he tried to get the federal government to improve the quality and increase the quantity of its documentary historical publications. Second, he worked for the creation of a national archives building in Washington.

Jameson’s efforts on behalf of documentary historical publications had a mixed fate. Early in the twentieth century, he waged a lengthy campaign for the creation of a national historical publications commission. Despite a promising start, this campaign was unsuccessful. Somewhat later, Jameson tried to get the government to publish historical records relating to the Treaty of Ghent and the
American Revolution. The proposal to commemorate the Treaty of Ghent never got off the ground. Although Congress appropriated a small amount of money to begin publishing Revolutionary records, it failed to provide funds to complete the project. During the 1920's, Jameson turned his attention to the historical publications of the State Department; he tried to get that department to publish a new Historical Register, to speed up publication of the Foreign Relations series, and to publish a series of instructions from American secretaries of state to American ministers abroad. Although officials of the State Department generally were unresponsive to Jameson's specific suggestions, in the late 1920's and early 1930's the Department somewhat expanded its publication program.

Jameson's greatest success with documentary historical publications came in the 1920's. After a long campaign by Jameson, Congress in 1929 approved publication of a series known as The Territorial Papers of the United States. The Territorial Papers, a publication of great value to historians of the West, still is being issued. Also in the 1920's, Jameson helped to secure funds to complete editorial work on the Library of Congress' edition of The Journals of the Continental Congress. Finally, in 1925 Jameson proposed to one of his friends in Congress that the government publish a new edition of the Writings of George Washington
to help commemorate the bicentennial of Washington's birth. Congress approved Jameson's plan, and the series was completed in 1944.

Jameson's campaign on behalf of an archives building was longer and more intense than his other lobbying efforts. Jameson began to work for an archives building in 1907. In acts of 1913 and 1916, Congress authorized construction of the building. From 1916 through 1926, Jameson tried to get Congress to appropriate funds to purchase a site and begin construction. Congress finally approved the necessary money in 1926. After the archives building was assured, Jameson advised governmental officials on matters of construction and on the creation of a suitable administrative establishment for the archives.
CHAPTER I

"A GATHERER AND DISPOSER OF OTHER MEN'S STUFF"¹

"... I could never be an excellent historian, [and] I am not a first-rate teacher" lamented John Franklin Jameson to his intimate friend Francis A. Christie in the spring of 1903. The Carnegie Institution of Washington had failed to choose Jameson as director of its Bureau (later called the Department) of Historical Research, and Jameson was depressed. While Jameson deprecated his abilities as a writer and teacher, he felt that his singular talents "in the direction of Heuristik" qualified him for the post.² Self-pity was uncharacteristic of Jameson, but self-disparagement was not. Both during and after his tenure as a college professor, Jameson often expressed the conviction that he fell short as an instructor and that he never would make his mark as a great writer.³


²Jameson to Christie, March 6, 1903, ibid., 85-86.

³Elizabeth Donnan, "Introduction" to ibid., 2-3, here-
Jameson, in fact, underestimated his capacity to shape both students and the written word. Former pupils, such as Charles H. Haskins and Abraham Flexner, considered Jameson to have been the decisive person in shaping their scholarly talents. As a token of appreciation for his help and guidance, a group of scholars that included Woodrow Wilson, Frederick Jackson Turner, and Charles McLean Andrews presented "Professor Jameson" with a Tiffany clock on his fiftieth birthday. Jameson's writings were broad in scope and substantial in number; his best known work, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*, still is used in university courses. Nevertheless, Jameson is best remembered neither as teacher nor as writer. His most lasting accomplishments lay in other domains. The many


4n. 516, *ibid.*, 301; and n. 8, *ibid.*, 305.


faceted nature of Jameson's life merits some attention.  

Jameson was born on September 19, 1859, in Somerville, Massachusetts. He prepared for college at Roxbury Latin School in West Roxbury, Massachusetts, being graduated in 1874. Although Jameson was admitted to Harvard University at the age of fifteen, his family decided that he should spend some time out of school. The following year, 1875, his father moved to the town of Amherst, Massachusetts, and Jameson, to his great disappointment, entered the college of the same name. During his freshman year, Jameson decided "to devote his life to the study of history."

After being graduated in 1879, his next logical step was graduate study in Europe. Financial limitations, however, precluded study abroad. Jameson instead accepted a teaching position at Worcester, Massachusetts High School. After one year, the administration terminated his employment, to the apparent satisfaction of both parties concerned.

At the urging of historian Herbert Baxter Adams, a resident of Amherst, Jameson began graduate study at The Johns Hopkins University, where Adams was chairman of the history department, in 1880. Two years later, Jameson

received the first Ph.D. in history awarded by that institution. Jameson spent the next six years as an instructor at Hopkins; during that time, he participated in the founding of the American Historical Association.

In 1888, Jameson joined the faculty of Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. At Brown, as at Hopkins, Jameson undertook several pieces of "hack work" to supplement his income. On the other hand, while at Brown, Jameson laid the foundations for some lasting historical works. In 1895, he became managing editor of the *American Historical Review*; in that capacity, he helped to insure that the newly founded journal would be one of scholarly excellence. Also in 1895, he helped to initiate and became chairman of the American Historical Association's Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Jameson temporarily abandoned editorship of the *Review* in 1901, when he became chairman of the history department at the University of Chicago. The years at Chicago were less than idyllic, and when the directorship at the Carnegie Institution became open in 1903 Jameson hoped that he would be able to secure it. Jameson's distress over failing to get the job was compounded by the fact that he had played a prominent role in formulating programs.

---

8For some sources of Jameson's dissatisfaction, see Donnan, "Introduction," 6.
for the Carnegie Institution's historical bureau.\textsuperscript{9} During the first two years of the Bureau's existence, Jameson was an invaluable adviser to Director Andrew C. McLaughlin. Then, in 1905, McLaughlin resumed his teaching career, and Jameson seized the opportunity to replace him.

Both personal and professional motives explain Jameson's desire to head the Bureau of Historical Research. As indicated, Jameson felt that neither teaching nor writing were his forte; rather, he believed that he could best excel in the area of historical spadework. In addition, Jameson was convinced that the growing historical profession needed not only brilliant writers, but also individuals who would bring together the historian and his raw materials.\textsuperscript{10} Jameson thus became a historical "powder monkey," who passed "forward ammunition for others to fire off."\textsuperscript{11}

As head of the Department of Historical Research, Jameson played an unparalleled role preparing what he termed historical "bricks."\textsuperscript{12} Under his supervision, the staff of the Department produced such documentary historical publications as The Letters of the Members of the Continental

\textsuperscript{9}See Jameson to Daniel Coit Gilman, February 14, 1902, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 79-82.

\textsuperscript{10}Jennings B. Sanders particularly emphasizes this motive. Jennings B. Sanders, Historical Interpretations and American Historianship (Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press, 1966), 59-60.

\textsuperscript{11}Jameson to Wilbur C. Abbott, October 6, 1924, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 302.

\textsuperscript{12}Jameson to Henry Adams, October 31, 1910, \textit{ibid.}, 136.

Under Jameson's direction, the Department met a number of other historical needs. One of Jameson's duties was to edit the American Historical Review, and he continued to infuse that journal with standards of excellence. The Department also served as a clearinghouse for persons who had any hint of interest in history. Jameson's correspondents ranged from grade school students to elderly scholars, who sought advice on equally diverse topics. So extensive was Jameson's correspondence that he once observed of a rare letter worth several thousand dollars: "It is absurd that any man's letters should be so highly valued on account of mere rarity. I know well that I am constantly diminishing the value of mine. . . ."  

During his years at the Carnegie Institution, Jameson  

---

13For progress on the various publication projects, see ibid., passim; and Jameson's reports in the Year Books published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington.  

was involved in a variety of other historical pursuits. He was a leading member of the AHA, serving as president, chairman of numerous committees, and adviser in planning the annual meetings. He engaged in a constant search for funds to prepare the annual bibliography, *Writings on American History*. He played a crucial role in obtaining funds for inauguration of the *Dictionary of American Biography* in 1928 and, then, in seeing it to completion in 1936.

In 1927, Jameson found that he would be expected to retire from the Carnegie Institution in two years. He also discovered that the Department of Historical Research was going to be phased out so that more money could be devoted to the study of Mayan civilization. Although retirement was impending and the Carnegie Institution had decided to put "'First Americans First,'" Jameson's life as an historian would not end at the age of seventy. Herbert Putnam, the Librarian of Congress, offered Jameson the position of Chief of the Division of Manuscripts. Jameson resigned from the Carnegie Institution and in September, 1928, embarked upon a new career.

His severance of formal ties with the Carnegie Institution and his advanced age now somewhat limited Jameson's activities. Nevertheless, he continued to engage in productive work. As Chief of the Division of Manuscripts, he

---

15 Jameson to Elizabeth Donnan, November 22, 1927, Box 98, File 852, Jameson Papers.
supervised programs that included the photocopying of materials for American history in foreign archives, the adding of many important collections to the Division's holdings, and the editing of the final volumes of the *Journals of the Continental Congress*. He aided staff members of the Department of Historical Research as they completed their undertakings. Leaders of the AHA and other scholars still turned to Jameson for advice and assistance. Then, in the spring of 1937, Jameson was struck by an automobile while he was boarding a streetcar in front of the Library of Congress. He never fully recovered from his injuries, and he died the next September.

For over three decades, Jameson was America's preeminent "keeper of the past." One aspect of those years has not yet been mentioned. Jameson's work at the Carnegie Institution, his activities within the AHA, and his service at the Library of Congress were only three components of his role in collecting, preserving, and making available the raw materials of American history. Jameson also concluded that he must work to obtain governmental assistance for historical enterprises. He thus devoted much of his time and energy urging the federal government to make available and to make secure for historians the records of the nation. Jameson emerged as the foremost lobbyist for historical interests in the United States.

Jameson's attempt to enlarge and enhance the government's historical activities had a mixed fate. Some of his
goals were not achieved, some were tangentially met, and some were fulfilled only after his death. Other undertakings were totally successful. Nevertheless, Jameson's effort to get the government more deeply involved in historical activity is a vital chapter in the story of an extraordinary individual.
CHAPTER II

THE MAKING OF A LOBBYIST

In order to put Jameson's role as a historical lobbyist in perspective, several topics need to be considered. The first is the nature and scope of the government's historical undertakings prior to 1905.

Governmental sponsorship of documentary publications has a history as old as the republic. In 1778, the Continental Congress provided $1,000 to help Ebenezer Hazard collect and publish documentary sources on the nation's history. Although only two volumes of Hazard's Historical Collections appeared, a beginning had been made.¹

Following Hazard's publication, there was a hiatus in federally sponsored publications until the period following the War of 1812. Then, as one manifestation of postwar nationalism, the government assumed sponsorship of several historical publications. In 1816, Congress appropriated

over $10,000 to subsidize the second edition of Wait's *State Papers* and *Public Documents*. Two years later, Congress authorized publication of Jared Sparks' *Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution*. The 1820's witnessed a reprinting of the *Journals* of the Senate and the printing or reprinting of several other government documents.2

The period from 1831 to 1861 was a prolific one for government-aided historical publications. During those years, Joseph Gales and William W. Seaton brought forth their thirty-eight volumes of *American State Papers*, and Peter Force published his *American Archives*. Publication of *American State Papers* was discontinued in 1861. Secretary of State William Marcy took an unfavorable view of Force's work, and that project never reached completion. Yet both works were notable accomplishments; *American State Papers* remains the "only reliable and comprehensive documentary source book" for the period 1780-1832.3

Although the "golden age" of governmental historical publications ended in 1861, a number of works followed. In 1861, Secretary of State Seward initiated the *Foreign Relations* series. 1881 saw the appearance of the first volume of the *Official Records* of the Civil War; this mammoth work, completed in 1901, cost nearly $3,000,000 to produce.

---

2Carter, "The United States and Documentary Historical Publication," 5-7.

3Ibid., 7-13.
In 1904, the Library of Congress brought out the first volume of its edition of the *Journals of the Continental Congress*. 4

Thus, Jameson had ample precedent in seeking governmental publication of documents. Despite the lack of a general plan, 5 and the delay, interruption, and termination of several works, the federal government had shown considerable support for publication of historical sources. For the preservation of historical records it had done considerably less.

Speaking before the American Historical Association in 1893, Mrs. Ellen Walworth recalled that her experiences in working on manuscript material in the State Department had brought her to the verge of tears. "By a single accident," she explained, "the nation might be stripped of these treasures of the past." 6 The federal government's treatment of its records undoubtedly had disturbed many other serious scholars.

The care of federal archives had been a matter of national interest since the birth of the republic. On September 5, 1774, the First Continental Congress chose

---

4 Ibid., 13-16.
5 On this point, see ibid., 16-17; and Chapter III, passim.
Charles Thomson as secretary. Thomson, who continued to serve until 1789, was largely responsible for the careful preservation of the nation's earliest records. As the new nation grew, however, the level of records custody seriously deteriorated. More land, more people, and more government meant more official papers. But these papers were handled haphazardly, and periodically fires destroyed government buildings and the papers they contained. As a result, the nation's records were largely useless to historians.

During the nation's formative years, some steps were taken to better protect official papers, such as the construction of fireproof buildings. But not until after the Civil War did public officials begin to think of a central records repository for the government. In 1878, President Rutherford B. Hayes recommended the construction of a "hall of records." A fire in the War Department three years later helped to spur the Senate to action. It voted $200,000 for implementing Hayes' proposal, but the House never considered the bill. The next two decades saw the introduction of many bills for the construction of a hall of records, but no building was approved, and records continued to pile up in individual federal offices.

Early in the twentieth century, it seemed that the objective might be realized. In 1901, the AHA alerted

---


Congress to the need of a depository where records would be safely kept and where "they would be available for scholars."^9 Perhaps spurred in part by the AHA resolution, Congress in 1903 appropriated $400,000 for the acquisition of a site for an archives building. The following year, the Secretary of the Treasury reported that the specified site had been acquired and urged Congress to provide funds for preliminary construction.\textsuperscript{10} There matters stood when Jameson joined the staff of the Carnegie Institution.

Jameson undoubtedly was aware of the government's publication activities and of the early drive for a "hall of records." Moreover, early in the twentieth century, Jameson personally participated in efforts to get the government to take new steps to assist history. These episodes undoubtedly heightened Jameson's awareness of what the government might do for history, shaped his attitudes about specific projects that the government should undertake, and better prepared him for the role that he would assume.

The first of Jameson's lobbying experiences took place in 1900. In that year, Representative J. William Stokes of South Carolina introduced a bill to promote better handling of public records.\textsuperscript{11} The bill directed the AHA "to


\textsuperscript{11}Cong. Rec., 56 Cong., 1 Sess., 4693 (April 25, 1900), 5358 (May 19, 1900).
investigate the character and condition of the archives and public records" of the states, territories, and nation and to "report to Congress the results" of the investigation along with recommendations for appropriate legislation.\(^{12}\)

In support of the bill, a congressional committee reported that the nation's records were scattered, ill-kept, subject to damage and loss, and were generally inaccessible to scholars and others who wanted to use them. Certainly, the report continued, there should be in Washington facilities where the nation's archives would be both accessible and properly cared for. Experience also indicated the need for better care of state archives. In many states the situation was worse than in Washington; in Nebraska, for example, the records of a constitutional convention literally had gone up in smoke when a janitor concluded that they were of no value.\(^{13}\)

Despite the severity of the problems, the bill proposed modest action. The only tasks immediately contemplated were the preliminary investigation and the making of recommendations. The AHA would receive $5,000 to defray the costs of the investigation. However, a well ordered plan for

\(^{12}\)Ibid., 5934 (May 24, 1900); and U. S. Congress, House, Committee on the Library, Perpetuation and Preservation of the Archives and Public Records of the Several States and Territories, and of the United States, 56 Cong., 1 Sess., 1900, H. Rept. 1767, 1.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., 2-5.
archival preservation and publication presumably might follow. ¹⁴

The Stokes Bill drew attention from Jameson and from the AHA's newly created Public Archives Commission. Jameson wrote to Senator George P. Wetmore of Rhode Island on behalf of the bill; Wetmore suggested that Jameson get someone in the Senate to introduce similar legislation. ¹⁵ A few days later, Hernando D. Money of Mississippi introduced the desired bill. ¹⁶ Jameson also solicited the aid of Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts, but Hoar thought that a stringent budget would preclude the appropriation. ¹⁷

Although Jameson was unable to make a personal representation on behalf of the bill, William MacDonald, chairman of the Public Archives Commission, presented history's case to the House Library Committee. ¹⁸ On May 26, the Stokes Bill was reported to the House. Contrary to

¹⁴Ibid., 1, 6.

¹⁵Wetmore to Jameson, May 3, 1900, Box 135, File 1746, Jameson Papers.

¹⁶Cong. Rec., 56 Cong., 1 Sess., 5399 (May 11, 1900); and William MacDonald to Jameson, May 24, 1900, Box 52, File 74, Jameson Papers.

¹⁷Hoar to Jameson, May 11, 1900, Box 94, File 766, ibid.

¹⁸William MacDonald to Jameson, May 24, 1900, Box 52, File 74, ibid.
Hoar's expectation, the Senate bill had passed two days earlier.\textsuperscript{19}

Then problems arose. The House failed to consider the bill during the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress. Individuals in the State and War Departments feared that the measure would interfere with their work and thus opposed it. To allay this opposition, the bill was amended (over William MacDonald's objections) so that it applied only to state and territorial records. By the time Congress reconvened, the bill had been altered so radically that the Public Archives Commission had lost interest in it.\textsuperscript{20}

The history of the Stokes Bill presaged much of Jameson's later career. The report on the bill made clear the need for an archives building. The bill had suggested governmental publication of certain documentary historical materials; had it passed, it might have laid the foundation for a national historical publications commission. Certain departments of the government would oppose both an archives and a publications commission. The effort of 1900 also indicated the need for careful attention to lawmakers and the legislative process if greater governmental aid to history were to be realized.

\textsuperscript{19}Cong. Rec., 56 Cong., 1 Sess, 6119 (May 26, 1900), 5934 (May 24, 1900).

\textsuperscript{20}MacDonald to Jameson, June 9, 1900, Box 52, File 74, Jameson Papers; and MacDonald to Jameson, November 23, 1901, ibid.
In 1904-1905, Jameson again played an active part in an attempt to secure additional governmental assistance to history. Secretary of State John Hay had requested that Congress appropriate $5,000 to begin the copying and publication of diplomatic correspondence from 1789 to 1869. About $20,000 eventually would be spent on the project. As Hay indicated, publication of the State Department's archives from the beginning of the Federal period until the Civil War had been sparse. Although access to the department's archives occasionally was granted, the attendant inconvenience caused many requests to go unfulfilled. 21

Andrew C. McLaughlin, then Director of the Bureau of Historical Research, had been largely responsible for Hay's request. 22 Once Hay had asked for the funds, McLaughlin attempted to insure an appropriation. He explained to Washington Gardner, member of the House Appropriations Committee, that publication of the State Department's archives would produce a twofold benefit. The published


22 Referring to the proposed project, McLaughlin wrote that "we have got so far that the Secretary of State has asked for an appropriation." McLaughlin to Charles H. Haskins, November 11, 1904, Box 92, File 718, Jameson Papers. Hay's request made reference to Van Tyne and LeLand's Guide, stating that "as an incident of the work of preparing it the great value of manuscript correspondence in the Department has become more emphatically evident than ever before." U. S. House, 58 Cong., 3 Sess., 1904, H. D. 44, 1.
records would be a boon to historical scholars, and the state Department would be relieved of constant applications for copying and inspection.\textsuperscript{23}

But McLaughlin's efforts alone could not secure the appropriation; rather, success depended in large degree "upon the activity of [other] historical investigators."\textsuperscript{24} McLaughlin initiated such activity. In a circular letter to his associates, he explained the importance of having the diplomatic archives printed and asked that the recipients write to members of the House Appropriations Committee and other congressmen to solicit their support. McLaughlin's circular inspired a massive letter-writing campaign. Historians from all parts of the country wrote to their congressmen urging the appropriation. Congressional responses ranged from enthusiastic interest in and pledges of support for the measure to mere promises of "careful consideration."\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} McLaughlin to Gardner, December 2, 1904, Box 85, File 595, Jameson Papers; and McLaughlin to Gardner, December 8, 1904, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{24} McLaughlin to Charles H. Haskins, November 11, 1904, Box 92, File 718, \textit{ibid.}

One colleague to whom McLaughlin naturally turned was Jameson, who, in turn, contacted several members of the House: two of his Amherst contemporaries, Frederick Gillett and George P. Lawrence of Massachusetts; his good friend D. L. D. Granger of Rhode Island; his own representative J. R. Mann; and the scholarly Samuel W. McCall of Massachusetts. Responses to Jameson's entreaties likewise ranged from enthusiastic to noncommittal.26

The effort to begin printing diplomatic archives was

---

26 McLaughlin to Jameson, December 28, 1904, Box 110, File 1079, ibid.; Jameson to McLaughlin, January 3, 1905, Box 97, File 843, ibid.; Sidney B. Fay to McLaughlin, January 5, 1905, Box 81, File 527, ibid.; Lawrence to Jameson, May 6, 1905, Box 77, File 460, ibid.; McCall to Jameson, January 9, 1905, Box 109, File 1053, ibid.; and Mann to Jameson, January 14, 1905, Box 77, File 460, ibid.
unsuccessful. The House Appropriations Committee failed to recommend the $5,000. Although Senator Henry Cabot Lodge tried to amend the appropriation bill to obtain the sum, his attempt was abortive.27

When Jameson replaced McLaughlin at the Carnegie Institution, he made an effort to keep the idea alive "until a more favorable season." Noting Lodge's interest in the project, he requested a meeting with the senator.28 Jameson's effort, however, had no immediate results. On the other hand, the diplomatic archives venture served as the precursor of a project that Jameson proposed nearly two decades later.

The legislative forays of 1900 and 1904-1905, then, served as dress rehearsals for Jameson. They heightened his awareness of how much the government could be doing for history, and they gave him practice in getting public officials to take a stand that he favored. The early 1900's, however, did not mark a radical change in Jameson's life. Well before the turn of the century, he had become versed in the government's aid (and lack of it) to history. He also had gained first hand experience in dealing with public officials and controversial situations.

27 Cong. Rec., 58 Cong., 3 Sess., 2968 (February 21, 1905); and U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill, 58 Cong., 3 Sess., 1905, Rept. 4377.

28 Jameson to Lodge, November 24, 1905, Box 109, File 1031, Jameson Papers.
As a graduate student, Jameson had visited Washington where he "learned his way to the materials and officials of the city." One of the officials was the President of the United States. Jameson's classmate, William Seelye, had obtained from his father a letter of introduction to Rutherford B. Hayes, and the two young scholars visited the chief executive. Jameson engaged in amiable conversation with both the President and his wife. Another early acquaintance of Jameson's was Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts. The two met in the spring of 1881; thereafter, Jameson sought Hoar's aid on a number of matters.

Perhaps the first time that Jameson saw the need to call upon public officials for help was in the spring of 1885. The Democrats had just captured the White House, and efforts were underway to replace Jameson's father as postmaster of Amherst with a "deserving Democrat." Jameson tried to save his father's position. He went to Washington to confer with officeholders, including Senator Hoar of Massachusetts and President Grover Cleveland. Simultaneously, faculty members from Amherst exerted pressure on Mr. Jameson's behalf. Despite these efforts, the axe fell on March 26; O. G. Couch received the Amherst postmastership.

29 Donnan, "Introduction," 2.

30 Jameson to Mrs. John Jameson, November 29, 1880, [and accompanying footnotes], Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 18; and n. 141, ibid., 41.

31 n. 130, ibid., 38-39.
Jameson's effort on behalf of his father was a brief exercise in lobbying. From 1885 through 1888, he engaged in a much broader foray with public officials. This apparently was Jameson's first experience in trying to create a nexus between the federal government and historical activity.

Two motives underlay Jameson's venture. First, by the early 1880's, Jameson had become convinced that in order for American history to advance, the documentary sources of the nation must be published. Second, he had decided to write a comprehensive history of the South. Jameson thus sought to edit and have published the records of the Virginia Company. 32

In order to execute his plan, Jameson had to find a publisher. This was a rather easy task. Houghton Mifflin Company, while concluding that the work "could not be pecuniarily valuable" to them, felt that the undertaking warranted their attention if it could be done under "reasonable security against loss." The initial step would be to issue a prospectus and solicit subscribers. Jameson provided the material for preparing the prospectus, and early in 1886 the publishers prepared 3,000 copies. 33

Jameson also had to obtain permission to publish the papers. A. R. Spofford, Librarian of Congress, informed

32n. 140, ibid., 41; and Donnan, "Introduction," 3.

33Houghton, Mifflin & Co. to Jameson, November 24, 1885, Box 133, File 1696, Jameson Papers; and Houghton, Mifflin & Co. to Jameson, February 5, 1886, ibid.
Jameson that he needed to get the consent of the Library Committee of Congress.\textsuperscript{34} In September, 1885, Jameson presented his case to Senator Hoar, a member of the Committee. He then proceeded to seek the needed permission. It was not forthcoming; the Library Committee had determined to "settle first the general policy concerning the publication of government documents by private individuals."\textsuperscript{35}

After a year of frustration, Jameson decided to "'make a regular assault on the Library Committee.'"\textsuperscript{36} In a lengthy letter to the Committee members, he told them that the association with Houghton Mifflin insured an adequate mechanical execution of the work. He tried to convince them of his own qualifications as an editor. He pointed out that publication would protect the manuscripts against loss, would be a great boon to scholars, and would require no compensation from the government. He explained that foreign governments had allowed private individuals to publish papers of their governments. In conclusion, Jameson promised to do the work "in a manner creditable to the government and the country."\textsuperscript{37} But Jameson again failed to obtain permission.

\textsuperscript{34}Spofford to Jameson, August 15, 1885, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{35}n. 140, Donnan and Stock (eds.), \textit{Historian's World}, 41.

\textsuperscript{36}Jameson to John Jameson, December 12, 1886, quoted in \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{37}Jameson [to Members of Library Committee], December 16, 1886, Box 133, File 1696, Jameson Papers.
Early in 1888, it appeared that Jameson might achieve his objective. Representative James Phelan of Tennessee and Senator Daniel Voorhees of Ohio introduced resolutions "authorizing and directing the Librarian of Congress" to grant Jameson the permission he sought.38

In 1887, however, Congress had created a federal commission on manuscripts; its members were the Secretary of State, the Librarian of Congress, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The commission was "to report to Congress the character and value" of historical material belonging to the government and to recommend methods and policies for publication.39 Rather than expedite Jameson's work, this commission presented another hurdle. Now, Jameson had to get the commission to make a favorable report to the Library Committee, "'then get the thing thro' the Com., then thro' the House.'" Perhaps because of this new obstacle, perhaps because of his relocation in Providence, Jameson abandoned the project.40

Soon after forsaking the Virginia company undertaking, Jameson presented his views on governmental aid to history to the AHA. At the 1890 meeting of the association, he delivered an address entitled "The Expenditures of Foreign

38Cong. Rec., 50 Cong., 1 Sess., 2619 (April 2, 1888), 2543 (March 31, 1888).

39Statutes at Large, XXIV, 542.

40n. 140, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 41.
Governments in Behalf of History." He pointed out that until 1889, nations such as Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands had surpassed the United States in the proportion of their total expenditures that were devoted to history. The United States' apparent new concern for history grew from a determination to complete the records of the Civil War. Although acknowledging the value of that compilation, Jameson questioned whether ninety-six percent of the money spent on history should go to one work, while many other materials remained in manuscript form or had been published only in part.  

Jameson concluded that more than money was needed to improve the nation's contribution to history. Also necessary was a "comprehensive and well arranged scheme of government publication." An expert commission should guide these publications. The ineffectiveness of the commission created in 1887 indicated that such a commission should not be limited to government officials. In creating the commission, "European experience should be consulted." Jameson ended his address with the hope that the commission would "soon come into existence."  

Perhaps because of Jameson's urging, the AHA in 1894

---


42 Ibid., 43.
memorialized Congress to create a historical manuscripts commission. But a governmental commission was not established. The closest approximation was the creation, in 1895, of the AHA's Historical Manuscripts Commission. During the ensuing thirty-five years, the Historical Manuscripts Commission published a myriad of documentary publications in the AHA Annual Reports. Nevertheless, Jameson had not abandoned his goal of a governmental commission on historical materials.

During the 1880's, Jameson had called upon the federal government for assistance. In the 1890's, it appeared that the government would need Jameson's aid. A boundary dispute broke out between British Guiana and Venezuela. President Cleveland asked for a commission to ascertain which boundary was historically correct; he implied that the United States would maintain that line once it was determined. The commission chose George Lincoln Burr of Cornell to serve as its historical adviser. Burr, believing that Dutch records would provide the data for resolving the boundary question, called upon Jameson for help. Jameson accepted the task. His findings, slightly modified by Burr, were published as a twenty-two page study

---


entitled Report on Spanish and Dutch Settlements Prior to 1648. Because Great Britain agreed to arbitrate, Jameson's report went unused.45 The episode nevertheless indicated Jameson's growing prestige as a scholar; nor was this the last time that Jameson would be consulted in an official or quasi-official capacity.

The same year that Jameson prepared his report, the United States witnessed one of its most critical presidential elections. In that intensely emotional contest of 1896, people lost their jobs for holding "unorthodox" opinions on the money question. When the witch hunt reached the college campus, Jameson led in the fight for academic freedom.

At the time, Jameson was teaching at Brown. The president of the college, Elisha Benjamin Andrews, had enjoyed a successful tenure. Enrollment had more than doubled, income had increased, and promising young scholars had joined the faculty. Andrews' views on the money question, however, offended some members of the college's governing corporation, in particular, Representative Joseph Walker. At a meeting of the corporation on June 16, 1897, Walker charged that Andrews' advocacy of free silver had cost Brown the support of large benefactors. In fact, Andrews advocated not free silver but international

45n. 159 and n. 160, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World. A copy of the report is found in Box 133, File 1688, Jameson Papers.
bimetallism. Because he had been abroad in 1896, he had not
taken an active role in the presidential campaign. Never­
theless, following Walker's tirade a committee of three was
appointed to confer with President Andrews. The committee
asked Andrews to stop promulgating his views. In response,
Andrews sent a letter of resignation to the corporation; he
also released to the press both the committee's request and
his resignation. This stirred up a torrent of newspaper
controversy.

Jameson became deeply involved in the ensuing alter­
cation. In an open letter to the corporation, he propounded
the theory that independence of thought and expression were
values higher than "'the material growth of a university.'"
He urged the corporation to take steps that would remedy its
ill-advised action. Two-thirds of the faculty holding the
rank of professor or associate professor signed Jameson's
"manifesto." Having gained faculty support for his position,
Jameson and his colleague Henry B. Gardner prepared a letter
for general circulation. It reiterated the belief that the
causes of free thought and free speech would be served if
the corporation tried to reverse Andrews' resignation.
During the month of August, Jameson solicited signatures for
the letter; a stack of favorable responses came to Jameson
at his summer retreat in Maine.

46The story of the controversy is taken from Elizabeth
Donnan, "A Nineteenth Century Academic Cause Celebre," New
England Quarterly, XXV (March, 1952), 23-46 passim; and
When the Brown corporation met on September 1, it had before it petitions and letters described as being a foot thick. Andrews was asked to withdraw his resignation; he consented to remain one more year. Academic freedom had won the day.

In the midst of the controversy over Andrews, Jameson became involved in another struggle. Sidney A. Sherman, assistant principal at Providence, Rhode Island High School, had charged in the Providence Journal that the city council was showing undue favoritism to the Union Railroad Company. Sherman's action angered the school committee, and, as a result, his salary was reduced by $400. Jameson wrote three letters to the Journal in an unsuccessful attempt to get support for the restitution of Sherman's salary and respect for his right of free expression.47

The Andrews and Sherman episodes evoke a picture of Jameson as one who vigorously defended the right of free speech. Perhaps of equal importance, both situations gave him practice in seeking help for worthwhile endeavors. It was a skill that served him well in later years.

When Jameson assumed his position at the Carnegie Institution, he thus had become knowledgeable about the relationship between history and the federal government. He had gained experience in attempting to enrich that relation-

47n. 175, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 69-70.
ship. He had sought support for worthwhile causes. But before considering Jameson's first intensive lobbying effort while at the Carnegie Institution, it is necessary to analyze those factors that enabled a competent historian to act as a competent lobbyist.

Jameson's visits to Washington, his acquaintance with public officials, his attempt to save his father's job, his efforts regarding the Virginia company records, his role in the freedom of speech controversies, his exertions on behalf of the Stokes Bill, and his part in the attempt to get diplomatic archives published—all served to increase his agility in dealing with public officials and to enhance his ability to gain support for his proposals. Numerous other factors also increased Jameson's effectiveness in strengthening the ties between history and the federal government.

Jameson's residency in Washington, as a staff member of the Carnegie Institution, was an obvious advantage to him. Proximity to the seat of government made it possible for Jameson to keep abreast of governmental activities. It was "inevitable" that he chaired AHA committees that dealt with federal officials.48 Living in Washington multiplied Jameson's opportunities to meet with the nation's lawmakers.49 Jameson also developed close rapport with persons


49See, for example, Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, December 16, 1907, and accompanying footnotes, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 114-15.
in administrative positions. In 1923, he wrote that Gaillard Hunt, chief of the State Department's Division of Publications, "is rather my best friend here in Washington"; Jameson's relations with Hunt's successor were nearly as warm.50

More important than residence in Washington was the status that Jameson attained as Director of the Department of Historical Research. A reciprocal relationship existed between Jameson and the Department. Jameson's prestige added to that of the Department,51 while Jameson's position as Director greatly increased his influence. Between 1905 and 1928, Jameson served as an unparalleled leader of historical activity in the United States.52

Because of his commanding position and seemingly boundless knowledge, professors and students looked to Jameson as a fount of information. Jameson almost invariably responded to inquiries with prompt, carefully considered replies. Thus, when Jameson found it necessary to arouse support for a given measure, he could depend upon a large body of historians around the country.

Public officials also sought Jameson's advice and

50 Jameson to Edward F. McSweeney, February 10, 1923, Box 101, File 926, Jameson Papers; and Tyler Dennett to Jameson, December 3, 1926, Box 77, File 464, ibid.

51 Donnan, "Introduction," 8.

information. When Representative Andrew J. Montague of Virginia was scheduled to make an address on "Modern Political Conditions in America," he called upon Jameson to suggest books on the subject. Representative Theodore Burton of Ohio received from Jameson a bibliography of historical works for a project he was engaged in. H. G. Clark solicited Jameson's recommendations for a person to serve as historian for the War and Navy Departments. When Harry G. Dwight found that the State Department archives under his supervision were in a deplorable condition, he asked Jameson to suggest someone who could study the situation, assemble and classify the papers, and make suggestions as to methods of disposal. Jameson recommended David W. Parker. Parker's Canadian citizenship disqualified him, and Dwight asked Jameson to suggest another applicant. In 1928, Secretary of State Kellogg called upon Jameson to help in the planning of the Seventh American Scientific Congress. The fact

53 Jameson to Montague, January 21, 1914, Box 113, File 1164, Jameson Papers; and Montague to Jameson, January 23, 1914, ibid.

54 Jameson to Burton, February 4, 1922, Box 123, File 1392, ibid.; and Burton to Jameson, February 6, 1922, ibid.

55 Clark to Jameson, November 27, 1914, Box 72, File 366, ibid.; Clark to Jameson, December 2, 1914, ibid.; Jameson to Clark, December 2, 1914, ibid.; Clark to Jameson [n.d.], ibid.; and Jameson to Clark, December 8, 1914, ibid.

56 Dwight to Jameson, June 17, 1924, Box 129; File 1567, ibid.; Jameson to Dwight, July 1, 1924, ibid.; and Dwight to Jameson, July 26, 1924, ibid.

57 Kellogg to Jameson, June 20, 1928, ibid.
that officeholders served as trustees of the Carnegie Institution helped to bring Jameson closer to persons of influence.58

Several public officials were Jameson's former teachers, former students, or fellow alumni. Elihu Root had been one of Jameson's instructors at Amherst.59 Charles Evans Hughes had received two degrees from Brown. Calvin Coolidge was an Amherst alumnus.60 Jameson would benefit from his relationships with all three men. On the other hand, collegiate ties sometimes had unanticipated results. Woodrow Wilson, a former student and close correspondent of Jameson's, was one of the Presidents least receptive to Jameson's requests for aid to history.61 In marked contrast was Jameson's relationship with Simeon D. Fess. Although Fess had served as president of Antioch College, Jameson held his intellectual abilities in low esteem. When Fess came to Washington as a congressman and expressed a desire to be helpful to scholars, it took Jameson some time


60n. 87, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 198; and n. 93, ibid., 325.

61For Wilson-Jameson correspondence, see ibid., passim. For Wilson's failure to come to the aid of history while President, see Chapters III and IX.
to recall that Fess had been his student at Chicago. Yet Fess became a crucial figure in Jameson's endeavors to get governmental assistance for history.62

That a number of officeholders also were historians contributed to Jameson's impact upon officialdom. Persons such as Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge come immediately to mind. Of at least equal importance in gaining legislative support for historical projects were Hiram Bingham, a longtime correspondent of Jameson's,63 and Fess.

Chance sometimes helped Jameson to gain support for his proposals. Miles Poindexter of Washington state was a neighbor of Jameson's nephew, Frederick Elmendorf; through Elmendorf, Jameson became rather well acquainted with

62Fess to Jameson, December 14, 1907, Box 82, File 532, Jameson Papers; Jameson to Fess, December 17, 1907, ibid.; Fess to Jameson, December 23, 1907, ibid.; Fess to Jameson, January 14, 1908, ibid.; Charles O. Paullin to Jameson, April 19, 1914, Box 118, File 1304, ibid.; and Jameson to Paullin, April 20, 1914, ibid. In the Jameson Papers, there is an undated memorandum which reads: "I see that Mr. Fess is here, and he speaks to me in terms which seem to show that from some quarter he has received encouragement to expect that he may at some time have opportunity to lecture for the Department. . . . I am clear that his acquirements are not sufficient to enable him to represent the Department satisfactorily. . . . I will add . . . that I do not believe he ever will acquire sufficient scholarship for that purpose." Box 82, File 532, ibid. For Fess' loyal aid to Jameson, see subsequent chapters.

63Bingham to Jameson, August 29, 1907, Box 60, File 194, ibid.; Bingham to Jameson, December 2, 1907, ibid.; Jameson to Bingham, May 15, 1909, ibid.; Jameson to Bingham, April 26, 1910, ibid.; Jameson to Bingham, August 18, 1919, ibid.; Bingham to Jameson, January 8, 1924, ibid.; and Jameson to Bingham, January 9, 1924, ibid.
Poindexter. When Poindexter became a United States senator, Jameson proposed that he "ought to immortalize himself by becoming the father of the National Archives Building." Poindexter responded favorably to Jameson's proposal and performed years of service on behalf of the archives.

Jameson also had ties with persons in the field of journalism. John H. Finley, a former student of Jameson's, was an associate editor and then editor-in-chief of the New York Times. At Johns Hopkins, Jameson became intimate friends with Albert Shaw, future editor of the Review of Reviews. When promoting historical causes, Jameson called upon Finley, Shaw, and other journalists to help arouse public opinion.

Although Jameson spent much energy cultivating the elected representatives of the people, he often expressed disdain for those representatives, the constituents that they served, and the structure of government within which they operated. In 1924, he wrote to Edward P. Cheyney: "At all times nine words out of ten that are spoken in the halls of Congress seem to be spoken for the purposes of advancing the

---

64Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, May 3, 1911, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 144; and n. 210, ibid.
65Donnan, "Introduction," 5; and n. 31, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 310.
fortunes of the party or the individual, ..."67 On another occasion, he wrote: "... I have seen a steady rise in the appreciation of specialized intelligence on the part of the executive Departments. ... I cannot say quite as much for Congress, which along with a good deal of patriotism, is showing a good deal of small politics."68 He once concluded that "the typical American mind is after all the Champ Clark mind, which 'knows it all' without reading; ..."69 In one of his most stinging statements, Jameson, shortly before Wilson's departure from the White House, wrote:

... I entirely agree with you that we are, so far as the presidency is concerned, destined to find ourselves in very commonplace hands, compared to the three great men we have just had. ... But what we shall have will be but a recurrence of the average president, for it was only by accident that we got Roosevelt, and only by his favor, a consequence of that accident, that we got Taft, and as for Wilson, I never forget that the chances were that we should get Clark, whose mind is, I should think, a shade lower in the scale of primitive development than that of any other public men to whom we have given the speakership let alone the presidency. Democracies can't always be having good luck. Most commonly they must take what they deserve.70

Perhaps years of frustration in trying to promote a

67Jameson to Cheyney, February 12, 1924, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 298.

68Jameson to Lord Bryce, June 18, 1917, ibid., 209.

69Jameson to Edward B. Krehbiel, February 13, 1919, ibid., 230.

70Jameson to William E. Dodd, May 12, 1920, ibid., 250.
national historical publications commission and an archives building had made Jameson cynical. Evidence, however, indicates that he genuinely felt contempt for Congress and the "common man."  

Despite Jameson's disdainful attitude toward those in elective office, it was necessary for him to seek their support in order to further the interests of history. Jameson initiated his first massive drive in behalf of history the same year that he joined the Carnegie Institution. This campaign lasted the better part of a decade.

---

71 For further indications of Jameson's contemptuous attitude toward elected officials and their milieu, see Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, May 19, 1916, ibid., 195; Jameson to Mary Scrugham, February 11, 1922, ibid., 266; and Jameson to Roscoe R. Hill, March 1, 1927, ibid., 324.
CHAPTER III

THE LAYING OF A FOUNDATION: THE MOVEMENT FOR A NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

During the two decades prior to 1905, there had germinated in Jameson's mind the need for a national commission on historical publications. The creation, in 1887, of a poorly conceived commission had helped to frustrate his desire to publish the Virginia Company records. In 1890, he had urged that a commission be created to direct a "well arranged scheme of government publication." In 1900, he actively had supported the Stokes Bill, which was designed to provide more systematic preservation and publication of the nation's records. In 1905, he launched an intensive movement for a national historical publications commission.

In November of that year, Jameson described what he had in mind to Gifford Pinchot, who had just been appointed a member of the Keep Commission. Among its many duties, this commission was to consider the publication of historical materials. Jameson first explained to Pinchot "the process by which European governments bring expert judgment to bear

1See Chapter II.
upon the problem of governmental historical publications." The general practice was to create a commission of experts in the field. It was the duty of such commissions to survey the field, determine what needed to be done, "recommend the important and pressing" tasks, and, if approval were obtained, "to engage editors and supervise and approve their work." ²

Dutch experience epitomized the proper procedure. The Queen of the Netherlands in 1903 had appointed a commission of eminent historians to survey Dutch historical publications. After nearly two years of work, the commission presented a lengthy report on Dutch history and the gaps that existed therein. The commission members rejected any plans for narrative histories, recognizing that their function lay in the realm of documentary publication. They thus considered "what documentary materials had been printed, what had not, what portions were relatively over-documented . . . and what were marked by genuine gaps." They also ascertained what must be filled "by long series of volumes, what moderate series seemed to be called for," and cases "where individual volumes would suffice." The members also recommended beginnings that could be made "as component parts of the great general scheme." The commission, Jameson added, had not dissolved after making its recommendations;

²n. 5, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 91; and Jameson to Pinchot, November 23, 1905, ibid., 91.
instead, it had become an advisory and supervisory board overlooking the execution of its proposals.\(^3\)

Jameson believed that a similar commission would improve the quality of documentary historical publications in the United States. Congress had appropriated considerable sums for publications. In some cases, the result had been satisfactory; in some cases it had not. To correct this haphazard situation, Jameson wanted a commission created. The members, Jameson surmised, cheerfully would serve without payment. It would be unwise, he concluded, for the commission to contain ex-officio members. Rather, it should be comprised of "seven or eight people best qualified, regardless . . . of their official positions."\(^4\)

In a separate letter to Pinchot, Jameson recommended that historians Alfred T. Mahan, Worthington C. Ford, Andrew C. McLaughlin, Frederick Jackson Turner, Albert Bushnell Hart, William A. Dunning, and Chief of the Record and Pension Office of the War Department General F. C. Ainsworth constitute the commission.\(^5\)

Pinchot took no action on Jameson's proposals, but Jameson was not ready to let his scheme fail. Early the next year, he spoke to the Columbian Historical Society of Washington on "gaps in the published records of United States history." Jameson prefaced his remarks with

\(^3\)Ibid., 91-92. \(^4\)Ibid., 92. \(^5\)Jameson to Pinchot, November 23, 1905, Box 119, File 1338, Jameson Papers.
allusions to Dutch achievements and American shortcomings in the realm of documentary historical publications:⁶

Figuratively speaking, we have bought enormous quantities of supplies for our excavations, we have engaged our workers, we have dug deeply here and there; but we have "made dirt fly" before we have mapped out our isthmus. . . . Would it not be more rational to take a lesson from the methodical procedure of the Dutch.⁷

Jameson continued to learn about the procedure followed in other countries. From Professor Reinhold Koser, he learned of the statutes governing the preparation of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica. He also sought information on the Canadian historical commission.⁸

Convinced of the need for a historical commission, and versed in the methods pursued by other countries, Jameson by 1907 wished to carry his case to President Roosevelt. Albert Bushnell Hart arranged for Jameson to have an interview with the President. Roosevelt agreed with Jameson that it would be wise to establish a "temporary commission to make a preliminary survey and lay out a plan. . . ." He was ready to appoint members whom Jameson had suggested. But Roosevelt was unable to find funds to pay


⁷Ibid., 818.

⁸Jameson to Koser, November 14, 1906, Box 101, File 937, Jameson Papers; Jameson to Koser, January 14, 1907, ibid.; and Jameson to C. W. Colby, April 6, 1907, Box 72, File 377, ibid.
the members' travel expenses to Washington. Jameson would have to find the money elsewhere.

Jameson first asked President Robert Woodward of the Carnegie Institution if he could draw upon his departmental appropriation. Woodward replied negatively but suggested that the Institution's executive committee might vote the funds at its October meeting. The Carnegie trustees apparently disallowed the request, for in December, 1907, Jameson turned to Secretary of State Elihu Root. He described to Root America's uneven history of documentary publications, elaborated upon the procedure followed in European nations, and explained the rationale for a preliminary commission. He inquired if Root might provide funds for defraying the members' travel expenses.

Jameson soon concluded that Root had reacted negatively to his request. As an alternative, he persuaded the American Historical Association to authorize a commission on documentary historical publications. He hoped to obtain from the AHA and other organizations funds for the commission to carry on its work. It was his wish that after

---

9Jameson to Hart, May 3, 1907, Box 91, File 712, ibid.; Secretary to the President to Hart, May 8, 1907, ibid.; Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, July 31, 1907, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 107; and Jameson to Robert S. Woodward, July 7, 1907, Box 67, File 305, Jameson Papers.

10Ibid.; and Woodward to Jameson, July 15, 1907, ibid.

the desired members had been identified, President Roosevelt would write to each one asking that he serve. A request from the President would help to insure that the "best" men would serve; it also would enhance the commission's influence with Congress and the public.  

To George B. Adams, president of the AHA, Jameson suggested a number of historians as members of the commission: Charles Francis Adams, Charles M. Andrews, William A. Dunning, Worthington C. Ford, Albert Bushnell Hart, Alfred T. Mahan, Andrew C. McLaughlin, and Frederick Jackson Turner. Two considerations dictated these recommendations. First, each proposed member had served on the executive council of the AHA and was known to the public. Second, since the government likely would devote itself to historical activity since 1763, Jameson had paid minimal attention to the colonial period; Andrews could handle the period from 1763 to 1775 and any pertinent material prior to those dates. It was Jameson's plan that at an organizational meeting in Washington the work be parceled out among the members. The division of labor would be based on areas of expertise; for example, Mahan would handle naval history, Turner social and economic history. Each member would

---

12 Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, January 7, 1908, Box 102, File 971, Jameson Papers; Charles H. Haskins to Jameson, December 17, 1907, Box 792, File 718, ibid.; Jameson to Haskins, December 18, 1907, ibid.; Jameson to Clarence Bowen, December 19, 1907, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; and Jameson to George B. Adams, January 9, 1908, Box 45, File 15, ibid.
prepare a report upon the "documentary materials for his section already in print, upon the needs for additional printed sources, and upon the government's needs of filling them." After some time for "incubation," a full report would be drafted. Adams accepted Jameson's recommendations and chose Jameson to chair the commission.

Jameson then tried to persuade the appointees to accept. In a lengthy letter to them, he described the current state of documentary publications ("far from satisfactory"); discussed the procedure followed in other countries, stressing the Dutch example; explained why the AHA had had to appoint the commission; and outlined the proposed mode of operation. Jameson's ultimate hope, he explained, was that after the commission had published its report Congress could be induced to establish a permanent commission to supervise "the government's publication of documentary historical materials."

Although the preliminary commission apparently would have to operate without governmental sponsorship, Jameson devised a strategy that would enable it to obtain quasi-official status. He explained to Senator Lodge that the

13Ibid.

14Jameson to Arthur G. Doughty, January 23, 1908, Box 78, File 473, ibid. The AHA apparently would defray the commission's expenses. Ibid.

15Jameson to commission members, February 1, 1908, Box 473, Records of the American Historical Association, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress, hereafter referred to as AHA Records.
impact of the commission's report "would be fortified if it could appear as proffered in response to a congressional request." He asked Lodge to introduce a joint resolution requesting the AHA to prepare the report and include it as part of the next Annual Report. Lodge replied that he gladly would introduce a resolution if Jameson would draw it up. On February 11, 1908, Lodge offered a resolution requesting the AHA to include in its next annual report "a statement of the gaps now existing in the records of United States history and a plan for so directing" the government's documentary historical publications "so as to supply these deficiencies." Shortly thereafter, Samuel McCall, apparently at Jameson's request, introduced a similar resolution in the House. Jameson also explained the commission's purpose to Senator George P. Wetmore of the Library Committee and sent Wetmore a three-page report to use if his committee chose to report favorably Lodge's resolution.

Events then took an unexpectedly favorable turn. Secretary Root, instead of discarding Jameson's earlier

---

16 Jameson to Lodge, February 5, 1908, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers; and Lodge to Jameson, February 6, 1908, ibid.

17 Cong. Rec., 60 Cong., 1 Sess, 1803 (February 11, 1908).

18 Jameson to McCall, February 12, 1908, Box 109, File 1053, Jameson Papers; and Cong. Rec., 60 Cong., 1 Sess., 2014 (February 13, 1908).

19 Jameson to Wetmore, February 12, 1908, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.
request, had concluded that a historical publications commission would serve a valuable purpose. He had suggested to Roosevelt that such a commission be attached to the Keep Commission. Roosevelt, in turn, had recommended that the Keep Commission institute a historical commission, its members being the same as those of the AHA commission. This dual appointment was doubly advantageous. The Keep Commission would pay the members' expenses and thus save the AHA money. More importantly, the fact that the commission's report would be issued by a group linked to the Keep Commission would "strengthen the report with Congress and with the public. . . ."  

Jameson found out from Gifford Pinchot that the Keep Commission had been intending to get Roosevelt "to put them out of existence." Jameson persuaded Pinchot to keep the commission alive long enough to establish the historical commission. President Roosevelt formally appointed the members in March. Although they were the same as those on the AHA commission, Ford was appointed chairman, and Jameson was selected to be secretary.  

Now the preliminary commission on historical publications had acquired official

20 Jameson to George B. Adams, February 24, 1908, Box 45, File 15, ibid.

21 Jameson to Charles H. Haskins, February 28, 1908, Box 92, File 718, ibid.; Jameson to Clarence Bowen, February 26, 1908, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; Jameson to George B. Adams, March 6, 1908, Box 45, File 15, ibid.; and Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, April 2, 1908, Box 978, File 103, ibid.
status.\textsuperscript{22}

The group, which Jameson decided should be called a committee,\textsuperscript{23} held its first meeting in March, 1908. Work on the projected report was divided among the committee members. A second meeting was held on June 1 and 2; the third and final meeting in October. Jameson played a vital role in the committee's work. He cleared the way for Charles Francis Adams, in charge of the portion on military history, to meet with the Adjutant General to discuss historical materials in the War Department. He received from his colleagues suggestions about the phraseology of the report. It was Jameson's responsibility to insure that the report

\textsuperscript{22} In point of fact, the commission had to shed its formal connection with the AHA and instead stand as a body appointed by the President alone. As Jameson explained: "... The terms of the statute making appropriations for the expenses of the Keep Commission would require that appointments should be made by the President, in such a sense that concurrent appointments by the President of the United States and the President of the American Historical Association would be likely to endanger the payments to members." The only change that would be necessary would be "to minimize mention of the Committee [AHA commission] in the forthcoming article upon the annual meeting in the 'American Historical Review,' and to suppress the list of its membership from the register commonly given at the end of that article." Jameson to Charles H. Haskins, March 6, 1908, Box 92, File 718, ibid.

\textsuperscript{23} Jameson to Gifford Pinchot, February 28, 1908, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to George B. Adams, March 6, 1908, Box 45, File 15, ibid.
emerged in polished form.\textsuperscript{24} Jameson concluded that his exertions had been worthwhile; the undertaking had been a great success. Never before had Jameson been on a committee "in which every man did fully all the parts of the work assigned to him."\textsuperscript{25} Then, on February 11, 1908, President Roosevelt transmitted the committee's report to Congress.\textsuperscript{26}

The opening part of the report emphasized that the committee did not intend to propose "vast and disproportionate expenditures . . . but rather to make suggestions which are in the interest of genuine economy." Nor would the committee suggest "vast schemes for instant execution"; instead, it compared itself to a group of farseeing architects who would frame plans for the long run. The United States government, the report explained, had published historical materials since its inception. During

\textsuperscript{24}Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, April 2, 1908, Box 103, File 978, ibid.; Jameson to Carroll D. Wright, June 3, 1908, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; Jameson to George B. Adams, October 26, 1908, Box 45, File 15, ibid.; Jameson to Frederick C. Ainsworth, May 6, 1908, Box 46, File 23, ibid.; William A. Dunning to Jameson, November 13, 1908, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; and Jameson to F. A. Crandall, January 12, 1908, ibid.

\textsuperscript{25}Jameson to George B. Adams, October 26, 1908, Box 45, File 15, ibid.

\textsuperscript{26}U. S. Congress, Senate, Message from the President of the United States, Transmitting a Report by the Committee on Department Methods on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government, Together with a Draft of a Proposed Bill Providing for the Creation of a Permanent Commission on National Historical Publications, 60 Cong., 2 Sess., 1909, Senate Doc. 714.
the preceding two decades, the quantity of publication had been ample and the amount expended "more than liberal." But there was a conspicuous "absence of a general plan." If a methodical plan was instituted, the government could obtain a much more satisfactory product at no additional expense.27

The next section of the report comprised a survey of historical publications divided according to topic—constitutio
tional and political history, financial and commercial history, economic and social history, diplomatic history, military history, and naval history. For each topic, the following points were considered: what materials already were in print, what might be done by the federal government to fill gaps, "the probable magnitude of each such underta­king," and "the relative importance of the enter­prizes. . . ." This twenty-five page compendium was an exemplary study of what had been done and what remained to be done in the realm of documentary historical publications.28

While many publications were suggested, the report selectively delineated those claiming top priority. These included "Commissions and Instructions to the Governors of the American Colonies," "State Trials," "Papers of Andrew Jackson," and "Official Records of the War with Mexico." The publication having highest priority, the one that would provide "a large part if not all" of the desired product,

27Ibid., 9-12. 28Ibid., 12-38.
would be entitled "National State Papers." It would be a revised version of the *American State Papers* volumes, with new series added for agriculture, labor, and other topics.  

After expressing a plea for a national archives building, the report presented its chief recommendation: that "Congress be requested to provided [sic] for a permanent advisory Commission on National Historical Publications." In establishing such a commission, Americans could profit from European experience. The Netherlands offered the best model for a historical commission.  

The report made specific recommendations for an American commission. Since the American analogue for European historical academies was the AHA, the commission members should be chosen from that organization. The commission would hold two regular meetings in Washington each year; other meetings would be held on call of the chairman "with the approval of three other members. . . ." The commission would be subdivided into committees on the materials held "by the executive departments and the Library of Congress." Correspondingly, editorial committees should be appointed within each department and within the Library of Congress to cooperate with the committees of the commission. Proposals for new publications could originate either upon the initiative of the commission or upon the initiative of the departments. "No new publication of documentary .

---

historical materials" would be undertaken "by any department or the Library of Congress unless the proposal" had approval "of a majority of the editorial committee of that department or of the Library of Congress and a majority of the appropriate committee of the Commission." The commission would "make general regulations as to the form of publication and details of editing and execution, . . . ".31

The report concluded with a draft of a bill for creating the commission. It provided

. . . That the President be authorized to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the members of the American Historical Association, nine persons of the highest standing for scholarship and judgment in the field of United States history to serve as a Commission on National Historical Publications, and to have authority to defray, out of such appropriations as may be made to said Commission, the cost of preparing and printing such volumes of material for American history as it may deem most useful.32

The committee having made its recommendations, the next step was to work for implementation. Jameson did not expect immediate results. Because Roosevelt was serving his last months in office when he transmitted the report, the Sixtieth Congress, said Jameson, would not "pay the slightest attention to any further recommendations on any subject" from him. Historians would "have to work upon Congress a good Deal" before the desired legislation could

31 Ibid., 43-45. 32 Ibid., 45.
The Sixty-First Congress convened in March, 1909. Jameson felt that during that session he could do no more than "conduct a campaign of education." He would talk the matter over with congressmen and would encourage his colleagues to do the same.\(^{34}\)

Jameson wrote to Samuel McCall, Chairman of the House Library Committee, and explained that the committee on historical publications would like to see its proposed bill, or one of similar import, introduced in Congress. Jameson requested a meeting with McCall in order to obtain the congressman's views and suggestions for modification of the bill.\(^{35}\) Jameson's interview with McCall apparently was more fruitful than he had anticipated, for on December 15, 1909, McCall introduced H. R. 15428, a bill authorizing the President to appoint a commission on national historical publications. The bill was virtually identical to that recommended in the committee report; the only substantive change was deletion of the requirement that the commission

members be picked from the ranks of the AHA.  

Jameson began to seek congressional backing for the bill. To several members of the House, he sent a copy of his committee's report, explained the rationale for the proposed commission, and solicited their support of the McCall Bill. He asked Elihu Root, now a senator, to introduce a similar measure in the upper house of Congress. Root quickly obliged.

Jameson also tried to insure that an impressive array of historians would appear before the House Library Committee when it met to consider the bill on January 5, 1910. He felt that the presence of Frederick Jackson Turner, the new president of the AHA, would be highly valuable. But Turner found it inconvenient to go to Washington and declined. Appearances by Charles Francis Adams, John Bach McMaster, James Ford Rhodes, and Albert Bushnell Hart also

---


39 Jameson to Turner, December 15, 1909, Box 132, File 1653, Jameson Papers; and Turner to Jameson, December 20, 1909, ibid.
would abet the cause.\textsuperscript{40} Jameson was particularly anxious that Alfred T. Mahan come, but the retired naval officer was reluctant to appear. "What can I do in addition to yourself and Turner"? he asked Jameson. When Mahan added, however, that "the Secretary of the Navy might order me on," Jameson followed up on Mahan's apparent desire to be coaxed. He asked McCall to request the Secretary of the Navy to order Mahan's attendance. Jameson's appeal to McCall brought the desired results.\textsuperscript{41}

Although Jameson was unable to secure the presence of all those he invited, a group of qualified scholars did testify before the Library Committee on January 5. In attendance were Dr. H. T. Colenbrander, Secretary of the Dutch Commission on National Historical Publications; Charles Francis Adams; Charles M. Andrews; Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress; Ruth Putnam, sister of the Librarian and a specialist in Dutch history; the recalcitrant Mahan; and Jameson.\textsuperscript{42}

Jameson made the opening statement. He repeated his

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40}Jameson to Adams, December 15, 1909, Box 45, File 11, \textit{ibid.}; James to McMaster, December 15, 1909, Box 77, File 464, \textit{ibid.}; Jameson to Rhodes, December 22, 1909, \textit{ibid.}; and Jameson to McCall, December 23, 1909, \textit{ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{42}Hearing on H. R. 15428, 61 Cong., 2 Sess., in Box 115, File 1211, Jameson Papers, hereafter referred to as Hearing on H. R. 15428.
\end{itemize}
familiar argument that the United States suffered from a lack of system in the publication of documentary historical materials. A national historical publications commission would remedy this deficiency. He emphasized that a permanent commission would save the government money, explaining that foreign governments had gotten more for their money by creating such commissions. Jameson pointed out that no massive publication scheme was immediately contemplated; in fact, he stated, "rapid execution would be bad execution."

He briefly explained the committee's recommendation to revive *American State Papers*.\(^4^3\)

In the course of his testimony, Jameson was asked whether the commission members should receive a salary. He replied that the committee report had recommended remuneration and that, in his opinion, payment would be advisable. As to a specific amount, Jameson merely said that "it would be appropriate that there should be some small compensation, . . . ."\(^4^4\)

Next to speak was Colenbrander. He gave a cursory view of the Dutch commission's background, operations, and projected plans. He explained that the Dutch system had worked well, for it had made possible publications that were "too difficult and too vast to be procured or to be published by private scholars. . . ."\(^4^5\)

\(^{4^3}\)Ibid., 1-6. \(^{4^4}\)Ibid., 5, 7. \(^{4^5}\)Ibid., 8-10.
Charles Francis Adams spoke next. He wholeheartedly supported the proposal for a commission. But most of Adams' testimony revolved around the question of compensation to the members. Adams strongly opposed payment. A small salary would leave the door open to "very ordinary men" and inferior works; instead, the members should serve "because the appointment is considered an honorable distinction, . . ." In Adams' view, the only person who should be salaried was the secretary. To illustrate his point, Adams alluded to the Massachusetts Historical Society. That body had as its only salaried official the secretary, Worthington C. Ford; the arrangement was most satisfactory.46

Mahan opened by stating: "I have very little to say, . . . because I have no experience in the matter." But he had ample words on the topic of compensation; he vehemently disagreed with Adams. The Massachusetts Historical Society, he explained, was "a voluntary association of men who come together voluntarily, and their own interest carries on this work." The federal commission, on the other hand, would be composed of men who would be performing a service to the government. They ought to receive "some moderate compensation as representing the time they give . . . and also to exert that influence that comes to a man when he is receiving money and who expects that he must give work in return."47

Charles McLean Andrews tried to redirect the Committee's attention to the question of the commission itself. He stated that "we are perhaps the most backward government in the world" in the preservation of historical materials. Creation of the commission was essential. Representative Burke, however, felt it necessary to probe Andrews' views on the question of compensation. While Andrews felt that "every man ought to be paid for what he does," he believed that rather than see the proposal fail the persons "interested in the matter would be perfectly willing to act or serve gratuitously, . . ."48

Herbert Putnam reiterated the argument that the commission was needed to provide "proper coordination, proper correlation, [and] scientific selection" of documentary materials. He explained that the commission would be a great help to the Library of Congress. The Library possessed vast quantities of material; a commission would help it to ascertain what should be published. Were the commission itself to edit and publish materials, it would relieve the Library of work that detracted from its other commitments. Such relief would be "most welcome." Asked if the commission could be housed in the Library, Putnam replied affirmatively. When queried about the issue of compensation, Putnam replied: "I have not given that

48Ibid., 13-15.
question any consideration at all..." 49

Later in the hearing, Jameson brought up an issue that would plague him in the ensuing months. Although the committee report had detailed an elaborate scheme for cooperation between the proposed commission and departments of the government, the departments might perceive the commission as threatening their own work. Agencies long in the habit of generating and executing their own publications might resent a commission that had the power of "repression." Jameson predicted, however, that if the commission began a good series of publications, the departments would "come into the habit of looking to such a commission to take charge of the historical publications which they believed to be expedient, rather than do themselves." Such had been the Dutch experience. 50

After the hearing, it was necessary to get the Library Committee to report the bill to the House. Jameson expected "some days" to pass before the bill would be reported. 51 "Some days" turned out to be over three months. McCall, the committee chairman, not only was occupied with a congressional investigation but also was stricken by illness. 52

49 Ibid., 16-20; and Putnam to McCall, January 6, 1910, in ibid., 23-24.

50 Hearings on H. R. 15428, 22.

51 Jameson to John Bach McMaster, January 7, 1910, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.

52 Jameson to Worthington C. Ford, January 27, 1910, Box 84, File 561, ibid.; and Jameson to Ford, March 5, 1910, Box 84, File 560, ibid.
bill was not reported until April 13.\textsuperscript{53}

While the bill was sitting in committee, Jameson tried to pave the way for its passage by enlisting congressional support.\textsuperscript{54} More pressing was the need to forestall opposition by the executive departments. Unless the bill was carefully explained to someone in each department, it seemed likely that such opposition would develop. Jameson counted upon Gaillard Hunt to explain the project to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. He elicited Andrew C. McLaughlin's help in getting a letter of introduction to the Secretary of War.\textsuperscript{55} He obtained from Frank W. Taussig a letter of introduction to the Secretary of the Navy.\textsuperscript{56} He explained to the Director and the Assistant Director of the Census Bureau that the commission would be useful to their work; in response, the Director promised to support the measure.\textsuperscript{57}

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53}Cong. Rec., 61 Cong., 2 Sess., 4646 (April 13, 1910).
\item \textsuperscript{55}Jameson to McLaughlin, January 10, 1910, Box 110, File 1080, Jameson Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{56}Jameson to Taussig, January 11, 1910, Box 77, File 464, \textit{ibid.}; and Taussig to Jameson, January 14, 1910, \textit{ibid.}.
\item \textsuperscript{57}Jameson to W. F. Willoughby, February 11, 1910, \textit{ibid.}; Jameson to Edward Durand, February 11, 1910, \textit{ibid.}; and Durand to Jameson, February 12, 1910, \textit{ibid.}.
\end{itemize}
Jameson also conferred with colleagues and legislators about the final form that the bill should take. One point of contention, presaged in the hearings, involved payment of members of the commission. Jameson had concluded that the members should receive $500 annually; if there were a permanent secretary, he should receive $2,500. But he realized that payment to the members would arouse congressional suspicion. Putnam told Jameson that Congress would be unwilling to appropriate lump sums "for the preparation and printing of volumes not specified. . . ." Rather, there likely would be individual appropriations for specific volumes or series. Jameson thought that the commission must have the power to initiate projects. On the other hand, he expected that "power to block undesirable enterprises . . . may not be given at first but may come later."

Senator Root also expressed serious interest in the bill and suggested changes to make it more palatable to the House. Jameson predicted that when "the mental engine of the Senator from New York gets through with it it may look like something very different."

In the end, though, it fell to Jameson to draft the amended bill. He rewrote it in light of


59 Phillip P. Robinson (Secretary to Root) to Jameson, February 9, 1910, ibid.

60 Jameson to Worthington C. Ford, January 24, 1910, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 127.
suggestions from Root, McCall, and other members of the Library Committee, and "inferences . . . as to what would probably pass." The bill was very different from the simple draft submitted by McCall the previous December.

As amended, the bill provided that the President appoint a commission of nine persons "of the highest standing for scholarship and judgment in the field of United States history, to serve for a period of four years each." The bill incorporated Root's suggestion "that before the preparation of any historical publication shall be begun by any department" or by any congressional committee the department head "shall" and the committee chairman "may" require the opinion of the commission "as to the advisability, scope, plan, and method of preparation. . . ." The bill gave the commission the powers of initiating publications and of directing publications once they had been approved by Congress. The commission would have a secretary who would be paid $2,000 annually. The commission members would receive travel expenses, but there would be no other remuneration. A sum not to exceed $10,000 would be authorized to fulfill the bill's objectives.

61 Jameson to Charles Francis Adams, April 15, 1910, Box 45, File 11, Jameson Papers.

62 H. R. 15428 (amended), Flippin Collection, XII, 35; and Jameson to Charles Francis Adams, April 15, 1910, Box 45, File 11, Jameson Papers.
Jameson also wrote the report to accompany the bill. This report emphasized that the bill had dealt wisely with controversial points. It imposed "no restrictions on the subsequent action of departments, bureaus," or congressional committees. However, it was assumed that legislative and executive authorities would give considerable weight to the commission's advice. In the interest of economy, expenditures were limited to the secretary's salary, travel expenses for the members, and "other assistance authorized by the President, . . ." Ten thousand dollars was a small sum with which to initiate the "creation of a body of historical materials" of which the country could be proud.

After nearly five years of effort, Jameson was on the threshold of seeing a national historical publications commission become a reality. The time had come to launch an all-out campaign for passage of the bill.

Following the procedure that McLaughlin had used in 1904, Jameson wrote a circular letter to his colleagues. In it, he briefly reviewed the history of H. R. 15428 and expressed confidence that its passage would put the government's historical publications on a better basis. He urged the recipients to promptly write their representatives, or

---

63 Ibid.

other members of the House, "urging them to vote for the bill when it comes up." 65

The response to Jameson's circular letter was prompt and lively. Historians throughout the country wrote to their congressmen requesting support of the bill. 66 Their letters elicited a wide range of replies. Some representatives genuinely understood the rationale for the bill and were anxious to lend their wholehearted backing. 67 Some, though not well informed on the problems of documentary historical publications, indicated that their confidence in the historians who had written them would insure their support to the measure. 68 Others replied in a rather

65 Jameson to "My Dear Sir," April 16, 1910, Flippin Collection, XII, 36-37.

66 Reuben Gold Thwaites to Henry A. Cooper (Wisconsin), April 18, 1910, Box 109, File 1053, Jameson Papers; Worthington C. Ford to A. J. Peters (Massachusetts), April 18, 1910, Box 84, File 561, ibid.; Max Farrand to Jameson, April 18, 1910, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; Francis W. Shepardson to Jameson, April 19, 1910, ibid.; and Charles H. Hull to Jameson, April 20, 1910, Box 95, File 799, ibid.

67 William Paine Sheffield (Rhode Island) to William B. Weeden, April 20, 1910, Box 115, File 1211, ibid.; George P. Lawrence (Massachusetts) to Albert Bushnell Hart, April 20, 1910, ibid.; William B. McKinley (Illinois) to Clarence W. Alvord, April 22, 1910, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; A. J. Peters (Massachusetts) to Worthington C. Ford, April 28, 1910, Box 84, File 561, ibid.; and John J. Esch (Wisconsin) to Jameson, May 20, 1910, Box 115, File 1211, ibid.

68 James C. McLaughlin (Michigan) to Jameson, April 19, 1910, Box 115, File 1211, ibid.; John W. Weeks (Massachusetts) to Albert Bushnell Hart, April 20, 1910, ibid.; John Q. Tilson (Connecticut) to Max Ferrand, April 20, 1910, Box 77, File 464, ibid.; and William A. Ashbrook (Ohio) to Francis W. Shepardson, April 21, 1910, ibid.
perfunctory manner but nevertheless pledged their support. As could be expected, many congressmen merely promised careful attention to or consideration of the bill.

Jameson not only initiated the letter-writing campaign but also maintained its impetus. The amount of relevant correspondence in the Jameson Papers is evidence that historians looked to Jameson for leadership. If a historian found that his congressman was recalcitrant, he could ask Jameson "to let a little light into him." In at least one instance, Jameson's careful explanation of the bill converted a doubter into a supporter.

---

69 Frederick H. Gillett (Massachusetts) to Albert Bushnell Hart, April 20, 1910, Box 115, File 1211, ibid.; John P. Swasey (Maine) to Henry S. Burrage, April 20, 1910, ibid.; Frank E. Guernsey (Maine) to Henry S. Burrage, April 20, 1910, ibid.; Amos L. Allen (Maine) to Henry S. Burrage, April 21, 1910, ibid.; Frank O. Lowden (Illinois) to Jameson, April 21, 1910, ibid.; Charles G. Washburn (Massachusetts) to Albert Bushnell Hart, April 23, 1910, ibid.; Patrick Gill (Missouri) to Mayo Fessler, April 23, 1910, ibid.; Richard Barthold (Missouri) to Mayo Fessler, April 27, 1910, ibid.; E. N. Foss (Massachusetts) to Albert Bushnell Hart, April 27, 1910, ibid.; and Walter I. Smith (Iowa) to Jameson, April 16, 1920, ibid.

70 Washington Gardner (Michigan) to Jameson, April 16, 1910, ibid.; John W. Dwight (New York) to Charles H. Hull, April 21, 1910, ibid.; Henry S. Boutell (Illinois) to Albert Bushnell Hart, April 21, 1910, ibid.; Henry Coudrey (Missouri) to Mayo Fessler, April 23, 1910, ibid.; Willis C. Hawley (Oregon) to Joseph Schafer, April 28, 1910, ibid.; George Edmund Foss (Illinois) to J. Q. James, May 9, 1910, ibid.; James R. Mann (Illinois) to Jameson, April 18, 1910, ibid.; Richard Wayne Parker (New Jersey) to William Nelson, April 19, 1910, ibid.; and E. H. Hayes (California) to Max Farrand, April 19, 1910, ibid.

71 William S. Bennett (New York) to William A. Dunning (Dunning's comments in margin), May 3, 1910, Box 60, File 182, ibid.; Jameson to Bennett, May 12, 1910, ibid.; and Bennett to Jameson, May 13, 1910, ibid.
three weeks after the campaign started, Jameson estimated that between forty and fifty representatives had taken a definite stand in favor of the bill.\textsuperscript{72}

While the letter writing proceeded, Jameson, in his continuing attempt to insure the bill's passage, corresponded with McCall. Jameson feared that the proposed payment of $2,000 annually to the commission secretary would arouse congressional opposition. Although this sum was just adequate to compensate a person employed full time, it was possible that Congress would not "adopt even a part" of the commission's proposals. If that happened, the secretary would have little to do, and the salary would be unjustified. Jameson therefore suggested that the bill be rephrased so as to provide the secretary with a salary "'not exceeding $2000 a year.'"\textsuperscript{73}

This bill, however, did not reach a vote in the second session of the Sixty-first Congress. H. R. 15428 had been placed on the calendar and was to be called on a "Calendar Wednesday." But the Library Committee, Jameson explained, "was not called again before the conclusion of the session." Apparently, the bill would have been considered had McCall placed higher priority upon it.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72}Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, May 4, 1910, Box 104, File 980, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{73}Jameson to McCall, April 19, 1910, Box 77, File 464, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{74}Jameson to Edmond S. Meany, September 1, 1910, Box 112, File 1124, \textit{ibid}.; and Jameson to Charles Francis Adams,
This outcome disheartened Jameson, particularly since the letter-writing campaign had borne "considerable fruit." Jameson hoped that the good impression created in March and April still would prevail when Congress reconvened in December.\(^7^5\) Also in the next session, it was imperative that McCall treat the bill as one "of urgent importance." Jameson asked members of the committee to write to McCall, impressing upon him the seriousness of the bill and urging him to press it to a vote.\(^7^6\)

One month after Congress reconvened, however, Jameson concluded that the bill was unlikely to appear before the House. Turning to his senate ally, Root, he expressed the hope that Root's bill for the creation of a commission would be reported and passed. Jameson was sure that "the prospect of passing such a measure in the House would . . . be increased if a similar measure came to it from the Senate."\(^7^7\) But this effort was to no avail; when Congress adjourned in the spring of 1911, neither house had considered the measure.

---

\(^7^5\)Jameson to Edmond S. Meany, September 1, 1910, Box 112, File 1124, Jameson Papers.

\(^7^6\)Jameson to Charles Francis Adams, November 17, 1910, Box 45, File 11, \textit{ibid}.

\(^7^7\)Jameson to Root, January 11, 1911, Box 125, File 1456, \textit{ibid}.

November 17, 1910, Box 45, File 11, \textit{ibid}. For a description of "Calendar Wednesday" and the observation that it "has been more honored in the breach than in the observance," see George P. Galloway, \textit{History of the House of Representatives} (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1962), 112.
Still, Jameson did not give up hope. Early in the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, Root introduced a bill for the creation of a national historical publications commission.78 This bill was essentially the same as H. R. 15428.79 The day after Root introduced his proposal in the Senate, Jameson wrote to J. L. Slayden, of Texas, the new Chairman of the House Library Committee. He sent Slayden a copy of Root's bill along with a proposed change. Jameson had found that some departments were afraid the commission would encroach upon work that they themselves wished to pursue. Jameson therefore suggested to Slayden that the bill be amended to allow a department or a congressional committee "to reserve to itself the preparation for publication of certain historical materials which are in its custody."80

Jameson was far less optimistic than he had been during the previous Congress. Slayden, he explained to Waldo G. Leland, lacked "the force or influence that McCall had."81 Jameson nevertheless did what he could to bring

78 Cong. Rec., 62 Cong., 1 Sess., 713 (April 28, 1911).
79 S. 1773, 62 Cong., 1 Sess., in Flippin Collection, XII, 103.
80 Jameson to Slayden, April 29, 1911, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers; Jameson to Root, January 11, 1911, Box 125, File 1456, ibid.; Jameson to Root, January 13, 1911, ibid.; and S. 1773 (with marginal notes), in Flippin Collection, XII, 103.
81 Jameson to Leland, May 3, 1911, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 144.
about favorable action. He induced McCall to urge upon Slayden the importance of the bill.\textsuperscript{82} He got John H. Latiné and presumably, other historians to keep the matter before their representatives and senators.\textsuperscript{83} He obtained from Woodrow Wilson a letter of introduction to a New Jersey congressman who sat on the Library Committee.\textsuperscript{84}

But a lobbying effort comparable to that of the previous year did not materialize. Perhaps Jameson had lost heart after seeing defeat follow upon the heels of anticipated success. Perhaps he now felt that he must devote more time and energy to the campaign for an archives building. At any rate, the impetus for the creation of a national historical publications commission clearly had diminished. A bill to that end was not even introduced in the House during the Sixty-second Congress.

In 1912, Jameson's interest in the project briefly revived. If Woodrow Wilson should be elected President, Jameson told Worthington C. Ford, he would bring the matter to his attention.\textsuperscript{85} During Wilson's first year in office,}

\textsuperscript{82} McCall to Jameson, May 5, 1911, Box 109, File 1053, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{83} Jameson to Latané, May 5, 1911, Box 101, File 953, \textit{ibid}.; and Latané to Jameson, May 8, 1911, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{84} Jameson to Wilson, December 14, 1911, Box 135, File 1772, \textit{ibid}.; and Wilson to Jameson, December 18, 1911, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{85} Jameson to Ford, September 25, 1912, Box 86, File 612, \textit{ibid}.
Jameson requested time to discuss with his former student the subject of a publications commission. Wilson apparently showed no interest.

After eight years of working for a national historical publications commission, then, Jameson temporarily abandoned the effort. This was not the first, nor would it be the last, of Jameson's disappointments in trying to get the government to aid history. Nevertheless, a foundation had been laid. In 1934, a national historical publications commission came into existence; in 1950, it became a viable organization. What Jameson could not accomplish during his lifetime was realized, albeit on a more limited scale, thirteen years after his death.

Meanwhile, there were other tasks at hand. The movement for an archives building was consuming an ever increasing share of Jameson's time and energy. Jameson also was turning his attention to other projects that required government assistance. These endeavors were less comprehensive in scope than was his lobbying for a commission on historical publications. But they could serve as opening wedges in Jameson's drive to enhance what the government did on behalf of the nation's past.

---

86 Jameson to Wilson, October 29, 1913, Box 169, ibid.
87 Higham, History, 36.
CHAPTER IV

"SOMETHING MORE RESTRICTED": PROPOSALS TO COMMEMORATE
THE TREATY OF GHENT AND TO PUBLISH RECORDS
OF THE REVOLUTION

While Jameson was working to bring about a national historical publications commission, he also became interested in two proposed governmental historical publications. He wanted one of these publications for its intrinsic value and because he thought it would abet the movement for a national historical publications commission. He opposed the other projected publication until after the movement for a publications commission had subsided. Then he supported it because he thought it would help enrich relations between historians and the federal government. One of the proposals never got off the ground; the other nearly culminated in a documentary historical publication of monumental proportions.

In January, 1912, Cuno H. Randolph, President of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, informed Jameson that a celebration of 100 years of Anglo-American peace would be held in the District in 1914-1915. Randolph asked Jameson to serve on the "Committee of One Hundred" that would
take charge of the celebration. Jameson gladly accepted the invitation.¹

The upcoming celebration inspired Jameson to propose an ambitious undertaking relative to the end of the War of 1812. To James Brown Scott, Secretary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Jameson described his plan. The United States government should commemorate the Treaty of Ghent by publishing "all the diplomatic correspondence of any importance relating to and leading up to the negotiations. . . ." Foreign governments, Jameson noted, had established precedents for such undertakings. The Mexican government had published documents commemorating a century of Mexican independence, the Russian government was undertaking "something rather magnificent" to commemorate the Russian resistance against Napoleon in 1812, and the Italian government "had done a pretty substantial thing with respect to the fiftieth anniversary" of Italy's unification in 1860. The United States, however, should not undertake the publication unless it were well done. If the project were to be carried out "by some clerk of a committee, or official untrained in history," as often was the case with governmental publications, then Jameson preferred that it not be done at all. To insure a first-rate publication, the work should be entrusted to a committee of scholars well

¹Randolph to Jameson, January 18, 1912, Box 86, File 612, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Randolph, January 19, 1912, ibid.
versed in diplomatic history.  

Jameson had another reason for wanting the Ghent publication to be executed by a group of historical scholars. "The use of such a method," he explained, "would force upon the Congressional mind the value of a permanent Commission on National Historical Publications." A model publication might serve as a lever to pry out of Congress the bill for a publications commission.  

Although Scott promised to promote Jameson's proposal in any way possible, he apparently took no further action on the matter.

In September, 1912, Jameson presented his plan to Woodrow Wilson. Anticipating Wilson's election in November, Jameson did not think it premature to explain to Wilson his proposal. Wilson's apparent failure to acknowledge Jameson's letter was a portent of how he would treat Jameson's entreaties once he was in the White House. Having failed to receive significant support for his proposal, Jameson resigned himself to seeing the end of the War of 1812 commemorated by the ceremonies within the District of Columbia. Meanwhile, however, there was afoot a movement to commemorate in grand fashion a far more significant episode

---

2 Jameson to Scott, March 11, 1912, Box 69, File 316, ibid.

3 ibid.

4 Scott to Jameson, March 15, 1912, ibid.

5 Jameson to Wilson, September 4, 1912, Box 135, File 1772, ibid.
in the nation's military history, the American Revolution.

Jameson first became aware of the movement in 1907. Frank B. Culver, Adjutant-General of Maryland, had informed the Commissioner of the Bureau of Pensions, V. Warner, that records relating to soldiers in the Revolution and the War of 1812, records then stored in various departments of the government, should be published. Warner acknowledged that such publications would be of great value to historians and genealogists, but he explained to Culver that such a publication would require congressional authorization and appropriations. Culver then presented his proposal to Herbert Putnam and Daniel Coit Gilman. Putnam transmitted Culver's communications to Jameson, and Gilman informed Culver that he should take up the matter with Jameson. Culver, acting on this advice, sought Jameson's help in stirring up congressional support for publication of the military records.

Jameson's response to Culver, though sympathetic, was basically negative. Jameson did not wish to "be backward in helping on any good undertaking." On the other hand, he explained, he was deeply involved in an attempt to create a national historical publications commission. He therefore doubted that he should support Culver's proposal "until the

6 V. Warner to Culver, July 30, 1907, Box 124, File 1421, ibid.

7 Culver to Jameson, August 1, 1907, ibid.
general field of what is possible and advisable has been thoroughly canvassed by some expert means."

The movement to publish records relating to the Revolution, however, proceeded without Jameson's assistance. Early in 1910, patriotic societies took up the proposal with great enthusiasm. In a memorial to Congress, the Society of Cincinnati urged that "the military and naval orders, reports, correspondence and records of the Revolutionary War" be collected and published. Many of these records, the memorial explained, were scattered throughout the original thirteen states and several foreign countries. This situation gave rise to the loss and destruction of valuable historical sources. Collection and publication of the Revolutionary archives not only would insure their preservation but also would revive interest in the Revolution and would reawaken patriotic impulses among the American people. Such a publication especially was needed "at this time when hosts of people of foreign tongues and ideas are crowding upon our shores, and the engrossing cares and distractions of modern life, civilization and pursuit of wealth absorb the attention of so many of our citizens." The Indiana

Jameson to Culver, [? 1907], ibid.

Memorial in File on S. 271, 62 Cong., Record Group 46, National Archives, hereafter referred to as File on S. 271. The memorial is undated. However, internal evidence indicates that it was passed early in 1910. The first bill for publication of Revolutionary records was introduced on February 28, 1910. Cong. Rec., 61 Cong., 2 Sess., 2534 (February 28, 1910). The Society had been the main driving
Society Sons of the Revolution and the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution similarly petitioned Congress for the collection and publication of the records of the Revolution.¹⁰

Largely at the urging of the Society of Cincinnati, on March 8, 1910, Senator George P. Wetmore of Rhode Island introduced a bill, S. 6991, "to authorize the compilation of the military and naval records of the Revolutionary war with a view to their publication, . . ." According to the bill, the Secretary of War would be responsible for collecting and compiling the "scattered" military records of the Revolution. The Secretary of the Navy would have the responsibility of collecting and compiling the naval records. The War Department would receive $50,000 to carry out the work; the Navy Department, $10,000.¹¹

Hazard Stevens, Chairman of the Memorial Committee of the Society of Cincinnati, insured that Wetmore's bill would not be lost in committee. He incessantly impressed upon members of the Senate Military Affairs Committee the desirability of passing the bill. Two months after the bill had

---

¹⁰ Petition by the Indiana Society Sons of the Revolution, March 1, 1910, ibid.; and resolution by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, May 20, 1910, ibid.

been introduced, Stevens informed Senator Morgan Bulkeley of Connecticut, a member of the Committee, that "we are greatly disappointed in the delay in obtaining a hearing" on the bill. After three months of lobbying by Stevens, the Senate Military Affairs Committee reported the bill with the recommendation that it pass.

The report on S. 6991 pointed out that much work needed to be done to prepare the records of the Revolution for publication. Legislation passed in the 1890's had provided that military records of the Revolution in various executive departments be transferred to the War Department. Although many transfers had been made, numerous records remained in the hands of the Library of Congress, state authorities, historical societies, and individuals. A similar situation prevailed with respect to the naval records of the Revolution. Before the Revolutionary archives could be published, it was necessary that they all be gathered in one place.

Before collection of the records could begin, the

---

12 Stevens to Bulkeley, March 14, 1910, File on S. 271; Stevens to Francis Warren, March 16, 1910, ibid.; Stevens to Bulkeley, April 17, 1910, ibid.; Stevens to Bulkeley, April 29, 1910, ibid.; and Stevens to Bulkeley, May 9, 1910, ibid.


14 U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Military Affairs, Compilation of Military and Naval Records of Revolutionary War, 61 Cong., 2 Sess., 1910, Rept. 790, 1-5 passim.
bill had to pass Congress. When Senator Bulkeley requested unanimous consent for consideration of S. 6991 on June 24, 1910, Senator Elmer Burkett of Nebraska objected and the bill went over. The bill next was brought up in December, 1910. At that time, Senator Joseph Bailey of Texas objected. Bailey did not "believe any human soul would be wiser or happier for the publication of these records" and felt it was "about time we were practicing that economy of which we have heard so much and seen so little." The bill finally passed the Senate on January 30, 1911, but it was not considered by the House during the Sixty-first Congress.

Jameson was firmly opposed to the legislative activity of 1910-1911. He explained to Clarence Bowen, Treasurer of the AHA and a supporter of S. 6991, that the committee on documentary historical publications appointed by President Roosevelt in 1908 had concluded that the government had taken the wrong track in adopting "on impulse . . . this, that or the other historical publication in a casual order and without regard to a general scheme." Instead, the committee had urged that governmental publications proceed according to an orderly, scientific plan framed by a commission of experts. It therefore would be

\[\text{Cong. Rec.}, 61 \text{ Cong.}, 2 \text{ Sess.}, 8869 \text{ (June 24, 1910).} \]
\[\text{Ibid.}, 61 \text{ Cong.}, 3 \text{ Sess.}, 110-11 \text{ (December 8, 1910).} \]
\[\text{Ibid.}, 61 \text{ Cong.}, 3 \text{ Sess.}, 1637 \text{ (January 30, 1911).} \]
unwise to initiate a new publication. It would be particu-
larly inconsistent for Jameson, who was actively supporting
creation of a national historical publications commission,
to support the publication of Revolutionary records. He
hoped that Bowen would adopt a similar view.\textsuperscript{18}

On April 6, 1911, Senator Wetmore reintroduced the
bill for compiling the Revolutionary records with a view to
their publication. The bill, S. 271, was reported on July
15, 1912, with amendments.\textsuperscript{19} One amendment made a minor
textual change. The other provided that "no part of the
sum" appropriated would be used to purchase records "that
may be discovered in the hands of private owners or in
public depositories." This provision was intended to guard
against persons attempting to make money by selling old
muster rolls to the government. Thus amended, the bill
passed the Senate.\textsuperscript{20}

When the House Military Affairs Committee considered
S. 271, it decided that further amendments were needed. The
Committee proposed that the Secretaries of War and Navy make
annual detailed statements to Congress showing how and to

\textsuperscript{18}Jameson to Bowen, February 8, 1910, Box 124, File
1421, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Cong. Rec.}, 62 Cong., 1 Sess., 105 (April 6, 1911),
62 Cong., 2 Sess., 928 (January 15, 1912).

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Military
Affairs, Compilation of Revolutionary War Records}, 62 Cong.,
2 Sess., 1912, Rept. 176, 1, 5; and \textit{Cong. Rec.}, 62 Cong.,
2 Sess., 1178 (January 22, 1912).
whom the money was being expended. More importantly, it recommended that the amount appropriated for the War Department be cut in half and that the Navy Department's appropriation be reduced from $10,000 to $7,000.  

The Committee's amendments, however, did not satisfy some members' penchants for economy. When the bill came before the House on August 5, 1912, Representative James Mann of Illinois stated that there should be an express limitation on the amount expended. This could be accomplished, he believed, by inserting an amendment confining expenditures "within the limits of the appropriation herein provided." Representative John Fitzgerald of New York doubted that the work could be completed with the sums of money provided. He stated that sending persons throughout the original thirteen states would involve work of such magnitude "that I doubt the advisability of authorizing it at this time." On Fitzgerald's objection, the bill went over.  

When the House next considered the bill, the question of expenditures again led to debate. Representative Martin Foster of Illinois warned:

---


... here is an innocent appropriation bill proposing to appropriate $32,000 to compile the Revolutionary War Records. ... And yet I want the House to distinctly understand that ... not next year but likely the year after, they will come back to this House asking another appropriation, and then another and another, and they will extend probably over a number of years, and no man knows what it will cost, but it will probably cost a million dollars before they are through with it.23

Compilation of the records, Foster continued, would require trips to France, England, and other European countries. "If the House is going to vote for this," he stated, "let us vote for it, believing and knowing that it is going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars before we are through with it."24

Representative James Hay of Virginia, Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, sought to counter Foster's arguments. He pointed out that expenditures could not exceed $32,000 unless a future Congress chose to appropriate more funds. There certainly was no intention to "expend anything like a million dollars, ..." Foster then directly asked Hay if he thought the work could be completed with a $32,000 appropriation. Hay replied: "... I do believe it can. ..."25

Mann asked Hay if he would accept Mann's amendment

---

23 Ibid., 62 Cong., 3 Sess., 4327 (February 28, 1913).
24 Ibid., 4327-28 (February 28, 1913).
25 Ibid., 4328 (February 28, 1913).
confining expenditures "'within the limitation of the appropriation herein made.'" Hay agreed, and the amendment passed. After hearing a further warning by Foster against an "innocent looking bill which will permit . . . men to roam over all the states . . . and possibly over a part of Europe to secure certain records," the House passed S. 271. The Senate promptly approved the House amendments, and the bill became law on March 2.26

Although Jameson showed more interest in S. 271 than in S. 6991,27 he was, at best, cool toward the new law. As late as December, 1913, he maintained that it should not have passed.28 Nevertheless, now that legislation for a new documentary publication had passed Congress, historians began to look to Jameson for leadership.

On June 6, 1913, Robert M. Johnston, a prominent military historian, informed Jameson that "I have been making use of your name in Washington these last few days. . . ." Johnston had been trying to convince the departmental personnel in charge of the Revolutionary records project that they should consult persons in the historical profession. Specifically, they should urge the creation of

26Ibid., 4328-29 (February 28, 1913), 4303 (February 28, 1913); and Statutes at Large, XXXVII, 723.


28Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, December 8, 1913, ibid.
an advisory committee that included professional historians. Johnston had let it be known that Jameson was "the one man in the country to direct such a Committee. . . ." Creation of an advisory committee, Johnston told Jameson, not only would ensure that the work would be well executed but also would help lead "to the control of the National Archives by scholars." 29

In his response to Johnston, Jameson indicated that he had modified his opposition to the legislation. He still preferred that a permanent commission on national historical publications direct activities such as compilation and publication of the Revolutionary records. But since he had been unable to bring such a commission into existence, he concluded that "to attempt something more restricted, such as is mentioned in your letter, may be a better pathway toward the best future results." Jameson thus pledged to do all that he could to see that the Revolutionary records undertaking was properly handled. 30

Jameson brought the subject to the attention of Secretary of War Lindley Garrison. He told Garrison that implementation of the statute would best be performed by a commission containing representatives from the historical profession. He explained that too often the government's historical work had been produced by "bureau men," with poor

29 Johnston to Jameson, June 6, 1913, ibid.
30 Jameson to Johnston, June 11, 1913, ibid.
results. Now the government had an opportunity to draw upon the best historical minds and execute a first-rate piece of work. "The government ought to have the very best. . . . Why should the government be without it when it can perfectly well have it?" Jameson asked Garrison.31

Garrison, however, felt no compulsion to put the project in expert hands. Hazard Stevens tried to persuade Garrison to select General George W. Davis, who had been in charge of the Official Records of the Civil War, to supervise the undertaking. But Garrison, "under the influence of the Adjutant General," picked Captain Hollis C. Clark, retired, to serve as Director of Publication of Revolutionary Military Records.32 Clark, according to Jameson, was "a very sensible and right thinking officer, [but] by his own avowal not at all an historical scholar. . . ."33

Not only had Garrison appointed a non-historian to direct the project, but also work was proceeding at a very slow pace.34 R. M. Johnston, distressed at the course of events, took up the matter with the Council of the AHA.35

---

31Jameson to the Secretary of War, July 7, 1913, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 159-60.


33Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, December 8, 1913, Box 124, File 1421, ibid.

34Charles H. Lincoln to Jameson, December 22, 1913, Box 108, File 1024, ibid.

35Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, December 11, 1913, Box 104, File 983, ibid.
The Council, in turn, appointed a committee to consider how the Council could "most effectively urge upon the authorities at Washington the proper publication of" the Revolutionary records. The committee members were Andrew C. McLaughlin, chairman, Jameson, and Albert Bushnell Hart.36

Jameson described to the other committee members the status of the undertaking and outlined the committee's tasks as he viewed them. He explained that only minimal progress had been made. Hollis C. Clark had been "occupying himself with the physical questions of photographic copying rather than with historical studies." Clark, Jameson continued, recently had paid him a visit. Jameson had taken this opportunity to impress upon Clark the ways in which historians could help him. He predicted that Clark would be "well disposed toward suggestions made by representatives of the historical profession."37

One of the committee's first tasks would be to offer advice on what should be included in the collection. The act of March, 1913, Jameson explained, had used the term "military records." While it would be economical to limit the compilation to military records in the strictest sense of the term, Jameson felt that historians and general readers would be better served if the phraseology was

36 Charles H. Haskins to Jameson, December 2, 1913, Box 124, File 1421, ibid.

37 Jameson to Hart, December 8, 1913, ibid.; and Jameson to McLaughlin, December 8, 1913, ibid.
interpreted broadly. He therefore asked Hart and McLaughlin to prepare statements of what should comprise the term "military records." Jameson also suggested that the committee hold a meeting with representatives of the military services on January 1 and 2, to discuss what should be included. The proposed meeting also would enable the committee to better define its relationship to the project. Hart, McLaughlin, and Jameson could feel their "way in accordance with what" they learned at the meeting.  

The goals that Jameson set for the committee apparently were too ambitious. McLaughlin, chairman of the committee, reminded Jameson that the committee's function was to recommend to the Council what action it should take relative to the Revolutionary Records project rather than to do "the thing ourselves." He did agree with Jameson's recommendation that the committee meet in January. McLaughlin suggested that the committee should recommend to the Council "that a committee be appointed to draft and propose suggestions to the War and Navy Departments concerning the character and scope of the work which they are undertaking" and possibly to offer assistance and suggestions that would help the Departments prepare the material in a satisfactory manner. It would be unwise, McLaughlin continued, for the committee to make sweeping criticisms of the

---

Departments or to advocate that the AHA control or supervise the project.\(^39\) Jameson agreed.\(^40\)

Before the three-man committee met in January, the Executive Council of the AHA authorized the President of the AHA to appoint a committee of five "to act for the association in an advisory capacity with respect" to the Revolutionary records undertaking.\(^41\) Although the President was thus empowered, whether or not he would appoint such a committee depended upon the attitude of the War and Navy Departments.\(^42\) The AHA would not try to impose its services where they were not wanted.

The attitude of the Departments soon became clear. Attending the January meeting with Jameson, McLaughlin, and Hart were the Assistant Secretaries of War and Navy, Henry Breckenridge and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The two Assistant Secretaries indicated that they would warmly welcome the AHA's assistance. Andrew C. McLaughlin, now President of the AHA, thereupon appointed an advisory committee comprised of Major John Bigelow, a member of the historical division of the General Staff, chairman, Frederic Bancroft, Admiral

\(^39\)McLaughlin to Jameson, December 11, 1913, ibid.

\(^40\)Jameson to McLaughlin, December 17, 1913, ibid.


\(^42\)Jameson to Justin Smith, January 5, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, Jameson Papers.
French E. Chadwick, retired, and Jameson.43

Breckenridge and Roosevelt's desire to use professional historians led Jameson to change his mind about the Revolutionary Records project. His enthusiasm for the undertaking hitherto had been at best muted. Now he was ebullient. Jameson explained to Waldo G. Leland that "this is the first time when any department has invoked the aid of the historical profession as such, for any historical publication; and in this we should rejoice."44 The AHA's role in the project might serve as the "entering wedge for much fuller participation of trained historical minds in governmental historical publications...."45 Jameson apparently believed that if the project was carried off well it might revive and bring to fruition the proposal for a national historical publications commission.46

Jameson notified the committee members of their appointments and explained their responsibilities. He informed them that a conference would be held on January 16 and 17 between the committee, Clark, and representatives of the Army and Navy war colleges. The purpose of the conference would be "to define the scope and limitations of the

43Ibid.
45Jameson to Justin Smith, January 5, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, Jameson Papers.
46Jameson to Franklin D. Roosevelt, January 6, 1914, Box 125, File 1454, ibid.
proposed collection . . . to decide upon methods which shall be followed in collecting, and to frame instructions for those who are to act . . . as searchers." After this conference, the committee's primary work would be to answer letters of inquiry from Clark and to recommend agents for carrying out the searches.47

When the group convened, they first considered "general principles of inclusion and exclusion." They found it difficult to reach conclusive judgments on this question without having fuller information about what documents existed. They decided first to obtain estimates of materials in two "specimen archives," those of Massachusetts and North Carolina. With this data in hand, the committee could reconvene on February 10 and make better informed recommendations.48

As to procedure, the committee concluded that in each state "local searchers should be chosen . . . from among men of approved historical training." The committee recommended Charles H. Lincoln as the searcher for Massachusetts, and Marshall de Lancey Haywood for North Carolina. The selection of searchers for the other states would be taken up at the

---

47 Jameson to Justin H. Smith, January 5, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, _ibid_. Cf. Jameson to Bigelow, January 5, 1914, Box 60, File 190, _ibid_.; Jameson to Chadwick, January 5, 1914, Box 70, File 333, _ibid_.; and Jameson to Bancroft, January 5, 1914, Box 58, File 150, _ibid_.

48 Jameson to the Secretary of War, January 19, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, _ibid_.
committee's next meeting. The search for both military and naval records would be conducted "in each repository by one person at one and the same time." 49

To insure the most nearly complete compilation, it was necessary to publicize the project. The committee recommended that posters asking for documents relating to the Revolution be sent to post offices around the nation and that the project be publicized in the American Historical Review and other historical journals. The committee also recommended that the War and Navy Departments request another $32,000 appropriation. 50

Jameson soon discovered that the committee's responsibilities would be broader than he had anticipated. Assistant Secretary Breckenridge concluded that the committee should have complete charge of appointing searchers for the respective states. The committee turned to Jameson for suggestions. Jameson, wanting to produce results that would justify Breckenridge's confidence, wrote to professors in the original thirteen states to solicit their suggestions for qualified searchers. 51

---

49 Ibid.  
50 Ibid.  
Although Breckenridge and Roosevelt wanted to "keep the whole matter out of the hands of politicians," political considerations sometimes did influence the selection of searchers. When Max Farrand suggested that Lewis B. Namier do the work in Connecticut, Jameson responded: "I doubt about appointing an Englishman. We don't want to make the halls of Congress resound with patriotic oratory." Representative Hay was pushing for the appointment of an individual named J. H. Lindsay to handle the project in Virginia. Lindsay, Jameson stated, was a "sensible and intelligent man, . . . but without historical training." But since Hay was Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, his assistance was vital if appropriations were to be continued. Compromise seemed the better part of wisdom. Jameson proposed to Clark that Lindsay be engaged to search for materials in private hands. But Jameson would not entrust Lindsay to work in the archives of Virginia and of the Virginia Historical Society; that task should be assigned to Morgan Robinson of the Virginia State Archives. In an apparent attempt to garner congressional

52 Jameson to W. G. Stannard, January 22, 1914, ibid.
53 Farrand to Jameson, February 13, 1914, Box 81, File 522, ibid.; and Jameson to Farrand, February 17, 1914, ibid.
54 Jameson to W. G. Stannard, January 22, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, ibid.
support for the project, Jameson invited Representatives Frederick Gillet of Massachusetts and Andrew Montague of Virginia to attend the second meeting of the advisory committee. If Jameson was acting politically, then he was acting wisely. Two days after the advisory committee met on February 10, 1914, the House Appropriations Committee convened to hear arguments in favor of an additional $32,000 appropriation.

Committee Chairman John Fitzgerald opened the hearing on a note that was at best skeptical:

The last Congress provided $32,000 to do whatever part of this work could be done with that amount, and no more.

And it was passed with the distinct understanding that it would be done for $32,000. Now, both departments, apparently working together, have come in and asked to have the amount doubled.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of the witnesses, explained that many more years of appropriations probably would be needed to complete the job. When asked how much money eventually would be needed, Roosevelt was unable to predict a precise amount.

Representative Charles Bartlett of Georgia inquired how much it had cost to prepare the Official Records of the

55 Jameson to Gillet, February 5, 1914, Box 124, File 1420, ibid.; and Jameson to Montague, February 9, 1914, Box 113, File 1164, ibid.

56 Hearing on Urgent Deficiency Bill, 1914, in Box 124, File 1421, ibid., 232.

57 Ibid.
Civil War. Breckenridge informed him that the cost had been about $3,000,000. When Fitzgerald asked if the Revolutionary records would require a comparable amount, Roosevelt stated that they would not. Roosevelt suggested that Major John Bigelow could make a reasonable approximation of cost. Bigelow stated that since the Revolutionary documents would require about one-third the number of volumes for the Civil War records, the cost would be about $1,000,000. Roosevelt pointed out that since the Revolutionary records were being copied by a photostatic process, instead of being copied in long hand, Bigelow's estimate probably was excessive.  

Fitzgerald then reiterated that the legislation had passed on the assumption that the work could be done for $32,000. Roosevelt stated that the Navy Department had not implied the work could be done for that amount and asked who had made such an implication. Charles Stewart of the Navy Department explained that the principal witness at the hearing to publish the records had been Hazard Stevens. He added that the Society of Cincinnati and similar groups had been the main forces behind the bill. Roosevelt suggested that Fitzgerald probably would prefer to discuss the matter "from the point of view of the departments rather than from the point of view of any private association." Fitzgerald promptly shot back: "We are taking it up from the point of view of the cost." Roosevelt explained the necessity of the

58 Ibid., 233.
undertaking. Since records of the Revolution were scattered all around the country, it was essential that they be gathered together and published. He also described the process by which work on the project was proceeding, explaining in detail how the money was being spent.59

Fitzgerald next implied that Roosevelt was acting improperly in coming before the Committee. The bill for collecting and publishing the Revolutionary records had expressly limited expenditures to $32,000. In light of this limitation, Fitzgerald stated, "this committee has no authority to recommend an appropriation in addition to what you have." Such a recommendation, he explained, would be subject to a point of order and "we would not take the risk." He added that "the historical publications which I have seen . . . hardly justify the expenditure." Fitzgerald seemed ready to terminate the hearing.60

Breckenridge, however, wanted to be heard. He offered a general defense of governmental historical publications, stating that the United States was quite remiss in the publication of historical material. He pointed out the need for a national historical publications commission, drawing his conclusions from the report issued by the committee appointed by Roosevelt in 1908. Breckenridge then made specific reference to the necessity of publishing the Revolutionary records. The records would be of utilitarian

59Ibid., 233-37. 60Ibid., 237-38.
value. For example, someone might wish to study the corres-
pondence that led up to Rochambeau's expedition in order to
help set a precedent for America's relations with another
country. Given the inaccessibility of material, he would
find this an impossible task. Completion of the Revolu-
tionary records project, however, would remedy the problem.
Breckenridge explained that publication of the Revolutionary
records was more vital than any other historical project,
including the compilation of the Civil War records. While
the records of the Civil War were primarily of interest to
military men, the Revolution had "established for the first
time in modern history a true Republic, and has its influ-
ence through the length and breadth of the world, . . ."
The records of that experience thus would be of far greater
use to the "public man" than the records of the Civil War.
Breckenridge concluded that "America is doing less for the
perpetuation and making accessible of her historical records
than any first-class nation in the world, and there is also
no doubt in my mind that the next step is to give access to
the Revolutionary Records, . . ." 61

The last person to speak before the Committee was
Frederic Bancroft. He explained that in 1888 he had been
Librarian of the State Department. At that time, the
Department had been in custody of many Revolutionary records,
but they were "'all in rags and tatters, . . .'" Bancroft

61 Ibid., 238-41.
had felt that something should be done to preserve the records, but the Secretary of State had pointed out that nothing could be done without the help of the House Appropriations Committee. So Bancroft had gone before the Committee and had succeeded in getting an appropriation to put the records in shape. Bancroft stated: "If you will go to the records that have since been transferred to the Library of Congress you will see there the most magnificent work ever done in this world, and that work started right here." Fitzgerald dryly observed: "A good many valuable things start in this committee." On that note, he terminated the hearing.62

Jameson had been out of town during the hearing. Upon his return, he learned that the hearing had not gone well. Fearing adverse action by the Appropriations Committee, he attempted to get historians to write members of the Committee to urge another appropriation.63 But Jameson's efforts were to no avail; the Committee failed to recommend more money.64

The debate on the bill to initiate the project,

62Ibid., 244-45.

63Jameson to R. D. W. Connor, February 17, 1914, Box 73, File 396, Jameson Papers; John Bigelow to Jameson, February 23, 1914, Box 60, File 190, ibid.; and Jameson to Marshall de Lancey Haywood, February 24, 1914, Box 124, File 1420, ibid.

64Swagar Sherley to Lyman Chalkey, March 7, 1914, Box 58, File 150, ibid.
Jameson realized, had helped lead to this action. During that debate, Representative Hay had stated that the entire job could be done for $32,000. This had been an absurdly low estimate, and it had provided good ammunition for Appropriations Committee members opposed to the undertaking.65 Jameson, however, believed that had he been at the hearing he could have convinced the Committee members "that the task was not immeasurable, though a large enterprise was contemplated."66

Although work on the project was proceeding in Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Virginia, the decision against further appropriations meant that no additional searchers could be employed.67 This situation caused Jameson considerable embarrassment. He had diligently solicited recommendations for searchers. Now he had to write to the prospective searchers, or to those who had recommended them, to inform them that their services would not be needed.68

Despite the unfavorable turn of events, Jameson did not give up hope for the project. Searchers were busily at

65Jameson to French E. Chadwick, May 7, 1914, Box 70, File 333, ibid.
66Jameson to Herbert Foster, April 1, 1914, Box 84, File 570, ibid.
67Jameson to W. A. Shelton, April 5, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, ibid.
68Ibid.; Jameson to Herbert Foster, April 15, 1914, Box 84, File 570, ibid.; and Jameson to Nathaniel W. Stephenson, April 17, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, ibid.
work in three states. Jameson believed that experience gained in those states would make it possible to frame reliable estimates about the total cost of the work. With these figures in hand, it seemed likely that the War and Navy Departments could secure further appropriations the next year.\textsuperscript{69} The Executive Council of the AHA apparently shared Jameson's optimism, for at its meeting in November, 1914, it voted to keep in existence the advisory committee on Revolutionary records.\textsuperscript{70}

On January 4, 1915, Hollis Clark appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to seek an appropriation of $50,000 to continue work on the Revolutionary records. Experience and careful study enabled him to offer a rather precise estimate of the total cost. The project would cost about $250,000; $150,000 for getting prints; and $100,000 for editing and printing. Clark carefully explained how this estimate had been reached.\textsuperscript{71}

Chairman Fitzgerald, apparently oblivious to Clark's statements, again referred to the original act. He stated that "it was the understanding of the Military Affairs

\textsuperscript{69}Jameson to French E. Chadwick, May 7, 1914, Box 70, File 333, \textit{ibid.}; Jameson to John Bigelow, May 7, 1914, Box 60, File 190, \textit{ibid.}; and Jameson to Justin Smith, May 7, 1914, Box 124, File 1421, \textit{ibid.}


\textsuperscript{71}Hearing on Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill, 1916, in Box 72, File 366, Jameson Papers, 343-45.
Committee . . . that the work would be completed for $32,000." Clark explained that he had not been connected with the project when the act had passed. Fitzgerald then inquired how many volumes the work would comprise. Clark estimated fifty volumes. Fitzgerald then curtly stated: "That is all."

The exchange between Fitzgerald and Clark portended the Committee's action. It failed to recommend the appropriation. Jameson surmised that "Fitzgerald is not very susceptible to persuasion, and of course had no appreciation of such things." He informed Charles Lincoln "that the case is hopeless so far as this session is concerned." The case, in fact, was permanently hopeless. At its 1915 meeting, the Executive Council of the AHA voted to discontinue the advisory committee on Revolutionary records.

A number of factors help explain why the promise of a new publication went unfulfilled. Had Hay not indicated that the project could be completed for $32,000, the Appropriations Committee would have had less reason to

---

72Ibid., 346.
73Hollis C. Clark to Jameson, February 4, 1915, Box 72, File 366, Jameson Papers.
74Jameson to Clark, February 6, 1915, ibid.
75Jameson to Lincoln, February 6, 1915, Box 108, File 1024, ibid.
oppose further funding. But had Hay acted otherwise, it is questionable if the bill would have passed. Perhaps the enormous cost of the Official Records had soured the Appropriations Committee toward another large-scale publication. Perhaps Jameson could have helped change the outcome. Had he vigorously supported the original bill for collecting the "scattered records" of the Revolution, he might have generated enough support for the project to make possible its completion. And although Jameson tried to garner backing for continued appropriations, his papers indicate that he did not invest as much energy in this lobbying effort as he did in others.

After the demise of the Revolutionary records project, Jameson temporarily abandoned efforts to promote documentary historical publications by the government. The failure to create a national historical publications commission and the abortive efforts on behalf of the records of the Treaty of Ghent and of the Revolution likely had dampened his fervor for such undertakings. The movement for an archives building was a constant drain on Jameson's time and energy. When the United States entered World War I, any hope for new historical undertakings by the government, unless they were related to the war effort, evaporated. After the War, though, Jameson resumed the effort to get the government to publish documentary material. And while the postwar period witnessed some striking successes, disappointments continued to intrude.
CHAPTER V

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND DOCUMENTARY HISTORICAL PUB­LICATIONS IN THE 1920'S

After World War I, J. Franklin Jameson campaigned vigorously to initiate new governmental historical publications and to insure that publications already in progress were properly executed. Aiding Jameson in these lobbying efforts was a newly created AHA committee, which Jameson chaired, the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government. Serving on the committee were several well known historians, men whose name carried weight with governmental officials. The fact that Jameson headed the committee helped to formalize his position as the spokesman of historical interests in the United States; when Jameson called upon legislators and departmental officials for aid, he legitimately could claim that he represented the entire historical profession. Jameson and the other committee members promoted a wide variety of documentary historical publications. But they focused much, perhaps a majority, of their attention on the historical activities of one agency of the government, the State Department.
There was ample precedent for the creation of a committee on the government's historical publications. In 1908, AHA President George B. Adams had appointed a committee on documentary historical publications to which President Roosevelt had given official status. In 1913 and 1914, the AHA had appointed committees to help insure the proper publication of Revolutionary records. World War I had lent a new dimension to relations between the historical profession and the federal government. Historians had aided the war effort by cooperating with the Committee on Public Information and by organizing the National Board for Historical Service.\(^1\) Shortly after the armistice, Jameson began to consider ways to maintain and take advantage of the cooperation that had grown up between historians and the government during the War. The National Board for Historical Service, he told Evarts Greene in November, 1918, "has acquired a certain amount of good will in Washington that ought not to be lost." On the other hand, Jameson pointed out, the AHA had not "acquired that status with the government which it ought to have. . . ." Jameson therefore suggested that the AHA create a "Committee for Historical Service to the United States Government." This committee would serve as a central exchange between governmental

officials and historians. It would strengthen the bond between historians and the government that the War had forged.  

Although Jameson's proposal for a committee for historical service was not adopted, leaders of the AHA were anxious to maintain a link between historians and the federal government. In 1920, the AHA Committee on Policy reviewed the work of the 1908 committee on documentary historical publications. It concluded that "results should be obtained from the important and exceedingly valuable work of" this committee. The Committee on Policy therefore recommended that the 1908 committee "be reappointed and charged with the consideration of methods by which its program, or some part thereof, may be carried out." The Executive Council of the AHA, in turn, appointed a committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government. Appointed to the committee were Jameson, chairman, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and Charles Moore, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress.

John Spencer Bassett, Secretary of the AHA, urged

---

2Jameson to Greene, November 21, 1918, Box 87, File 646, Jameson Papers.

Lodge to accept the appointment.\(^4\) Lodge, however, replied that he made it a rule "never to be a member of any committee or association which is pressing legislation upon the attention of Congress."\(^5\) During 1921 and 1922, then, the committee on documentary historical publications remained a two-man operation. Moreover, during the first two years of its existence the committee did little. In 1922, Jameson reported that no progress had been made "in advancing either the comprehensive project prepared in 1908 . . . or in any other lesser scheme of documentary historical publication."\(^6\)

In 1922, the Executive Council of the AHA decided that the committee on documentary historical publications should become a more viable entity. The government, the Executive Council concluded, was "doing nothing for United States history." As a first step in trying to remedy this situation, the Executive Council voted to increase the membership of the committee on documentary historical publications to nine and to instruct the committee "to make a list of material that needed to be published. . . ."\(^7\)

\(^4\) Bassett to Lodge, March 19, 1921, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.

\(^5\) Lodge to Bassett, March 21, 1921, ibid.


\(^7\) Ibid., 78.
Jameson, John Spencer Bassett, and Charles Moore decided upon the membership of the committee. Jameson felt that it should include Worthington C. Ford, Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles McLean Andrews, and Andrew C. McLaughlin, the members of the 1908 committee who still were living and who still were professors of history. Jameson believed that the remaining members should be chosen from among John Bach McMaster, Ira Farrand, Justin Smith, and Gaillard Hunt. These men were known to the Secretary of State, an important consideration since the committee's initial proposals likely would deal with diplomatic history. They also had political influence; McMaster, for example, "probably would not do much, but his name is very good with congressmen." 8

Bassett had no objection to Jameson's suggestions. But he thought that it might be wise to include one or two men, such as Senator Lodge and Elihu Root, "who are associated with public life." 9 In response, Jameson revealed his deep contempt for the senator whose help he had sought in earlier years. Lodge, he stated, "is too mean and selfish to help any cause that is of no interest to him politically." When the AHA had been incorporated in 1889, Justin Winsor had been unable to get any help from Lodge.

---

8 Jameson to John Spencer Bassett, January 5, 1923, Box 58, File 159, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Bassett, February 24, 1923, ibid.

9 Bassett to Jameson, January 11, 1923, ibid.
Jameson had asked Winsor about this circumstance, and Winsor had explained: "If you know Lodge, you know that he would not help anything that does not benefit him personally." Root, by contrast, was "a noble spirit, public-spirited in every fixture, but at his present age tries to keep out of all new commitments." Jameson also corresponded with Charles Moore about the makeup of the committee and found that Moore agreed with Jameson's recommendations. The committee thus came to consist of Jameson, chairman, Andrews, Bassett, Ford, McLaughlin, McMaster, Moore, and Turner. Once the committee had been brought up to full strength, Jameson outlined the committee's tasks.

Jameson preferred to implement the recommendations made by the 1908 committee. He realized, however, that Congress would neither make appropriations for a historical commission nor approve a large-scale publication program. "Concluding that any grandiose scheme ran no chance of acceptance," he decided that the committee instead should recommend a limited publication effort. He also concluded that the committee should concentrate its lobbying efforts

---

10 Jameson to Bassett, January 13, 1923, ibid.

upon the State Department.  

Jameson informed Andrew C. McLaughlin that two factors had dictated the choice of the State Department. For one, that department was headed by Charles Evans Hughes, who was sympathetic to historical endeavors, was an alumnus of Brown, and had been friendly to Jameson. Second, according to Jameson, in 1923 the "public mind" was "alive as never before to the interest and importance of diplomatic history." A third possible motivation was that in 1921 a Division of Publications had been established within the State Department. The Office of the Historian of the War, the Office of the Editor of Laws, the Bureau of Rolls and Library, and certain portions of the former Division of Foreign Intelligence had been incorporated within the Division. The Division was in charge of all publications issued by the State Department. Gaillard Hunt, a professional historian and a friend of Jameson, had been appointed Chief of the Division. The fact that the State Department had undertaken a more systematic approach to its publications and had placed a qualified historian in charge may have

---


13 Jameson to McLaughlin, March 15, 1923, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.

helped prompt Jameson to devote his efforts to that department.

A final probable reason for concentrating on the State Department was that Jameson already had laid the groundwork for the enrichment of the Department's historical publications. In 1921, Jameson had met with Secretary of State Hughes to discuss ways in which the Department could further the study of diplomatic history. Also in 1921, he had urged Gaillard Hunt to initiate new documentary historical publications. Hunt's response had been favorable. He informed Jameson that "it is my ambition to bring the government and scholars into closer relationship. ... We are entering upon a new era in the Department and we can hope for better results in the future." Jameson's proposals became items on the agenda of the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government.

One of Jameson's suggestions to Hunt was that a new edition of the Historical Register of the Department of State, a list of ambassadors and ministers to the United States, be published. The last edition had come out in

15 Jameson to Hughes, May 11, 1921, Box 129, File 1567, Jameson Papers; Hughes to Jameson, May 13, 1921, ibid.; and Jameson to Hughes, May 27, 1921, ibid.


17 Hunt to Jameson, May 17, 1921, Box 129, File 1567, Jameson Papers.
A new edition of the Register would be of value both to personnel in the State Department and to students of diplomatic history. Hunt informed Jameson that the Historical Register had been brought up to date; the only problem was to find money with which to print it.

Despite this auspicious beginning, a new Historical Register was not published. In 1923, Jameson complained to Worthington C. Ford: "Hunt in two years has not yet got ready the new edition of the Register . . . which was his first task." After Hunt died in 1924, Jameson discovered that Hunt had been quite remiss in attending to the Historical Register. Harry G. Dwight, who temporarily assumed Hunt's duties in the State Department, informed Jameson that "a complete register does not appear to have been attempted. . . ." Hunt's compilation was incomplete, much of the material had not been brought up to date, and much of the data had not been verified. What Dwight had on hand comprised only about one-tenth of the material needed to compile a complete Historical Register. At its meeting in 1925, the AHA passed a resolution urging the State

19 Hunt to Jameson, May 17, 1921, Box 129, File 1567, Jameson Papers.
20 Jameson to Ford, May 17, 1923, Box 84, File 560, ibid.
21 Dwight to Jameson, December 2, 1924, Box 129, File 1567, ibid.
Department to publish a new edition of the Historical Register. But the Department apparently took no further action on the matter.

Jameson's first attempt to get the State Department to bring out a new publication thus ended in failure. The Historical Register, however, was not the most important of Jameson's proposed State Department publications. He had in mind something far more comprehensive. In May, 1921, Jameson suggested to Gaillard Hunt that the State Department initiate a systematic publication of instructions from American secretaries of state to American ministers abroad. This publication, Jameson explained, "would show the development of our foreign policy about as well as the publishing of everything..." In response, Hunt omitted any specific reference to the publication of the instructions but assured Jameson that the State Department was ready to embark upon new historical publications of reasonable dimensions. Jameson's proposal lay dormant for the next year and a half. Then, early in 1923, he began a vigorous campaign to get the State Department to publish the instructions.

---


24 Hunt to Jameson, May 17, 1921, Box 129, File 1567, Jameson Papers.
Jameson's first step was to gain the financial backing from the Carnegie Institution. The Carnegie Institution had established a program of fellowships for historians of proven ability. Jameson invited Samuel F. Bemis to apply for one of the fellowships for the 1923-1924 academic year. He explained to Bemis that he was about to bring to the attention of Secretary Hughes the proposal for publishing the instructions to ministers. Jameson planned to have Bemis' work dovetail with that proposal. Bemis would prepare the first volume of instructions under the aegis of the Department of Historical Research; Jameson then would present Hughes with Bemis' prototypical volume of the proposed series. If Hughes adopted the proposal, then Hughes could go before the House Appropriations Committee with Bemis' volume as "a pretty definite example of what he wants to have done. . . ." Another reason for enlisting Bemis' services was that Gaillard Hunt had been chairman of the Knights of Columbus Historical Committee that had awarded a prize to Bemis for his book on the Jay Treaty. If Bemis were to prepare the sample volume, it would fortify Jameson's case with the Chief of the Division of Publications.25

Bemis told Jameson that he was interested in

25 Jameson to Bemis, January 23, 1923, Box 60, File 179, ibid.; and Jameson to Worthington C. Ford, April 18, 1923, Box 84, File 560, ibid.
receiving the fellowship.\textsuperscript{26} Jameson recommended Bemis to President John Merriam of the Carnegie Institution and explained to Merriam his plan for having Bemis prepare the volume of instructions.\textsuperscript{27} The executive committee of Carnegie Institution awarded Bemis the fellowship and approved of his preparing a volume of instructions during his tenure as a fellow.\textsuperscript{28}

Jameson's next task was to convince Hughes that the publication of instructions should be begun. Jameson met with Hughes in the spring of 1923 and outlined the proposal. Hughes generally approved of the plan, with the understanding that it subsequently would be presented to him in writing and in a more explicit form.\textsuperscript{29}

In preparing the formal proposal to Hughes, Jameson called upon the other members of the committee on documentary historical publications. He composed a draft of a letter to Hughes, submitted it to the committee members, and solicited their amendments and suggestions. After receiving responses from the committee members, Jameson would prepare a final draft and send it to Hughes on behalf of the committee.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{26}Bemis to Jameson, January 28, 1923, Box 60, File 179, \textit{ibid.}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{27}Jameson to Merriam, February 3, 1923, \textit{ibid.}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{28}Walter M. Gilbert to Jameson, February 9, 1923, \textit{ibid.}; and Jameson to Bemis, February 13, 1923, \textit{ibid.}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{29}Jameson to J. J. Jusserand, April 11, 1923, Box 100, File 896, \textit{ibid.}
\end{flushright}
"The good array of names," said Jameson, "[would] impress the Secretary. . . ." 30 The members of the committee approved of Jameson's draft, suggesting only a few minor textual changes. 31

On April 23, 1923, Jameson sent his proposal, with the signatures of the committee members appended, to Secretary Hughes. Jameson explained that "the interest of the American public in the history of our foreign relations has greatly increased of late. . . ." The State Department should minister to this interest "by a fuller publication of historical materials" illustrating the course of American foreign policy. Such publications not only would be of use to historical writers but also would enlighten public opinion. Foreign nations had recognized the value of enlightening the public mind about foreign affairs and thus had spent large sums to publish materials illustrative of diplomatic history. The United States, for its part, had published six volumes of American State Papers, Foreign Relations, during the nineteenth century. But since then it had confined its efforts in the diplomatic area to publishing the Foreign Relations series. The State Department,

30 Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, March 15, 1923, Box 77, File 464, ibid.

31 Andrew C. McLaughlin to Jameson, April 16, 1923, ibid.; John Spencer Bassett to Jameson, April 15, 1923, Box 58, File 159, ibid.; Worthington C. Ford to Jameson, April 16, 1923, Box 84, File 560, ibid.; and Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, April 23, 1923, Box 105, File 993, ibid.
Jameson believed, had a duty to better elucidate the history of America's foreign policy.\(^{32}\)

The State Department, Jameson continued, possessed an enormous amount of manuscript material. He acknowledged that from this mass "a moderate selection must be made. . . ." Of the materials on hand, the most important were the instructions sent from the secretaries of state to diplomatic representatives abroad. "In these Instructions," Jameson explained, "the whole course of American policy can be treated. To them the other series . . . are in the main but adjuncts." The instructions should be printed. The series should begin in 1784 or 1789 and extend to 1889. The entire compilation would occupy about "twenty octavo volumes of six hundred pages each." Jameson suggested that the instructions "to the ministers accredited to each foreign country should be printed in a separate chronological order. . . ."\(^{33}\)

Jameson also suggested a procedure for editing the series. The United States should follow the French example of entrusting each volume to a historian well versed in the diplomatic relations between the United States and the nation to which the given volume pertained. The AHA, particularly the members of the committee on the documentary

\(^{32}\)Jameson to Hughes, April 23, 1923, Box 129, File 1567, \textit{ibid}.

\(^{33}\)\textit{Ibid}.
historical publications of the United States Government, could assist the State Department in carrying out the editorial work. Jameson also explained that the Department of Historical Research was eager to underwrite the first volume. This volume would be a "specimen" for the State Department to use in the quest for congressional funds. 34

Hughes agreed that the instructions should be printed and informed the committee members that the State Department would prepare a volume of instructions "which may serve as an example of future volumes." The printing of the volume, he explained, "must depend upon the availability of funds to cover the cost of publication." Hughes flatly rejected Jameson's offer of outside assistance. While Hughes did not question the competence of the staff of the Department of Historical Research, he doubted that a staff member "would have that familiarity with the archives themselves which is essential for the preparation of the volume." Moreover, Hughes stated, "the Department would not feel justified in submitting to any one not directly responsible to it the selection of material which pertains to its relations with a foreign power." This decision was not intended to suppress material "but to emphasize the desire of the Department to have full control" over its own publications. The Department

34 Ibid.
would rely upon its own staff to prepare the instructions.\footnote{Hughes to members of the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government, May 7, 1923, Box 77, File 464, \textit{ibid.}} Jameson immediately brought Hughes' response to the attention of Gaillard Hunt. He explained to Hunt the rationale for offering outside assistance on the project. Jameson doubted that there were persons in the State Department with sufficient scholarly breadth to handle the entire project. Foreign experience had shown that the execution of publications such as instructions to ministers could not be handled "by the regular staff of a ministry of foreign affairs." Instead, European governments had assigned these projects to scholars of diplomatic history who were "not at the time connected with the foreign offices of their respective countries." The staff of the State Department, moreover, was so busy with assigned duties that it seemed unlikely they could undertake an additional project without outside help. It therefore seemed necessary that non-governmental personnel lend their aid to the publication. Jameson added that if Hunt agreed that all the work must be done by officials of the State Department, he had "only to say so." If Hunt felt a need for outside assistance, then Jameson, with the approval of his committee, would make further representations to Secretary Hughes.\footnote{Jameson to Hunt, May 9, 1923, \textit{ibid.}} Hunt's reply was blunt and to the point. He informed Jameson that there
was no need "for further action by the Historical Association's Committee. There should be no difficulty in preparing the first volume for publication. The Department can do the work." 37

Jameson, now realizing that Hunt had drafted Hughes' letter, was distressed. Earlier in the year, Hughes had told Jameson that the State Department would welcome outside help, but Hunt apparently had convinced Hughes to reconsider. The decision against using outside assistance boded ill for the proposed publication, for it was unlikely that the State Department alone could execute the publication of instructions. The Department, Jameson told Worthington C. Ford, "cannot provide adequate editing for some of the proposed volumes" and "they have not the time." 38 Jameson also feared that the State Department would "make no serious push for an appropriation for printing." 39 In short, the project would not be done or if it was it would "not be done well enough to give historical scholars any satisfaction." The blame lay with Hunt who, according to Jameson, "has a very exalted sense of the competence of the Department of State." 40

37 Hunt to Jameson, May 14, 1923, ibid.
38 Jameson to Ford, May 17, 1923, Box 84, File 560, ibid.
39 Jameson to Frederick Jackson Turner, November 16, 1923, Box 77, File 464, ibid.
40 Jameson to Ford, May 17, 1923, Box 84, File 560, ibid.
Jameson's colleagues shared his anger. Ford wrote:

The official mind is . . . feminine in its jealousies—unreasonably strong. . . . I long since decided that my connections with government officials would be as restrained as I could make them. They are a guy lot to get on with.  

Turner dejectedly concluded that "we shall always meet the difficulty of a 'superior person' in a department blocking a well proportioned general plan, and desiring to control his own departmental publications."  

In his committee reports to the AHA, Jameson concealed his pessimism about the proposed publication, but he avoided raising false hopes for its success. His report for 1923 stated that Secretary Hughes had "made a most gratifying response" to the proposal and that the project was proceeding under the direction of Gaillard Hunt. But he warned that since appropriations had not been made to employ additional workers in the State Department "the project can not be expected to go forward rapidly. . . ." In 1924, he reported that a lack of funds for hiring editorial workers had prevented significant progress on the project.  

Early in 1925, however, prospects for execution of

41 Ford to Jameson, May 21, 1923, ibid.
42 Turner to Jameson, November 20, 1923, Box 77, File 464, ibid.
43 Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1923, 92.
the series brightened. Hughes, at Jameson's urging, secured funds to hire two additional copyists to work on the project.\textsuperscript{45} Jameson now became convinced that the instructions would be published.\textsuperscript{46} But also in 1925, Frank Kellogg replaced Hughes as Secretary of State. Jameson had not met the new Secretary. Wishing to gain Kellogg's support for the publication, Jameson obtained from Professor William Folwell a letter of introduction to Kellogg.\textsuperscript{47} Jameson met with Kellogg in June and later submitted to him a written statement about the publication of instructions. He explained to Kellogg the value of the project and described the progress that had been made on it during Hughes' tenure at the State Department. He made two requests to Kellogg: first, that one or both of the copyists secured by Hughes be allowed to work on the instructions during fiscal 1926; and second, that Kellogg seek appropriations to keep the project going during fiscal 1927.\textsuperscript{48}

Jameson tried in other ways to keep the project alive. In October, 1925, he urged the Director of the

\textsuperscript{45}Jameson to Dear Mr. [?], March 30, 1925, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{46}Jameson to Charles K. Webster, March 9, 1925, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 307.

\textsuperscript{47}Jameson to Folwell, March 7, 1925, Box 83, File 555, Jameson Papers; and Folwell to Jameson, March 10, 1925, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{48}Jameson to Kellogg, June 25, 1925, Box 129, File 1567, \textit{ibid}.
Budget not to be parsimonious in allowing funds for copyists and editors to prepare the instructions. At Jameson's urging, the AHA in 1925 adopted a resolution asking that the project be completed.

Jameson's efforts were unsuccessful. Although Kellogg indicated to Jameson a desire to continue work on the publication of instructions, he really was rather uninterested in the historical activities of the State Department and apparently did nothing to move the project forward. Without the support of the State Department, the publication of instructions had no chance of being realized.

In 1929, Jameson resigned as chairman of the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government. Advanced age and duties at the Library of Congress made it necessary for him to give up the post. He recommended that Samuel F. Bemis replace him as chairman.

49 Jameson to Herbert M. Lord, October 26, 1925, Box 49, File 54, ibid.

50 Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1925, 60. Cf. ibid., 98.

51 Ibid., 98; and Jameson to John H. Finley, September 18, 1925, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 310.

52 The AHA Annual Reports for the years 1926 through 1929 make no reference to the project. After 1925, Jameson had no further correspondence with Kellogg or other State Department officials regarding the publication of instructions.

53 Jameson to Dexter Perkins, October 26, 1929, Box 49, File 54, ibid.; and Jameson to Perkins, December 18, 1929, Box 119, File 1319, ibid.
Under Bemis' leadership, the committee tried to revive the publication of instructions to ministers. Upon the recommendation of the committee, the Secretary of the AHA in 1930 conveyed to the Secretary of State a resolution urging that the project be resumed. In 1931, however, Bemis reported that the project "is still indefinitely suspended."

Jameson had worked hard to get the State Department to begin publishing instructions to ministers. As often was the case in Jameson's career, portents of success had ended in failure. As chairman of the committee on documentary historical publications, however, Jameson did not confine his efforts to initiating new projects. He also attempted to bring the already established Foreign Relations series up to date.

Until the early twentieth century, the annual volumes of Foreign Relations had come out on schedule; that is, the volume pertaining to a given year had appeared soon after the end of that year. But starting in 1907, the series began to fall into arrears. The volume for 1906 was published in 1909, the volume for 1907 appeared in 1910, and the volume for 1908 came out in 1912. By 1925, the series...


was ten years behind schedule. This troubled Jameson.

In September, 1925, Jameson expressed his concern to John H. Finley, associate editor of the New York Times. He explained to Finley that the publication was far behind schedule and that Secretary of State Kellogg was unlikely to rectify the situation. While Secretary of State Hughes had been keenly interested in keeping the public informed about diplomatic history and had planned to seek appropriations to help bring Foreign Relations up to date, Kellogg was less sensitive than Hughes to the historical work of the State Department. Personnel in the State Department, Jameson continued, had "with some difficulty" persuaded Kellogg to request a $50,000 appropriation to bring Foreign Relations up to date, but Jameson expected the Director of the Budget to cut out the request. If that occurred, it was unlikely that Kellogg would ask the House Appropriations Committee to restore the request. Jameson asked Finley to say something "vigorous" about this dilemma in the Times, but Finley failed to heed Jameson's request.

Jameson conducted other lobbying activities on behalf of Foreign Relations in 1925. He explained to the Director of the Budget that the series was far behind schedule,

56 Jameson to Milton Shreve, February 1, 1926, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.

57 Jameson to Finley, September 18, 1925, and accompanying footnote, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 310-11.
described the value of the publication to the public, and urged the Director not to "economize too much on the side of those things that make for enlightenment. . . ."58 At the 1925 meeting of the AHA, Jameson got the Association to pass a resolution urging the Secretary of State and the Appropriations Committee to bring Foreign Relations up to date.59

Despite Jameson's efforts, the Director of the Budget eliminated the budget request for Foreign Relations. Jameson, in the name of the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government, therefore began to lobby with congressmen. He explained to Representative Milton Shreve of Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the State Department, that the Foreign Relations series was of value to the State Department, to legations abroad, to congressional committees that dealt with foreign relations, and to historians. But the worth of the publication inevitably diminished as it steadily fell behind schedule. Four annual appropriations of $50,000 each would enable the State Department to catch up. Jameson begged Shreve to lend his aid in obtaining "this relatively small provision. . . ."60

58Jameson to Herbert M. Lord, October 26, 1925, Box 49, File 54, Jameson Papers.

59Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1925, 60. Cf. ibid., 97.

60Jameson to Shreve, February 1, 1926, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.
Jameson also carried his campaign to Rollo Ogden, editor of the New York Times. Believing that an article in the Times would influence both members of Congress and of the State Department, Jameson told Ogden that he would be grateful for anything that Ogden might "see fit to do or say." Ogden chose to say a great deal. Shortly after he received Jameson's letter, a lengthy editorial on Foreign Relations appeared in the Times. The editorial briefly recounted the history of Foreign Relations, described how it had fallen into arrears, and told of the elimination of the proposed appropriation for bringing it up to date. Although the editorial praised governmental economizing, it concluded that cutting out the $50,000 request for Foreign Relations was false economy.

Stirred by Jameson and by the Times editorial, a number of historians wrote their congressmen to urge the appropriation for Foreign Relations. Senator James Wadsworth, recipient of one such letter, brought the subject to the attention of Assistant Secretary of State Robert Olds. Olds explained to Wadsworth that nothing could be done unless there was further action by the Director of the Budget or Congress. But such action was not forthcoming; the House

---

61 Jameson to Ogden, February 12, 1926, Box 116, File 1242, ibid.
Appropriations Committee failed to restore the $50,000 cut.64

Jameson now brought the matter to the attention of Senator Reed Smoot of Utah. Jameson explained to him why *Foreign Relations* was a valuable publication, described how it had fallen into arrears, and sought Smoot's aid in getting the Senate to restore the $50,000 request.65 But Jameson was unsuccessful in getting the Senate to vote additional funds for *Foreign Relations*.66

Although Jameson's efforts had failed, there was a promise of greater success for fiscal 1927. The Department of State again requested an additional appropriation, and this time the Director of the Budget allowed the item to remain. Jameson wrote to members of the House Appropriations Committee asking for passage of the appropriation and urged his fellow historians to do the same.67 Congress failed to approve the request, at least in its entirety, for by 1930 the *Foreign Relations* series was twelve years in

64 Jameson to Reed Smoot, March 11, 1926, Box 77, File 464, Jameson Papers.
65Ibid.
arrears. The AHA, in the form of resolutions to the Secretary of State, continued to regret the delay in publication.\textsuperscript{68}

Since the \textbf{Budget} of the United States Government and appropriation bills for the State Department do not specify line items for \textit{Foreign Relations}, it is not possible to present a year-by-year account of how Congress treated the State Department's requests for appropriations for the publication. Other evidence, however, indicates that blame for the retardation of \textit{Foreign Relations} did not lie entirely with Congress. Beginning with the budget estimates for fiscal 1927, the State Department consistently requested larger appropriations for printing and binding. Until the depression struck the nation, Congress granted the full amounts requested.\textsuperscript{69} It therefore seems likely that the failure to bring \textit{Foreign Relations} up to date can be ascribed as much to a lack of vigor on the part of the State Department and a stringent attitude by the Director of the Budget as to congressional stinginess.

\textsuperscript{68}Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1930, 63, 65, 74.

\textsuperscript{69}See, for example, Message of the President of the United States Transmitting the Budget for the Service of the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1927 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1925), 817; and Message of the President of the United States Transmitting the Budget for the Service of the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1928 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1926), 817. For further evidence on this point, see the Budgets through fiscal 1933. Starting with that fiscal year, Congress began to trim the Department's budget requests for printing and binding.
Although Jameson's efforts to enlarge and enhance the State Department's historical publications in the 1920's largely had been frustrated, at the end of the decade he witnessed a degree of success. In April, 1929, a conference was held in Washington to consider expansion of the publications of the State Department. Attending the conference were representatives of the Third Conference of Teachers of International Law, the American Society of International Law, the American Political Science Association, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Historical Association. Charles Warren, H. Barrett Learned, and Jameson represented the AHA.  

The conference participants chose a committee to meet with the Secretary of State to discuss proposals for enlarging the Department's publications. Their principal immediate objective was to get adequate appropriations to publish the arbitrations of the United States. They also appointed a committee to consider the "whole question of a comprehensive program for the publications of the Department of State. . . ." Suggested for inclusion in this comprehensive program was publication of the "progress of the ratification of treaties," publication of a Historical Register, publication of Foreign Relations for the years 1829 to 1861, and publication of diplomatic instructions

---

70 Minutes of a joint meeting of the Committees on the Enlargement of the Scope of the Publications of the Department of State, Box 51, File 64, Jameson Papers.
from 1789 to 1889.\textsuperscript{71}

In 1929, the State Department initiated an enlarged publications program. Although the \textit{Historical Register} and instructions to ministers, two of Jameson's prized proposals, were not included in the program, several significant innovations were made. For one, the Department speeded up publication of the "World War Supplement" volumes of the \textit{Foreign Relations} series. Under the direction of Hunter Miller, the Department also began the \textit{Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America}, a series comprising "complete and literal copies of the texts . . . of all treaties and international acts of the United States" which were or ever had been in force. Too, the Department began an \textit{Arbitration Series}, thus adopting the chief objective of the 1929 conference. By 1934, the Department had published the complete records of one arbitration and partial records of several others. Another new project was the \textit{Conference Series}, which comprised publications of the State Department relating to international conferences.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{72}Address delivered by Dr. Cyril Wynne, Chief of the Division of Research and Publication, Department of State . . . March 24, 1934, Box 285, State Decimal File: 1910-1929. Further evidence of the State Department's determination to pursue an enlarged publication program is seen in the amounts that the Department requested and had appropriated for the purposes of printing and binding. For fiscal 1930, the State Department was appropriated $210,000 for printing and binding. For fiscal 1931, the amount was increased to over $300,000. The request for fiscal 1931 was submitted in 1929, the year that the Department embarked
Pressure from historians and students of international law had helped cause the State Department to begin this publication program. Some credit for the increased activity should go to Jameson. He had participated in the 1929 conference on the enlargement of the State Department's publications. It also is possible that Jameson's incessant lobbying for State Department publications in the early and middle 1920's had, by the end of the decade, helped to create an atmosphere within the Department that was more conducive to new publishing ventures.

In the 1920's, then, Jameson worked to get the State Department to enrich its program of documentary historical publications. The programs in which Jameson showed the greatest interest, a new Historical Register, instructions to ministers, and Foreign Relations, either were ongoing projects of the Department or were series that required new initiatives by the Department. Also in the 1920's, outside interests foisted a new publication upon the State Department. Jameson was the person most responsible for seeing


that this series came to fruition. Oddly, though Jameson was relatively unsuccessful in getting the State Department to improve its publications program, he was instrumental in getting Congress to provide for a new State Department publication. This new publication was a crowning success in Jameson's efforts on behalf of the documentary historical publications of the United States Government.
CHAPTER VI

THE TERRITORIAL PAPERS

In 1929, Congress provided for a new documentary historical publication, The Territorial Papers of the United States. The legislative history of that publication divides into two phases. In 1925, Congress passed a bill which provided that the federal government would arrange territorial documents for publication by the states. After four years of lobbying by historians, legislation was passed to initiate federal publication of the documents. Although J. Franklin Jameson showed only slight interest in the initial legislation of 1925, he, more than any other person, was responsible for the law of 1929 that established The Territorial Papers as a government publication.

Jameson had a long-standing interest in the territorial documents in the possession of the federal government. The second edition of Van Tyne and Leland's Guide to government archives, prepared under Jameson's supervision, contains a section on "Territorial Papers" in the Department of State.\(^1\) The 1908 committee on documentary historical

\(^1\) Claude Halstead Van Tyne and Waldo Gifford Leland, Guide to the Archives of the Government of the United States
publications recommended that the proposed National State Papers contain a "series embracing the governmental papers on . . . Federal relations with the States and Territories." 2

In 1911, the Carnegie Institution published David W. Parker's Calendar of Papers in Washington Archives Relating to the Territories of the United States (to 1873). In a preface to the Calendar, Jameson explained that Parker's volume was the second step "in the exploitation of archives" by historians. Van Tyne and Leland's Guide surveyed the contents of government archives in general; Parker's Calendar described in detail a selected class of archival materials. The third and final step would be publication of the documents described in the Calendar. Parker's volume was the first Carnegie Institution publication devoted to a particular group of archives in Washington. There were sound reasons for this choice. Although scholars interested in the early history of the thirteen original states found ample archival materials within the states or in London, historians of the West looked to Washington for unprinted source materials on the period that preceded a state's admission into the Union. Parker's Calendar provided students of Western history with a much needed tool for more


2U. S. Senate, 60 Cong., 1 Sess., 1909, S. D. 714, 21.
systematic research in government archives.\textsuperscript{3}

The disorderly condition of territorial documents in Washington also created a need for a specialized calendar. Since 1873, when Congress put the territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior, territorial records had been relatively well concentrated in the Department of Interior. But for the period prior to 1873, when the territorial governments depended upon the Department of State, territorial archives were widely scattered. Territorial records within the State Department were haphazardly distributed between the Bureau of Rolls and Library and the Bureau of Indexes and Archives. Records relating to the territories also were found in the Department of War, the General Land Office, the files of the House and Senate, and the Library of Congress. Jameson pointed out that the Calendar was limited in scope, because all the papers relating to the territories could not be calendared in one volume. In order to satisfy the prevailing needs of historians, it concentrated on papers which dealt "with the territory as a whole, as an administrative unit," and which accordingly had to do with "its government and its constitutional and political history."\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., 3-5.
After supervising Parker's Calendar, Jameson apparently made no effort to publish the territorial documents. But in the early 1920's, there arose a movement for federal publication of territorial papers. This movement largely was the work of an amateur historian from Indiana, Jacob Piatt Dunn.

Dunn was a man with varied interests. He practiced law, tried his hand at prospecting, and engaged in journalism. An ardent Democrat, Dunn served two terms as City Comptroller of Indianapolis and once sought election to Congress. He also contributed a great deal to the development of historical scholarship in Indiana. As the state's librarian from 1889 to 1893, he did much to build up the State Library's historical collection. When the Indiana Historical Society reorganized in 1886, Dunn became Recording Secretary of the Society and held that position until his death in 1924. He largely was responsible for the Society's continuing success, and he edited many of its publications.5

Dunn wrote a great deal on early Western, territorial, and Indian history. His works included *Documents Relating to French Settlements on the Wabash; Executive Journal of the Indiana Territory* (edited and annotated with William Wesley Woollen and Daniel Wait Howe); *Indiana and Indianans: A History of Aboriginal and Territorial Indiana and the Century of Statehood* (five volumes); and *Massacres of the Mountains: A History of the Indian Wars of the Far West.*

Dunn's research involved extensive use of territorial documents. For example, his *Indiana: A Redemption from Slavery* is abundantly documented from sources such as territorial executive journals, petitions in the files of Congress, *American State Papers*, and unpublished letters.

Dunn felt that Western historians suffered inordinate handicaps when they sought access to archival materials relating to the territories. In 1922, he complained to Jameson: "You cannot realize . . . the discrimination against us. The states east of the Alleghanies have long had their colonial material available, but the most important of ours is inaccessible without special research and expense." Dunn's proposed solution to this problem was federal publication of territorial papers. Dunn suggested

6 For a fairly complete bibliography of Dunn's work, see Caroline Dunn, *Jacob Piatt Dunn: His Miami Language Studies and Manuscript Collection*, 55-59.

to Jameson that they form a "Two Power Pact," according to which Dunn would work for an archives building and Jameson would support publication of the territorial papers.\(^8\)

Jameson welcomed Dunn's support of the archives building and promised that a movement for publication of the territorial papers would have his hearty cooperation.\(^9\)

Dunn proceeded to lobby for both the territorial papers and an archives building. At its meeting in 1922, the Indiana Historical Society passed resolutions urging Indiana congressmen to secure appropriations for publication of historical material relating to the territories in government archives and to support construction of an archives building.\(^10\) Dunn soon found himself in an enviable position to promote the desired legislation. In 1923, he became the private secretary to the newly-elected senator from Indiana, Samuel M. Ralston.\(^11\)

Ralston had had an extensive career in politics. He was an unsuccessful candidate for public office in 1888, 1896, and 1898. In 1912, however, he was elected governor of Indiana by the largest plurality in the state's history. As governor, Ralston worked for the regulation of lobbying,

---

\(^8\) Dunn to Jameson, May 26, 1922, Box 80, File 489, Jameson Papers.

\(^9\) Jameson to Dunn, May 31, 1922, ibid.

\(^10\) Box 57, File 136, ibid.

good roads, conservation, adequate state institutions, and for banking, labor, and utilities legislation. He left office in 1917 to practice law. In 1922, he won the Democratic nomination for senator and defeated Albert J. Beveridge by approximately 30,000 votes. Ralston also, as a member of the Indiana Historical Society, had shown interest in historical activities. During his gubernatorial administration, the Indiana Historical Commission was created to "edit and publish historical material" and to arrange a centennial celebration of Indiana's statehood. Ralston served as an ex-officio member of the Commission and appointed most of the other commission members. Ralston thus could be expected to support Dunn's proposal for publishing territorial papers.

At Dunn's urging, on March 26, 1924, Ralston introduced S. 2935, a "bill for the publication of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the

---


14 Kate Milner Rabb, "The Indiana Historical Commission, Indiana History Bulletin, II (May, 1925), 163.
national archives." The bill provided that the "historian" of the Department of State was "to collect, have copied and arrange for publication, the official papers of the Territories [listed in Parker's Calendar] together with any additional similar documents that may be found in the course of compilation." Once sufficient progress was made to justify publication, the Government Printing Office would print and publish the papers. Publication would be based on the chronological order of each territory's admission into the Union. There would be 10,000 copies, distributed as follows: "one copy to each designated depository of the United States, five hundred to the Library of Congress for exchange purposes, one hundred to the executive departments . . . ten copies to each member of the Senate and House of Representatives; and the remaining copies . . . deposited with the Superintendent of Documents for sale." The bill provided annual appropriations of $25,000 until the publication was completed.

After introducing the bill, Ralston explained that "the people of 35 states of the Union are denied access to

15 Cong. Rec., 68 Cong., 1 Sess., 4994 (March 26, 1924). For concrete evidence that Dunn had been the instigator of the bill, see Jameson to James A. Woodburn, April 10, 1924, Box 136, File 1784, Jameson Papers; Jameson to Logan Esarey, April 17, 1925, Box 131, File 1615, ibid.; and "American Historical Association: its work and its Endowment," Indiana History Bulletin, III (September, 1926), 207.

16 S. 2935, 68 Cong., 1 Sess., Box 7531, State Decimal File: 1910-1929.
the sources of their own history because the United States" had not published its territorial papers. Western states especially felt this deprivation because they were passing through their centennial periods, "when their history becomes a matter of general public interest." Publication of the territorial papers would satisfy a great need of historians of the West. Furthermore, printing the papers would promote historical education, the best possible guarantor of "Americanization."  

Jameson was relatively uninterested in Ralston's bill and saw little hope for its passage. He told James A. Woodburn, history professor at Indiana University, that he doubted the bill would make much headway "in the present session, in which the Senate seems not likely to do any useful things." To Christopher B. Coleman, Director of the Indiana Historical Commission and Ralston's main adviser on the territorial papers after Dunn's death, Jameson suggested modifications of Ralston's bill. But when Coleman proposed that Jameson meet with Ralston to discuss these changes, Jameson replied: "Perhaps I shall go to see him. I do not speak of this as a certainty, because I am frightfully busy with things in which I know that something can be accomplished, and I am not sure that in this line anything

---

17 Cong. Rec., 68 Cong., 1 Sess., 4994 (March 26, 1924).
18 Jameson to Woodburn, April 10, 1924, Box 136, File 1784, Jameson Papers.
Jameson was especially occupied with his proposed publication of instructions to ministers. He was working to get an appropriation for that project and was hesitant to "try for anything else in this present session" unless it was likely to succeed.

Meanwhile, Ralston sought out the State Department's opinion of his bill. He got Dunn to present the bill to Harry G. Dwight, Chief of the Division of Publications of the Department. Gaillard Hunt, Dwight's recently deceased predecessor, had promised the Department's full aid in preparing the territorial papers. But Dwight and Assistant Secretary of State John B. Wright feared that Hunt "out of the goodness of his heart, may have committed us to something which may loom larger than we at present suspect." Nevertheless, Secretary of State Hughes wanted to be as obliging as possible. He assured Ralston that the State Department would be happy "to cooperate in any way possible in issuing the proposed publication."

When the bill came before the Senate on December 30, 1924, Senator Reed Smoot of Utah expressed reservations.

---

19 Coleman to Jameson, November 21, 1924, Box 131, File 1614, ibid.; Coleman to Jameson, December 9, 1924, ibid.; and Jameson to Coleman, December 12, 1924, ibid.

20 Jameson to Coleman, January 9, 1925, Box 72, File 379, ibid.

21 Dunn to Dwight, May 2, 1924, Box 7531, State Decimal File: 1910-1929; Dwight to Wright, May 5, 1924, ibid.; Wright to Dwight, May 6, 1924, ibid.; and Hughes to Ralston, May 9, 1924, ibid.
about the proposal. Smoot asked Ralston how long it would take to complete the project, and Ralston replied that he had been given an estimate of two years. This did not satisfy Smoot, who felt that the Senate Printing Committee had not adequately investigated the project's eventual cost. Smoot explained:

... we have had two or three bills along similar lines that would have cost the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars. I should like to have some kind of report ... as to what this could cost. I see that the initial appropriation is for $25,000, but that is no indication of what the ultimate cost ... will be.22

On Smoot's objection, the bill was passed over so that further information could be obtained from the State Department.23

Ralston attempted to satisfy Smoot's curiosity. He telephoned Tyler Dennett, the new Chief of the Division of Publications, to inquire about the total cost of publishing the territorial papers. Dennett replied that printing and binding 10,000 copies of territorial papers would require about $120,000. The total expense for personnel would be approximately $54,500. A reasonably adequate edition of territorial papers thus would cost about $175,000. Dennett cautioned Ralston that his estimate was of "the roughest kind" and was rather conservative; it could cost a great


23Ibid., 990.
deal more than $175,000 to publish all the important territo­rial papers in the State Department. In fact, Dennett had given an estimate of the wildest kind. He confided to Jameson that "one might just as easily have made an estimate of $500,000." Dennett believed that "even the figure which I have given will be sufficient to kill the propo­sition."25

Because of the large expense contemplated, the bill had no chance of passing the Senate. Senators Ralston and Smoot, however, reached a compromise. S. 3925 was amended to provide that "upon the request of the governor of any State or any organization duly authorized by him," the Chief of the Division of Publications of the State Department would have "collected, edited, copied, and suitably arranged for publication" the territorial papers listed in Parker's Calendar "together with such additional papers of like character that may be found." The Secretary of State would furnish free of charge "to the proper authorities of the several States for publication a copy" of the papers that had been copied and arranged. The Chief of the Division of Publications was authorized to hire not more than five persons who were especially qualified to arrange the
territorial papers. These persons would be hired "without regard to the classification act of 1923 and the civil service laws and regulations made thereunder. . . ." This exemption would insure that the work would be put "in the hands of the best historical scholars whose services" could be obtained, men who "were not available through the usual channels. . . ." For executing the work, S. 3925 authorized appropriations of $20,000 for fiscal 1926 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years. As amended, S. 2935 passed the Senate without debate on February 18, 1925. It soon passed the House and became law on March 3.27

The Ralston Act was far from satisfactory. Instead of establishing a government publication, the Act merely provided that the federal government would arrange the papers, while publication would be left up to the states. Yet once the Act had passed, Jameson developed a deeper interest in territorial papers legislation. He attempted to get the Ralston Act properly implemented and, more important, he worked for federal publication of the papers.

Less than two weeks after Ralston's bill became law, Christopher Coleman informed Jameson that Ralston was not satisfied with the measure. The provisions of the Act were limited and, in the long run, would be extravagant because

27 Cong. Rec., 68 Cong., 2 Sess., 4032-33 (February 18, 1925), 5022 (February 18, 1925), 5310 (March 3, 1925); and Charles Evans Hughes to Ralston, February 17, 1925, Box 7531, State Decimal File: 1910-1929.
there would be much duplication. Ralston, however, saw a way to ameliorate the situation. If the states showed a sufficient demand for the territorial papers before section two of the law, which provided for the states to obtain copies of the papers, had been worked out, then Ralston thought he could get through Congress an increased appropriation and a provision that the territorial papers be printed as a government document. Coleman asked Jameson's help in creating a demand for the territorial papers.  

Jameson, as chairman of the AHA committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government, sent a circular letter to persons in the states that had a territorial history. His correspondents included the "chief historical official of the state, or the chief friend of history therein, or the one most likely to influence suitably the governor." Jameson outlined the history of the Ralston Act and explained that the State Department would prepare a state's papers for publication only upon application by the governor of the state or someone authorized by him. He described the dangers of leaving the Act's provisions to chance: some governors would make the necessary request and some would not; some states would print the papers and some would not; historians would have to search for the published papers in a variety of state

---

28 Coleman to Jameson, March 27, 1925, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.
historical publications. Inconsistencies between state boundaries and territorial boundaries made the situation even more complex. 29

A solution could be found if the governor of each state affected by the law requested that his state's papers be collected, edited, copied, and arranged. Then the Secretary of State probably would ask for an appropriation for collecting and editing all the territorial papers. Once all the papers had been arranged for publication, it would be possible to persuade Congress to provide for governmental publication of the territorial papers. Jameson believed that "it ought not to be difficult to cause the Senators and Representatives of twenty-nine states to push for such appropriations." But the success of this plan depended upon a request from every state involved. Jameson urged the recipients of his letter to get their governors to request arrangement of their territorial papers. 30

In some states, interested persons made the necessary request even before receiving Jameson's letter. Governor John J. Blaine of Wisconsin wrote to the Secretary of State in March, so that by the time Joseph Schafer, Superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, received Jameson's letter, Wisconsin's request was "a matter of


30Ibid.
Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Superintendent of the State Historical Society of Iowa, brought the Ralston Act to the attention of Governor Hammill. Shambaugh received from Hammill a letter authorizing the State Historical Society to make the request to the State Department, and Shambaugh thereupon made the necessary application. In general, however, the response to Jameson's circular letter was slow. Three months after he wrote it, only ten governors or persons duly authorized by them had asked the Secretary of State to have their territorial papers arranged.

Jameson therefore sent a second letter to historians in the states that had not taken action. Again he asked them to get their governors to make the request specified in the Ralston Act. Speedy action was imperative since the

31 Schafer to Jameson, April 1, 1925, ibid.
32 Shambaugh to Jameson, March 31, 1925, ibid.
33 Jameson to Christopher Coleman, June 23, 1925, ibid. In addition to Iowa and Wisconsin, the states that had complied and the persons apparently responsible for action in those states were: Mississippi—Dunbar Rowland, Director, Department of Archives and History, State of Mississippi. Colorado—James H. Willard, Department of History, University of Colorado. Oklahoma—W. F. Galpin, Department of History, University of Oklahoma. Utah—George Emory Fellows, Department of History and Political Science, University of Utah. Tennessee—John Trotwood Moore, Librarian and Archivist, Division of Library and Archives, Department of Education, state of Tennessee. Oregon—G. F. Young, Secretary, Oregon Historical Society. Nebraska—Addison E. Sheldon, Secretary and Superintendent, Nebraska State Historical Society. Idaho—Representative Burton L. French and Harrison D. Dale, Department of Economics and Political Science, University of Idaho. This information is taken from various letters in ibid.
State Department was about to make up its budget estimates.\(^{34}\) Christopher Coleman helped Jameson to instigate action. He offered to get Indiana's Governor Edward Jackson to write to governors of the states that had not complied.\(^{35}\) In August, at the direction of Executive Committee of the Indiana Historical Society, Coleman personally wrote to the governors of those states that had not requested arrangement of their papers.\(^{36}\)

Historians offered a variety of reasons for their failure to act on Jameson's first letter. Frank Heywood Hodder twice had attempted to see the governor of Kansas, but both times the governor had been out of town.\(^{37}\) The governor of Minnesota had been involved in a fight over state reorganization when Jameson's letter arrived; Solon Buck concluded that the governor would give the territorial papers more attention if Buck delayed approaching him on the matter.\(^{38}\) Edgar L. Hewett of New Mexico had been out of town when Jameson's letter arrived.\(^{39}\) "For some unaccountable reason," Jameson's first letter had not reached Edmond

---

\(^{34}\)Jameson's circular letter, June 23, 1925, \textit{ibid.}\(^{35}\)Coleman to Jameson, July 13, 1925, \textit{ibid.}\(^{36}\)Coleman to Governor A. V. Dohaney (Ohio), August 1, 1925, \textit{ibid.}\(^{37}\)Hodder to Jameson, July 24, 1925, \textit{ibid.}\(^{38}\)Buck to Jameson, April 3, 1925, \textit{ibid.}\(^{39}\)Hewett to Jameson, October 7, 1925, \textit{ibid.}\)
S. Meany of Washington. Upon receiving Jameson's second letter, Meany promptly contacted Governor Ronald Hartley, who wrote to the State Department. Requests from the states slowly came in, and by October, 1925, only four states and Alaska had failed to make the necessary request to the State Department.

Jameson and his colleagues expended much energy trying to get the remaining four states to take action under the Ralston Act. Although California had not been a territory, there were a number of documents relating to California in Parker's Calendar. Jameson therefore wished to have an application from California "to make the whole thing complete." Edward H. Krehbiel agreed to ask Governor Friend Richardson to make the necessary request, but he was

---

40 Meany to Jameson, July 3, 1925, ibid.; Meany to Hartley, July 3, 1925, ibid.; and Meany to Jameson, July 15, 1925, ibid.

41 Tyler Dennett to Jameson, October 9, 1925, ibid. In addition to Hodder, Buck, Hewett, and Meany, the persons apparently responsible for action pursuant to Jameson's second letter were: Alabama--Mrs. Marie B. Owen, Director, State of Alabama Department of History and Archives. Arkansas--D. Y. Thomas, History Department, University of Arkansas. Illinois--Otto L. Schmidt, President, Illinois State Historical Society. Michigan--G. N. Fuller, Secretary and Editor of Michigan Historical Commission. Nevada--Jane Elizabeth Wier, Department of History and Political Science, University of Nevada. North Dakota--O. G. Libby, University of North Dakota. Wyoming--Laura A. White. This information is taken from various letters in ibid. One can see that in his letter writing efforts Jameson contacted a combination of history professors and persons affiliated with state historical societies and associations.

42 Jameson to Edward B. Krehbiel, March 30, 1925, ibid.
not sure that Richardson would because the Governor was "a queer kind of a party, and much depends upon the way this thing happens to strike his untutored and opinionated mind." Krehbiel was unable to get Richardson to act, so Jameson sought the help of Charles E. Chapman, professor of history at the University of California. Chapman did his best to gain Richardson's compliance with the Ralston Act, but the recalcitrant governor refused.

The situation in Ohio was particularly complex. C. B. Galbreath, secretary, editor, and librarian of the Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society, was responsible for getting Governor A. V. Dohaney to make the request to the State Department. Before Dohaney complied with Galbreath's request, he received Christopher Coleman's letter asking that he request arrangement of Ohio's papers. Dohaney, in turn, asked Galbreath to make the application to the State Department. Galbreath wrote to the State Department to ask that the papers be arranged, but he failed to include the letter from Governor Dohaney that formally authorized him to make the request. As a result, by the end

---

43 Krehbiel to Jameson, April 4, 1925, ibid.
44 Jameson to Chapman, October 12, 1925, ibid.
45 Chapman to Jameson, October 21, 1925, ibid.; and Chapman to Richardson, October 21, 1925, ibid.
46 Galbreath to Jameson, April 1, 1925, ibid.; and Galbreath to Jameson, July 2, 1925, ibid.
47 Galbreath to Jameson, August 26, 1925, ibid.
of 1925, Ohio had not officially complied with the Ralston Act. Despite Jameson's efforts, Ohio, California, Louisiana, and Montana never made an official request to have their territorial papers arranged.

During 1925, Jameson also became involved in the selection of an editor for the territorial papers. Shortly after the Ralston Act passed, Tyler Dennett told Secretary of State Kellogg that it would be wise if Kellogg consulted members of the AHA for advice about editing the territorial papers. Dennett specifically urged Kellogg to contact Jameson's committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government. This would accomplish two purposes. First, Kellogg would gain the confidence of historians that the work was being conducted "according to approved methods of historical research and publication." Second, Kellogg could use the committee as a protective barrier between himself and governors who might press him to hire personnel who were unqualified or incompetent. He could do this by obtaining the committee's opinion as to who should do the work and refusing to hire anyone who did not have the committee's approval.

48 Tyler Dennett to Jameson, December 4, 1925, ibid.


50 Dennett to Kellogg, March 17, 1925, Box 7531, State Decimal File: 1910-1929.
Kellogg, acting on Dennett's advice, sought Jameson's aid in selecting personnel to edit the territorial papers. He explained to Jameson that while the Ralston Act put the Chief of the Division of Publications in charge of the territorial papers, that provision was designed to utilize an existing office of the State Department and to avoid "setting up any new pieces of machinery." The project actually would be supervised by someone who was an expert in territorial history. Kellogg pointed out that although the Ralston Act exempted persons who worked on the project from civil service laws, this exemption should not lead to any lowering of standards in selecting the staff. In fact, the exemption imposed upon the State Department a special obligation to hire personnel who met the highest standards of historical scholarship. Kellogg thus asked Jameson to get the committee on documentary historical publications to recommend two or more experts in territorial history for the position of editor of the territorial papers. 51

Jameson promptly contacted the committee members. He sent them a copy of Kellogg's letter and requested suggestions for a "first grade editor." 52 After receiving the opinions of his colleagues, Jameson responded to Kellogg. He not only suggested candidates for editor but also laid

51 Kellogg to Jameson, August 23, 1925, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.

52 Jameson to committee members, August 19, 1925, ibid.
out a plan that would bring the best results under the existing law and also would lay the basis for "the larger and better results that can be obtained if Senator Ralston's" plan for having the papers published passed Congress.53

Jameson explained to Kellogg that it was unlikely that a man meeting Kellogg's high standards could be persuaded to spend two or three years working on the territorial papers. Men of such calibre already had good jobs, which they could not abandon for a "brief length of time and then stop, leaving them unattached and, so to speak, out of step. . . ." But a solution could be found because collecting scattered territorial documents and getting them copied and arranged was one type of task while editing them for publication was another. It seemed possible to engage one man to supervise the collecting, copying, and arranging, and them to hire another man to edit the papers for publication if subsequent legislation provided for publication by the federal government. The committee agreed that Dr. Newton D. Mereness was the person best qualified to handle the first phase of work. Mereness was familiar with territorial history and had been "engaged in work of just this type, for a group of western historical societies. . . ." But Mereness should not edit the papers for publication. The person best qualified for that task was Theodore C. Pease, Editor of Publications of the Illinois State

53Jameson to Kellogg, September 21, 1925, ibid.
Historical Society. If Pease would not accept, Solon Buck, Secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society, would be a very good second choice. Jameson believed that either Pease or Buck could obtain a one-year leave of absence, presumably the time needed to edit the papers for publication.\footnote{Ibid.}

Kellogg accepted Jameson's recommendation and hired Mereness to direct the collecting, copying, and arranging of the territorial papers.\footnote{Tyler Dennett to Jameson, August 6, 1926, \textit{ibid.}}

Before work could begin on the project, Congress had to appropriate funds. Although the Ralston Act authorized annual appropriations of $20,000 for fiscal 1926 and the two succeeding fiscal years, the Act had passed too late for an appropriation to be available at the beginning of fiscal 1926. Secretary of State Kellogg expected that a deficiency appropriation, which would have made funds available early in 1926, would pass Congress, but the House Appropriations Committee failed to recommend the deficiency appropriation.\footnote{Kellogg to Jameson, August 13, 1925, \textit{ibid.}; U. S. Congress, House, \textit{Supplemental Estimate of Appropriations for the Department of State}, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 1926, House Doc. 152; and U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, \textit{First Deficiency Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1926}, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 1926, H. Rept. 175.} Funds would be available no sooner than July 1, 1926.

Jameson tried to insure the State Department's support of an appropriation. Near the end of 1925, he
decided that the Department needed to be more fully convinced that "historical students in the West" wanted the Ralston Act executed. He believed that this objective could be accomplished if the Council of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association discussed the subject with Tyler Dennett. Jameson therefore urged members of the Council to request Dennett's presence at the Council meeting in December.\textsuperscript{57} The members of the Council, in turn, telegraphed Kellogg to request Dennett's attendance.\textsuperscript{58} Acting Secretary of State Joseph Grew agreed that Dennett should go to the meeting.\textsuperscript{59} Dennett attended and assured the members of the Council that the State Department was doing everything possible to get the territorial papers under way.\textsuperscript{60}

Even though the State Department was doing its best to obtain an appropriation, that department was hindered "by the President's rigid injunctions regarding economy."\textsuperscript{61} If an appropriation was to be obtained, a lobbying effort would

\textsuperscript{57}Jameson to Mrs. Clarence S. Paine, December 12, 1925, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers; and undated note to C. B. Galbreath, G. N. Fuller, Joseph Schafer, Christopher B. Coleman, Theodore C. Pease, Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Solon J. Buck, and Mrs. Clarence S. Paine, ibid.

\textsuperscript{58}See, for example, Joseph Schafer to Kellogg, December 22, 1925, Box 1034, State Decimal File: 1910-1929.

\textsuperscript{59}Grew to J. B. Wright, December 23, 1925, \textit{ibid.}; and Grew to Joseph Schafer, December 24, 1925, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{60}Dennett to C. B. Galbreath, January 5, 1926, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{61}Jameson to Christopher B. Coleman, December 12, 1925, \textit{ibid.}
have to be directed at Congress. Jameson took charge of this lobbying effort.

At its 1925 meeting, the AHA adopted Jameson's resolution on the territorial papers. The resolution asked that an appropriation be granted and urged Congress to provide for publication of the territorial papers as a public document.62 Jameson then attempted to bring the resolution to the attention of Congress. He compiled a list of eighty-two AHA members from states that had a territorial history and asked each of these historians to contact a designated congressman. They were to send their representatives a copy of the AHA resolution and a personal letter urging an appropriation for and further legislation on the territorial papers. Jameson himself contacted 147 other congressmen.63

Many of the congressmen were noncommittal in their responses, promising only "serious consideration" or "further study" of the subject.64 Other congressmen agreed


63 Undated sheet with instructions, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Christopher B. Coleman, December 12, 1925, ibid.

64 W. H. Sproul (Kansas) to Jameson, January 28, 1926, ibid.; William E. Hull (Illinois) to C. T. Wyckoff, February 8, 1926, ibid.; Henry M. Winston to Jameson, March 5, 1926, ibid.; John F. Miller (Washington) to Edmond S. Meany, February 5, 1926, ibid.; Ralph E. Updike (Indiana) to Christopher B. Coleman, February 6, 1926, ibid.; Sam D. McReynolds (Tennessee) to S. L. Ware, February 3, 1926, ibid.; N. J. Sinnott (Oregon) to Jameson, January 28, 1926, ibid.; E. E. Eslick (Tennessee) to American Historical Association, January 28, 1926, ibid.; and Gilbert M. Haugen (Iowa) to Jameson, January 29, 1926, ibid.
to back the appropriation but were pointedly silent about legislation to publish the territorial papers.\textsuperscript{65} Some representatives, on the other hand, not only promised to support the appropriation but also pledged their support for making the territorial papers a government publication.\textsuperscript{66} Although some congressmen replied perfunctorily to the letters they received, others acted zealously upon the request for an appropriation. Thomas Marshall, a professor at Washington University, got Representative C. A. Newton of Missouri to encourage the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Martin B. Madden, to support the appropriation.\textsuperscript{67} Representative Morton D. Hull of Illinois, at the request of Andrew C. McLaughlin, also urged Madden to get the appropriation through Congress.\textsuperscript{68}


\textsuperscript{66}John M. Nelson (Wisconsin) to Joseph Schafer, January 30, 1926, \textit{ibid.}; Philip D. Swing (California) to Jameson, January 28, 1926, \textit{ibid.}; and C. C. Dunway to Jameson, March 6, 1926, \textit{ibid.}


\textsuperscript{68}Hull to McLaughlin, February 4, 1926, \textit{ibid.}
When the subcommittee on appropriations for the State Department met in 1926, Tyler Dennett appeared to speak in favor of the appropriation. He briefly reviewed the history of the Ralston Act, explaining that it originally had contemplated publication of the territorial papers but subsequently had been limited in scope. He described how "the state historical societies . . . as soon as the law was passed, seemed to get right behind the question. . . ." He also told the subcommittee members that he had attended the Council meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and there had "found a great deal of interest in the subject. . . ." Finally, he explained that historians were working to extend the law so as to "carry out the original intention of Senator Ralston." 69 The congressmen apparently were satisfied by Dennett's presentation. The Appropriations Committee recommended and Congress approved a full $20,000 appropriation for fiscal 1927. 70

In 1927, Congress readily appropriated another

69 U. S. Congress, Hearings Before the Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations in charge of Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and Labor Appropriations Bill for 1927, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 1926, 44-46.

70 U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Appropriations Bill, Fiscal Year 1927, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 1926, H. Rept. 388, 3-4; and Statutes at Large, XLIV, Part 2, 331.
With the granting of this appropriation, the Ralston Act's authorization of funds expired. If work on the territorial papers was to continue, new legislation would have to pass Congress. But historians wanted this new legislation to do more than extend the Ralston Act. Instead, they wanted the government to provide for publication of the territorial papers. Jameson had begun to work for this goal late in 1925. From 1926 through 1929, he led an intensive campaign to achieve the desired objective.

Early in 1926, historians began to consider ways of getting a bill for publication through Congress. Christopher Coleman suggested to Jameson that Dennett or Mereness should make a careful estimate of publication costs. Then a congressman could be induced to introduce a bill for publication based on this estimate. Because Ralston had died in 1925, a new champion of the territorial papers would have to be found. Coleman offered to "secure one of the Indiana Senators or Representatives to sponsor the bill."\(^{72}\) Mennes concluded that in order to gain congressional support for publication a vigorous campaign would be needed.


\(^{72}\) Coleman to Jameson, February 2, 1926, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.
He suggested to Christopher Coleman that funds for such a campaign should be raised from "some men of means. . . ." The money would be used to enable historians to travel to Washington to lobby for publication. Mereness also thought that in at least twenty states someone should be designated as a leader "in the business of having history men and other educated men of influence arouse the interest of the members of the State delegation in Congress in the matter." It was highly important that someone "be found in Utah to win Senator Smoot."\(^73\) Tyler Dennett likewise concluded that new legislation would require "a good deal of careful explanation . . . to Congressmen." He doubted that this could be "accomplished by mere correspondence."\(^74\)

While Coleman, Mereness, and Dennett pondered ways of promoting new legislation, other historians stimulated congressional interest in the matter. After receiving Jameson's circular letter of December, 1925, C. B. Galbreath wrote to his friend, Senator Frank B. Willis of Ohio, to urge publication of the territorial papers. Willis responded favorably to Galbreath, promising to do all he could to get the territorial papers published. Encouraged by Willis' response, Galbreath offered also to contact his other senator, Simeon D. Fess, whom he knew "almost equally

\(^73\)Mereness to Coleman, February 5, 1926, \textit{ibid.}\(^74\)Coleman to Jameson, February 15, 1926, \textit{ibid.}\)
as well. 75 Jameson encouraged Galbreath to write to Fess; Galbreath obliged and found that Fess was anxious to work for publication of the territorial papers. At Galbreath's suggestion, Jameson personally met with Fess on the proposed legislation. 76 James A. Woodburn offered to discuss the territorial papers with the senators from Indiana when he was in Washington in March. 77

Apparently at Woodburn's request, Senator Alfred M. Robinson of Indiana, Ralston's successor in the Senate, asked Jameson to give him a draft bill for further action on the territorial papers. Jameson prepared the draft and explained to Robinson why it should pass. He informed Robinson that Ralston had wanted to get the territorial papers printed, enumerated the shortcomings of the existing legislation, and explained that historians were anxious to have the Ralston Act amended to provide for publication. He asked Robinson to introduce the bill in the Senate. 78 As it turned out, however, the bill for expanding the Ralston Act was introduced by Jameson's former student, Simeon D. Fess.

On March 26, 1926, Fess introduced S. 3725, a bill to

75 Galbreath to Jameson, January 11, 1926, ibid.; and Willis to Galbreath, December 31, 1925, ibid.

76 Jameson to Galbreath, January 20, 1926, ibid.; Galbreath to Jameson, January 28, 1926, ibid.; and Jameson to Galbreath, January 30, 1926, ibid.

77 Woodburn to Jameson, March 10, 1926, ibid.

78 Jameson to Robinson, March 22, 1926, ibid.
amend the Ralston Act. It provided that once the territorial papers had been collected, copied, arranged, and edited, there would be "printed and bound an edition of four thousand copies of this publication for the use of the Department of State. . . ." It authorized $125,000 "or so much thereof as may be necessary" to carry out the provisions of the bill. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Printing.79

Oddly enough, Tyler Dennett convinced Jameson that quick passage of the bill would be unwise. Before work began on the territorial papers on July 1, 1926, Dennett needed to know if Congress eventually would provide for publication of the documents. Dennett explained to Jameson that "it would be very difficult to follow a plan. . . . which would lend itself equally well to the alternative courses [of] . . . supplying copies of papers to the States, and Publication by the Government." There would be waste if the State Department started to prepare the papers for distribution to the states and subsequently was "instructed by Congress to prepare them for publication." By June, 1926, it seemed likely that the papers would be published. Fess and Senator George H. Moses of New Hampshire thought there was "a pretty good prospect that the federal government" would print the

79Cong. Rec., 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 6327 (March 26, 1926); and S. 3725, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., File on S. 1168, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., Record Group 46, National Archives, hereafter referred to as File on S. 1168.
territorial papers once a manuscript was ready. The response to Jameson's letter writing campaign of the previous December convinced him that "so far as the House is concerned . . . the prospect of ultimate action toward federal printing is good." The State Department thus could carry out its work on the assumption that the territorial papers would be printed. Therefore, Dennett explained to Jameson, no effort should be made to secure further legislation until there was a manuscript to print or until so much progress had been made that it was possible "to make close estimates of quantities and of expenditures." Jameson thus informed Fess that no further action should be taken on his bill during the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, and Fess agreed. 80

In January, 1927, Jameson concluded that it was time to act on Fess' bill. In a lengthy letter to Fess, Jameson expressed the hope that Fess would "succeed in persuading the Senate to pass" S. 3725 with some amendments. Tyler Dennett had concluded that editing and printing the territorial papers would cost $100,000, so Jameson suggested that the authorization be reduced from $125,000 to $100,000. In order to "make the law sufficiently explicit to insure the actual appropriation," Jameson urged an amendment providing that the money "be available for the fiscal year 1928-1929.

and for as much longer as may be necessary in order to
finish the work." Jameson also suggested an amendment that
would add unexpended annual appropriations to those of the
following fiscal year; otherwise, unexpended balances would
go back into the Treasury where they could not be drawn on
again.81

Jameson next focused his attention upon the Senate
Printing Committee. He asked Fess, a member of the Com-
mittee, to arrange a meeting.82 But Fess informed Jameson
that Committee Chairman George Wharton Pepper of Pennsylvania
was not able to give sufficient attention to the territorial
papers "due to the fact that he goes out the fourth of March,
has been busy with the banking bill, and has not been
well. . . ."83 Jameson wrote to Pepper, who replied that he
hoped to convene a meeting of the Committee within a few
days.84 Jameson also contacted another committee member,
Duncan Fletcher of Florida. Fletcher, who apparently had
not studied the situation, informed Jameson that the "Fess
Bill . . . has passed the Senate--months ago--and went to
the House. Your efforts, may I suggest, should be directed
there."85

81 Jameson to Fess, January 10, 1927, ibid.
82 Jameson to Fess, February 19, 1927, ibid.
83 Fess to Jameson, February 21, 1927, ibid.
84 Jameson to Pepper, February 19, 1927, ibid.; and
Pepper to Jameson, February 22, 1927, ibid.
85 Fletcher to Jameson, February 22, 1927, ibid.
The Printing Committee finally met and on March 1, 1927, reported S. 3725 to the Senate. The Committee had not accepted Jameson's amendments but had proposed an amendment of its own relative to the distribution of the territorial papers. The amendment provided that the Senate would receive 600 copies, the House 1,300 copies, and the State Department 2,100 copies of the publication. The Senate accepted the amendment and passed the bill. The bill then was referred to the House, but the House adjourned before it could consider S. 3725.

Although measures to expand the Ralston Act had not passed in the Sixty-ninth Congress, in the Seventieth Congress historians and interested legislators resumed the campaign to get the territorial papers printed. In December, 1927, Representative Theodore Burton of Ohio and Senator Fess introduced identical bills, H. R. 6040 and S. 1168. The bills provided that work would be continued on the territorial papers and that they would be issued as a government publication. Not more than five historical experts, appointed "without regard to the Classification Act of 1923 and the Civil Service Rules," would handle the

86 Cong. Rec., 69 Cong., 2 Sess., 5215 (March 1, 1927).

87 Ibid., 5447 (March 2, 1927).

88 Ibid., 70 Cong., 1 Sess., 225 (December 7, 1927), 347 (December 9, 1927); and Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Years 1927 and 1928 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1929), 175.
project. There would be 600 copies of the publication for the Senate, 1,300 copies for the House, and fifty copies for the Department of State. A total of $125,000 would be authorized, with not more than $50,000 appropriated for any one year, and appropriations would remain available until expended. "Copy reading, proof reading, and index making" would be handled by "the regular editorial staff of the Department of State. . . ." 89

If one of the bills was to become law, it needed the support of the congressional printing committees. Although Fess no longer was a member of the Senate Printing Committee, the new chairman of that committee was Hiram Bingham, a friend of Jameson's and a historian. 90 Although Bingham was expected to support the Fess bill, he introduced a measure that contravened the intent of that bill. Bingham's proposal authorized another $20,000 appropriation for continuing work under the Ralston Act. 91 Bingham introduced the measure "lest by chance there should be too great a delay in the enactment of the Fess bill," 92 but he did not realize that if it passed it likely would foreclose for some time any possibility of printing the territorial papers. Jameson

89 S. 1168, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., File on S. 1168.
90 Cong. Rec., 70 Cong., 1 Sess., 482 (December 12, 1927). For a brief biographical sketch of Bingham, see New York Times, June 7, 1956, 1.
91 S. 2536, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., File on S. 1168.
92 Bingham to John W. Oliver, January 20, 1928, ibid.
apparently convinced Bingham of the danger inherent in his proposal, for nothing further came of it.

Historians mobilized in support of S. 1168. Christopher Coleman served as a "committee of one" of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association to promote the bill. He got "one person in each state in the MVHA to work for the bill in his own state, both personally and through others." Interested scholars wrote to Bingham to urge favorable action on S. 1168. They pointed out that state publication of the papers would lead to duplication and waste, explained that federal publication of the papers would be a great convenience to historians who could not afford to travel to Washington, described the integral relationship between territorial history and national development, and stressed the responsibility of the federal government to publish such historical documents.

Meanwhile, Jameson proposed to Bingham a minor alteration of S. 1168. He urged that the bill be amended to

---

93 Jameson to Henrick Shipstead, January 21, 1928, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.

94 Coleman to Jameson, December 16, 1927, ibid.

provide "a sufficient number of copies for distribution by the Superintendent of Documents to depository libraries."

Unless this amendment was added, the territorial papers would have to be designated as a Senate or House document in order for depository libraries to obtain copies of the publication. Such a designation was undesirable because then "the proof-reading would go out of the hands of the State Department," and it was "highly desirable that the proof-reading should be done by the same set of persons, relatively expert in territorial history, who had done the editing."96

Certain parts of the bill drew fire from members of the executive branch. The Public Printer objected to the provision that put the State Department in charge of copy reading, proofreading, and index making. He complained to Bingham that such a procedure "is impractical, as it covers work which ordinarily devolves upon this office."97 Bingham brought the Public Printer's objection to Jameson's attention.98 Jameson replied that he had insufficient information to respond to the complaint. He explained that Tyler Dennett had suggested the amendment to keep proofreading within the State Department and urged that Dennett be

96Jameson to Bingham, January 11, 1928, ibid.

97George H. Carter to Bingham, January 9, 1928, ibid.

98Bingham to Jameson, January 12, 1928, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.
invited to attend the hearing on the bill to help resolve the conflict. The Secretary of the Civil Service Commission asked that the provision "for the employment of historical experts without regard to the civil service rules" be eliminated as unnecessary. Since the President had the authority to authorize such appointments, "any exception [should] be left to him."\(^{100}\)

The Senate Printing Committee reported S. 1168 on February 3, 1928.\(^{101}\) The Committee had accepted Jameson and Dennett's amendment that insured the State Department's control of proofreading and had retained the provision that exempted the territorial papers staff from civil service rules. The Committee also proposed a minor textual change.\(^{102}\) The Senate agreed to the amendments and passed S. 1168 without debate on February 6.\(^{103}\)

While S. 1168 made its way through the Senate, Jameson also tried to get favorable House action. On January 11, 1928, he suggested to Edward M. Beers of Pennsylvania,....

\(^{99}\)Jameson to Bingham, January 13, 1928, ibid.

\(^{100}\)John T. Doyle to George H. Moses, January 6, 1928, File on S. 1168.

\(^{101}\)Cong. Rec., 70 Cong., 1 Sess., 2045 (February 3, 1928).

\(^{102}\)U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Printing, Papers of the Territories of the United States, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., Rept. 227, 1.

\(^{103}\)Cong. Rec., 70 Cong., 1 Sess., 2555 (February 6, 1928).
Chairman of the House Printing Committee, the addition to H. R. 6040 of the amendment that insured the State Department would handle proofreading.\footnote{Jameson to Beers, January 11, 1928, Box 131, File 1615, Jameson Papers.} Beers apparently was not as sensitive to historical needs as was Bingham, for six weeks after Jameson contacted Beers, the Committee had not met. The Committee convened in late February, but since Jameson was out of town Theodore Burton got Beers to postpone consideration of the territorial papers bill until after Jameson returned.\footnote{Jameson to Burton, March 1, 1928, \textit{ibid.}; and Burton to Jameson, March 6, 1928, \textit{ibid.}} The Committee delayed meeting again for several more months. Jameson was sure that the Committee would report the bill favorably if only "those three men" could be persuaded to "devote an hour in holding a meeting." Beers, however, was busy campaigning for reelection.\footnote{Jameson to Christopher B. Coleman, April 23, 1928, \textit{ibid.}} Even after the Pennsylvania primary passed, the "blessed committee" would not meet. Jameson complained to Newton Mereness: "Why it should take three months to get three men in the same building to come together for a meeting is one of the permanent mysteries of political science."\footnote{Jameson to Mereness, May 7, 1928, \textit{ibid.}}

The Printing Committee finally met late in May to
consider S. 1168, which had passed the Senate and had been referred to the House. The Committee recommended passage of the bill with a proposed technical change in the printing and distribution of the territorial papers. The amendment provided for printing 1,950 copies for the Department of State, of which six copies would go to each senator, two copies would go to each representative, and fifty copies would be for the use of the Department of State. This amendment was designed to obviate a provision of the printing act of 1895, which would have led to printing more copies of the papers than was contemplated in the Fess bill.108

Because the Committee presented its report only one day before Congress adjourned, the House failed to consider S. 1168 in the first session of the Seventieth Congress. Before Congress reconvened in December, 1928, appropriations under the Ralston Act expired. Therefore, while the territorial papers bill was pending in Congress, work on the project ground to a halt on June 30, 1928.109

As Jameson predicted,110 S. 1168 was called up early in the second session of the Seventieth Congress. But final action was slow to come. When the bill first came up, Beers


109*Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Years 1927 and 1928*, 175-76.

110Ibid., 176.
had it passed over without objection.\(^{111}\) When it was next in order, Louis Cramton of Michigan stated that he had reservations about the bill, and it again was passed over.\(^{112}\)

Two weeks later, on January 21, 1929, Cramton described in detail his objections. He pointed out that the method of distribution proposed by the House Printing Committee left several hundred of the 1,950 copies unprovided for. He concluded that this slack should be taken up by giving copies to deserving organizations. Cramton therefore proposed an amendment that would provide "8 copies for each State or Territory, to be distributed to historical associations, commissions, museums, or libraries, and to other nondepository libraries therein designated by the governor of each State or Territory, [and] 4 copies for the Library of the Department of Interior." Fiorello LaGuardia of New York agreed that Cramton's amendment equalized the distribution. Cramton also proposed changes in the financial specifications of the bill. He urged that the authorization read "'not more than $125,000'" and that the provision allowing appropriations to remain available until expended be deleted. He explained that "appropriations of that kind are lost sight of and not checked up."\(^{113}\)

\(^{111}\) *Cong. Rec.*, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., 770-71 (December 17, 1928).


Representative Eugene Black of Texas was severely critical of the bill. He asked: "[W]hat value would these Territorial papers be ordinarily to members of Congress[?] Why the large number printed. . . [?]" LaGuardia replied that members of Congress probably would send their copies to historical societies. Not satisfied, Black stated that "I believe I will ask that this bill go over until next time." Representative Fred Letts of Iowa asked Black not to object, for the bill was of pressing concern to historical interests. Black replied that "several years ago Congress printed 15 volumes of the testimony of the Industrial Commission at a cost of more than $90,000. Those were distributed to Members of Congress and----" At this point, LaGuardia interjected: "And very valuable." Black continued: "There was no need whatever of printing the testimony and it cost a very large sum of money." Letts explained to Black that unless the bill was passed the $40,000 already spent on the territorial papers would be wasted. But Black thought there was "no immediate hurry . . . for the completion of this work," and on his objection the bill was passed over once more. 114

The House again considered the bill on February 25, 1929. This time Black was silent. The House accepted Cramton's three amendments, and the bill passed without further debate. 115 Deletion of the provision making

114Ibid. 115Ibid., 4270 (February 25, 1929).
appropriations available until expended undoubtedly bothered Jameson. But had the Senate disagreed with the House amendments, a conference committee would have had to convene to iron out the differences. Since Congress was only a few days from adjournment, further delay likely would have meant the death of S. 1168. Probably for that reason, Jameson made no effort to keep the provision regarding appropriations intact. On February 26, Fess moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments, and the Senate agreed.116

The original intent of Ralston's bill now had become law. Nevertheless, considerable time passed before the first volume of territorial papers was ready for publication. Not only had the project become inoperative in June, 1928, but also the new legislation passed too late to secure an appropriation for fiscal 1930. In his committee report for 1929, however, Jameson told the AHA that Congress probably would approve a sufficient appropriation for fiscal 1931.117

It was in fact rather easy to obtain an appropriation. Tyler Dennett again reviewed the history of territorial papers legislation for the House subcommittee in charge of State Department appropriations. Although Dennett emphasized that the plan had been initiated by Congress, he

116 Ibid., 4410 (February 26, 1929).

made it clear that the State Department intended to "carry it through in conformity with the best standards of histori-cal scholarship." The House Appropriations Committee recommended and Congress approved a $15,000 appropriation for the first year's work on the territorial papers.

With money appropriated for the project, it was necessary to decide upon editorial procedures and to choose an editor. While Jameson felt that the best plan would be to have a full-time editor work on the territorial papers in Washington, he doubted that "a first rate man . . . would be free to do it." On the other hand, a qualified historian probably could be convinced to work in Washington for three months; concurrently, the "tasks of annotation by regions" could be sublet to several other scholars. Jameson thought that under such an arrangement Christopher Coleman should serve as overall editor. On the other hand, if it was necessary to "have one general whole-time editor," Wayne E. Stevens, Arthur C. Cole, Evarts Greene, Solon Buck, and Theodore Pease were possible prospects for the position.


119 U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Appropriations Bill, Fiscal Year 1931, 71 Cong., 2 Sess., 1930, H. Rept. 381, 5, 30; and Statutes at Large, XLVI, Part 1, 174-75.

120 Jameson to Tyler Dennett, March 22, 1930, Box 51, File 64, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Christopher B. Coleman, March 18, 1930, ibid.
Then, with an editor under consideration, a new obstacle arose. The State Department "received a request from the President not to undertake any new work for the present fiscal year unless there were overwhelming reasons for doing so." Therefore, resumption of work on the territorial papers was postponed, and negotiations with prospective editors were dropped.\textsuperscript{121} The AHA committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government regretted this decision. The committee urged the AHA to petition the State Department that editing and printing of the territorial papers "be put in motion forthwith." The Council of the AHA adopted the committee's resolution and sent it to other historical societies "with a view to securing action from them on this matter."\textsuperscript{122}

Perhaps prompted in part by historians, in the spring of 1931 the State Department again began to seek an editor. The editorship would be a full-time position. Wayne Stevens was the Department's first choice, but Stevens declined the position. Departmental officials then became interested in Clarence E. Carter. Carter, who was on the faculty of Miami

\textsuperscript{121}U. S. Congress, Hearing Before the Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations in charge of Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and Labor Appropriation Bill for 1932, 71 Cong., 3 Sess., 1930, 88-89.

\textsuperscript{122}Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1930, I, 64-65, 74.
University, was highly recommended by Jameson.\textsuperscript{123} Jameson and Carter first had corresponded when Carter was a graduate student at the University of Illinois. Starting in 1915, Jameson aided Carter as Carter collected and edited the correspondence of General Thomas Gage. Jameson suggested source material to Carter, unsuccessfully sought for Carter a Guggenheim Fellowship, asked various historical societies to finance the printing of the Gage correspondence, and helped Carter to arrange a research trip to England.\textsuperscript{124}

In May, 1931, Hunter Miller, Historical Adviser of the State Department, offered the editorship to Carter.\textsuperscript{125} In June, Carter came to Washington to discuss the position with Assistant Secretary of State Wilbur J. Carr and Cyril Wynne, Assistant Historical Adviser of the State Department. He accepted the Department's salary offer of $5,600 annually, and in August, 1931, became editor of \textit{The Territorial Papers}.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{123}Hunter Miller to Wilbur J. Carr, May 29, 1931, Territorial Papers Files, Office of the Editor, \textit{The Territorial Papers of the United States}, hereafter referred to as Files.


\textsuperscript{125}Miller to Wilbur Carr, May 29, 1931, Files.

\textsuperscript{126}Wynne to Carr, June 1, 1931, \textit{ibid.}; and Wynne to Hunter Miller, June 19, 1931, \textit{ibid.} With the selection of
Even though *The Territorial Papers* now was established as a government publication, its continuance depended upon the will of Congress. Every year, representatives of the State Department appeared before congressional committees and subcommittees to seek appropriations. Some years Congress granted the full budget requests; other years it reduced them. In 1937, with authorized funds about to run out, historians and governmental officials waged a vigorous and successful campaign for reauthorization. In 1945, a second reauthorization passed Congress. Then, in 1950, administration of *The Territorial Papers* was transferred from the State Department to the National Archives. This was a boon to the project, because the postwar years so greatly magnified the responsibilities of the State Department that personnel of the Department were able to devote relatively little attention to *The Territorial Papers*. The staff of the National Archives, on the other hand, could be counted upon to vigorously support the publication. Moreover, with the move to the Archives, Congress no longer had to approve specific annual appropriations for the series. Instead, funds for *The Territorial Papers* came out of the operating expenses of the General Services Administration.\(^{127}\)

---

\(^{127}\)For the later history of *The Territorial Papers*, see Alan Harvey Ginsberg, "History and the Federal Government: Legislative Activity Relating to *The Territorial Papers of the United States, 1924-1945*" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of History, Louisiana State University, 1968), 77-125 *passim*. 

---
Jameson was little involved with the legislation for the *Territorial Papers* during the 1930's. During that decade, he concentrated his declining energies upon trying to insure an adequate organization for the National Archives. Yet in 1937, the year of his death, Jameson sent to Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona a historical resume of the *Territorial Papers* and urged Hayden to support reauthorization.128

The *Territorial Papers* was Jameson's greatest achievement in the field of governmental historical publications. As he put it: "No historical publication by the United States Government has illuminated so many different portions of our history..." And as Jameson worked for this monumental achievement, he successfully promoted other documentary historical publications of the federal government.

---


CHAPTER VII

THE JOURNALS OF THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS AND THE WRITINGS OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Two federally sponsored documentary historical publications for which J. Franklin Jameson deserved considerable credit are the Journals of the Continental Congress and the Writings of George Washington. When work on the Journals was interrupted, Jameson helped to get the series completed. The idea for publishing a new edition of Washington's writings originated with Jameson, and Jameson headed an advisory committee on the Writings.

In 1905, the Library of Congress began publishing a new edition of the Journals of the Continental Congress. Almost from its inception, the project encountered financial problems. In October, 1911, Gaillard Hunt, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, informed Jameson that work on the volumes for 1781 had stopped the previous summer because "the Library had spent its printing fund."¹ Eleven years later, in 1922, Charles Moore, Acting Chief of the Division of Manuscripts, notified Jameson that

¹Hunt to Jameson, October 2, 1911, Box 108, File 1021, Jameson Papers.
publication of the Journals virtually had stopped. The last volumes published, those for 1782, had come out in 1914. Since Moore was finding it difficult to get additional volumes published, he suggested to Jameson that a resolution be introduced in the Senate "calling upon the Committee on Printing to investigate the matter and report to the Senate what unfinished Government publications should be taken up and carried to completion."\(^2\)

Jameson thought it highly important that the Journals be completed and was disturbed by the delay. But he advised Moore that the subject should not be pushed "by a general resolution. . . ." Since the Journals were "the only thing worth doing that" had not been completed, Jameson feared that a general resolution would result in "several half-baked schemes" being brought forward "which might draw attention away from the journals of the Continental Congress themselves." At the same time, Jameson offered to help Moore get an appropriation for publishing the Journals.\(^3\)

By the end of 1925, little progress had been made on the Journals. Only two more volumes, those for 1783, had been published. Therefore, the AHA, at the urging of the committee on the documentary historical publications of the

\(^2\) Moore to Jameson, November 18, 1922, ibid.; and Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1925, 98.

\(^3\) Jameson to Moore, November 20, 1922, Box 108, File 1021, Jameson Papers.
United States Government, adopted a resolution asking Congress to provide for speedy completion of the *Journals*.\(^4\) Congress failed to appropriate the necessary funds, and in 1926, the Executive Council of the AHA, at the request of the committee on documentary historical publications, urged Congress to make appropriations for completion of the project.\(^5\) Publication of the *Journals* finally began again late in the 1920's. By October, 1928, volumes 26 and 27, covering 1784, were ready for the press, and in 1929 they were published. In the 1930's, publication of the remaining volumes proceeded at a satisfactory pace.\(^6\)

The resolutions of Jameson's committee on documentary historical publications perhaps helped prompt Congress to provide funds for publication. Jameson also played an important part in getting money to edit the *Journals*. During the 1920's, the Library of Congress apparently ran out of funds to compensate an editor adequately. But in November, 1928, Jameson discovered that William Evarts


\(^5\) Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1926, 98, 51.

\(^6\) Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Years 1927 and 1928, 176; Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1929, 79. For reports of progress in subsequent years, see, for example, Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1930, I, 63; Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1931, I, 61; and Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1932, 68.
Benjamin, a New York financier, was interested in subsidizing editorial work on the remaining volumes. Benjamin hoped that the work would be done by John C. Fitzpatrick, who had been Assistant Chief of the Division of Manuscripts since 1902. Although Fitzpatrick recently had resigned his post at the Library of Congress to edit *Washington's Writings*, he was willing to edit the Journals. Jameson felt that Fitzpatrick was ideally suited to handle the task. He therefore decided to obtain from Fitzpatrick an estimate of costs for editing the volumes, send this estimate to Benjamin, and ask Benjamin to pay for Fitzpatrick's work.7

In March, 1929, Fitzpatrick informed Jameson that editorial work on the volumes for 1785 and 1786, if started within a few weeks, could be completed by July 1, 1930. It also might be possible to edit the volumes for 1787, 1788, and 1789 within that time. Fitzpatrick expected payment of approximately $5,000 annually for doing the work. His work would be expedited if he could hire a copyist-assistant for twenty-five weeks at a salary of $25 weekly.8 Benjamin agreed to provide the funds necessary for Fitzpatrick to do the editorial work on the remaining volumes of the

7 Jameson to Evarts B. Greene, March 7, 1929, Box 50, File 61, Jameson Papers.

8 Fitzpatrick to Jameson, March 11, 1929, Box 1, Papers of John C. Fitzpatrick, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress, hereafter referred to as Fitzpatrick Papers.
Journals. 9

While the Journals of the Continental Congress was an isolated documentary historical publication, the Writings of George Washington comprised one part of the commemoration of the bicentennary of Washington's birth. It required much legislative activity to provide for that commemoration and for the publication of Washington's Writings. A key figure in getting necessary legislation through Congress was Senator Simeon Fess.

On February 22, 1924, Fess introduced Senate Joint Resolution 85. The resolution provided for the creation of a commission to be known as the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington. The membership of the Commission would comprise the "President of the United States; the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives ex officio," eight persons appointed by the President, four senators, and four representatives. The members would serve without compensation. The Commission would prepare programs to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of Washington's birth and would cooperate with state bicentennary commissions. The Commission could hire secretarial assistants and "engage the services of expert advisers. . . ." The Commission would expire on December 31, 

9Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1929, 79.
1934. Representative Robert W. Moore of Virginia introduced a similar resolution in the House. 10

On May 3, 1924, Fess, on behalf of the Library Committee, reported the resolution to the Senate. The Library Committee recommended that the resolution pass and that $10,000 be provided for the Commission to carry out its work. 11 Shortly thereafter, Representative Daniel A. Reed of New York reported the House resolution. The House Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions also recommended that the resolution pass and that $10,000 be appropriated. The Committee had concluded that the Vice-President, instead of the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, should serve on the Commission. 12

The Senate considered the resolution on May 22, 1924. Senator William H. King of Utah inquired whether the proposed $10,000 would "pay for the celebration or merely for the formulation of the program." Fess explained that the money would enable the Commission to make plans. Although

10 Cong. Rec., 68 Cong., 1 Sess., 2936 (February 23, 1924), 2977 (February 22, 1924).

11 Ibid., 7737 (May 3, 1924); and U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Library, Celebration of the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington, 68 Cong., 1 Sess., 1924, Rept. 491, 1.

King at first did not understand why it was necessary to appropriate funds "for merely planning the celebration," Fess pointed out that a clerical force had to be employed. This apparently satisfied King, and the resolution passed the Senate without further debate.\(^{13}\)

In the House, to which the Senate resolution was referred, Representative Thomas Blanton of Texas opposed funding the proposed commission. He thought it was unwise to appropriate money for a celebration that was eight years in the future. Blanton explained:

> This is merely the nose of the camel getting under the tent. . . . We will give this $10,000 to some committee, some commission, some bureau this year, and they will waste it, and . . . when the Congress meets, you will find this distinguished committee with its distinguished chairman . . . coming in again next year with another resolution . . . and then, instead of asking for $10,000 next year, he will ask for $50,000. Two years from now it will be $100,000, and the closer we get to 1932 every year . . . you are going to have the appropriation grow like a rolling snowball. . . .

> Why, if it were necessary to appropriate to celebrate this occasion, I would vote with you to the limit when 1932 comes, but there is no necessity now for spending this money eight years before the celebration.\(^{14}\)

Despite Blanton's opposition, the resolution passed the House by a vote of 306 to nineteen. The Senate agreed to the House amendment that made the Vice-President a member of

\(^{13}\)\textit{Cong. Rec.}, 68 Cong., 1 Sess., 9170-71 (May 22, 1924).

\(^{14}\)\textit{Ibid.}, 11205-206 (June 7, 1924).
the Commission and to some other minor amendments.\footnote{Ibid., 11206 (June 7, 1924), 11141 (June 7, 1924).}

Although Jameson kept abreast of the congressional resolution to create the Commission,\footnote{John A. Stewart to Jameson, April 2, 1924, Box 134, File 1725, Jameson Papers; Jameson to Stewart, April 7, 1924, \textit{ibid.}; and Stewart to Jameson, April 14, 1924, \textit{ibid.}.} he apparently took little or no action to drum up support for the measure. But once the Commission was established, Jameson played an important role in defining its activities. Early in 1925, Fess asked Jameson to suggest programs that the Commission should undertake. Jameson replied that the commemoration should include a number of historical publications. "The commemoration of Washington's life," he explained, "should not expire with the speeches and the firewords, but . . . some things having the nature of permanent commemoration should remain, and not merely monuments or statues . . . but printed memorials that can circulate everywhere throughout the country. . . ." Jameson had three specific projects in mind. First, the General Orders of the Commander-in-Chief, "which may fairly be called the central documents of the [Revolutionary] war," should be printed as a complete series. Second, Jameson suggested preparation of a book of "'Washington as seen by Contemporaries.'" This volume, which would contain "all those interesting descriptions of the man, or records of interviews with him, or visits to him at Mt.
Vernon, which were written by the many persons who actually saw and visited him," would "make the man Washington real to all readers, young and old." Finally, Jameson urged publication of a new edition of Washington's *Writings*. Two existing editions, those of Jared Sparks and Worthington C. Ford, were out of print. Moreover, Ford had printed "a good many letters that Sparks did not print, and vice versa." The new edition should contain all the letters from both the Sparks and Ford editions along with other writings that were not found in either set.17 Fess thanked Jameson for his suggestions and assured him that they would be included as part of the work of the Washington Bicentennial Commission.18

Early in 1927, Albert Bushnell Hart was appointed Historian of the Commission. Hart favored a new edition of Washington's *Writings* and helped get the Commission to adopt the publication as part of its program. He corresponded with publishing companies about the cost of printing the volumes and asked Jameson's advice on how much an editor of the *Writings* should be paid.19 In May, 1928, Hart told Jameson that "we have it all fixed up for a definitive


18 Fess to Jameson, March 20, 1925, Box 82, File 532, Jameson Papers.

19 Jameson to Hart, January 14, 1927, Box 91, File 712, ibid.; and Hart to Jameson, November 7, 1927, Box 134, File 1725, ibid.
edition of Washington's Works when the appropriation is made," but added: "I have no means of pushing the matter."\textsuperscript{20} Fortunately for Hart and Jameson, Fess was vigorously promoting legislation for publishing Washington's Writings.

On February 8, 1928, Fess introduced S. 3092, which authorized a $300,000 appropriation for the Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out its programs. The bill provided for a number of projects; the main undertaking would be the "editing, indexing, publication, and distribution of George Washington's writings. . . ." The bill easily passed the Senate.\textsuperscript{21} The House Printing Committee recommended that the bill pass,\textsuperscript{22} but the House failed to consider it in the First session of the Seventieth Congress.

In the next session of Congress, Fess introduced another bill, S. 5616, to enable the Commission to carry out its plans. The bill authorized a $334,000 appropriation for preparing items such as handbooks relating to George Washington, a "George Washington map," a "George Washington atlas," and a "George Washington portrait." The first and most important provision of the bill was for the preparation of a definitive edition of Washington's Writings. The bill

\textsuperscript{20} Hart to Jameson, May 18, 1928, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Cong. Rec.}, 70 Cong., 1 Sess., 2668 (February 8, 1928), 6510 (April 16, 1928).

went into considerable detail about how work on the various projects would be carried out and how funds would be expended.\textsuperscript{23} It passed the Senate without debate on February 28, 1929,\textsuperscript{24} but it never was considered by the House.

After the second consecutive failure of Congress to provide for Washington's \textit{Writings}, Jameson prepared a memorial for the Council of the AHA to send to Congress. The memorial explained that while the existing editions of the \textit{Writings} were out of print and thus could be obtained only at a very high cost, the \textit{Writings} were "an historical source of incalculable value" that "ought to be accessible to every serious reader." It pointed out that editorial work on the new edition would be done by John C. Fitzpatrick, "whose name guarantees to the edition workmanship of the highest order." After briefly reviewing the legislative history of bills relating to Washington's \textit{Writings}, the memorial closed with the hope that "legislation securing this most appropriate commemoration to Washington may be passed as early as is possible in the present session of Congress."\textsuperscript{25} Jameson also personally urged congressmen to

\textsuperscript{23}S. 5616, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., Box 21, Fitzpatrick Papers.

\textsuperscript{24}\textit{Cong. Rec.}, 70 Cong., 2 Sess., 4714 (February 28, 1929).

\textsuperscript{25}Memorial, Box 51, File 65, Jameson Papers. Cf. H. Barrett Learned to Jameson, December 22, 1929, Box 86, File 607, \textit{ibid}. 
support legislation for preparing the publication. Meanwhile, Fess once again attempted to get a bill through Congress.

On February 1, 1930, Fess introduced S. 3398, a bill to enable the Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out approved plans. He explained that while the Senate previously had passed such bills, there had been differences with the House as to what the bills should include. He believed that the present bill would "be satisfactory to both Houses...." The bill was considerably more detailed than Fess' earlier proposals for publishing Washington's Writings. It provided not more than $56,000 to prepare a manuscript of a definitive edition of Washington's Writings. There would be an appropriation of $157,975 for printing, binding, and distributing the publication. Three thousand sets would be published; 2,000 would be sold by the Superintendent of Documents, and the remaining 1,000 would be distributed to the President, the libraries of the House and Senate, the Library of Congress, cabinet members, the Vice-President, representatives, senators, various other government officials, and members of the Commission. The bill passed the Senate without debate.27

The bill met opposition in the House. Two aspects of

---

26Albert Bushnell Hart to Jameson, February 24, 1930, Box 86, File 607, ibid.

27Cong. Rec., 71 Cong., 2 Sess., 2812-13 (February 1, 1930), 3278-79 (February 8, 1930).
the proposal bothered Representative William H. Stafford of Wisconsin. First, Stafford was "struck with the anomalous condition of the Government for the first time . . . in its history authorizing the compilation of private papers and writings." Theretofore, Stafford pointed out, "that character of work had been done by private publishers."

Second, Stafford thought that $56,000 was "an outrageous appropriation for the work of compilation. . . ." Representative John Q. Tilson of Connecticut replied that as far as the work serving as a precedent for government publications, "I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is only one George Washington." Furthermore, Tilson explained, the proposed appropriation was moderate in light of the fact that scholars such as Hart and Fitzpatrick would supervise the work. Stafford and Tilson continued to debate, with Stafford implying that those who would prepare the publication were "hack writers." Tilson finally mollified Stafford to the point that Stafford agreed not to object to the bill, but Stafford expressed the hope that "now that the Government is going into the publishing business . . . this may be used as a precedent to compile the private papers and letters of that great President during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln." Tilson offered some minor amendments, which were accepted, and the House passed the bill without further debate. The Senate quickly concurred
in the House amendments.  

Jameson played an important part in implementing the legislation. Hart appointed him chairman of an advisory committee on Washington's Writings. The advisory committee helped to determine the "form and format" of the new publication. Probably more important, Jameson went to great lengths to secure for John C. Fitzpatrick photostats of Washington's letters from "librarians, historical societies, universities, and private individuals" around the country.  

Jameson's work on the publication sometimes met an unsympathetic response. When Jameson suggested to the Public Printer a detailed format for the title page of Washington's Writings, the Printer replied that "I am of the opinion that this office is competent to design its publications in a creditable manner." But to Fitzpatrick, Jameson's assistance was invaluable.  

---

28 Ibid., 3899 (February 18, 1930), 3905 (February 19, 1930).
30 Jameson to the Public Printer, November 13, 1930, Box 3, ibid.; and Public Printer to Jameson, November 18, 1930, ibid.
31 Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1932, 100.
Jameson's advisory committee also helped draw up additional legislation relative to Washington's Writings.\textsuperscript{32} This legislation, passed in 1932, provided that libraries could purchase the entire series for $50 if they ordered it no later than July 1, 1932. The purpose of the enactment was to encourage libraries to subscribe immediately and to avoid having volumes stack up at the Government Printing Office. The law also enabled incumbent congressmen to obtain copies of the publication even if they were defeated in a subsequent election.\textsuperscript{33}

Despite Jameson's interest in the work of the Washington Bicentennial Commission, he found it prudent to set limits on his involvement. In 1931, Hart got the President of the AHA to appoint an advisory committee to the Commission, and Jameson was designated chairman. Jameson concluded that he already was spread too thin and, more importantly, he surmised that the committee was "quite needless, a mere gesture, pretty nearly a sham. . . ." Thus he declined the appointment.\textsuperscript{34} Samuel Eliot Morison also was appointed to the advisory committee. Morison confided

\textsuperscript{32}Jameson to Samuel Eliot Morison, February 17, 1931, Box 86, File 607, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{33}U. S. Congress, House, Committee on the Library, Sale of the Writings of George Washington, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 1932, H. Rept. 588, 1; Cong. Rec., 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 5414 (March 7, 1932); and Statutes at Large, XLVII, Part 1, 63-64.

\textsuperscript{34}Dexter Perkins to Jameson, February 10, 1931, Box 86, File 607, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Perkins, February 14, 1931, \textit{ibid}. 
to Jameson that Hart was "slipping badly, in spite of an apparent outward vigor"; a paper that Hart "recently wrote for the Massachusetts Historical Society on Washington's ancestors was simply shocking for inaccuracy bordering on illiteracy." Morison was afraid that Washington's Writings would turn out to be a "very bad piece of editorial work" and that the advisory committee would share the blame for the poor results. Jameson assured Morison that the publication was being expertly handled by Fitzpatrick, but advised Morison that he should feel no reservations about declining to serve on the committee.35

Jameson's interest in Washington's Writings lasted into his final years. On December 31, 1934, as provided in the law of 1924, the Washington Bicentennial Commission expired, and the Controller General stopped funds for editing and publishing the Writings. Samuel F. Bemis, chairman of the committee on the documentary historical publications of the United States Government, brought this dilemma to the attention of Conyers Read, Executive Secretary of the AHA.36 Read sent Bemis' letter to Jameson, who was aware of the situation. Jameson informed Read that Representative

---

35 Morison to Jameson, February 13, 1931, ibid.; and Jameson to Morison, February 17, 1931, ibid.

Sol Bloom of New York recently had gotten through Congress a joint resolution that provided for paying Fitzpatrick's salary and for continuing publication of Washington's Writings. The future of the publication was assured.

Although the federal government never adopted the comprehensive publication plan that Jameson and his colleagues proposed in 1908, Jameson may have been pleased as he surveyed what the government was doing in the area of documentary historical publications in the 1930's. Two series, the Journals of the Continental Congress and Washington's Writings, were nearing completion, and The Territorial Papers was moving along well. The success of these projects was due to some degree to the efforts of J. Franklin Jameson. But while Jameson did a great deal to get the government to publish historical materials, his most notable accomplishment, the one that consumed more time than any other, was to get the government to care for its unpublished records adequately.

37Jameson to Read, March 6, 1935, Box 98, AHA Records; and Jameson to Read, March 8, 1935, ibid.
CHAPTER VIII

THE MOVEMENT FOR A NATIONAL ARCHIVES--
THROUGH JUNE 28, 1916

Of all the historical projects for which Jameson sought federal support, none occupied more of his time and attention than an archives building. Jameson began actively to lobby for an archives building shortly after he became Director of the Department of Historical Research. He campaigned persistently until 1926, when Congress appropriated funds to construct the building. After completion of the building was assured, Jameson worked with government officials on selection of a site, construction of the edifice, and creation of an archival organization. While the first decade of Jameson's campaign for an archives building was one of hard work and considerable frustration, it also was a decade of significant progress.

Although Jameson emerged as the preeminent figure in the movement for a national archives building, in the early twentieth century several other individuals also worked to improve the care given to governmental archives. In 1906, Secretary of the Treasury Leslie M. Shaw called the attention of Congress "to the importance of an appropriation for
a hall of records." Shaw explained that "for more than twenty years efforts" had "been made to secure an appropriate place for the constantly increasing records" of the government. He urged "that a suitable building be authorized," but Congress failed to act on his request.

Also in the early 1900's, a Massachusetts genealogist named Lothrop Withington lobbied for archival preservation. Withington discussed the inadequate handling of federal records with Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts, and the aged Hoar advised Withington to seek aid from Senator Lodge. Lodge agreed to sponsor a bill drafted by Withington, and in December, 1906, he introduced S. 6728, "A Bill to Establish a Record Office." The bill provided for the creation of a Board of Record Commissioners with "custody of all records over eighty years old"; if "so ordered by the President" or other top level government officials, the Board could assume custody of records less than eighty years old. Under the Board of Record Commissioners, there would be a Record Office headed by a Record Keeper. "To house the records in the Board's custody," there would be a Record Office Building in Washington with "ample accommodations" for historians and other scholars. Senator George Wetmore of Rhode Island, Chairman of the Library Committee, pigeonholed the bill, apparently because of opposition from

---

1U. S. Congress, Senate, Hall of Records for Treasury Department and Additional Quarters for Post Office Department, 59 Cong., 1 Sess., 1906, Senate Doc. 508, 1.
Ainsworth R. Spofford, Librarian of Congress. Spofford had "a mania for retaining in his hand a monopoly of all literary matters in Washington."\(^2\)

Approximately one year after the effort to pass the Lodge bill, Jameson began to campaign actively for an archives building. In December, 1907, he discussed it with President Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt believed that an archives building should be constructed but thought it would take some time before that objective could be achieved. Although Jameson agreed with Roosevelt's estimate of the situation, he nevertheless planned "to work constantly toward this end, doing from time to time what can be done. . . ." For the moment, Jameson would advance the archives in two ways. First, he would have "a little private discussion with members of Congress" to "keep the matter before their minds. . . ." Second, he urged Roosevelt to ask department heads for data "as to the amount of space which each department would require for the storage of present material and . . . as to the annual growth rate of these requirements."\(^3\)

Roosevelt asked for the information that Jameson


\(^3\)Jameson to Roosevelt, December 12, 1907, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers.
wanted; along with his request to department heads, Roosevelt enclosed a letter from Jameson on the need for an archives building. Several department heads merely responded to Roosevelt with reports on storage requirements and estimates of growth needs. Other department heads, however, made a point of expressing their lack of interest in an archives building. Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson explained that the deposit of records in a building "remote from the Department would not be convenient and probably would interfere to a noticeable degree with our investigations." Wilson thus was of the opinion "that the Department of Agriculture need not be considered in the building of a Hall of Records." Martin A. Knapp, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, likewise stated that documents under his jurisdiction were "frequently used in current business" and that the Commission was "of the opinion that it would not need any space in the Hall of Records referred to." Charles Walcott, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, told Roosevelt that "the Institution

---


5Wilson to Roosevelt, December 16, 1907, ibid.

6Knapp to William Loeb, December 23, 1907, ibid.
is now able to take care of all of its own papers. . . ."  

By contrast, some government officials urged upon Roosevelt the need for an archives building. Oscar Strauss, Secretary of Commerce and Labor, reported that "each year adds to the accumulation of files in a constantly increasing ratio." "It seems needless," Strauss continued, "to enter into any argument as to the desirability of a properly designed and constructed fire-proof building for the storage of the valuable records and documents of the Government. . . ."  

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Beekman Winthrop commented on the Treasury Department's long-standing desire for a "hall of records" and explained that "the necessity for some structure of the character described grows constantly."  

Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, explained that although the Library of Congress was "the depositary [sic] of certain historical manuscript material in the possession of the Government," the "function of the Library" did "not in the least diminish the necessity for a building . . . for the accommodation of administrative records of the various departments. . . ." To Putnam, there was a "clear distinction between such manuscript collections as the Papers of the Continental Congress, of Washington and other personal collections, and those records which are

7Walcott to Roosevelt, December 27, 1907, ibid.
8Strauss to William Loeb, December 17, 1907, ibid.
9Winthrop to William Loeb, December 24, 1907, ibid.
accumulated from the ordinary operations of the various executive departments." Administrative records "should be set aside in a building especially constituted for their accommodation . . . where they would be accessible, not merely to the several departments in which they originated, but to the investigator at large."\(^{10}\)

Shortly after Jameson met with Roosevelt, he began working through the AHA to drum up support for the archives. In 1908, the Council of the AHA adopted a resolution drawing the "attention of the President and of Congress to the importance" of a "hall of records" and expressing "the hope that Congress may see fit during the present session to take some steps toward creating such a repository."\(^{11}\) The Council also appointed a committee to represent its wishes to the President and to Congress.\(^{12}\) The committee consisted of Jameson as chairman, Alfred T. Mahan, and John Bach McMaster.\(^{13}\) Jameson turned out to be the only active member of the committee. In 1919, he explained to Henry Jones Ford that "Mr. McMaster is no answerer of letters, and Admiral Mahan was remote from Washington . . . so that in point of

---

\(^{10}\)Putnam to Roosevelt, December 20, 1907, \textit{ibid.}\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\)Memorial, November 27, 1908, Box 243, AHA Records.\(^{12}\)

\(^{12}\)Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1908 (2 vols.; Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909), I, 30.\(^{13}\)

\(^{13}\)Jameson to Mahan, December 8, 1908, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to McMaster, December 9, 1908, \textit{ibid.}\(^{14}\)
fact the action of the committee consisted in doing whatever I could here in Washington. . . ." Nevertheless, the committee served Jameson well as a vehicle "to refer to whenever there seemed to be any question of what business [Jameson], as an outsider to the government, had to meddle in the matter."¹⁴

Soon after the committee was appointed, Jameson contacted various government officials about the archives. Secretary of the Treasury George B. Cortelyou had devoted a part of his annual report for 1908 to the need for "a proper Hall of Records. . . ." In December, 1908, Jameson asked Cortelyou for an interview to discuss how the AHA could assist him, Cortelyou, in obtaining such a building. The two men had a productive meeting on December 28, and, shortly thereafter, Jameson sent Cortelyou a copy of "a history of the movement for a national Hall of Records in Washington. . . ."¹⁵ When Cortelyou left office in March, 1909, Jameson lost a potentially helpful ally in the movement for an archives building.

In October, 1909, Jameson contacted E. C. Heald, Supervising Architect of the Treasury. Jameson told Heald that he had read in a newspaper that Heald's office was

¹⁴Jameson to Ford, January 22, 1919, Box 57, File 135, ibid.

¹⁵Jameson to Cortelyou, December 17, 1908, Box 57, File 133, ibid.; Jameson to Cortelyou, January 7, 1909, ibid.; and Cortelyou to Jameson, January 8, 1908, ibid.
working on plans for a hall of records. Jameson wanted to know "in what stage of advancement the matter of the plans may be" and explained that the Department of Historical Research, "as representing the historical profession in America," wished to help in the drawing of plans. The Department had collected "information and some printed material . . . respecting the best archive buildings in Europe" and desired to place it "at the disposal of whoever is concerned."\(^{16}\) Heald, however, replied that the statement in the newspaper was "entirely wrong. . . . I can positively state that at this time no work is being done on the building. . . ."\(^{17}\)

In May, 1909, Jameson met with Senator Nathan Scott of West Virginia, but the Senate was so busy with the tariff that Scott was unable to give much attention to the archives. The next spring, believing that "a more suitable period for the consideration" of an archives building had come, Jameson requested another meeting with Scott to show him "some important materials relating to the archives and the need for better housing of them. . . ."\(^{18}\) Scott explained to Jameson that it was "a bad time to take up the matter. . . . The orders to us all from the White House are to keep down

\(^{16}\)Jameson to Heald, October 27, 1909, ibid.

\(^{17}\)Heald to Jameson, November 5, 1909, ibid.

\(^{18}\)Jameson to Scott, May 28, 1909, ibid.; and Jameson to Scott, March 16, 1910, ibid.
expenses in the appropriation bills as much as possible. . ." Scott, however, promised to help Jameson promote an archives building "another year, or at the next session of Congress. . . ."¹⁹

Concurrently, Jameson tried to get President William Howard Taft to support the movement for the archives. In September, 1910, he explained to Charles D. Norton, Taft's secretary, that both government officials and historians long had felt the need for a satisfactory archival repository. But, Jameson continued, "however heartily the project is approved by individual heads of executive departments, it will not be taken up in earnest by Congress until their attention is pointedly directed to the matter by the President." Jameson therefore hoped that Taft would include in his "next annual message a brief recommendation upon the subject." Jameson offered to supply Norton with a memorial on the need for an archives building.²⁰ He also wrote directly to Taft. Taft forwarded Jameson's letter to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Charles D. Hilles and asked Hilles to consider the question of an archives building and report to him on September 26. Hilles, in turn, informed Jameson that he would be glad to have Jameson's memorial on the subject and that he would bring the memorial to Taft's

¹⁹Scott to Jameson, March 17, 1910, ibid.

²⁰Jameson to Norton, September 7, 1910, ibid.
Norton replied to Jameson on November 9. He agreed with Jameson that the care of government documents was unsatisfactory and that this situation needed to be remedied. Norton suggested that "the organization of the present Library of Congress might be an effective one through which to classify, index and store these valuable records." Jameson concluded that Herbert Putnam had "got wind" of his correspondence with Taft and Norton and was responsible for Norton's suggestion that the Library of Congress administer the archives.

Jameson replied at length to Norton on the question of archival administration. He explained that many departments would object to the "outright installation of an archive organization in Washington, whether independent or associated with an existing office." Better results could be obtained if Congress would first provide for a building, in which departments could deposit their papers "subject to regulations framed by the department." Although there would have to be an overall superintendent of the archives building, there would be no centralized archive administration but only "such archival forces as each department might

---

21 Taft to Jameson, September 10, 1910, Box 120, File 1363, ibid.; and Hilles to Jameson, September 13, 1910, Box 132, File 1643, ibid.

22 Norton to Jameson (with marginal notes by Jameson), November 9, 1910, Box 57, File 133, ibid.
depute to its own concerns in" the building. Jameson realized that this was not an ideal arrangement, but he believed that after a few years "the advantages of a centralized archive administration would be apparent and the way would be open to its creation without much friction."

Jameson also considered what should be done if the time was ripe "for the creation of an archive establishment" without "halting temporarily at an intermediate stage. . . ." He knew of "no official in Washington more competent to create such an organization" than Herbert Putnam. But Jameson doubted that having the Library of Congress administer the archives was "the wisest permanent mode of settling the archive problem." Although the functions of archives and libraries had much in common, they were two different types of organizations and therefore should be separate. For the immediate future, there could be an archival organization which, "while separate from that of the Library of Congress," would "be placed under the general supervision of the Librarian of Congress. . . ." But while the plan would work well during Putnam's tenure, there was no guarantee that the Librarian of Congress always would "be a good head of an archive system. . . ." In the long run, there should be a separate archival organization.

In Jameson's response to Norton, one notes two

---

23Jameson to Norton, November 21, 1910, ibid.
24Ibid.
problems that continually occupied Jameson's attention. First, he knew that his campaign for an archives building might arouse opposition from some government departments, and he did his best to allay such opposition. Second, Jameson wanted to insure that, whatever temporary expedients might be resorted to, there eventually would be an independent archival organization.

Despite Jameson's efforts, Taft failed to mention the archives in his annual message for 1910. Jameson nevertheless continued his campaign to get support for the project. At its meeting in 1910, the AHA petitioned Congress "to erect in the city of Washington a national archive depository." Early in 1911, Jameson proposed to his colleagues on the archives committee a two-pronged attack. First, the members of the committee would present the 1910 AHA resolution and a memorial signed by the committee members to a senator and a representative and get them to present the memorial in the Senate and House. Second, the committee would try to get Taft to recommend action on the archives in his next annual message.

The first part of Jameson's plan worked well. On February 24, 1911, Representative George P. Lawrence of

---


26 Jameson to McMaster, February 10, 1911, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Mahan, February 10, 1911, ibid.
Massachusetts introduced the AHA resolution and Jameson's memorial in the House. Senator Lodge introduced the resolution and memorial in the Senate and had them printed as a public document. The memorial pointed out that "the records and papers of the Government in Washington" were "scattered in more than a hundred different repositories." In most cases, the papers were inaccessible and were "stowed away in places where the paper is deteriorating from the effects of damp or of heat." The overcrowded condition of government buildings had made it necessary to store archival material "in unsuitable buildings in various parts of the city, costing large sums annually in rent. . . ." In many cases, valuable records had been destroyed by fire, and papers that had great value for "present and future historians" had been declared useless and had been destroyed. The remedy for these problems was "the erection of a suitable national archive building."  

The attempt to get Taft's support for the archives was less successful. In June, 1911, Jameson informed Charles D. Hilles, now Taft's secretary, that the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had developed "so considerable an interest in the proposal" for an archives building that

27 Cong. Rec., 61 Cong., 3 Sess., 3379 (February 24, 1911).

28 Ibid., 3383 (February 25, 1911).

29 U. S. Congress, Senate, National Archive Building, 61 Cong., 3 Sess., 1911, Senate Doc. 838.
"there is an excellent chance of their reporting in favor of such a measure next December or January." Jameson had enlisted Senator Miles Poindexter of Washington and Representative Morris Sheppard of Texas in the movement for an archives building, had drafted bills on the subject for them, and expected "one or the other or both of these bills" to be introduced in Congress. Developments in Congress, in short, made it even more important that Taft recommend an archives building in his next annual message.30 Jameson was disappointed; in his annual message, Taft failed to mention the need for an archives building.

Despite his failure to get favorable action from Taft, during 1911 Jameson made considerable headway in getting congressional support for the archives. In May, 1911, Representative Burton L. French of Idaho, who had been a student at the University of Chicago during Jameson's tenure there, got the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to invite Jameson to address the Committee on the "preservation of historical records."31 Jameson opened his presentation by explaining the nature of his "interest in this matter." His position as Director of the Department of Historical Research, he explained, brought him into contact with all those who "care much about historical research in the country. . . ." Thus he was "obliged . . . to take a

30Jameson to Hilles, June 22, 1911, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Hilles, June 14, 1911, ibid.

31Morris Sheppard to Jameson, May 8, 1911, ibid.
great deal of notice of the contents and situation of the Government's historical materials." Jameson also explained that he was chairman of the AHA committee on the archives, that the AHA had passed resolutions favoring an archives, and that he therefore had the job of doing "whatever might be done to promote the purposes" of the AHA resolutions.32

Jameson then described "the state of things here in Washington . . . ." He explained that each department and bureau kept its own papers and that this led to confusion "because of the changes of bureaus from department to department, and because of consolidations and alterations of systems." Another problem was that the large accumulation of records made it impossible to store those records properly within their respective offices. In many cases, the papers of a department had to be stored in rented buildings, a practice that cost a great deal of money (more than $37,000 in 1906 alone). The rented buildings were not fireproof. Nor were the papers in government offices safe from fire; conflagrations in the War Department, the Treasury Department, and the Patent Office had destroyed valuable records. Besides the danger from fire, government archives suffered from dampness; Jameson's aide Waldo G. Leland had found "volumes stored in places so damp that the moisture drips from the roof upon them until the bindings become moldy and

the leaves stick together." In some places, dirt injured government records.\textsuperscript{33}

Jameson pointed out that some government records were useless and should be destroyed. But under the system in effect, overcrowding or lack of knowledge led to the destruction of papers that should be preserved. Jameson described an incident when "10 tons of Confederate records were on their way to destruction" because "they were of no good for the purposes of the particular office in which they were at that time stored." In another instance, early census schedules had been saved from destruction only "by timely action."\textsuperscript{34}

Jameson explained that "the only permanently satisfactory remedy for the existing state of things is a national archives building. . . ." He emphasized that the primary reason for building such a structure would be "for purposes of convenience of the Government in administration." If someone in a government agency needed to find a document, a properly organized archival system would make the task easy. As it was, government officials had to search in many places to find what they needed. While governmental efficiency was the main rationale for constructing an archives building, the historical motive was "not an unimportant one." It was important "for the country that its history should

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}, 4, 13-15.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}, 17-19.
be well written and well attended to."  

Representative John Burnett of Alabama asked if Jameson proposed to remove all department records to an archives building. Jameson replied that such a procedure "would certainly be inexpedient." Each department would "have to judge for itself as to what things it needed to have right at hand." At the same time, Jameson pointed out that "there are many departments which could get papers they want more quickly from a modern archive building properly arranged than they can in the present state of things, when the papers are technically under their control . . . but still are so stored away that they can not get them."  

Representative Ira Copley of Illinois asked Jameson if he was familiar with the experience of other countries in the field of archival preservation. Jameson replied that England offered the "leading case of a concentration of national archives." Burnett suggested that England had an advantage over the United States because its government buildings were close to each other. Jameson pointed out that, although in England department buildings were near to each other, they were farther away from the Public Record Office than "our departments are from any situation in which an archive building would be likely to be put." Jameson then explained that at the outset departments which sent  

36Ibid., 20.
material to the Public Record Office kept control and jurisdiction of the material. But after a few years, the departments saw the advantage of putting the materials under the permanent control of the Public Record Office. Presumably a similar pattern would develop in the United States; at first, the departments would "have control over their own deposits in" the archives building, but "in the end they would grow tired of that and consent to a more unified administration." Jameson also described the archival system of Canada, which was highly concentrated, and those of Paris, Berlin, and St. Petersburg, where the concentration was not as great. He presented the Committee members with a book on the Vienna archives, which was "the best and most modern of the national archives buildings in Europe." 37

Representative Richard W. Austin of Tennessee asked Jameson if he had any estimate of costs for a suitable archives building. Jameson replied that the cost would depend upon the amount of space needed, which in turn would depend on how many papers the departments would deposit in the building. "But of course," he added, "such a building should make a large provision for the future." A rational procedure would be to construct an edifice that would accommodate the papers that the departments were willing to part with and that could be expanded as needs grew. Although Jameson was not well informed about costs, he reported that

37Ibid., 21-23.
in 1900 the Supervising Architect of the Treasury had estimated the cost of a site and a building with a capacity of 5,000,000 cubic feet, which was "a higher estimate than has been made in any other case, at $3,000,000." 38

Burnett asked whether an archives building would necessitate additional governmental expenses for clerical assistance. Jameson acknowledged that it would, but explained that the money would be well spent because the "Government would be able to lay its hands on the papers it wanted with a rapidity and efficiency not available at the present time." Jameson presented the Committee with a copy of the memorial that Lodge and Lawrence had introduced in 1910 and with a copy of a paper on European archives prepared by Gaillard Hunt. With that, the hearing ended. 39

Other congressmen aided Jameson in his campaign. Miles Poindexter, the newly elected senator from Washington, was a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Jameson got Poindexter to "make himself the person specially interested in the archive matter so far as that committee is concerned." 40 In the House, Jameson enlisted Morris Sheppard of Texas, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. 41 By the summer of 1911, Poindexter


40 Jameson to Charles Moore, May 25, 1911, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers.

41 Gondos, "Archives," 78.
and Sheppard apparently thought that it was time to get congressional action on the archives. They asked Jameson to prepare bills for them, and Jameson responded with "drafts of a bill for an archive building."42

On June 19, 1911, Sheppard introduced H. R. 11850, a bill based on Jameson's draft. On February 8, 1912, Poindexter introduced a parallel bill, S. 5179, in the Senate. The bills directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare designs and estimates for a national archives building containing not less than 1,500,000 cubic feet of space, "suitable for the orderly storage of records, documents, and other papers which have accumulated in the various departments and executive offices and in the files of the Senate and House of Representatives and are not needed for current use." The designs would be prepared "with a view to the erection" of a building large enough eventually to contain 4,000,000 cubic feet of space. Before the designs and estimates were completed, an inspection would be made "of the best modern national archives buildings in Europe" and consultation would be held with European authorities "on the construction and arrangement of archive buildings." The total cost of the building would not exceed $1,000,000. A commission consisting of the Vice-President, the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of the Treasury, the

42 Jameson to Poindexter, June 12, 1911, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Sheppard, June 12, 1911, ibid.
Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Interior would approve the designs and estimates and would approve a site for the building. After the commission acted, the Secretary of the Treasury would purchase "or cause to be taken for public use" the site that the commission had approved. Five thousand dollars would be authorized for the preparation of the designs and estimates.43

Jameson and other historians began to lobby for favorable action on the proposed legislation. In July, 1911, Jameson explained to Secretary of the Treasury Franklin MacVeagh that while the need for an archives building was "pretty well understood by the members" of Sheppard's committee, chances of getting the bill passed would "be very greatly fortified . . . if the feeling is created that the need is strongly and daily felt by administrative officials." He therefore asked MacVeagh to let Sheppard know how badly the building was needed. MacVeagh responded by sending Sheppard a letter on the importance of an archives building.44 The Mississippi and Alabama State Departments of Archives and History prepared a memorial in favor of the archives, which Senator John Sharp Williams of Mississippi


44Jameson to MacVeagh, July 11, 1911, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers; and MacVeagh to Jameson, July 29, 1911, ibid.
Charles H. Haskins, Secretary of the Council of the AHA, discovered that Representative J. M. Nelson of Wisconsin was a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and he suggested to Frederick Jackson Turner that he write to Nelson. Turner agreed, and Nelson informed Turner that he would be "glad to support the bill. . . ."46

In December, 1911, Jameson prepared a letter to be presented to Sheppard on behalf of the Council of the AHA. In the letter, Jameson again emphasized that the main reasons for erecting an archives building were administrative reasons. At the same time, "the interests of history involved in the matter, while secondary," were "by no means slight and unimportant." Jameson described some of the valuable archival materials in Washington and stated that "if the history of the United States is worth studying . . . the duty of providing for these archives a proper storehouse is one that ought to claim the early attention of Congress." He thus asked Sheppard to give his "earnest attention . . . in the present session of Congress, to the providing in Washington of an adequate National Archive Building."47

45 George Peabody Wetmore to Jameson, July 12, 1911, ibid.; and "Memorial to the Congress of the United States for a National Archives Building," ibid.

46 Haskins to Jameson, October 5, 1911, Box 243, AHA Records; Haskins to Turner, October 5, 1911, ibid.; and Haskins to Jameson, November 24, 1911, ibid.

47 Members of the Council to Sheppard, December 2, 1911, ibid.
Jameson got the members of the Council to approve of their names being affixed to the letter, so that the appeal to Sheppard would contain an impressive list of historians. Also in 1911, the AHA adopted a resolution thanking Sheppard for his efforts on behalf of the archives.

Jameson sought the aid of persons other than historians and government officials. In January, 1912, he sent a circular letter to state regents and officers of the Daughters of the American Revolution. He reminded the recipients that at the previous Continental Congress of the DAR, he had addressed the organization on the need of an archives building. "I urged all those who heard me," he continued, "to appeal individually to their Members of Congress in behalf of this measure, when the proper time came." Jameson explained that the proper time had come. Although the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds seemed to favor Sheppard's bill, Jameson expected the bill to encounter opposition in the House because of "the desire for an economical session." He thus urged the members of the DAR to write "personally on the

48 Charles Francis Adams to Jameson, December 8, 1911, Box 45, File 11, Jameson Papers; James Schouler to Jameson, December 9, 1911, Box 57, File 133, ibid.; Alfred T. Mahan to Jameson, December 9, 1911, ibid.; Jameson to Andrew D. White, December 11, 1911, ibid.; and Theodore Roosevelt to Jameson, December 12, 1911, ibid.

subject to" their "Representative[s] and to any other member of the House known to you." 50

The response to Jameson's appeal was encouraging. Mrs. William Cumming Story, the New York State Regent, replied that "I am heartily in favor of a National Archive Building" and "will be happy to do what I can in support of such a measure as you describe..." 51 Mrs. Samuel W. Jamieson, the Virginia State Regent, informed Jameson that she was writing to Carter Glass, her congressman, and to "some friends in Lynchburg" in support of the archives. 52 The State Regent of Maine, Mrs. Edwin A. Richardson, informed Jameson that it gave her great pleasure "to write our Representative from this District and urge his influence toward success." Mrs. Richardson added that "I shall not hesitate to write more than the one letter... as we daughters are truly patriotic and believe in the practice as well as the preaching of patriotism." 53 Mrs. Chalmers Meek Richardson, the State Regent of Mississippi, pledged "the sincere interest and cooperation of the Mississippi Daughters" and promised to see that resolutions were passed at the State Conference "in support of this important and

50 Jameson's circular letter, January 15, 1912, Box 57, File 134, Jameson Papers.

51 Mrs. Story to Jameson, January 18, 1912, ibid.

52 Mrs. Jamieson to Jameson, January 20, 1912, ibid.

53 Mrs. Richardson to Jameson, January 22, 1912, ibid.
patriotic measure." She also promised to contact "several personal friends among the Representatives." \[54\]

There also was an enthusiastic response from officers of local chapters. Mrs. Alice Kern, Secretary of the Mary Bartlett Chapter of the DAR, informed Jameson that each member of her chapter "would do all in her power towards creating a sentiment in favor of" the archives. \[55\] Mrs. Maurice B. Tenny, Corresponding Secretary of the Milwaukee Chapter, told Jameson that the members of her chapter would urge Representative J. M. Nelson to exert his influence on behalf of the archives. \[56\] Mrs. W. S. Moore, Corresponding Secretary of the Washington Heights Chapter, informed Jameson that her chapter had voted "to give its support to the bill and towards that end a letter had been written to Hon. John J. Fitzgerald. . . ." \[57\] Similar letters of support came from other chapters around the country. \[58\]

Jameson also tried to get the Knights of Columbus to support his campaign. Early in 1912, he wrote to Professor

---
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Charles H. McCarthy, of the Catholic University, to inquire what progress McCarthy had made with the Knights "in respect to the National Archive Building." In July, the National Association of State Libraries, apparently at Jameson's urging, endorsed the movement for a "hall of records" and sent copies of a resolution on the subject to members of Congress.

Jameson also turned to the news media for support. He suggested to Frederic J. Haskin, correspondent for the Washington Evening Star, that Haskin devote an article to the archives. Haskin replied that he would get such an article "in my schedule as soon as possible." Jameson told the editor of the Washington Times, J. C. Welliver, that while "every other civilized nation" had a national archives building, "we have none." The one good feature of this dilemma, he concluded, was that since "no real steps toward improvement by concentration or by makeshift buildings" had been made, "we have carte blanche to erect here in Washington the finest National Archive Building in the world." To J. Stewart Bryan, editor of the Richmond

---

59 Jameson to McCarthy, January 25, 1912, ibid.
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News Leader, Jameson explained that favorable action on the archives would require "some pressure from public opinion. . . ." Bryan replied that he was "greatly interested in the protection of our national archives" and would be glad to assist Jameson in his effort.63 In November, 1912, The Nation published an article stating that "there can be no excuse for further delay" in the construction of an archives building.64

Jameson received assistance from an unexpected source. Miss Rosa Pendleton Chiles, a free-lance writer, had become concerned about the government's archives. She made a general survey of archives in Washington, discovered that they were in a deplorable state, and prepared an article based on her findings which she sent to Jameson. Jameson was impressed by Miss Chiles' work and felt that its publication would help to bring about favorable legislation. Therefore, he wrote to S. S. McClure, publisher of McClure's magazine, and Albert Shaw, editor of the Review of Reviews, asking that they consider publishing the article.65 Shaw published it in the February, 1912 issue of the Review of Reviews under the title of "The National Archives: Are They

63 Jameson to Bryan, November 19, 1912, ibid.; and Bryan to Jameson, November 25, 1912, ibid.

64 "The National Archives Again," The Nation, Vol. 95, November 7, 1912, 426-27, Flippin Collection, XIV, 30-32.

65 Gondos, "Archives," 109-110; Jameson to McClure, November 3, 1911, Box 57, File 133, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Shaw, November 10, 1911, ibid.
in Peril?" Jameson was delighted with Shaw's action and ordered 500 copies of the article for distribution to members of Congress.66

Another favorable development came in February, 1912. After nearly two years of requests from Jameson, President Taft addressed himself to the subject of the archives. In a special message to Congress, he stated:

I can not close this message without inviting the attention of Congress . . . to the necessity for the erection of a building to contain the public archives. The unsatisfactory distribution of records, the lack of any proper index or guide to their contents, is well known to those familiar with the needs of the Government in this Capitol.67

Having gained considerable support for archives legislation, Jameson, early in 1912, began to work with Poindexter to obtain passage of Poindexter's bill. In February, he asked Poindexter whether a hearing on S. 5179 should be held during the Second session of the Sixty-second Congress, "in which the House will presumably not act on the subject, but in which impressions may be made upon Congressional and public opinion" or whether a hearing should be deferred until the next session, "assuming that after November 5 [election day] the House will be less rigidly devoted to economy."68

66Shaw to Jameson, January 4, 1912, Box 57, File 134, ibid.; Jameson to Shaw, January 8, 1912, ibid.; and Gondos, "Archives," 111.
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Poindexter hoped to get the Senate to pass his bill during the current session, "both for the purpose of keeping the matter before the public and also because favorable action by the Senate would offer a favorable precedent for future action." He thus arranged a hearing on the bill for March 1. Poindexter asked that Jameson arrange for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury to attend and suggested that Jameson invite "any others whom you may deem advisable."69

Jameson tried to gather an impressive array of witnesses for the hearing. He invited Charles McLean Andress to share with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds his knowledge of the British Public Record Office.70 He asked Herman V. Ames, Chairman of the AHA's public Archives Commission, to attend "and lay before the committee whatever there has been in the practice or experience of states that deserves attention by persons who are planning a national building."71 Jameson also invited Alfred T. Mahan and John Bach McMaster,72 presumably so that the AHA committee on the archives would be fully represented. Rosa Pendleton Chiles could "tell the committee about those special evils of the present situation which have come under

---
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your observation."73 Gaillard Hunt was invited because of his first-hand knowledge of "the best new archive building in Europe."74

Herman Ames was planning to attend the 125th anniversary of the University of Pittsburgh on February 28 and 29; to attend the hearing, he would have to go directly to Washington without returning home. Ames nevertheless was willing to inconvenience himself if Jameson thought that his presence could not be spared. Jameson told Ames that "under the circumstances ... it would be unreasonable to ask you to be here."75 Mahan, as usual reluctant to attend a congressional hearing, told Jameson that "I decided early in the winter that I would not leave home until it was over. . . . You can sufficiently represent the Hist. Association."76 The list of witnesses that Jameson finally compiled included Chief Clerk of the Treasury James L. Wilmeth, Commissioner of the General Land Office Fred Dennett, Miss Chiles, Hunt, Andrews, and Waldo G. Leland. Jameson hoped, but was not sure, that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury also would attend.77
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Jameson was the first speaker; he explained that his statement would be brief because he had fully presented his views to the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the previous spring. He spent most of his time describing the role of the other witnesses. The Chief Clerk of the Treasury had come because the Treasury Department was "more oppressed with the difficulties of caring for its papers than any other one department and . . . would probably have more to turn over to an archive building than any other department. . . ." Since the Interior Department stood second to the Treasury in needing an archives building, the Commissioner of the General Land Office would testify. While the Treasury and Interior Departments suffered most from inadequate archival conditions, most other departments also were "oppressed." Miss Chiles would save time by speaking of "all in a summary way." Hunt would discuss what he had learned at the International Congress of Archivists in Brussels in 1910. Leland was knowledgeable both about archival conditions in Washington, because of his work on the Carnegie Institution's Guide, and about European archives, because he had been in Paris preparing a guide to materials for American history in French archives. Andrews would speak with expertise on the Public Record Office. Before concluding his statement, Jameson reiterated his belief that an archives building "would come into existence mainly for administrative convenience and for the purposes of Government business. . . ." Historical interests, while
not to be ignored, played "a secondary part in the matter. . . ."78

The next speaker, James L. Wilmeth, Chief Clerk of the Treasury Department, spoke "about the Treasury needs first from an administrative standpoint." Since the Treasury Department had the duty of accounting for all public money advanced for public purposes, it was essential that the Department's papers be intact and accessible. But, in reality, the Department's files were "scattered in three or four buildings." In many places, the papers enlarged from heat and dampness during the summer and shrank during the winter. The Department had felt "the absolute need of an archives building for a long time," and felt "it more so now than ever before. . . ." Wilmeth also noted that an archives building was needed to preserve historical records. The Treasury Department frequently had calls for historical papers. The Department currently was gathering up "scraps of revolutionary records--muster rolls, printed rolls, and written rolls." But, he explained:

We have no use for them now. . . . They serve no purpose at all now in the offices where they are kept. They are rather precious records, however; invaluable of their sort. We want to get those together and make suitable disposition of them.79


79 Ibid., 7-10, 15.
Fred Dennett, Commissioner of the General Land Office, spoke next. The Land Office, he explained, was housed in "the old Post Office Building." The Office's old files were stored in the basement; heating pipes passed through part of the basement and raised the "temperature up to a degree that brings great disaster to the papers. . . ." Senator George Sutherland of Utah, Chairman of the Committee, asked Dennett if the "dead files" (cases which had been "patented for such a length of time that it is to be presumed that they will not be required for current business or for any pressing use") needed to be preserved. Dennett responded by describing a case, known as the "Chicago lake-front case," in which attorneys had come to the Land Office to consult relevant old records. Because the records were poorly kept, officials of the Land Office had to spend two or three weeks searching for them. In short, the files were of value and needed better care.80

Rosa Pendleton Chiles presented a discouraging picture of government archives. The system of filing old papers was inadequate; nearly all of them were "filed folded, so that they crumble and are easily destroyed." Moreover, papers were so crowded "as to be utterly inaccessible. . . . They are piled from floor to ceiling and the ceilings in many places are 16 feet high." Miss Chiles had found the worst conditions in the Treasury Department; there,
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she explained:

The files of the Secretary of the Treasury are on the top floor of the Treasury Building. There are millions and millions of them. It is just one huge mass from one end of the building to the other. There is a real danger of spontaneous combustion.81

Other repositories were nearly as bad. In the Winder Building, which was used to store government records, files were kept in an area where there was "a network of electric wires not inclosed in metal." Miss Chiles had wanted to go to the annex of the Court of Claims Building. The annex had been flooded by a heavy rain the previous night, so the person in charge had spread some old shutters for her to walk on; she found it a great "physical test to balance" herself on the shutters. In the Cox Building, papers were so dusty that she felt "a hesitancy in touching them for fear you will come in contact with every known and unknown species of germ." When Miss Chiles had commented about the dust in the Cox Building, she was told that "they had a vacuum cleaner, but they used it only occasionally. . . ."82

Gaillard Hunt explained that the Public Record Office in London "more nearly assimilates . . . what ours will be, if you will give us one. . . ." But an ideal archives building should not be built like the Public Record Office. Rather, the model archives buildings in Europe were those being constructed in Dresden and Berlin, for they provided for all the existing archives and made "provision for 100

years of expansion." If an archives building allowed adequate space for expansion, then it was possible to follow "a system of arrangement that does not have to be disturbed." On the other hand, if a building had to be added on to rather than expanded, the facilities would have to be rearranged. In short, an American archives building should allow ample room for expansion.83

Waldo G. Leland touched on a point that he felt had not been adequately covered by the other speakers. An archives building, he explained, would greatly increase "the efficiency of transaction" of public business. In order for the government to carry on its functions, it was necessary to refer constantly to all sorts of records; the records should be arranged so that they could be found with minimal delay. But materials of the various departments were so scattered and poorly kept that an orderly arrangement was impossible. Clerks in the departments found it difficult to lay their hands on records and often returned records to places other than where they originally had located them.84

Leland also emphasized that "the care of its records is a proper function for a Government." European governments recognized this obligation; "almost everywhere in Europe," Leland stated, "we find that some provision had been made for taking care of the old records of historical value." Leland told how he had been embarrassed when he

83Ibid., 27-28.  
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attended the International Congress of Archivists. When asked by a Belgian if "we had any archives in America," Leland replied "that we had, but that as yet we did not take any care of them." One did not have to go to Europe to see examples of proper archival care. Canada and several of the states had made provisions for the proper housing, classification, and administration of public records.85

Charles McLean Andrews' main point was that the United States should profit from British experience. The British had made several mistakes in building an archival repository. For one, they had been tardy in recognizing the need for an archives building; fifty-one years elapsed between the issuance of the first report by a British commission on the archives and the construction of the Public Record Office. During that interim, public records suffered from many destructive forces, and, as a result, many of the archives were in a condition that showed "the effect of damp and vermin and soaking in sewer water and other conditions that made them nearly illegible." The sooner that records could "be gotten out of improper places of deposit the better for the future." A second lesson to be learned from the British was "that no makeshift should be adopted." The British wasted many years trying "to adapt the attic of the new Houses of Parliament" to serve as a record office before they realized that it was necessary to "take the bull by the
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horns and build a new building. . . ." Finally, the British had built too small an edifice. As a result, new sections continuously had to be added, and anyone could see "the effects of that piecemeal construction. . . ." On the other hand, the British had done some things well. Most important, "they made provision for a very wide range of work." They set apart portions of the Public Record Office "for all those who might need to use the records either for official or legal, technical, historical, or literary purposes; and they set these apart in such a way that they were entirely separate. . . ."86

An unexpected witness was Lothrop Withington, who had pushed for an archives building earlier in the century. Withington stated that he was surprised to hear Jameson "put the historical phase of this question in second place." "Nothing to my mind," he stated, "can put history in second place, and those old papers constitute our history." Jameson replied that he had not intended to belittle the importance of history. History, he explained, "is not secondary in my mind," but he realized that if an archives building were approved it probably would be "more for reasons of administrative efficiency than for reasons of history."87

Since the Supervising Architect of the Treasury was absent, Jameson ventured some opinions about the size of the proposed building. It was difficult to project precisely
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how large a building would be needed, since it was not possible to predict how many records the department would turn over to the building at the outset. In light of this fact, Jameson felt that the bill under consideration was excellent, since it contemplated a building that was adequate for present needs and that could be expanded to accommodate "whatever may be turned over to it in the future." Jameson explained that in other countries executive departments became increasingly willing to turn over their papers to the archives; this pattern made it all the more necessary to construct a building suited to expansion.88

Congress took no further action on the archives in the Second session of the Sixty-second Congress. Poindexter had to leave Washington for some time because of his mother's death. However, before Poindexter left he informed Jameson that he "thought a bigger building than was contemplated in the bill might as well be built at first." Also in the spring of 1912, the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds decided to "push for a public buildings bill" which would include an archives building. But Sheppard was out of town for an extended period, and the subcommittee in charge of the matter failed to take any action on the archives in Sheppard's absence.89

88Ibid., 39-40.
89Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, March 15, 1912, Box 104, File 982, Jameson Papers.
this interruption, Jameson believed that the archives would be "taken up in good earnest" in the next session of Congress and "pushed to a conclusion." 90

In order to gain support for the archives building before Congress reconvened, in November, 1912, Jameson sent a circular letter to members of historical societies which solicited their backing for the archives. Jameson's effort was quite successful. Clarence W. Alvord, Editor of the Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, wrote to Governor Deneen and to Representative Ira Copley to enlist their support. Alvord also planned to get the trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library to pass a resolution in favor of the archives and send it to the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. 91 William Nelson got the New Jersey Historical Society to pass a resolution in favor of the archives. 92 Robert H. Kelby, Librarian of the New York Historical Society, and R. D. W. Connor, Secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission, got their organizations to pass favorable resolutions. 93 Franklin L. Riley, Secretary and Treasurer of the Mississippi Historical
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Society, prepared a memorial to be signed by the officers and executive committee of the Historical Society and also urged them to write letters to members of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Riley also tried to enlist the support of the editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal.\textsuperscript{94}

Reuben Gold Thwaites explained that while it would not be possible to call a meeting of the entire State Historical Society of Wisconsin, he would get members of the Executive Committee to work individually for the archives.\textsuperscript{95} William MacDonald, of Brown University, promised to contact members of the Rhode Island Historical Society about the archives.\textsuperscript{96} E. O. Randall, a member of the Executive Committee of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, pledged his society's support of the archives and indicated that he personally would confer with Ohio congressmen on the subject.\textsuperscript{97} O. G. Libby, of the University of North Dakota, promised his support, and Thomas M. Owen, Director of the State of Alabama Department of Archives and History, wrote to Alabama's congressmen as well as to the members of the House Committee on Public Buildings and

\textsuperscript{94}Riley to Jameson, November 19, 1912, \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{95}Thwaites to Jameson, November 19, 1912, \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{96}MacDonald to Jameson, November 20, 1912, \textit{ibid}.
\textsuperscript{97}Randall to Jameson, November 12, 1912, \textit{ibid}.
George M. Martin, Secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society, got his organization to send a memorial to Congress urging erection of an archives building. The Texas State Historical Association adopted resolutions in favor of the archives, and Eugene C. Barker, of the University of Texas, wrote to several Texas congressmen.

Jameson also wrote to representatives and senators in his attempt to forward the archives. In November, 1912, he wrote to Sheppard and enclosed an article by Leland entitled "The National Archives: A Programme." Sheppard replied that "it is impossible to say what view the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will take of this subject, but I am going to insist on definite action of some kind." When Eugene C. Barker informed Jameson that Representative Oscar Calloway seemed favorably disposed toward the archives, Jameson sent Calloway a copy of Leland's article and a lengthy explanation of why an archives building was needed. Jameson urged Henry Cabot Lodge to present in the Senate a memorial passed by the Massachusetts
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Historical Society, and Lodge agreed.\textsuperscript{103} Not all the congressmen who Jameson contacted were favorably disposed toward the archives. Representative John L. Burnett of Alabama told Jameson, "I do not know where you got the impression that our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are unanimously of the opinion that such building ought to be started forthwith." Burnett was "of the opinion that there are many buildings needed much more than the one you refer to and . . . I am opposed to any appropriation for the Archives Building at this session."\textsuperscript{104} Jameson informed Burnett that he was sorry for misrepresenting his position. He agreed with Burnett that proposed buildings for the Department of State, Department of Justice, and Department of Commerce and Labor were badly needed. At the same time, Jameson felt that in view of "the enormous pecuniary value and administrative importance of the masses of papers preserved here in Washington in a hundred scattered repositories . . . I am not able to feel otherwise than that a National Archive Building has a very high place upon the list of structures for which appropriations might soon be made."\textsuperscript{105}

Jameson again asked Taft to make a recommendation.

\textsuperscript{103}Jameson to Lodge, December 24, 1912, \textit{ibid.}; and Lodge to Jameson, December 26, 1912, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{104}Burnett to Jameson, November 30, 1912, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{105}Jameson to Burnett, December 5, 1912, \textit{ibid.}
about the archives in his annual message. He told Taft he was confident some decisive step toward the erection of an archives building "could be had at the next session of Congress if some pressure toward that end is exerted." Taft responded favorably in his annual message of December 6, 1912, stating that "a hall of archives is ... badly needed. ..." 

Although Jameson worked hard to get passage of an archives bill in the Third session of the Sixty-second Congress, as time passed he became pessimistic about prospects for success. Early in 1913, he told Hubert Hall, of the Public Record Office: "I wish I could tell you that large progress has been made this session towards the erection of a proper National Archive Building, but the session is proving to be a disappointing one in that respect. ..." But Jameson's pessimism was unwarranted.

On February 5, 1913, the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported Poindexter's bill, S. 5179. The Committee recommended that the bill pass with amendments. The designs and estimates would be for a building of 3,000,000 cubic feet instead of 1,500,000 cubic feet; the projected
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ultimate size was raised from 4,000,000 to 8,900,000 cubic feet; and the initial cost was increased from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. Finally, the $5,000 for preliminary plans was to be directly appropriated rather than authorized.109

Meanwhile, the House was considering an omnibus public buildings bill. As a historian of the archives explains:

From time to time innumerable individual bills for public buildings and works accumulate in the files of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Rather than deal with these in individual pieces of legislation,... the Committee combines these into a single all-inclusive legislative package known as the omnibus bill.110

On February 15, Representative Burnett introduced an omnibus bill, and it passed the House two days later.111

As the bill made its way through the Senate, Poin­dexter helped insure that it included provisions for an archives building. These provisions were largely those of S. 5179 as amended. The Public Buildings Act of 1913 directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare designs and estimates for an archives building of 3,000,000 cubic feet. The building would be built upon a lot large enough for the building to be expanded to 8,900,000 cubic feet. Before the designs and estimates were completed, inspection would be made of "the best modern national archive buildings in Europe" and there would be consultation "with the best

110Ibid., 148.
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authorities in Europe on the construction and arrangement of archive buildings." The total cost of the building would not exceed $1,500,000. The designs and estimates would have to be approved by a commission made up of the Vice-President, the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Interior. After the commission had approved the designs and estimates, then the Secretary of the Treasury would "purchase, or cause to be taken for public use, by condemnation or otherwise . . . a site for said building . . . which shall be approved by the said commission." For preparing the designs and estimates, $5,000 was authorized to be appropriated.\textsuperscript{112}

Jameson now attempted to get the legislation implemented. First, he wanted to confer with the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, Oscar Wenderoth, who would prepare the designs. Jameson obtained from Poindexter a letter of introduction to Wenderoth and met with him in March. Jameson gave Wenderoth a copy of Van Tyne and Leland's Guide, because it showed "the nature of the contents for which provision must be made in the proposed building," gave him a copy of the plan of the British Public Record Office, and offered to assist him in any way that might be useful.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{112}Jameson to Poindexter, March 5, 1913, Box 57, File 134, Jameson Papers; and Statutes at Large, XXXVII, Part 1, 884-85.
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Wenderoth thanked Jameson for his advice and materials and told Jameson that he hoped they could continue to work together.\textsuperscript{114}

Jameson's next objective was to get the $5,000 appropriated for preparing the designs and estimates. He decided to take up the question with Secretary of the Treasury William G. McAdoo. He obtained from William Barclay Parsons, a member of the Executive Committee of the Carnegie Institution, a letter of introduction to McAdoo.\textsuperscript{115} Jameson then requested an interview with McAdoo, but McAdoo's private secretary, Bryan R. Newton, informed Jameson that McAdoo was so busy with other matters that he had to defer meeting with Jameson until a later date.\textsuperscript{116} In September, 1913, Newton was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Treasury "with the public buildings as one portion of his charge." Jameson therefore decided that he should see Newton about the appropriation. For a letter of introduction to Newton, he sought the aid of Edward G. Lowry, managing editor of the New York \textit{Evening Post}. Lowry arranged for Jameson to meet with Newton.\textsuperscript{117}
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Jameson took other steps to advance the archives. The Public Buildings Act of 1913 had created a commission, comprised of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, two members of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and two members of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to "present to Congress a connected scheme, involving annual appropriations for the construction of public buildings heretofore authorized. . . ." In October, 1913, Jameson sent each of the commission members a lengthy letter about the archives. He detailed the evils of the existing situation and asked that the commission give the archives building "a high place on the programme," recommend "unanimously the decisive steps toward the erection of such a repository," and urge the "immediate making of the necessary appropriations for its inspection."

Jameson received some encouraging replies from the commission members. Senator Sutherland wrote Jameson, "I quite sympathize with your point of view and shall do all I possibly can to bring about the recommendation and later an appropriation for the erection of this very necessary
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Representative Austin told Jameson, "I have always . . . favored the construction of a national archives building . . . and will continue to give this matter my support until a sufficient appropriation is made. . . ." Nevertheless, the commission was slow to act. In late October, Jameson explained to Leland that the only substantive action the commission had taken since its creation in March was "to ask the Supervising Architect to devise a system for standardizing the plans for federal public buildings" outside of Washington. On a note of despair, Jameson added:

I have added to my will a request to my executors to push the matter of the National Archive Building. It gives me pleasure to add that all public authorities who admit having read your article are willing to admit that something ought to be done (by someone else). 

At the 1913 meeting of the AHA, Jameson also indicated that "the immediate prospects of a national archive building are not bright." The Public Buildings Commission, he explained, "intends in its first report to confine itself to the local buildings and will not take up for a good while any other questions." He pointed out that money had not yet been appropriated to make plans for the archives building.
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Therefore, he continued, "the point for the present attack seems to be . . . the House Committee on Appropriations; and if any member of this audience have any influence with any member" of the Committee "I should be glad if they would write to him in support" of the appropriation.123

In the spring of 1914, Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo, perhaps influenced by Jameson's urging, recommended that Congress appropriate the $5,000 for making plans for the archives building. Jameson asked Poindexter to get members of the House subcommittee in charge of the matter to support McAdoo's request. Poindexter contacted members of the subcommittee, but without success; the House Appropriations Committee reported out the Sundry Civil bill without the $5,000. Jameson hoped that Poindexter could "obtain insertion of this item as a Senate amendment in the Sundry Civil Bill."124 Jameson then found out that McAdoo also was attempting to get the Senate to amend the Sundry Civil bill to include the money for the archives. Jameson asked Poindexter to introduce the amendment, "have it referred to the committee on appropriations, and, if possible, see that it is incorporated by them when the bill is reported to the Senate."125 Poindexter introduced the amendment to the
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Sundry Civil bill in June and a month later told Jameson that the Senate had adopted it. He also alerted Jameson that "it is very important the conferees of the House and Senate . . . understand the importance of the amendment and anything you can do in that behalf will be very much appreciated."\(^{126}\) Jameson accordingly wrote to the members of the conference committee, explaining the need for an archives building and urging approval of the $5,000 appropriation.\(^{127}\)

While Jameson worked with Poindexter to get the appropriation through Congress, various organizations were lending their aid to the effort. R. C. Ballard Thurston, President General of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, informed Jameson that Bruce Haldeman, president of the Courier Journal company, "the leading democratic newspaper of the south," had promised to write Representative Swagar Sherley of Kentucky, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, in support of the appropriation. The Filson Club of Louisville, Thurston added, had passed resolutions in support of the appropriation. Thurston was to "appear before another club" in Louisville "to address them on the same object, and they will probably pass similar resolutions." Finally, Thurston promised to

\(^{126}\)Poindexter to Jameson, July 9, 1914, \textit{ibid}.

get "a few of our prominent democrats" to write to Representative Sherley about the appropriation.\textsuperscript{128}

Early in 1914, Victor H. Paltsits, Chairman of the Public Archives Commission of the AHA, had arranged for Jameson to address the American Library Association on the archives.\textsuperscript{129} Jameson delivered his address in May, when the proposed appropriation was before Congress. He opened by pointing out that most European nations, as well as Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and Colombia, had an archives building. Therefore, "the presumption must be that there is some merit in the idea of a national archive building." He went on to describe the many problems that the United States suffered as a result of its lack of an archives building. "To me," Jameson stated, "the main reason for interesting ourselves in the problems of a national archive building is that present conditions interpose almost intolerable obstacles to the progress of history." But, he added, "as the actual world goes, we are to expect business considerations to have greater weight than the interests of history." "Very well," Jameson exclaimed:

Put the matter on that ground. Is it good business for a government to spend $50,000 a year for rental

\textsuperscript{128}Thurston to American Historical Association, May 7, 1914, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{129}Paltsits to Jameson, January 21, 1914, Box 117, File 1289, \textit{ibid.;} Jameson to Paltsits, January 23, 1914, \textit{ibid.;} Paltsits to Jameson, March 9, 1914, \textit{ibid.;} and E. G. Anderson to Jameson, February 7, 1914, Box 53, File 81, \textit{ibid.}
of bad quarters, when for the same sum capitalized it could build magnificent quarters with much greater capacity.\textsuperscript{130}

Jameson's point, which he so often made, was that an archives building would not come into being because of the clamor of historians, "a feeble folk relatively," but because of "the steady and powerful pressure of administrators. . . ." He closed his speech by tracing the history of legislation relating to the archives and explaining that a proposal for funds to prepare plans was before Congress. He urged the members of the Association to keep "public opinion alive on a subject of so much importance from the historical and the governmental points of view. . . ." The Association responded to Jameson's plea by passing a resolution that approved the steps "made toward the erection of a national archive building" and urged Congress to pass the $5,000 appropriation.\textsuperscript{131}

Jameson's lobbying apparently helped to bring about favorable congressional action. On July 21, 1914, John J. Fitzgerald of New York, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, informed Jameson that the Senate amendment appropriating $5,000 had been agreed to in conference.\textsuperscript{132}

\begin{footnotes}
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Congress approved the conference committee's recommendation, and the Sundry Civil bill of August, 1914, provided $5,000 for making designs and estimates for an archives building.\textsuperscript{133}

Then, with money appropriated, there arose an obstacle to further progress. Oscar Wenderoth concluded that $5,000 was inadequate to prepare preliminary plans. Secretary McAdoo and Assistant Secretary Newton supported Wenderoth's contention. In a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, McAdoo explained that if the capacity of the archives building was to be about 9,000,000 cubic feet, then the building would cost over $3,000,000. For a building of that cost, $30,000 was needed to prepare preliminary designs and estimates. Newton sent a copy of McAdoo's letter to Poindexter, along with a letter of his own. In this letter, Newton implied that the Treasury Department had not been sufficiently consulted about the cost of preparing designs and estimates. "Inquiry in the Office of the Supervising Architect," he explained, "fails to disclose any record or knowledge of the Department having made any statement that the sum of $5,000 would be sufficient for the preparation of preliminary designs and studies." Wenderoth had been supervising Architect for more than seven months before the passage of the Public Buildings Act of 1913, yet Wenderoth had not been consulted by either the House or Senate Committees on Public Buildings and

\textsuperscript{133}Statutes at Large, XXXVIII, Part 1, 610.
Grounds "regarding the adequacy of an allowance of $5,000 for the preparation of plans." In conclusion, Newton stated that the preparation of plans and estimates could not even be started with the amount appropriated. "The Comptroller of the Treasury" had ruled that an "administrative officer charged with the expenditure of an appropriation may not undertake that expenditure unless he believes that all of the objectives for which it was intended may be accomplished within the limit of cost." Were an official to undertake an expenditure "knowing that the limit is insufficient, and knowing that he will create a deficiency, he commits a penal offense."134

McAdoo suggested that the way out of this dilemma was to pass additional legislation providing more money for preparing designs and estimates.135 Poindexter referred McAdoo's correspondence to Jameson, explaining that he was willing to work for new legislation.136 In response, Jameson explained that the supposed need for additional money was based on the erroneous assumption that the building would contain 9,000,000 cubic feet and would cost over $3,000,000. In fact, the act of 1913 provided for a building of only 3,000,000 cubic feet, at a cost of $1,500,000. While he
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admitted that $5,000 might be inadequate, Jameson questioned the basis of McAdoo's conclusions.137

As it turned out, the furor was unnecessary. Wenderoth apparently had been either misinformed or obstinate. After he left office in the spring of 1915, the new Supervising Architect, James A. Wetmore, concluded that $5,000 was sufficient to make preliminary plans and began to work on them.138

While plans on the building were being prepared, Jameson asked Poindexter's help on a related matter. The Public Building Act of 1913 specified that before the plans were completed, inspection would be made of European archives buildings and European authorities would be consulted. Jameson hoped that Poindexter could get these requirements repealed. For one, wartime conditions in Europe made it difficult to inspect the new archives buildings of Vienna, Dresden, and Berlin, "the best present examples of national archive buildings of large dimensions." Furthermore, the Comptroller of the Treasury had determined that no portion of the $5,000 appropriation could be used to inspect European archives, and it would be difficult to get additional appropriations for the visit. Jameson believed that "through my assistant Mr. Leland and his knowledge of European archives, I can put the chief draftsman [of the

137Jameson to Poindexter, February 6, 1915, ibid.
138Jameson to Poindexter, May 27, 1915, ibid.
Treasury Department] in possession of most of the information that would be got from a European tour of inspection."\textsuperscript{139} Poindexter agreed that the law should be amended "so as not to require inspection of European buildings" and believed that objective could be achieved "early in the forthcoming session. . . ."\textsuperscript{140}

In November, 1915, Jameson reported to Poindexter that "the work of making the preliminary plans" was proceeding satisfactorily.\textsuperscript{141} Poindexter was "delighted to know that work on the plans is going ahead as it should" and repeated that he foresaw no difficulty in getting repeal of the European inspection requirement. Poindexter touched upon another subject. He thought that Jameson should try to get the Secretary of the Treasury to include in his budget estimates a request for funds to construct the archives building. In Poindexter's opinion, if the Secretary would request funds, there would be no difficulty in securing an appropriation, "in view of the fact that the building itself has been authorized by law; and it is quite unusual to fail to make such appropriations . . . as fast as the appropriations are asked for by the construction department, in this case the treasury."\textsuperscript{142}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{139} Jameson to Poindexter, May 27, 1915, \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{140} Poindexter to Jameson, June 1, 1915, \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{141} Jameson to Poindexter, November 15, 1915, \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{142} Poindexter to Jameson, November 19, 1915, \textit{ibid.}
\end{flushleft}
Jameson, in fact, had been working throughout 1915 to get appropriations for the building. In April, he discussed the subject with Louis E. Van Norman, editor of *The Nation's Business*, who had published an article on the need of an archives building. In May, he sent Lodge a copy of his address to the American Library Association and asked Lodge's help in forwarding the movement for the building. Lodge was in sympathy with Jameson's objective but felt that "under existing conditions it may be difficult to secure the necessary appropriations from Congress." Also in May, he informed John H. Moore, of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, that "the thing for which your society should strike is such action by Congress" as would provide an appropriation for "the erection of the building."

By November, 1915, Jameson had written to "all the members of the 64th Congress" whom he knew to urge support for construction. He also worked through various acquaintances to secure congressional backing. He asked Governor L. Bradford Prince of New Mexico to urge upon Senator Thomas B. Catron the importance of an appropriation

143 Jameson to Eliot Goodwin, April 12, 1915, Box 57, File 135, *ibid.*, and Van Norman to Jameson, April 15, 1915, *ibid.*
144 Jameson to Lodge, May 10, 1915, *ibid.*
145 Lodge to Jameson, May 12, 1915, *ibid.*
146 Jameson to Moore, May 27, 1915, *ibid.*
147 Jameson to Poindexter, November 15, 1915, Box 120, File 1348, *ibid.*
for the archives. Prince promised to do so, adding that a "result with him depends very much on the manner in which he is approached."  

Jameson got Justin Smith to bring the archives to the attention of Senator William Dillingham of Vermont.  

Evarts B. Greene, at Jameson's request, contacted Representative William B. McKinley of Illinois on the subject.  

Charles R. Waite, President of the University of Wisconsin, urged Senator Robert M. LaFollette to support the archives.  

Thomas M. Owen wrote to Senators John Bankhead and Oscar Underwood and personally met with Representative Stanley Dent about the archives. Numerous other historians and supporters of the archives also wrote to their representatives and senators.

---
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150 Greene to Jameson, November 10, 1915, Box 87, File 645, *ibid.*
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Even before Poindexter suggested that he do so, Jameson had presented his case to the Secretary of the Treasury. In a letter to McAdoo, with enclosed copies of his speech to the American Library Association and Leland's "The National Archives: A Programme," Jameson described in detail the history of legislation relating to the archives building. He explained that "an earnest effort will be made in this next session to persuade Congress to make an appropriation of $500,000 for the beginning of the work." He asked that McAdoo enter "an item of $500,000 for this building in the estimate now under consideration." Although Jameson was "aware of the motives . . . for economy in Government expenditure," he pointed out that "the appropriation which I desire is in itself a notable measure of economy."

First, it is economy in the sense that it is better for the Government to pay a moderate sum for a suitable building, rather than to pay out each year the interest on that sum for unsuitable rented quarters. Second, it is economy in the sense that to have the Government's papers well arranged and quickly accessible, is more economical than to have time wasted daily in searches. Thirdly, it is economy in the sense in which insurance is economical, for there are half a dozen places in this town where a conflagration might in half an hour burn up papers which . . . are worth to the Government many times the cost of a proper archive building.  

---


154 Jameson to McAdoo, November 10, 1915, Box 57, File 134, ibid.
McAdoo, however, failed to act on Jameson's request.  

Jameson continued to work through the AHA to get support for the archives. At the 1915 meeting of the AHA, a joint session, attended by members of the AHA, the American Political Science Association, the American Economic Association, and "other national societies" was held "to further the interests of the building of the national archives." 

Waldo G. Leland, who was in charge of planning the meeting, considered having Secretary of Interior Franklin K. Lane chair the session. Jameson, however, urged Leland to get Poindexter to serve as chairman for several reasons—"his service to the cause . . . his interest in the subject and information upon it, his power of speaking, and especially the fact that a senator can speak with more freedom about a piece of proposed legislation than a cabinet officer can. . . ." Leland heeded Jameson's advice. 

The speakers at the session presented impressive testimony upon the need for an archives building. Harvard economist Frank W. Taussig spoke about "the value of

---

155 Poindexter to McAdoo, January 7, 1916, Box 57, File 135, ibid.


157 Leland to Jameson, July 20, 1915, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers.

158 Jameson to Leland, August 8, 1915, ibid.

159 Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1915, 262.
governmental records to the study of history, economics, and politics." Gaillard Hunt described the value of governmental records "to the Government itself." He explained that "without a proper arrangement, classification, and housing of records it was impossible to carry on the work of the Government rapidly and efficiently." Leland showed pictures of foreign archives buildings and "emphasized the fact that almost all European nations" were "far ahead of the United States in the matter of caring for their records..."

Leo F. Stock, of the Carnegie Institution, illustrated with pictures the deplorable condition of American archives. He "showed valuable records next to steam pipes or water pipes, showed pictures taken in attics of Federal buildings and in cellars." At the close of the session, the members passed a resolution approving "of the efforts which" had "been made toward the erection of a national archive building" and urging "upon Congress the passage of appropriations for the speedy construction of a suitable building in which to concentrate and properly care for the muniments of the American people." 160

In 1916, Jameson and Poindexter continued their efforts to get further action on the archives. Poindexter asked Victor Paltsits to get members of the Public Archives Commission to urge the House Appropriations Committee to

160 Ibid., 262-64.
support funds for the building. Jameson continued to ask associates to write their congressmen in support of an appropriation. When, in March, a fire broke out in a building containing records of the Bureau of Immigration, Jameson requested R. C. Ballard Thurston to use the event to impress upon Representative Sherley the need for an archives building. In response, the Kentucky Society of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution passed resolutions urging erection of the building and sent a copy to Sherley. Jameson also contacted Assistant Treasury Secretary Newton in his continuing attempt to get the Treasury Department to submit to Congress an estimate for the archives building.

By March, 1916, the Supervising Architect's Office had completed preliminary plans for the building. Jameson's immediate objective now was to get the commission created by the Public Buildings Act of 1913 to convene and to discharge its duties of approving the plans and a site

---

161 Poindexter to Paltsits, January 7, 1916, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers.
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for the archives building. Jameson wrote a letter to each of the members of the commission, asking that they act quickly since speedy action would expedite passage of an appropriation by Congress. He enclosed a memorandum he had prepared regarding possible sites. Jameson emphasized that he had "no attachment to any particular site" but was merely presenting all the advantages and disadvantages of each possible site in hopes that this information would save the commission time.167

The commission members met on April 4. However, they failed to act on the plans or to choose a site, concluding that no action could be taken until the European inspection requirement either had been complied with or repealed.168 Poindexter believed that the law had "been substantially complied with . . . as it does not require a visit to Europe, but merely an examination of European archives buildings." He thought that such an examination had been satisfactorily completed through the consultation of plans, drawings, and pictures of European archives. However, "as a practical matter in order to meet the objections" of the commission, Poindexter concluded that it would be wise to amend the act of 1913 specifically to eliminate the clause relative to

167 Jameson to Franklin K. Lane, April 1, 1916, ibid.; Jameson to Champ Clark, April 1, 1916, ibid.; Jameson to Newton D. Baker, April 1, 1916, ibid.; and Jameson to Bryan R. Newton, April 1, 1916, ibid.

168 Gondos, "Archives," 185-86.
European inspection.\textsuperscript{169} Jameson told Poindexter that he wanted the amendment passed very soon; Congress would not hold hearings on the purchase of a site and construction of a building until the commission acted, and Jameson hoped that hearings could take place before he left for his summer retreat in Maine.\textsuperscript{170}

Poindexter obliged on May 3 by introducing a bill to repeal the European inspection provision. The bill quickly passed the Senate and was referred to the House.\textsuperscript{171} The House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds held a hearing on the bill, which Jameson attended. Jameson explained that the European inspection requirement had been included so as to "get the benefit of European advice." However, the "best models of national archive buildings now in existence" were "not accessible to such inspection in war time." On the other hand, the Supervising Architect's office had secured plans of European archives buildings, and Jameson had gotten Leland to collect "all possible archive materials and plans of buildings in Europe" and had transmitted this material to the office of the Supervising Architect. Still, the commission created by the act of 1913 would not act on the plans or approve a site until the

\textsuperscript{169} Poindexter to Jameson, April 25, 1916, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{170} Jameson to Poindexter, April 26, 1916, \textit{ibid.}

proviso regarding European inspection had been observed or repealed. In short, what originally had been a sound part of the 1913 act now was an obstruction to further action; passage of the bill would remove that obstruction. James A. Wetmore, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, substantiated Jameson's statement. He confirmed that the commission would not act because of the existing requirement and explained that his office favored repeal.¹⁷²

The Committee recommended that the bill pass, and on June 10, the House passed the bill.¹⁷³ Thus, Public Law 119 of the Sixty-fourth Congress stated that "the acquisition of a site for a national archive building and the construction of the said building" is "hereby authorized without . . . inspection and consultation in Europe."¹⁷⁴

The period from 1907 through June, 1916 was one of mixed success in the movement for a national archives. Although Jameson, along with congressmen, historians, and other supporters, worked incessantly to secure an archives building, progress was agonizingly slow. In 1915, Jameson told David W. Parker that the campaign for an archives building "is slower than any campaign in Europe, present or past. I have been standing practically in the same trenches

¹⁷²U. S. Congress, House, Hearings Before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, 64 Cong., 1 Sess., 1916, Flippin Collection, XV, 142-45.


¹⁷⁴Statutes at Large, XXXIX, Part 1, 241.
for several years, occasionally oppressed by noxious gases from Congressmen, but never yet quite reduced to sur­render." Nevertheless, there also was cause for gratifi­cation. The acts of 1913 and 1916 had authorized selection of a site for and construction of an archives building. Jameson and his cohorts had gained widespread support for appropriations to implement these authorizations. But despite the gains that had been made by 1916, seventeen more years passed before the cornerstone was laid for an archives building in Washington.

175 Jameson to Parker, April 28, 1915, Box 117, File 1294, Jameson Papers.
CHAPTER IX

THE MOVEMENT FOR A NATIONAL ARCHIVES—THROUGH THE
PASSAGE OF THE APPROPRIATION OF 1926

After Congress repealed the European inspection
requirement in 1916, Jameson once again attempted to get
the commission created by the Public Buildings Act of 1913
to approve a site for an archives building. He was unable
to persuade the commission to hold another meeting since
most of the members were out of town campaigning. While
Jameson waited for the commission to convene, he brought the
archives to the attention of President Woodrow Wilson. He
described to Wilson the shortcomings of the archival system
in Washington, traced the history of legislation relating to
the archives, and explained that the most pressing need, now
that authorizing legislation had passed, was an appropriva-
tion to purchase a site. Jameson asked Wilson to recommend
an appropriation for a site in his next message to Congress.
Such a recommendation, he explained, "would come with
additional force, from one who . . . is known to speak with

1See Chapter VIII.

2Jameson to Nathaniel W. Stephenson, November 1, 1916, Box 129, File 1571, Jameson Papers.
authority from the point of view of an historian.\(^3\) Wilson, in a brief reply, told Jameson that there was no use proposing an appropriation for the archives in the current session of Congress. Although Wilson expressed the hope "that we can turn to it in some future Congress and push it to action,"\(^4\) he apparently did nothing on behalf of the archives.

After he was rebuffed by Wilson, Jameson concluded that there was little hope for an appropriation in the immediate future and decided to concentrate on getting the commission to approve a site.\(^5\) Early in 1917, he urged Vice-President Thomas Marshall, chairman of the commission, to call a meeting.\(^6\) Marshall promised to hold one in the near future but cautioned Jameson that it would be impossible to get an appropriation for the archives in the current session of Congress.\(^7\) Jameson told Marshall that he did not expect an appropriation, but he tried to convince the Vice-President that if the commission acted on a site the movement

\(^{3}\text{Jameson to Wilson, November 15, 1915, Box 57, File 135, ibid.}\)

\(^{4}\text{Wilson to Jameson, November 16, 1916, ibid.}\)

\(^{5}\text{Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, November 20, 1916, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 202.}\)

\(^{6}\text{Jameson to Marshall, January 12, 1917, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers.}\)

\(^{7}\text{Marshall to Jameson, January 19, 1917, ibid.}\)
for an archives building would be significantly advanced. 8

But Marshall procrastinated, and by August, 1917, the com-
mission had not yet met. 9 Jameson asked Professor Samuel B.
Harding of Indiana University to refer him to persons who
might increase Marshall's interest in the archives. 10

Harding told Jameson that "we at the State University did
not get along very well with Marshall while he was Governor,
and I am afraid we should have little weight with him" and
suggested that Jameson contact Jacob Piatt Dunn, Secretary
of the Indiana Historical Society, and Meredith Wilson, a
novelist who was interested in history. 11 Despite Jameson's
efforts, over a year passed before the commission met.

While Jameson waited for Marshall to act, support for
the archives came in from various sources. In July, 1917,
Mrs. Sarah E. Guernsey, President General of the DAR,
informed Herbert Putnam that she was anxious to support the
movement for an archives building. 12 Putnam assured her
that the aid of the DAR was most welcome and forwarded her

8 Jameson to Marshall, January 22, 1917, ibid.

9 Jameson to Poindexter, August 9, 1917, ibid. Jameson tried to find out from Poindexter what Marshall's attitude was toward the archives, and Poindexter informed him that "it has been one of indifference." Poindexter to Jameson, August 11, 1917, ibid.

10 Jameson to Harding, October 18, 1917, ibid.

11 Harding to Jameson, October 21, 1917, ibid.; and Harding to Jameson, October 23, 1917, ibid.

12 Mrs. Guernsey to Putnam, July 20, 1917, ibid.
letter to Jameson. Jameson, in turn, told Mrs. Guernsey that interested parties should not wait for the end of World War I to urge upon Congress an appropriation for the archives. He planned to lobby for an appropriation in the next session of Congress and tried to arrange a meeting with Mrs. Guernsey to discuss ways in which the DAR could help him.

In August, Dr. G. M. Brumbaugh, editor of the National Genealogical Society Quarterly, told Jameson that the war had increased the need for an archives building. The necessity of finding space to store war records was "dooming large quantities of most valuable historical and genealogical records to early destruction." An archives building would insure proper preservation of both old records and material relating to the war. Jameson thanked Brumbaugh for his interest in the archives and assured him that he was trying to get congressional appropriations for a building.

Later, Brumbaugh prepared an editorial on the need of an archives building for the October issue of his magazine. He sent a copy of the article to Jameson along with a letter in which he stated that "a temporary fire proof storage place must be secured at once." Although Jameson appreciated

---

13 Putnam to Mrs. Guernsey, July 23, 1917, ibid.
14 Jameson to Mrs. Guernsey, August 1, 1917, ibid.
15 Brumbaugh to Jameson, August 4, 1917, ibid.
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17 Brumbaugh to Jameson (with enclosure), October 22, 1917, ibid.
Brumbaugh's editorial, he told Brumbaugh that efforts to get a temporary building only would delay the construction of a proper repository.\textsuperscript{18}

At the Eighth Annual Conference of Archivists, held late in 1917, an archives building also was promoted as a war measure. In an address entitled "The Archives of the War," Waldo G. Leland explained that "the accumulation for the war period of records in the War Department, the cantonments, the American Expeditionary Forces, the draft boards, etc. will greatly exceed the previous accumulation [of military records] of 120 years." This plethora of materials made it even more imperative that an archives building be constructed without delay. Following Leland's presentation, Professor Robert M. Johnston of Harvard stated, "I am boiling over with indignation on this question of a national building for our archives and documents."

Johnston continued: "This matter should not be neglected. . . . It should be done if nothing else than as a war economy."\textsuperscript{19}

Poindexter also tried to keep the archives movement alive during World War I. In 1918, he tried to get through Congress a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to erect an archives building on a site that he and Jameson had agreed upon. However, the bill did not pass the

\textsuperscript{18}Jameson to Brumbaugh, October 24, 1917, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{19}Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1917 (Washington, 1920), 117, 119, 128-29.
Any real chance for success had to await the end of the war.

Shortly after the armistice, in February, 1919, the Council of the AHA revived the committee on the archives and appointed Jameson chairman. In December, 1919, the committee was made a standing committee of the Association. Jameson's committee report for 1919 explained that some progress had taken place during that year. The Treasury Department had selected a site for an archives building, a square bounded by Twelfth and Thirteenth and B and C streets, Northwest. The commission created by the act of 1913 had approved the site, and the Treasury had secured options on the property. Despite these gains, appropriations were needed to purchase the site and to begin construction. However, Jameson explained, attempts to secure appropriations in the previous summer's sundry civil appropriation act had been unsuccessful, and the House subcommittee on the sundry civil bill was not likely to approve an appropriation in the current session of Congress. On the other hand, "the return from France of the archives of the American Expeditionary Force" was creating such a demand for

20 Gondos, "Archives," 215-16; Jameson to Poindexter, May 7, 1918, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers; and Poindexter to Jameson, May 27, 1918, ibid.

storage space that the Senate might pass an appropriation.22 In 1920, however, neither the Senate nor the House voted funds for the archives.23

Then, in January, 1921, a fire in the Commerce Department Building destroyed a number of census records. At the time of the fire, the sundry civil bill was before the Senate Appropriations Committee, chaired by Francis Warren of Wyoming. Jameson got colleagues to immediately contact Warren, describe to him the disastrous effects of the fire, and urge him to include in the sundry civil bill an appropriation for an archives building.24 Jameson also persuaded Poindexter and Smoot to "work" on Warren.25 Jameson personally wrote to the members of the subcommittee on the sundry civil bill. He sent them a memorandum detailing the damage that government archives had suffered and were likely to suffer from fire. Between 1873 and 1915, there had been 254 fires in government owned or government occupied buildings in Washington; in several cases, these fires had


23Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1920, 88.

24See, for example, Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, January 12, 1921, Box 110, File 1081, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Allen Johnson, January 12, 1921, Box 99, File 878, ibid.

25Jameson to Wilfred H. Munro, January 12, 1921, ibid.
destroyed important material. Such disasters would continue, for most of the government's records were kept on wooden shelves and at least half of them were in buildings that were not fireproof. In terms of the destruction of historical papers, the worst fire had been the recent one in the census office. Jameson hoped that "this disaster, coming after so many other fires among our national records," would prompt the subcommittee to insert in the sundry civil bill an appropriation to purchase the site for and begin construction on an archives building.26

The Senate subcommittee failed to recommend the appropriation.27 Poindexter then tried to get the Senate to act. On January 17, 1921, he introduced an amendment to the sundry civil bill appropriating $486,000 to purchase a site and to make "working plans" for an archives building.28 Jameson thanked Poindexter for his effort and promised to contact those members of the House that he knew.29 On February 9, the Senate passed the amendment, and Jameson

26"Memorandum on a National Archive Building as a Measure of Economy," Box 57, File 135, ibid.; Jameson to Francis E. Warren, January 12, 1921, ibid.; Jameson to Carter Glass, January 12, 1921, ibid.; Jameson to Charles Curtis, January 12, 1921, ibid.; Jameson to Wesley L. Jones, January 12, 1921, ibid.; and Jameson to Lee S. Overman, January 12, 1921, ibid.

27Jameson to Wilfred H. Munro, January 19, 1921, ibid.


29Jameson to Poindexter, February 5, 1921, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers.
thought that the appropriation would be approved by the House. The House, however, failed to accept Poindexter's amendment.

Although Jameson was disappointed by Congress' inaction, he undoubtedly was gratified by the support that historians lent to the archives in 1921. In April, Joseph Schafer, Superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, sent Jameson copies of resolutions that the Mississippi Valley Historical Association had passed in favor of the archives. Schafer also was trying to get the Wisconsin legislature to adopt a memorial to Congress and was getting his colleagues to have memorials passed by their state legislatures. Solon J. Buck, Superintendent of the Minnesota Historical Society, decided to bring the influence of his organization to bear upon Congress, and he wrote to all of Minnesota's congressmen to urge an appropriation.

At the Annual Conference of Historical Societies, which met in December, Newton D. Mereness read a paper on the archives. The paper was followed by a question and answer period which "revealed [that] conditions in the Washington archives" were "not complimentary to a civilized

30 Jameson to Poindexter, February 11, 1921, ibid.

31 Schafer to Jameson, April 19, 1921, Box 136, File 1780, ibid.

32 Buck to Jameson, May 12, 1921, Box 64, File 269, ibid.; and Buck to Jameson, March 13, 1922, Box 57, File 136, ibid.
people." As a result, the Conference adopted a resolution urging Congress to immediately acquire a site for and begin construction on an archives building.33 Also late in 1921, Jameson prepared a memorial on the archives that was adopted by the Council of the AHA. The memorial recalled that for thirteen years the AHA had been promoting an archival repository in Washington. During that time, especially since the start of World War I, the need for an archives building had become increasingly evident. The money that the government spent to store its records in rented buildings easily would pay for an archives building. Thus, the Council asked Congress to at least appropriate funds for the purchase of a site.34

Support came from persons other than historians. In May, 1921, Harold Phelps Stokes, Washington correspondent for the New York Evening Post, prepared an article on the archives with material that Jameson had provided him.35 At its twentieth Annual Congress, the DAR petitioned Congress to immediately provide an appropriation for an archives building.36

33Victor H. Paltsits to Jameson, February 15, 1922, ibid.; and John C. Parrish to Oscar W. Underwood, January 10, 1922, ibid.

34Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1921, 86.

35Stokes to Jameson, May 13, 1921, Box 57, File 135, Jameson Papers.

36Memorial in ibid.
One invaluable source of new support was the American Legion and, in particular, its National Historian Eben Putnam. In the spring of 1921, Putnam suggested to Waldo G. Leland that there should be erected in Washington "an enormous combination memorial and archive building." By August, however, Putnam and his colleagues in the American Legion had abandoned this proposal in favor of an archives building that would contain one memorial section, a lobby or rotunda where exhibits could be held. Leland explained to Putnam that for many years historians had wanted "just one thing—a suitable archive building which should be just an archive building and nothing more." It would be inappropriate for historians now to ask the government to incur the additional expense of having the archives building serve a memorial purpose. However, Leland told Putnam that historians had no objection to Legion members lobbying for an archives building that would contain a place for memorial exhibits. While the Legionnaires should point out to congressmen that historical interests had not originated the idea of a memorial section in the building, they could indicate that historians did not object to the proposal. Leland thought that by taking a cooperative attitude on the question of a memorial section he could insure the Legion's active support of the archives. Jameson, who was abroad during Leland's discussions with Putnam, assured Leland that
he had taken the right course of action. The Legion began to lend wholehearted support to the movement for an archives building. It passed resolutions in favor of the archives, promoted the subject in publications, and its members urged congressmen to support the project.

While grassroots support for the archives grew, legislative developments continued to be unfavorable. In making his budget estimates for fiscal 1923, Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon requested $500,000 to acquire a site for the archives. Then, when the item came before the House subcommittee on the Treasury Appropriation Bill, James A. Wetmore was asked: "When was this authorized?" Wetmore erroneously replied: "The building itself, in my opinion, has never been authorized." The subcommittee chairman therefore eliminated the item. Jameson got Representative Frederick W. Dallinger of Massachusetts to introduce an amendment to restore the item, and Dallinger made a speech on the subject based on materials that Jameson had provided

37 Leland to Jameson, August 25, 1921, Box 105, File 991, ibid.; and Jameson to Leland, September 7, 1921, ibid.

38 Putnam to Leland, November 25, 1921, Box 57, File 136, ibid. For examples of the Legion's activities on behalf of the archives, see resolutions passed by the Fifth Annual Convention of the American Legion in ibid. For a more detailed account of the Legion's growing interest in the archives, see Gondos, "Archives," 257-79.

39 Jameson to Reed Smoot, January 10, 1922, Flippin Collection, XVII, 86-87.
But Representative Thomas Blanton of Texas made a point of order against the amendment, based on his belief that the section of the Public Buildings Act of 1913 that required a commission to approve a site had not been executed. The chair sustained Blanton's point of order. 41

Jameson was discouraged by the proceedings in the House. He wrote to Andrew C. McLaughlin:

... I don't think we shall get the thing this session. Perhaps in 1923, perhaps in 1933, or in 1943. Francis Bacon proposed the British Public Record Office in 1616 and they got it in 1856. 42

But Jameson was not ready to give up. Because Poindexter was out of town, he sought the aid of Smoot in getting an appropriation for a site. In a letter of January 10, 1922, he explained to Smoot what had happened in the House and told him it was a matter of record that the commission created by the act of 1913 had met and had properly discharged its functions. Jameson described the need for an archives building and pointed out that public support for the project had been constantly growing. He warned Smoot that if the appropriation was introduced in the Senate there probably would be an objection to it on the basis that the government already owned ample land for


41 Jameson to Reed Smoot, January 10, 1922, Flippin Collection, XVII, 88-89; and Jameson to Andrew C. McLaughlin, January 11, 1922, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.

42 Ibid.
constructing an archives building. In fact, Jameson explained, the government owned no lots large enough to accommodate a building of 9,000,000 cubic feet. Having briefed Smoot on the situation, Jameson told him that if he could get an appropriation for a site the historians of the nation would be grateful to him.43

Shortly after he received Jameson's letter, Smoot introduced an amendment to restore the $500,000 appropriation for purchasing a site. After considerable debate, Smoot's amendment passed the Senate. When the amendment came before the House, Representatives Dallinger and Fess defended it. However, the House voted it down by a vote of 131 to 8, and when the appropriation bill went to a conference committee, the Senate conferees agreed to drop the amendment.44 Thus died any hope for an appropriation in the First session of the Sixty-seventh Congress. Despite his great disappointment, Jameson was able to discuss the outcome with some humor. To Hubert Hall, he wrote:

One week after the vote we had a fire on the roof of the Treasury Building . . . and if the fire had gone thirty feet further it would have reached the attic where old Treasury archives are kept. The same thing happened last year one week after the vote. We must try to have our fires earlier; then an immediate impression could be made.45

43Jameson to Smoot, January 10, 1922, Flippin Collection, XVII, 86-100.


45Jameson to Hall, March 3, 1922, Box 91, File 695, ibid.
Jameson had watched the House debate Smoot's amendment and concluded from it that the House was not likely to appropriate funds for a site in the foreseeable future. He believed that one reason for the unfavorable vote was the desire of many members that "post offices in their districts should be built first. . . ." However, the main reason for the House's action was opposition to the government buying more land in the District of Columbia. Therefore, Jameson concluded that the best hope for success would be to propose in the next congressional session erection of an archives building on land already owned by the government. 46

Although the attempt to secure a congressional appropriation in early 1922 was unsuccessful, public support for the archives continued to increase. Eben Putnam asked Jameson to prepare a resolution on the archives for presentation to the Convention of the Military Order of the World War. Jameson responded with a draft that recounted the evils of archival arrangements in Washington and pointed out that "every other civilized government" had constructed an archives building. The resolution emphasized that papers growing out of World War I had added greatly to government records and thus had increased the need for an archives building. It concluded with a plea to Congress to appropriate funds for an archives building at the "earliest

moment." The Convention adopted Jameson's resolution, and Jameson thanked Putnam for this additional contribution to the movement.\textsuperscript{47} Other veterans organizations similarly petitioned Congress.\textsuperscript{48}

A Washington resident named Evelyn B. Baldwin initiated his own campaign for the archives. He prepared a resolution on the subject, which he sent to Jameson. Jameson helped Baldwin to polish the resolution and sent him, for "ammunition," a speech that Fess had made on the archives in Congress in 1916. Baldwin then wrote to state historical societies and history departments of state universities, enclosing the resolution. He urged the recipients to pass the resolution or one of similar import and forward it to the President, the Vice-President, and their congressman; to write to their senators and representatives urging that they work for an archives building; and to protest to Martin B. Madden, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, elimination of the budget item providing an appropriation for the archives.\textsuperscript{49} Shortly after he received Baldwin's letter, Charles H. Hull of Cornell warned Jameson that

\textsuperscript{47}Jameson to Putnam, September 9, 1922, \textit{ibid.}; Putnam to Jameson, September 20, 1922, \textit{ibid.}; and Jameson to Putnam, November 1, 1922, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{48}Resolution adopted by President's Own Garrison, No. 104, Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., in \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{49}Baldwin to Jameson, October 21, 1922, \textit{ibid.}; Jameson to Baldwin, October 21, 1922, \textit{ibid.}; Jameson to Baldwin, October 24, 1922, \textit{ibid.}; and Baldwin's circular letter, October 28, 1922, \textit{ibid.}
Baldwin was "somewhat incoherently" urging "a letter drive against congressmen in favor of an archive building."
Although Hull believed that he could get a large number of letters written, he asked Jameson: "Do you want it done just now?"  
Jameson explained to Hull that Baldwin was "an enthusiastic person, of moderate intelligence," who was anxious to do everything possible for the archives. Jameson had encouraged Baldwin's campaign, for it would "help to keep the project alive in the minds of congressmen, and to create or maintain a favorable atmosphere. . . ." Twisting a phrase, Jameson added: "He that is not against us is with us."  

H. H. Raege, a member of the American Legion, also took up the archives movement with enthusiasm. He assured Jameson that the Legion could "get an archive building right off the bat," either through the House Appropriations Committee or the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. However, as Jameson explained to Leland, Raege's confidence was based on the Legion's recent success in getting Congress to appropriate $17,000,000 to build hospitals for veterans of World War I. Jameson doubted that members of the American Legion would "be as mad at not getting a National Archive Building as at not getting the

50 Hull to Jameson, November 27, 1922, *ibid.*

51 Jameson to Hull, December 1, 1922, *ibid.*
In May, 1922, Smoot came up with a rather surreptitious method of getting the archives through Congress. He would try to persuade Secretary Mellon to purchase a site for the archives and thus compel Congress to appropriate necessary funds. Although Jameson believed that Mellon had the authority to take such action, he doubted that he would do so. More important, Jameson thought it would be unwise to "fly in the face of the House," for such action would "make bad feeling for the whole project. . . ." Jameson preferred more conventional tactics in his attempt to get an archives building.

Although early in 1922 Jameson had concluded that Congress would appropriate funds for an archives building only if it was constructed on land already owned by the government, by August he decided to make another attempt to have a site purchased. Treasury Secretary Mellon had submitted a $500,000 estimate for fiscal 1924 for the purchase of a site. After Mellon submitted the estimate, Jameson met with Director of the Budget H. M. Lord and later sent him a lengthy letter in support of the estimate. Jameson repeated the familiar arguments in favor of an archives

---

52 Jameson to Leland, April 25, 1922, Donnan and Stock (eds.), Historian's World, 268.

53 Jameson to Leland, May 29, 1922, ibid., 274.

54 Jameson to Charles H. Hull, December 1, 1922, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.
building. He told Lord that even "those members of the House who opposed the appropriation in the last session said they 'were in favor of our having a National Archive Building, but'--." Jameson also tried to clear up misunderstandings that had come up in congressional debates. First, it had been said that construction of the building was not authorized; in fact, the acts of 1913 and 1916 had provided the necessary authorization. Second, although Blanton had charged that the commission created in 1913 had not discharged its function of approving a site, the commission had taken the necessary action. Finally, while some congressmen had contended that the government owned plenty of land for a site, a report prepared by Colonel Charles H. S. Sherrill for the Public Buildings Commission proved that sites thought to be available for an archives building either were committed to other purposes or were unsuitable. Jameson therefore hoped that Lord would allow the estimate to remain in the budget. Smoot also urged Lord to retain the estimate. But Lord, "having his orders from the President to make both ends meet," cut out the estimate.

By late 1922, Jameson had come to the conclusion that the House probably would not approve an archives building,

55 Jameson to Lord, August 17, 1922, Box 57, File 135, ibid.
56 Jameson to Eben Putnam, September 9, 1922, Box 57, File 136, ibid.
57 Jameson to Charles H. Hull, December 1, 1922, ibid.
or other additional construction in the District of Columbia, until an omnibus public buildings act passed. He explained to Charles H. Hull that while every member of the House acknowledged the need for an archives building, most of them did not "care a fortieth part as much about that as they do about that post-office in Podunk." But once a "gigantic Pork Barrel. Bill" seemed likely to pass, the Senate probably would demand that the bill include provisions for the archives. Although an omnibus act and the archives now seemed inextricably connected, there was little hope of getting either approved in the congressional session that opened in December, 1922. Nevertheless, in the Fourth session of the Sixty-seventh Congress Jameson's Senate allies once again tried to do something for archival preservation.

Smoot proposed a makeshift solution. In January, 1923, he introduced an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill to provide $1,000,000 for placing steel stacks in the old Pension Office Building as a temporary repository for the archives. The Senate adopted Smoot's amendment, but it died in conference. Jameson was not sorry to see it fail, for he considered the proposal unsafe, dangerous, and likely to defer indefinitely the construction of an archives building.

58 Ibid.
60 Jameson to Eben Putnam, February 8, 1923, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.
Poindexter also introduced an amendment, which Jameson had drawn up, to the independent offices appropriations bill. Poindexter's amendment appropriated $500,000 to begin construction of an archives building on land owned by the government; Jameson still thought there was a chance the House would accept a Senate bill on the archives if it did not require the purchase of additional land. The Senate passed Poindexter's amendment on January 21, 1923.\(^{61}\) Jameson immediately contacted members of the House to urge passage of the amendment; he went to great pains to explain that the building was authorized so as to avoid the misunderstandings that had arisen the last time the House considered funds for the archives.\(^{62}\) Members of the American Legion also applied pressure for House adoption of the amendment.\(^{63}\) A conference committee, however, recommended that the amendment be dropped, and the House agreed to this recommendation.\(^{64}\) Jameson again accepted defeat with a degree of humor. Shortly after the Sixty-seventh Congress adjourned, he wrote to Hubert Hall:

\[\ldots\] Congress held its closing session Sunday morning. I did not attend the obsequies, but felt


\(^{62}\)See, for example, Jameson to Abram P. Andrew, January 24, 1923, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Theodore Burton, January 24, 1923, \textit{ibid.}

\(^{63}\)Jameson to Eben Putnam, February 8, 1923, \textit{ibid.}

\(^{64}\)Gondos, "Archives," 358-60.
as Judge Hoar did regarding the funeral of Governor Butler, whom he detested; someone asked him satirically if he was going to attend. "No," said the Judge, "I do not expect to be able to attend, but the proceedings have my entire approval."65

Although the Poindexter amendment had failed, Jameson felt that gains had been made in the recent session of Congress. First, the Senate debates had increased congressional interest in the archives.66 Second, members of Congress had had it proved to them that an archives building was authorized; the President of the Senate had overruled a point of order that the building was not authorized, and the Speaker of the House had indicated he would do likewise. Finally, the fact that the Senate had voted funds for actual construction of an archives building was an advance over the previous year's proceedings.67 Despite these gains, Jameson had suffered an irreplaceable loss. Miles Poindexter had been defeated for reelection in 1922, so his effort on behalf of the archives early in 1923 was his last.

The movement for an archives building in 1923 continued as if on a treadmill. Veterans organizations again passed resolutions in favor of the archives.68 Historians

65Jameson to Hall, March 7, 1923, Box 91, File 695, Jameson Papers.

66Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1923, 80.


68Jameson to Eben Putnam, February 26, 1923, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.
continued to write to their congressmen, although Jameson was convinced that the House members would be slow to act on the archives because they were "far more interested in the post-office building at Podunk than they are in anything in the District of Columbia." The Treasury again submitted estimates, this time for both the purchase of a site and for the beginning of construction, Jameson again urged that the estimates be retained, and again they were eliminated.

In September, 1923, Jameson presented the case for the archives to President Calvin Coolidge. First, he traced for Coolidge the legislative history of the archives from the Public Buildings Act of 1913 to the time of his letter. He explained that the Treasury had submitted for fiscal 1925 budget estimates of $484,000 for the purchase of the site selected in 1918 and $500,000 for beginning construction. Jameson, however, was certain that the House would not approve either estimate. But Jameson thought that if the Director of the Budget substituted for the Treasury's estimates a request for $300,000 for construction on land already owned by the government it would have a good chance of passing the House. If the Director of the Budget made such an estimate and the House approved it, Jameson would be

---

69Evarts B. Greene to Jameson, February 23, 1923, Box 87, File 646, ibid.; and Jameson to Greene, February 26, 1923, ibid.

70Jameson to Mr. Klover, October 22, 1923, Box 57, File 136, ibid.; and Jameson to Eben Putnam, July 22, 1924, ibid.
satisfied. For one, $300,000 was about as much money as would be needed for the archives in fiscal 1925. Second, Jameson had located two sites that were suitable for construction of an archives building; both had temporary buildings on them that were in poor condition.\textsuperscript{71}

Jameson next described why an archives building was needed. The main arguments, he explained, "lie on the business side." Government records were crowded, scattered, and subject to destruction. The government was paying $101,000 annually to rent storage space for its archives, the dispersion of records caused great delay in the conduct of governmental affairs, and fire had destroyed large quantities of government papers. In short, Jameson stated, "economy, efficiency, and safety all call for such a building."\textsuperscript{72}

Finally, Jameson requested that Coolidge do two things to advance the archives. First, he asked that in his next message to Congress Coolidge "forcibly" recommend construction of an archives building. Congressmen did not have a vested interest in the archives, no large body of voters was "deeply excited on the subject," and heads of executive departments had been unable to get an archives building. If the proposal for an archives building was to succeed, it needed "a strong push from the Executive

\textsuperscript{71} Jameson to Coolidge, September 29, 1923, \textit{ibid.}

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Ibid.}
himself." Second, Jameson asked Coolidge to get the Director of the Budget to take favorable action on an estimate for the archives. 73

Coolidge failed to recommend an archives building. However, late in 1923 he recommended to Congress that it appropriate $5,000,000 annually for ten years to construct "public buildings in the District of Columbia." Before Coolidge could request an appropriation for this building program, Congress would have to pass authorizing legislation. Jameson, however, tried to get the archives building placed in a "privileged position." He explained to Coolidge and to the Director of the Budget that funds for the archives could be appropriated immediately because the authorizations already had passed Congress. But Jameson was unable to get Coolidge to propose a direct appropriation for the archives; instead, the building would "have to take its fate, first with the general appropriation of $5,000,000, and then among it against the other buildings clamored for." 74

In the First session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, Representative Richard N. Elliott of Indiana introduced a bill to authorize construction in the District of Columbia along the lines recommended by Coolidge. However, Elliott's bill died in committee. 75 In Jameson's opinion, Coolidge's

73Ibid.
74Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, December 12, 1923, ibid.
recommendation failed to pass due primarily to opposition
from Representative John W. Langley of Kentucky, Chairman of
the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
Langley had "served notice time and again" that he would
"not approve of any proposals for building anything in
Washington until some 'relief can be had for the suffering
districts in which additional post-offices needed to be
built.'" As Jameson realized, further construction in
Washington depended upon passage of an omnibus public
buildings act.\textsuperscript{76}

Because Congress delayed passage of a building
program, Jameson began to consider an alternative method of
acquiring an archives building. In October, 1924, Ernest D.
Lewis, editor of \textit{The Roosevelt Quarterly}, informed Waldo G.
Leland that he had been following with interest the movement
for the archives. Lewis suggested to Leland that someone
from the AHA get in touch with the Roosevelt Memorial
Association to see if the Association could be persuaded to
construct an archives building as a memorial to Roosevelt.\textsuperscript{77}
Leland transmitted Lewis' letter to Jameson, who in turn

\textsuperscript{76}Jameson to Henry M. Wriston, April 12, 1924, Box 138, File 1802, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{77}Lewis to Leland, October 21, 1924, Box 57, File 136, \textit{ibid.}. 
wrote to James R. Garfield, President of the Roosevelt Memorial Association. 78 Jameson explained to Garfield that the AHA had been promoting an archives building for nearly two decades. While Jameson acknowledged that the federal government was the logical agency to provide archival care, he suggested that "in view of President Roosevelt's great interest in American history (as well as in efficiency in the management of government) such a building might not be an inappropriate memorial to him." 79

Garfield agreed that an archives building would be a fitting memorial to Roosevelt. However, he doubted that contributors to the Roosevelt Memorial Association wanted their donations spent on such a structure. Garfield nevertheless agreed to present Jameson's suggestion to his association. 80 As Jameson probably expected, the Executive Committee of the Roosevelt Memorial Association refused to provide a building that they felt was the responsibility of the federal government. 81 Jameson would have to rely on federal action after all.

78 Jameson to Lewis, December 3, 1924, ibid.
79 Jameson to Garfield, December 3, 1924, ibid.
80 Garfield to Jameson, December 6, 1924, ibid.
81 Hermann Hagedon to Jameson, January 12, 1925, ibid.
In his budget message to Congress in December, 1924, Coolidge again urged a systematic program for constructing public buildings in the District of Columbia.\textsuperscript{82} During the next year, 1925, bills were introduced in the House and Senate for construction of public buildings both within and outside of the District. It now seemed possible that there would be an omnibus act and that the archives would be carried along with it. However, the bills differed so widely in nature that there was a prolonged and inconclusive struggle between the House and Senate, and neither bill became law.\textsuperscript{83}

In December, 1925, Coolidge once again urged Congress to pass a public building act. Congress finally acted. In January, 1926, Representative Elliott and Senator Smoot introduced parallel bills authorizing expenditures of $150,000,000 for construction in the District of Columbia and in the states. The House bill soon passed with amendments and was referred to the Senate where it was further amended. A conference committee ironed out the differences, and on May 25, 1926, the first public buildings act since

\textsuperscript{82}Gondos, "Archives," 284-85.

\textsuperscript{83}Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1925, 79.
1913 became law. The act put the Secretary of the Treasury in charge of having constructed a variety of public buildings; $50,000,000 was authorized for projects in the District of Columbia. Of significant import for the archives, the act provided that the Public Buildings Commission, created in 1919, would decide in what order buildings in the District of Columbia would be constructed. The chairman of the Public Buildings Commission was Reed Smoot.

Before the Public Buildings Act passed, Jameson urged Smoot that the Public Buildings Commission give special attention to an archives building. He reiterated that such a building would increase the efficiency of transacting government business and would be a boon to historians. He therefore hoped that the Commission would put the archives building high on its agenda. The Public Buildings Commission met in early June, and after the meeting Smoot announced that an archives building would be the first project to be taken up by the Commission. Jameson told Eben Putnam: "I am now able to expect to see a National Archive


85 Statutes at Large, XLIV, Part 1, 630-34.

86 Jameson to Smoot, April 2, 1926, Flippin Collection, XIX, 154-56.
Building here in Washington before I die."\textsuperscript{87} In a lighter vein, he told Leland that "at present my favorite Senator is Hon. Reed Smoot . . . and I am thinking of joining the Mormon Church [Smoot was a Mormon elder]. . . ."\textsuperscript{88}

Before an archives building was absolutely assured, an appropriation to implement the provisions of the Public Buildings Act had to pass Congress. Jameson was confident that the appropriation would pass,\textsuperscript{89} and his optimism was well founded. The deficiency appropriation act of July 3, 1926, appropriated $1,000,000 for the acquisition of a site for an archives building and authorized the Secretary of the Treasury "to enter into contracts for the entire estimated cost of such building," for a sum not to exceed $6,900,000.\textsuperscript{90}

Congratulatory notes poured into Jameson's office. Rosa Pendleton Chiles told him that "but for your unwearied labors the bill would never have been put through. The

\textsuperscript{87}Jameson to Putnam, June 4, 1926, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.

\textsuperscript{88}Jameson to Leland, June 3, 1926, Box 107, File 1007, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{89}Jameson to Eben Putnam, June 4, 1926, Box 57, File 136, \textit{ibid}.

\textsuperscript{90}\textit{Statutes at Large}, XLIV, Part 1, 841, 874.
archives building is your work, and a fine task it was." 91 John C. Fitzpatrick told Jameson that "to you more than to any other one man belongs the lion's share of the credit, and I feel sure that no one could successfully dispute this." 92 James G. McDonald, Chairman of the Foreign Policy Association, wrote: "Without your untiring zeal an indifferent Congress could never have been stirred to action. All of us are your debtors." 93 The self-effacing Jameson acknowledged that he deserved such praise. He wrote to Miss Chiles: "Everyone is to be congratulated . . . but persons like you and me who really tried to do something about it, may well feel that we are specially to be congratulated." 94

After nearly twenty years of effort, Jameson's goal of an archives building was within reach. But before the building was completed, government officials spent several years deciding upon a site, settling issues related to construction, and determining a system for administering the

91Chiles to Jameson, June 2, 1926, Box 71, File 351, Jameson Papers.

92Fitzpatrick to Jameson, June 15, 1926, Box 57, File 136, ibid.

93McDonald to Jameson, July 2, 1926, ibid.

94Jameson to Chiles, June 3, 1926, Box 71, File 351, ibid.
archives. Jameson was anxious to lend his assistance to these endeavors, and government officials were more than ready to consult the man who had laid the groundwork for the national archives.
CHAPTER X

THE COMPLETION OF THE ARCHIVES AND THE
SELECTION OF AN ARCHIVIST

Before construction of the archives building could begin, a site had to be selected. Initially, the Public Buildings Commission planned to use the site that the Treasury had chosen in 1918, a square bounded by Twelfth and Thirteenth and B and C Streets, Northwest. In the spring of 1927, however, a conference of archivists convened by the Treasury Department recommended that the site be changed to the area between Ninth and Tenth Streets and B Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest. The Public Buildings Commission approved this recommendation.

Jameson feared that the Public Buildings Commission was not moving quickly enough on the archives. In June, 1927, he read in the newspaper that buildings for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the Internal Revenue Service would have precedence over the

---

1 Jameson to Waldo G. Leland, June 3, 1926, Box 107, File 1007, Jameson Papers.
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archives in the construction program within the District of Columbia. Jameson told Reed Smoot that while departments such as Agriculture were large and influential, no government agency was actively promoting the archives. He asked Smoot to get the Public Buildings Commission to push for acquisition of the site and for erection of the building. Smoot explained to Jameson that the government already owned the sites for the Agriculture, Commerce, and Internal Revenue Service buildings. The site for the archives building, by contrast, had to be bought. Smoot assured Jameson that he was concerned about the archives and would get action on it as soon as possible.

Early in 1928, the Justice Department began condemnation proceedings on the site. Two years later, however, the Board of Architectural Consultants recommended still another location for the archives. This site, bounded by Ninth and Seventh Streets and B Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, was owned by the government. In July, 1930, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to begin construction on the site. Ground was broken on September 9, 1931, and on February 20, 1933, President

---

3 Jameson to Smoot, June 22, 1927, Box 57, File 137, Jameson Papers.

4 Smoot to Jameson, June 23, 1927, ibid.

5 Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Years 1927 and 1928, 176.
Herbert Hoover laid the cornerstone for the archives building.\textsuperscript{6}  

Even before the final site was selected, government officials consulted Jameson on architectural matters. In September, 1926, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Charles Dewey asked Jameson to attend and to recommend participants for a conference on plans for the archives building.\textsuperscript{7} Jameson suggested three names to Dewey. Herbert Putnam should attend the conference because he was familiar with a building similar to archives buildings and because he had experience with materials that were used by government officials and the public. Charles Moore, Chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, should be consulted because the contents and activities of the Division of Manuscripts closely resembled those of an archives. Worthington C. Ford also should be present; while Chief of the Division of Manuscripts he had visited many foreign archives, and he was quite familiar with government records in Washington. Dewey accepted Jameson's recommendations.\textsuperscript{8}  

In 1930, the government again sought Jameson's advice


\textsuperscript{7}Jameson to Christian A. Bach, September 3, 1926, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.  

\textsuperscript{8}Jameson to Charles S. Dewey, September 4, 1926, ibid.; and Dewey to Jameson, September 17, 1926, ibid.
on the archives. President Hoover appointed an advisory committee, comprised of Jameson and representatives from the State Department, the Treasury Department, the War Department, the Interior Department, and the General Accounting Office, to supply information for determining the size and character of the archives building. The committee based its deliberations on the assumption that the building would contain about 10,000,000 cubic feet of space. It concluded that during the first fifty years of operation less than fifty per cent of this capacity would be needed. For this reason, not all the stacks would have to be built at the outset. On the other hand, the space requirements for government papers eventually would exceed the capacity of the building. Therefore, it would be necessary to concentrate the stacks by excluding from the stack area natural light and air. The committee recommended that the building contain a general search room and two smaller search rooms. There also should be a library, filled mainly with government documents, in close proximity to the search rooms. Architects and engineers utilized these recommendations in constructing the archives building.

---

9"Report of the Advisory Committee on the National Archives Building, 1930," 51, Flippin Collection, XXI, 91. For Jameson's contributions to the committee, see the draft of the paper which he prepared for the committee. Ibid., XXI, 63-75.


The problem to which Jameson gave most attention was the creation of an administrative establishment for the archives. In June, 1926, Jameson explained to Senator Fess that an archival organization needed to be set up long before the building was completed; otherwise, the staff of the archives would be overwhelmed by incoming records and chaos would result. Several years earlier, Jameson had drawn up a memorandum on an archival establishment; he now offered to prepare a revised memorandum and send it to Fess along with a draft of a bill on archival organization.12

Jameson completed the memorandum in November, 1927. In it, he explained that each department of the government, at the outset at least, would want full liberty to manage and consult the papers it had deposited in the archives building. However, successful administration of the archives would require a high degree of uniformity in the classification, accessibility, and use of documents. It was necessary to reconcile the habits and jealousies of departments with the need for a uniform system. In Jameson's opinion, departmental hostility could be reduced by creating an establishment that was not attached to any one department but that was independent of all. However, he feared that creation of a wholly independent establishment would lead to archivists being appointed because of their political

---

12 Jameson to Fess, June 23, 1926, Box 57, File 136, Jameson Papers.
influence. Jameson therefore thought that the Librarian of Congress should be appointed "Director of the Archives." Although future Librarians of Congress might not be as well qualified as Herbert Putnam, Putnam's long and successful tenure made it likely that Presidents would appoint men of high standards to serve as Librarian. A competent Librarian far more likely would appoint a top rate archivist than would a head of an executive department to whom the archives was an incidental matter.13

The Librarian of Congress would appoint the Archivist, who would be in charge of the national archives. He also would appoint two assistant archivists. The Assistant Archivist in charge of the Division of General Administration would have under his immediate direction "functions relating to personnel, disbursing, supplies, files, the photographic or photostat room, the bindery, and the superintendent of the building." The Assistant Archivist in charge of the Division of Operations "would have jurisdiction over the work of classification and indexing, the library, the map room, the superintendency of the public search room, and the superintendency of stacks and rooms for government searches." Under this arrangement, the national archives would not be subordinate to the Library of Congress. Rather, the proposed organization was analagous to the arrangement

13"Memorandum on Organization of the National Archives," Flippin Collection, XX, 13-17.
by which the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, and the Bureau of American Ethnology, three independent establishments, all were headed by the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.\(^{14}\)

According to Jameson, the archives should be classified and arranged in accordance with the arrangement in the offices from which they originated. When a department sent a large amount of material to the archives building, the head of that department should appoint a departmental staff member to have charge of the deposit. The departments also should play a role in making regulations for the "classification, custody, use, and loan" of the material. This could best be done by creating an Archive Council. The Council would contain representatives from each department that had substantial deposits in the archives building. The Director of the Archives would chair the Council, and the Archivist would serve as its Secretary. The Council would meet at least once a year to frame regulations for the handling of records and to consider the destruction of useless papers.\(^{15}\)

Jameson also wanted to have a National Historical Publications Commission made part of the archival establishment. The Director of the Archives would be the Chairman of the Commission, and the Archivist would be the Secretary. Other members would include the Chief of the Historical Section of the War Department General Staff, the

\(^{14}\)Ibid., 16-21. \(^{15}\)Ibid., 23-25.
Superintendent of Naval Records in the Navy Department, the Chief of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress, and two members of the AHA. The Commission would help the government to produce documentary historical publications that were "credible to the nation." 16

Shortly after Fess received Jameson's memorandum, he introduced a bill to create an archival establishment. The bill incorporated all of Jameson's recommendations. However, Smoot objected to the bill, and no further action was taken on it. 17

Early in 1929, Smoot, on behalf of the Public Buildings Commission, asked government agencies to appoint members of a committee to discuss an organization for the archives and to prepare a bill on the subject. The committee consisted of Jameson, Tyler Dennett from the State Department, the Chief Clerk of the War Department, and representatives from the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, and the Office of the Supervising Architect. After a number of meetings, the committee drafted a bill which Smoot introduced as S. 3354 on January 29, 1930. 18

16 Ibid., 25-29.
17 Cong. Rec., 70 Cong., 1 Sess., 347 (December 9, 1927), 3962 (March 2, 1928).
The Smoot bill provided for an archival establishment that was entirely independent of other agencies. It provided that the archives building and its contents would be under direct control of the Archivist of the United States, who would be appointed by the President. Like the Fess bill, it provided for a National Archives Council to aid the Archivist in making regulations for the "arrangement, custody, use, and withdrawal" of material in the archives building. Smoot's bill also included a National Historical Publications commission based on Jameson's recommendations. The bill established a detailed system for the transfer of government records to the archives building. Within six months of completion of the building, records through the year 1860 would be transferred; thereafter, papers covering sequential five year periods would be transferred every five years. Government agencies could transfer more recent records, provided they were approved by the National Archives Council and were not needed to transact current business.  

Smoot expected his bill to pass without difficulty. But the Senate became so preoccupied with the tariff and other issues that the bill was not reported. However, the Smoot bill had established a precedent; all subsequent bills

\[19\text{S. 3354, 71 Cong., 2 Sess., Flippin Collection, XXI, 14.}\]

\[20\text{Jameson to Evarts B. Greene, March 10, 1930, Box 57, File 137, Jameson Papers.}\]

\[21\text{Jameson to Evarts B. Greene, March 29, 1930, ibid.}\]
on the archives provided for an establishment that was wholly independent of other agencies. During the next three years, several more bills on archival organization were introduced in Congress, but none passed. By 1934, the archives building was nearing completion, and creation of an archival establishment could be delayed no longer.

In 1934, three bills on an archival establishment were introduced in Congress. One was H. R. 8910, which Sol Bloom of New York had prepared with Jameson's help. Senator Kenneth McKellar of Tennessee unexpectedly introduced a bill, S. 3110, which had been drawn up by one of his constituents who aspired to become Archivist. Fess also introduced a bill, S. 2942. The Fess bill contained essentially the same provisions as the Smoot bill of 1930. While Jameson considered it the best of the three bills, Senator Tom Connally of Texas, Chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, failed to get it out of committee. The real contest thus was between the Bloom

\[\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\text{See, for example, S. 689, 72 Cong., 1 Sess. Flippin Collection, XXII, 18; S. 692, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., ibid., 20; and S. 161, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., ibid., XXII, 69.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\text{H. R. 8910, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., ibid., XXIII, 20; and Jameson to Bloom, January 9, 1934, Box 57, File 137, Jameson Papers.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\text{S. 3110, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., Flippin Collection, XXIII, 7; Jameson to A. R. Newsome, March 22, 1934, Box 57, File 137, Jameson Papers; and Jameson to Convers Read, ibid.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\text{S. 2942, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., Flippin Collection, XXIII, 2; and Jameson to A. R. Newsome, March 22, 1934, Box 57, File 137, Jameson Papers.}\]
bill and the McKellar bill. Jameson considered both to be basically good proposals.\textsuperscript{26} However, one important difference in the bills caused Jameson to favor H. R. 8910. McKellar's bill gave the Archivist a much greater degree of authority to decide what records should be transferred to the archives building than did the Bloom bill. Jameson feared that the McKellar bill would arouse departmental hostility, that some member of the House would be convinced to oppose it, and that, as a result, no bill would pass.\textsuperscript{27}

The Bloom bill passed the House on April 16. When the bill reached the Senate, the Committee on the Library recommended that the McKellar bill, reintroduced as S. 3681, be substituted for it. The Library Committee also recommended that the salary of the Archivist be $8,000 instead of $10,000 as provided by both the Bloom and McKellar bills.\textsuperscript{28}

The Senate approved the Library Committee's recommendations. The House disagreed with the Senate's action, and a committee of conference met to resolve the differences. The conference committee recommended adoption, with minor modifications, of the McKellar bill with restoration of the

\textsuperscript{26}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{27}Jameson to Simeon D. Fess, April 23, 1934, \textit{ibid.} For a side by side comparison of the two bills, see \textit{Cong. Rec.}, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 9707-9708 (May 28, 1934).

$10,000 salary. The House accepted the report of the conference committee.\textsuperscript{29}

The National Archives Act of 1934 provided that the Archivist would have full power to requisition for transfer to the archives building records that the National Archives Council had approved for transfer. The Archivist would make regulations for the "arrangement, custody, use, and withdrawl" of material in the archives building. The heads of government departments, however, could exempt from examination by public officials and private citizens confidential material transferred from their offices. The act also created a National Historical Publications Commission.\textsuperscript{30}

Although Jameson had preferred the Bloom bill, he told Tyler Dennett that

\begin{quote}
... the act is good in the main, and workable. Anyhow, the main point is that an act was passed. There was a time when I feared that the session would end without this.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

With the archives building nearing completion and an establishment for the archives having been created, it was necessary to select an Archivist. Early in 1933, Dunbar Rowland, Director of the Mississippi Department of Archives

\textsuperscript{29}Cong. Rec., 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 11268-69 (June 12, 1934), 11624 (June 15, 1934), 11696 (June 15, 1934), 12068 (June 16, 1934), 12161 (June 16, 1934); and U. S. Congress, House, Committee of Conference, Establish a National Archives of the United States Government, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 1934, H. Rept. 2048.

\textsuperscript{30}Statutes at Large, XLVIII, Part 1, 1122-23.

\textsuperscript{31}Jameson to Dennett, June 19, 1934, Box 57, File 137, Jameson Papers.
and History, had started a campaign to get himself appointed Archivist. Albert Shaw recommended to Jameson that Rowland get the job.\(^{32}\) Rosa Pendleton Chiles, hearing of Rowland's campaign, asked Jameson to apprise her of Rowland's qualifications and to tell her what Roland had done in the movement for the archives. Miss Chiles told Jameson that if he, Jameson, wanted the position of Archivist he should have first claim on it.\(^{33}\) Jameson informed Shaw that Rowland was too old to be Archivist and, besides, that he was not particularly well qualified.\(^{34}\) Similarly, he informed Miss Chiles that Rowland was not well suited for the job and that he had not done much in the campaign to get an archives building. In his letter to Miss Chiles, Jameson took himself out of contention; not only was he too old to be Archivist, but also he had no desire for the post.\(^{35}\)

Jameson professed to have no candidate for Archivist. Nor did he think that the AHA should have a candidate. The AHA's only action should be to urge the President to appoint someone with outstanding administrative abilities.\(^{36}\) Conyers Read, Executive Secretary of the AHA, generally agreed with

\(^{32}\)Shaw to Jameson, March 23, 1933, ibid.

\(^{33}\)Chiles to Jameson, March 27, 1933, ibid.

\(^{34}\)Jameson to Shaw, March 28, 1933, ibid.

\(^{35}\)Jameson to Chiles, April 1, 1933, ibid.

\(^{36}\)Ibid.; and Jameson to Conyers Read, May 20, 1933, Box 124, File 1405, ibid.
Jameson. He thought that the AHA should define the qualifications of the Archivist and, possibly, submit a list of names for the President to choose from.\footnote{Read to Solon Buck, May 11, 1934, Box 94, AHA Records.}

As time passed, however, pressure grew for the AHA to take a stand. In May, 1934, William E. Dodd, then American Ambassador to Germany, urged Read to have the AHA propose a person or persons to be Archivist.\footnote{Read to Jameson, May 11, 1934, \textit{ibid}.} During a subsequent meeting of the Executive Committee of the AHA, the names of Solon J. Buck, Waldo G. Leland, Dumas Malone, A. R. Newsome, R. D. W. Connor, and Randolph Adams were discussed, but no formal recommendation was made.\footnote{Read to Jameson, May 24, 1934, \textit{ibid}.} Also at the meeting, Jameson was appointed chairman of a committee to consider candidates for the position of Archivist.\footnote{Read to Jameson, November 30, 1934, Box 124, File 1405, Jameson Papers.} Jameson, perhaps against his better judgment, now openly expressed a preference.

In Jameson's opinion, Waldo G. Leland unquestionably was the ideal candidate for Archivist. Leland had great administrative ability, he was a tactful person, and he was eminently familiar with archives both in Washington and in foreign countries. Leland, however, did not want to exchange his position as Secretary of the American Council
of Learned Societies for that of Archivist. As a second choice, Jameson suggested R. D. W. Connor, then a professor of history at the University of North Carolina. Connor was "a man of affairs," he knew "how to deal with politicians," and he made "the impression of being a man of power." He had done a good job of organizing the North Carolina Historical Commission. Although Connor was not as familiar as Leland with European archives, he recently had gained experience with foreign archives while spending a year in the Public Record Office. The Senate probably would prefer Connor, a Southern Democrat, to any other candidate.  

Within the AHA, sentiment began to crystallize around Connor, and the committee of the AHA recommended that he be appointed Archivist. Throughout the summer of 1934, Jameson actively lobbied for Connor, getting public officials, historians, and other scholars to come to Connor's support. In September, Jameson recommended Connor's appointment to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The next month, Roosevelt summoned Connor to Washington and informed him that he would be the first Archivist of the United States.  

Soon the rest of the archives staff was appointed,  

---

41 Jameson to Read, May 28, 1934, Box 94, AHA Records.  
42 Read to Jameson, June 1, 1934, ibid.; and Read to Jameson, November 30, 1934, Box 124, File 1405, Jameson Papers.  
records began to pour into the building, and the National Archives became a functioning entity. 44

On Constitution Avenue, in Washington, D. C., midway between the Capitol and the White House, there is an elaborate columned entrance to a building which thousands of tourists visit annually. On the next street, Pennsylvania Avenue, there is a less impressive entrance to the same building. Just inside this entrance there hangs a plaque that bears the face of a bearded, elderly scholar. This plaque is a tribute to the man who, more than any other individual, made the National Archives a reality. But the plaque in the National Archives inadequately conveys the significance of Jameson's work. Publications of the Carnegie Institution, the American Historical Review, numerous government publications, and thousands of scholars who annually do research in federal records also bear witness to the importance of one dedicated historian—John Franklin Jameson.
CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSION

J. Franklin Jameson had the potential to become either a great scholar or a great administrator. His knowledge of history was both broad and deep. He was proficient in the use of the English language, his writings always being unambiguous and to the point. He was both persistent and patient. Although Jameson expected perfection in his own work, he was tolerant of the shortcomings of others; when colleagues failed to adequately fulfill their tasks, he rarely responded with an admonishment or an unkind word. He was deeply devoted to helping others; no matter how trivial a request for assistance might seem, Jameson invariably responded to it promptly and thoughtfully.

During Jameson's early career, it seemed that he might become one of America's most outstanding historical writers. He well could have written the comprehensive history of the South that he often contemplated writing. Certainly his intellectual abilities made him equal to the task. Yet Jameson failed to spend his most productive years writing historical works. Instead, he made his mark as an organizer of historical source material and as a lobbyist for federal aid to history.
Several reasons help explain why Jameson excelled as an "historian's historian" rather than as an historian in his own right. Although he was exceedingly well versed in historical data, Jameson did not enjoy struggling with the nuances of scholarly problems. Of equal importance, Jameson felt that he was not capable of writing great history. His fund of knowledge and his expertise in writing could not compensate for a basic lack of self-confidence. Furthermore, Jameson spread himself too thin. He devoted an immense, perhaps an inordinate, amount of time editing the American Historical Review and working on various projects of the AHA. With the passage of time, moreover, Jameson became increasingly preoccupied with minute details of historical editing and legislative procedure. Although this characteristic served him well as an organizer of research and as a lobbyist, it limited his accomplishments as a scholar. After Jameson became Director of the Department of Historical Research, his duties there precluded the possibility of his doing much scholarly writing.

But Jameson's failure to develop as a great writer was not all due to negative reasons. Jameson saw a distinct need for someone to assume leadership in making historical materials better available to scholars. In the early days of the historical profession, it was especially important that someone take responsibility for giving guidance and direction to the nation's historians. Jameson consciously decided to assume this responsibility, and he fulfilled it
very well.

In order to make historical materials more accessible and to better provide for their care, Jameson had to act as a lobbyist. In his lobbying efforts, Jameson was greatly influenced by foreign examples. When Jameson campaigned for a national historical publications commission, for individual documentary historical publications, and for a national archives building, he repeatedly alluded to European accomplishments in those areas and suggested that the United States follow Europe's lead. Although Jameson looked to Europe for inspiration and guidance, he emerged as a qualified lobbyist in his own right. He had an unequaled ability to mobilize American historians in support of worthwhile endeavors. His familiarity with the legislative process and with members of the federal government immeasurably increased his ability to get legislative and executive support for historical projects. Jameson also was a shrewd lobbyist. Although he mainly was interested in an archives building for the benefits it would provide to scholars, when he lobbied for the archives he repeatedly stressed that it would be a measure of economy and convenience for the government. This tactic undoubtedly helped increase governmental support for the archives.

Much like historians today, Jameson thought that the government should do more than it was doing to aid historical undertakings. Yet unlike present-day scholars, he did not fear that governmental aid to history would lead to
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governmental control of history. That a close tie between
the government and the historical profession might undermine
the profession's independence and objectivity never seemed
to trouble Jameson. Perhaps this was because Jameson was so
immersed in the nuts and bolts of legislative activity that
he did not have time to ponder the problems that might arise
from a close bond between history and the federal government.
Or perhaps Jameson simply was confident that if federally
sponsored programs were entrusted to competent scholars
there would be no danger of governmental interference. At
any rate, Jameson never seemed to doubt that federally aided
historical works, if executed by qualified historians, would
be beneficial and would involve no liabilities.

Jameson's accomplishments as a lobbyist were and
continue to be helpful to students of America's past. The
documentary historical publications that Jameson initiated
have provided a wealth of source material for historians.
The National Archives Building has made it immensely easier
for historians to do research in government records; as a
result, the quality of historical writing in America has
become increasingly sophisticated. Jameson also laid the
groundwork for continuing governmental aid to history. The
present-day National Historical Publications Commission
might never have been created if Jameson had not lobbied for
such a commission for nearly thirty years. The Fitzpatrick
edition of the Writings of George Washington, another of
Jameson's proposals, was the model for later compilations
of papers of American statesmen.

Jameson's career as a lobbyist is significant in other ways. For one, it suggests a need for scholars in the United States to more actively promote governmental aid to scholarly enterprises. Such a need is especially apparent in 1973 when the President is radically cutting back federal aid to educational and scholarly undertakings. Also, at a time when many Americans have become discouraged about the impact they can have upon public affairs, Jameson's story is proof that one dedicated person can have a significant effect upon governmental policies.

Perhaps there will never again be a historical lobbyist comparable to Jameson. Perhaps the historical profession has become too large and too fragmented for any individual to exercise Jameson's type of leadership. But in his day, J. Franklin Jameson, the historian as lobbyist, accomplished much for the advancement of historical undertakings in the United States. He should not be forgotten.
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